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CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: All right.
Thank you. We have a quorum present, so we'll start the meeting. Looks like we have a really big imbalance between the left wing here and the right one. You're in the right wing. I like being in the right wing. I'm just filling in.

First of all, I want just to a few mechanical things. I want to remind everybody that if you're speaking to please turn your microphone on; and if you're not, to please turn it off.

Also, as we get to the resolutions later in the meeting, if anybody has to recuse themselves, please state your name and agency and the reason for recusal. I wanted to mention -- okay, never mind.

I wanted to congratulate Dr .
Bendross-Mindingall on her reappointment to the Board. She's not here right now, but she might be. Judge Prescott also for receiving the Justice Peggy Quince Judicial Excellence Award. The award is named in honor of retired Supreme Court Justice, and honors outstanding judiciary
members for service, high standards of judicial conduct and their contributions to the administration of justice.

I want to congratulate the members of our Finance committee, Bill, Wendy, and the rest of the finance staff, on the receipt of the GFOA's Certificate of Achievement of Excellence in Financial Reporting for the 11 th year in a row. To those of you who don't know, it's the highest form of recognition in governmental accounting, and obtaining it represents a significant accomplishment. So thank you, Bill, and, finance staff.

Just a reminder that we'll be holding Champions for Children on April 11th. This year we're awarding -- Dr. William E. Pelham, Jr. will be posthumously awarded the David Lawrence Champion for Children's Award for his outstanding contributions to child welfare throughout his life, Dr. Pelham, who served for many years on the Trust Board and was director of the Center for Children and Families at Florida International University.

The Excellence in Direct Service Award will be given to Bianca Sandoval, a dedicated counselor at Kayleen's Learning Center Corp.

The Excellence in Youth Leadership Award will be given to Zoe Terry, a remarkable 12th grader at Miami Country Day School.

The Excellence in Advocacy Award will be given to Ruban Roberts for his advocacy work including his teen talk dialogue sessions program.

And, finally, we'll recognize three outstanding programs of the year: Our own, The Children's Trust Books for Free program, the Liberty City Optimist Club of Florida, Inc, and University of Miami Jump Start.

So $I$ hope you all will join us at that event to celebrate all those programs and individuals.

Finally, $I$ want to give you a
reminder that the Board retreat will be held February 22nd, in lieu of our next Board meeting. It will be at 8:30 a.m.,

United Way, right?
MR. HAJ: Probably.
CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: To be determined.

Okay. Are there any public comments?
MS. LEON: There are no public comments, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: Okay. Then
I'11 turn it over to -- (inaudible) is not here. So the minutes of the November 13th Board of Directors meeting were in your packets.

Is there a motion to approve those minutes?

BOARD MEMBER HINCAPIE: So moved, Hincapie.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: Hincapie.
Second?
BOARD MEMBER FERRADAZ: Second, so moved.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: A11 in favor?
COLLECTIVELY: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: Any opposed?
Okay, the motion carries. Thank you.
We have two -- Ms. Morris is not
going to be here today?
We have -- with us today are now former Board Member, Annie Neasman, who's a gubernatorial appointee for the last I think six years, or something like that, and we're here to give her an award for her service and to thank her for her service.

Annie, I think we originally met when we did a field trip to her Jessie Trice Agency, and she's just done outstanding work in our community, been an active member for our Board and we thank her for her service.

Jim, do you want to say something and then Annie you can come up here.

MR. HAJ: Sure, please.
Annie, always great seeing you. I just want to thank you for your years of service to this Board. Also, I think everybody knows Annie from Jessie Trice, but even before Jessie Trice, she had another career with the Florida Department of Health. And your leadership at the local level, at the statewide level and
just being an advocate for Children and Families and being a great friend to us, truly we appreciate. We tried to keep Annie on the Board, but she wants to go enjoy her retirement, so it's bittersweet, but we will miss you and I know that you will still be in the community advocating for Children and Families.

BOARD MEMBER NEASMAN: Just thank
you. It has been a tremendous journey for me. Serving the Children's Trust has been tremendously precious, because you all have taken care of the children and families in this community, and certainly my current organization has benefited from that with the many children that we serve in the schools and their families. We could not have done it without your support. And I know that you will continue to do that as the new CEO, his name is Ryan Hawkins, will be coming onboard next month. I know that you will be continuing to support those children, all children, throughout Miami-Dade County.

And, Jim, I can't thank you and staff for that trip that you talked about at Jessie Trice, which really tremendous and shows how much you care about the entire community. So thank you all very much for this.

MR. HAJ: Thank you, Annie.
BOARD MEMBER NEASMAN: Thank you for having me.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: With that, I'11 turn it over to Dr. Dan Bagner for the Nominating Committee report.

BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair.

So just to give everyone a little bit of a background, an e-mail was sent to the Board on October 30th soliciting applicants for the Board officer positions. The deadline for applications closed November 30th. And our chair, Ken Hoffman, indicated he will not serve another term as chair unfortunately, but we thank him for his tremendous service over the many years and appreciate him leading us as a board.

So Mark Trowbridge had indicated that he was interested in serving as Chair, and was nominated by three other Board Members for this specific position, for the Chair position. And then there was also one nomination for the Treasurer position in the event that Mark Trowbridge is chair, and that is Matt Arsenault, who is nominated for the Treasurer position. Vice Chair Pam Hollingsworth and Secretary Marissa Leichter also expressed interest in serving another term in their present positions.

No other applicants or nominees were presented to us. So we met as a committee, the nominating committee, on December 4th to approve this nomination, and we present the following slate of officers for you all to review and approve: As Chair, Mark Trowbridge, as I mentioned; as Vice Chair, Pam

Hollingsworth; as Treasurer, Matt Arsenault and as Secretary, Marissa Leichter. We approved this slate unanimously and presenting it to you for
your approval.
So, as such, I'd like to have a motion to approve this nomination for slate of officers to serve between April 2024 and April 2026.

BOARD MEMBER SALVER: I'11 move it, Salver.

BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: Can I have a second?

BOARD MEMBER GERSTEIN: (Inaudible).
BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: Any discussion? Okay, with that, all in favor?

COLLECTIVELY: Aye.
BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: Any opposed?
That passes. Our new -- congratulations to our new board members.

And thank you, Mr. Chair.
BOARD MEMBER EXCEUS: I'd like to say we're going to miss you, Ken.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: One of the items discussed -- one of the items that we discussed and approved at the bylaws committee and it was tried -- also discussed with the Board was to transition the way that we conduct board meetings, to
make it more informative and interactive. Considering this, during this Board meeting, we're going to have staff provide an Early Childhood presentation directly tied to the first six resolutions. And during that presentation, Board Members can discuss the topics presented, provide comments and input to staff.

If we obtain -- get 21 members at present, right now we have 20 members, we were intending to adopt these resolutions as a consent agenda. Directors have had the opportunity -- we'11 go through that if we get the 21 st member, but for right now, I want to turn it over to staff to do the presentation.

MR. HAJ: Mr. Chair, thank you.
In front of you we have -- there will be a PowerPoint popping up to go through our Early Child Care and our Thrive by 5 presentation.

There has been great work from the Board since 2016, when we pivoted from Quality Counts to our current Thrive by 5 system. I think we're preaching to the
advocates here when I think everybody here knows that 90 percent of brain development happens before age five. So the earlier we invest in children, the earlier we send children to quality investment programs, the better we'll be long term. When we did the pivoting in 2016, when we looked around, there was lack of quality in the low income areas. So we pivoted our entire investment strategy, and all the supports and we went to a Thrive by 5. We knew if we build it, they will come.

So what we want to do, provide you here, it's kind of an overview what's happening at the state level, what's happening at the local level and also what's happening from the business community, because we also talk about doing early child care, but we cannot do this without the business community.

There's some slides. Pretty much every week, there's another national article, media article, something coming out about the crisis of early child care.

From access to early child care, the businesses cannot find employees, and one of the major obstacles is child care, and we do know that even this year, or 2022, the last time we read it, we had 46 percent of the kids enter kindergarten, at what they call kindergarten readiness rate. So they're entering kindergarten behind the eight ball. So we know all these things and we get a piecemeal, but today we're trying to get the collective approach and we have some presenters both at the state level and from the business community.

So what I'd like to introduce is one of our speakers, and $I$ believe Kyle is on. Kyle Baltuch is the Vice President of the Florida Chamber Foundation. He is a great partner. The chamber -- the Florida chamber has been outstanding in many things throughout this community, throughout the state, but the early child care, the last three to four years, they really embraced and started pushing from the business community to take care of our
youngest children in this community and our state.

So, Kyle, I'd like to turn it over to you. Welcome to the Children's Trust. You're here in front of an amazing board. And, Kyle, I believe -- I'm not sure if you're in Orlando or in Tallahassee today.

MR. BALTUCH: I'm in Tallahassee today, but thank you. Thank you for the introduction.

And, yeah, as you can see on the slide, you know, I think there's been interesting conversation taking recently around early learning in the State of Florida and really around the country. And for years, we all, and of course all the advocates in the room, have been having this conversation about what it means to the long-term development of children and their educational advancement in the state, but recently the conversation has really shifted here in the capitol to talk a lot about what it means for our economy and what does it
mean for the business community.
If we jump to the next slide, you know, the question essentially that's being asked, and we ask when we did this untapped interim report was, does access to child care and early learning impact today's workforce? And, you know, again, let me blow the lead in here and tell you that the answer is yes.

If we jump to the next slide here, what we can see is that the study that we conducted towards the end of 2023 , or I would say throughout the second half of 2023, in Florida, it's the only report that's done that takes Florida specific data, Florida specific surveying, it found that the access to child care is costing us -- the lack of access to child care is costing our economy about $\$ 5.4$ billion a year annually, and those are direct costs, so relatively conservative calculation there.

We saw over the past six months that 15 percent of all parents with children under the age of five had to leave their
job due to challenges accessing child care. It is the number one reason that parents with children under the age of five are leaving their job right now. It is above they're leaving their job, because they got another job, so it is a significant challenge.

On top of just leaving your job, we're also seeing parents struggle with missing work, whether they're having to move to part-time, or they're having challenges accessing full time care or they're having trouble accessing care that goes beyond normal hours. Sixty-four percent of parents have had to miss at least one day of work over the past quarter to take care of their children.

And then another big one is that we are seeing that those parents that are leaving their jobs, and leaving the workforce, they're not going out for short stints. They are leaving the workforce and plan to be out for more than a year, at least 45 percent. So, again, a really, really significant challenge.

We jump to the next slide, we see that, you know, what is causing this challenge, and it's in a few different areas, we'll kind of talk about them here one by one.

One is just access. Do we have enough child care slots for the demand that we may have in the state? As you can see, there's just some national
conversations and some work done by the bipartisan policy center that shows that our gap is about 100,000, between the slots that we have and the slots that we need. So, again, how do we get just more child care facilities and more child care slots open in the State of Florida? And we'll have to hold that one just constant here for a second, but just to be thinking in the back of your mind, how do we get more slots available?

We jump to the next slide, another big challenge that we have is cost. In the State of Florida, the median cost is about $\$ 1,260$ per month to access child care for all under the age of five. As
you can see, infant care is obviously much more expensive than school age care. And when we talk about parents, at the end of the day, in the State of Florida, making incomes anywhere in the -- I'm sorry, is there a question? As we see incomes ranging, you know, for the middle income families anywhere between 50 and $\$ 60,000$, it's just not an affordable situation to be in. So affordability is a big challenge that we face, access and affordability.

And as we jump to the next slide here, we just have a challenge with the number of actual front 1 ine providers. As you can see, our numbers are still not rebounded from pre-Covid. In pre-Covid, we had challenges with child care. And a lot of that is to due to the fact that child care front line work is financially not the most rewarding. So, again, that's a challenge there as well. We need to get more slots, we need to make it more affordable, and more accessible, but at the same time, we need to find a way to
incentivize more people to come back into the fold and work in the childcare sector. So, you know, kind of a three-headed monster that we're dealing with.

If we jump to the next slide here. I just want to kind of give you a high level of what's going on in the state. Again, right now we anticipate that there are upwards about 388,000 individuals across the State of Florida that are out of work, either temporarily or somewhat permanently, because they are at home taking care of a child. We need to speak about getting this correct, could bring back about 150 to 175,000 parents back into the workforce.

Another one, which I didn't really touch on yet, but a very interesting data point that's coming out from the Census Pulse Survey, it shows that about 609,000 respondents, or 600 -- an estimated 609,000 families in Florida are planning to change or reduce their child care arrangements to save money. Terrifying when we consider that there are really
only about 1.1 million children under the age of five in the State of Florida. So we're looking at about half of families right now are saying this is a major stressor in causing them to potentially change their plans here in the short term.

So, again, we need to make sure that we're getting affordability right, and we're getting access right and we're getting care right and making sure that it's all quality at the end of the day, because we can't lose that perspective that the long-term range goal and long-term educational development is really, really key, but today's business community is also being impacted dramatically.

That's why we are very, very supportive of a few bills that are working their way through legislature along the policy side. Our Florida Chamber of Commerce and the lobbying team has done a great job working with legislators, such as Representative Fiona McFarland, Representative Dana Trabulsky, Senator

Alexis Calatayud, Senator Erin Grall, and others, as they really work to address challenges in all those fields, from affordability to regulation, to how businesses might be able to invest. I'm really excited if -- really excited to see where this is headed.

I'm not sure if I have another slide or not, apologies for that. If we jump to the next, we'll see. It will either be myself or will either be handing over to my friend Michele Watson. Looks like I'll be handing it over to Michele.

MR. HAJ: Kyle, I appreciate it. Michele? Is Michele on the line?

So I'd like to introduce Michele. Michele is a friend to all of us. I think if you've been a board member for a couple of years, you've seen Michele. Michele is -- we have an association of children councils and trusts, and there's the trust, Miami-Dade Trust, and 10 others, and we meet weekly, every Friday we're on a call, to really talk about these issues and many other issues across the State of

Florida. And Michele is not only leading this, all our efforts, but she is an expert in the early child care arena.

So, Michele, with that, I'd like to turn it over to you.

MS. WATSON: Thank you so much, Jim. Thank you for having me.

You know, when we talk about affordability of care, we talk about what programs have been put in place. And so School Readiness is the program that's been put in place for our lowest earners that is known as our School Readiness program, but also as subsidized child care. So to qualify, you have to be 150 percent or below the federal poverty level to qualify for School Readiness. Once you get in the program, you're able to stay in until your income reaches 85 percent state median income.

So what that lends itself to is the fact that we have a small subset of families that can actually qualify for these services, especially now since the minimum wage amendment has gone into
effect and we're starting to see wages rise post-pandemic.

And we also know that the program is not fully funded. So right now, out of the state's eligible children in the School Readiness program, only 24 percent are about a quarter of families actually have access to subsidized child care. So when there's not access to the care, as Kyle pointed out, they're either staying home so that they can care for their young children and/or they're moving into very informal or underground care opportunities where there's not health and safety or education actually happening. It's more just how that child can be taken care of when that individual family is at work.

So there's approximately 1.3 miliion children younger than age six in Florida. So what this means for Miami-Dade, is 185,000 children and on1y 9,400 approximately receiving services. So under six, in School Readiness, is about five percent. And that's because the cost of living in Miami-Dade is actually really
high, and so the wages are keeping up with that, but when you have a statewide eligibility threshold of 150 percent federal poverty level, what's happening is families in your community are no longer qualifying, because the wages have outgrown that 150 percent federal poverty level.

BOARD MEMBER SALVER: Can I ask a question?

MS. WATSON: Of course.
BOARD MEMBER SALVER: Yeah. With those figures that you're showing, the 5.09 percent of the children in Miami-Dade County receiving S. R., is that the percentage who are eligible for S. R. in Miami-Dade County?

If you look at the federal poverty level and the number who qualify, is it just five percent of all the children in Miami-Dade County or is there a higher percentage that qualify and only 5.09 percent are actually receiving services?

MS. WATSON: So I am not going to answer for the Early Learning Coalition.

I know Pam Hollingsworth is in the room. She might be able to tell us if Miami-Dade County has a waiting list. If Miami-Dade County does have a waiting list, that means that that is the presented known need, and so children on the waiting list are not receiving services. If there's not a waiting list, then what it would show us through the data is, yes, only five percent are actually accessing services at this time.

BOARD MEMBER SALVER: Yeah. I'm actually asking a different question.

What percentage of the children would be eligible for services, right, not -- I understand how many are actually accessing that.

VICE-CHAIR HOLLINGSWORTH: Uh-hum.
So I don't have a clear answer to that.
If that's something that the coalition is working very hard to find out and identify at this time.

I can say to Michele's point that the coalition does not have a waitlist. It's one of the few coalitions in the state
that does not have an ongoing waitlist.
You know, we clear up -- we've been clearing our waitlist each month as a unified point of entry and we've been clearing it each month for the past (inaudible).

So we have all kinds of data in terms of those that apply, how many of them actually qualify, but we do believe that many of the barriers are just as Michele mentioned, you know, with the salaries going up, and, you know, families are unable to access services. So there's some legislation, you know, happening now that --

BOARD MEMBER SALVER: Yeah, I was wondering, do we know what percentage of the families in Miami-Dade County fall below the 150 percent level?

VICE-CHAIR HOLLINGSWORTH: We do not.
BOARD MEMBER SALVER: We don't?
MS. WATSON: So there is census data that will allow you to look at that from the last census.

The difficult part of the School

Readiness program is you have to be working or in school. So what that data doesn't tell us is, out of that total number of families, 150 percent or below the federal poverty level, how many of them are working or in school versus how many of them are not and able to stay home and care for their child.

BOARD MEMBER SALVER: Okay. I mean, I was asking sort of a basic question.

That in the County, of the families with children, how many fall below that 150 percent level? You know, I understand other criteria, but, again, $I$ would imagine the percentage is much, much higher than five percent.

MR. BALTUCH: It will -- sorry, this is Kyle Baltuch. It will be. You have 142,000 families, give or take. The problem is families can obviously define above the age of five.

In Miami-Dade that fall below that 150,000-- I'm sorry, 150 percent of the federal poverty line figure, if I were to give you a rough estimate, you know, just
falling below 100 percent of the federal poverty line for children in Miami-Dade, that's 19.3 percent. So you're probably looking at a factor that's at least 50 percent greater than that. So that would be anywhere in that say I would 27 to 33 range is probably where you're looking at that percentage being.

BOARD MEMBER SALVER: Okay. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER DUNN: Yes. I don't know the exact data in terms of where -what that number looks like, but I can say this, and I believe Commissioner Hardemon will bear me out with this, probably Judge will also. I know a lot of it is driven by areas like Liberty City, Little Haiti, Overtown. And probably if you go to the south, places like Perrine or so, but I know the data, because at one time the City of Miami was the third poorest city in the nation at one point. I don't know what it is now. And we know, and this is no pun, but we know it didn't come from areas like Brickell. We know that. So it
came from areas such as District 5, in the City of Miami, or District 3, in Miami-Dade County. It's driven by those areas. And it's sort of a dubious recognition, but that's what it is. It's those numbers, you'11 find the bulk of the people in that below -- and probably let me throw another area in there. Probably areas like the Redlands or the Homestead area, that would factor into those areas. So you can get all your data from there, and that will give you a guesstimation of what it kind of looks like.

BOARD MEMBER SALVER: Yeah. And, clearly, what's behind my question is, that there is this huge unmet need here, right? Children who would be eligible for this kind of program, but just aren't able to receive it, right?

BOARD MEMBER DUNN: Yes.
MR. BALTUCH: Yeah.
BOARD MEMBER SALVER: I think we all know that, but $I$ was just trying -MR. BALTUCH: No, I appreciate that. BOARD MEMBER SALVER: -- to wrap my
head around how big that gap was. It's big.

BOARD MEMBER DUNN: It's huge, enormous.

BOARD MEMBER SALVER: Right.
MR. HAJ: Michele, go ahead.
MS. WATSON: Perfect. So we can move on to the next slide.

I also want to say that School Readiness slide doesn't include those families that are still low income 133 percent below the federal poverty level that are participating in Head Start and Early Head Start as well, so that is also capturing a subset of your low income families that weren't contemplated in the numbers in that slide.

So expand School Readiness
eligibility threshold, what we're seeing now is, Kyle just told us, $\$ 5.38$ billion in loss revenue. Twenty-four percent of low income families were forced to leave the workforce due to lack of access.

Florida has one of the six lowest income eligibility thresholds in the nation. So
that is how we calibrated the entry threshold correctly to what we're seeing today, in today's market.

We have the ability -- Florida's low eligibility threshold directly impacts the ability for parents to enter and thrive in the workforce, and two-parent-working households right now cannot qualify at minimum wage. So if you have two individual parents making $\$ 13$ an hour, they are already not eligible for the program, because their income would come in about 200 percent federal poverty level.

So what you're seeing now is family profile eligibility current income threshold of 150 percent of what that means. So what you're seeing now is who's eligible and who's not eligible. So right now two parents, three children, I think this might be switched around. And the key, just to be honest, what you're going to see is -- never mind. It's two parents, three children are eligible, but two parents, two children are not. The
more children you have, if you're two parents, you can actually qualify, but one parent, one child is eligible all the way until we hit the minimum wage threshold in 2016 -- I mean, 2026, at $\$ 15$ an hour, and then one parent, two children will remain eligible past $\$ 17$ an hour.

So what we need to make sure is that we are looking at what is the right calibration of entry that's going to serve the maximum number of families, so that we can make sure that they're all having high quality early childhood experiences.

So with that, on the next slide, you're going to see that the legislature is really working really hard on making sure that we can calibrate these programs in the right way.

So SB 916, so Senate Bill 916, entitled The School Readiness Program by Senator Alexis Calatayud out of Miami is proposing that we take in Florida -instead of using federal poverty level, that we take state median income. And that's because state median income is
actually rising in Florida faster than some of the other 50 states. Median income is rising, which makes the federal poverty level kind of depressed for usage of determining eligibility for School Readiness.

So she's contemplating that we change the entry threshold at 55 percent state median income. So 55 percent for state median income means for a family of two, so one parent, one child, you can come in at approximately that equates to 163 percent federal poverty level. For a family of three, it's about 159 percent federal poverty level and for a family of four, it's 157 percent federal poverty level. So it's really trying to work hard to increase those eligibility thresholds so that we can capture more families.

The counterpart to that bill is House Bill 929 by Representative Dana Trabulsky, out of Saint Lucie County where they also have a Children's Services Council, and so that is the companion to that bill that also looks to calibrate it at 55 percent.

So we're really excited.
Those bills were introduced last week in the second week of session. They were up in committees, and hitting their first committee stop, which means that there is still time for them to be able to be heard and passed, which will hopefully help alleviate some of the access issues that we're seeing, not only in Miami-Dade County, but across the State of Florida. Next is -- oh, sorry, I was going to the next bill, Rachel.

Next is Senate Bill 820, Child Care and Early Learning Providers, and House Bill 635 is the companion, by Senator Erin Grall out of Fort Pierce and Representative Fiona McFarland out of Sarasota. These bills really look to do a number of things. They look to reduce cost for child care providers. So one of the things they do is they include insurance requirements. Insurance cost have gone up for child care providers over the last few years, almost 80 percent. So they're looking to figure out ways that
they can help with those insurance costs, so those costs aren't passed on to families.

They're also looking at the licensing standards to be legally operating. So for child care licensing, there was conducted a report that's there's 537 distinct child care licensing standards; and out of those, 64 were the ones that were most tied to health and safety. So how do you really look at getting rid of redundant or health and safety standards that don't relate to the health and safety of the child.

And then lastly, part of this bill is five million dollars for the creation, through a child care tax credit, that can be given to businesses in the State of Florida that can be a tax credit from their sales tax, it can be a tax credit from their alcohol and tobacco tax, their insurance tax, there's multiple taxes that a business can get if they provide a child care stipend on behalf of their employees, for their employees' children or
grandchildren, up to $\$ 3,600$ a year. So that could be a stipend of $\$ 300$ per child, per month.

The other portion of that bill is it helps -- allows businesses to tap into a plot of dollars to create their own child care facilities within their own business enterprise. So if they have extra land that they're not using, if they have within their current building extra space, they absolutely can turn that into a child care center. As part of that, they have to be accredited by a national accrediting association to meet the health and safety standards. They also have to have staff that are background screened and have the 40 clock hours to be a child care instructor. And so as long as the provider provides the child care services, that individual company can draw down tax credits to offset the costs of building out those centers.

And so we are really excited that that is a solution. One hopefully by reducing duplicative and expensive
licensing regulations will help kind of offset the increasing cost of child care as well as having employers be part of the solution on behalf of their employees, will help with employee retention, will help with employee recruitment, but also will help ensure that children are in really safe and learning -- educational environments.

So then we have Senate Bill 1026 is Early Learning by Senator Erin Grall and House Bill 1353, Early Learning by Representative John Snyder. And so what you will see in those bills is those are policy bills. Those really look at how we run our School Readiness in our VPK Programs.

Some of the highlights of that bill is previously early learning coalitions only had a four percent admin to do all of the work to administer VPK. It moves that up to five percent to align with the School Readiness program. It also makes some technical changes to some ways that we calculate the VPK performance metric.

It also includes executive functioning as a domain that children need to learn in the early childhood space.

And I think one of the neatest pieces of this legislation is that creates a summer bridge program, so it allows students who participate in the VPK program after their four-year-old year, who are in the lowest 20 percentile in terms of what they received on their formal final assessment, to access a hundred hours summer bridge program. So 100 extra hours during the summer, four hours a day to be able to get more intensive early literacy and early math skill training before they hit kindergarten.

So, as you know, Jim has started off with, you know, we have seen lower school -- kindergarten readiness scores and gave that percentage as part of his presentation. That summer bridge program is hoping to make sure that we are reaching and providing interventions in our most at-risk and at-need children the
summer before they hit kindergarten.
And then Senate Bill 1400, School
Readiness Program and HB 487 by
Representative Robert Bartleman and Senator Shev Jones, this really deals with our children with special needs. Right now, to participate in the School Readiness program, you can have an IEP and receive access to services, but if you have an ISSP, so that is the infant plan for how you receive accommodations and how we best have a supportive environment for you as you are a young, young child with special needs, this includes having those that have an ISSP or a diagnosis from a physician to allow them to access School Readiness services to be able to be served in environment that make sure that it has trained professionals in there. There's 10 hours of training as well as there's accommodations being made for that child.

So I will say that this is just probably the early learning bills that are moving the most. I will tell you in my 20 years of working with the legislature
and in legislative sessions, this year is the most early learning bills we've seen on record. So there's a number of significant early learning bills related to having -- requiring child care providers to have cameras in their facilities so parents can remote in and some others. We haven't seen those move yet, but these are the ones that will most likely move in a way that will help offset the cost and the burden of serving and making sure that our children are receiving the best early education.

BOARD MEMBER GIMENEZ: I have a question.

MS. WATSON: With that, I'm going to turn it back over to Rachel.

BOARD MEMBER GIMENEZ: Wait, before you leave.

MR. HAJ: She has a question, so hold on a second.

BOARD MEMBER GIMENEZ: Yes, I have a question, Michele. I'm Lourdes Gimenez, by the way.

Regarding the senate bill and the
house bill 1026, 1353, you mentioned funding for summer before they enter kindergarten, correct?

MS. WATSON: Yes, ma'am.
BOARD MEMBER GIMENEZ: Will there be any funding while the child is in the pre-K program where they can receive the interventions already during their regular pre-K time?

MS. WATSON: So one bill that's not on here that showed up last week that I'm very excited about that they're starting to include is Senate Bill 7038. It's actually an education bill in its title, but what they did is, right now a child who is not performing well, a child who is not performing well in their kindergarten, first grade or second grade assessments, all the way through fifth grade, can receive a read -- step-up reading scholarship where they can access tutoring services for children who are struggling with their program assessment.

So I'm very pleased to announce that as part of that Senate Bill 7038, they
included pre-K or VPK students in those tutoring dollars. So not only at the end of their program, if they still aren't ready for Kindergarten, but during their program, they'11 be able to access those tutoring dollars to get really specific interventions that will help them to be more ready for Kindergarten across the way, and we're waiting to see where that's going to go.

BOARD MEMBER GIMENEZ: I'm glad to hear that. Michele, did I lose you?

MS. WATSON: No.
BOARD MEMBER GIMENEZ: Because I'm a firm believer -- I was a former -- I am still an educator, but $I$ am former official professional educator, and I firmly believe in early interventions and the earlier we can provide those interventions when see a child who's developmentally not functioning at the rate that he should be, that if we provide those interventions early, we can help, you know, fill in the gap a lot sooner.

MS. WATSON: Absolutely. No, I 100
percent agree and was very excited to see that.

BOARD MEMBER GIMENEZ: Thank you.
MR. HAJ: Michele, thank you.
Turn it over to Rachel.
MS. WATSON: Do I have another question?

BOARD MEMBER DUNN: Just an addendum to my comments. Lest my colleague take me in the woodshed, I forgot to mention District 2 in the Miami-Dade County School Board, that's our colleague Dr. Dorothy Bendross-Mindingal1. I just wanted to put for the record that those are the areas that usually drive the below the poverty level threshold, so $I$ just wanted to put that on the record. So $I$ don't know if she's watching, but she'11 laugh about it later with me. I rather her laugh about it than take me to the woodshed.

BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: I just want to make a quick comment, too, and a question that might lead what you're going to talk about Rache1.

With these points about this huge gap
in families not getting the services even when they're eligible. So I think that's an important point, because one of the things we put a lot of efforts is these families that are just missing that cut point. So they're struggling, because they're not poor enough and they can't benefit from the services already existing. So we've done a lot from the Trust perspective to help those families, which is what you're going to talk about, what we're voting on today, which is great, but $I$ think the other side of the coin that maybe you can speak to a little bit more is, how do we get more of these families who are eligible to actually get the services that they're eligible for. Given that there's no waitlist, right, it sounds like -- and given the low numbers and low percentages we're seeing of families who are eligible, but not actually getting the services, what can we do as the Trust to help engage those families?

MS. SPECTOR: Sure. Yeah, I think we
will hit on that. So, yeah, okay.
So back to Jim mentioned, I think that a lot of what I'm gonna talk about is gonna respond. So your investments and our Thrive by 5 system are in response to a lot of what you heard Kyle -- both Kyle and Michele mention. That's happening, not only at the state level, but obviously here in our community.

So back to what Jim mentioned, back in 2016, '17, we had a Board early child work group, which is when we came together to really look at our investments in our previous child care quality system, Quality Counts and when we were moving to Thrive by 5. And one of the asks from that group, which some of you were a part of that group, was really taking a look comprehensively at our county.

And so Laurie and her team prepared this early childhood system mapping that we spent a lot of time surveying and interviewing all of the early childhood partners from around the County, and you can see that the investments here
represent the federal investments, the state investments and the local investments. Most of the federal investments are for Early Head Start, Head Start, house services, early intervention services and whatnot, but you can see how our -- the Children's Trust local investment is really contributing to the overall early childhood system in our community.

And another thing to point out that was very important to our Board where group was serving infants and toddlers, really focusing on children birth to two, you could see that 23 percent -- only 23 percent at that time when we did this were really being served by those dollars, but now through Thrive by 5 , we have a big focus on serving infants and toddlers, so we're hoping to continue to see that number rise.

Next slide, Juana.
So the second piece of the map was showing the Children's Trust investments in the three different components of early
childhood funding that we categorize our investments at the Children's Trust. So early childhood quality is our Thrive by 5 quality improvements system. I'm going to get into more detail about the different components and then early child care access and early intervention.

So the resolutions that you are gonna see before you today are all related actually to early childhood access and early intervention. So here is where we are providing match funding in order to drawdown the maximum amount of federal and state dollars into our community to serve those families that you're asking about that are under 150 percent of the federal poverty rate, but do not qualify for the School Readiness program, because the families are not working. And so these investments that you're voting on today allow us to serve the maximum number of children in our community.

And then our early intervention services as well were to fund all children birth to -- well, birth to five. Children
that have special needs that are not able to access statewide early intervention services, because they don't meet criteria, but they still have significant needs that the earlier -- as Lourdes mentioned, the earlier we intervene, the better chance the child has of catching up, so those are the resolutions that you'll be voting on today.

And I'm moving onto our Thrive by 5 early learning system. So this is where our Board group and some of you really forced us to go back to the table. We met with a lot of partners. We really re-envisioned what our investments could look like. And then our goal is very simple, you can read it on the screen, but essentially we want every single child in our community to have access to high quality early learning experiences, whether that be through Head Start, through the School Readiness program and through our investments in Thrive by 5.

So one thing is to support programs to achieve high quality, and another thing
is to create access so that children can actually get into those programs and we're trying to do both.

So our system has multiple components, as you can see on the slide. We partner with most of the early -- the early childhood system partners. We do leverage state funding and we build off of our state system.

Our state, through the department of early learning and the early learning coalition, has a tiered payment differential system where we reward providers for having high quality, and they received a tiered payment differential. We stack our differentials on top of what the state offers to really give a meaningful investment into program so that they can reinvest into their program to achieve high quality to invest in their early childhood teachers, who, you know, make very low wages, as you heard Kyle mention. And so those supports, our providers report to us their enrollment monthly and we provide them
with an award every month.
You also heard Dan refer to, and Kyle, like, families that just aren't meeting the criteria for the School Readiness program.

So there actually is no waitlist in Miami-Dade County, as Pam mentioned, for the School Readiness program. So we would assume that the majority of the people that qualify have signed up and they're being served. It is a workforce program, but we have over close to 1400 children on our Children's Trust Families Forward scholarship waitlist. So these are families that are between 150 and 300 percent of the federal poverty rate. So in Michele's example, these could be, like, a family of two, two working parents, with two children, who each earn $\$ 15$ an hour. Those are the people that are qualifying, some of the people that are qualifying for our scholarship program. And we're going to show a video and a little bit more information.

And then another -- oh, not yet. And
then another -- another issue that Kyle raised is retention and the amount -- the number of child care educators that we have, which has gone down following the pandemic and continues to go down, because in our community, the median rate is about $\$ 13.00-$ well, the minimum wage is 12 right now I think, so $13,13.50$ is the median. That's what we're making -that's what they're making on average.

And so our Ascend program, which we have -- I think I've spoken about here, and we just redesigned, is to -- serving to retain -- help the program retain teachers, but also to incentivize teachers to come into the program. They can earn awards up to $\$ 6,000$ a year and they can earn their award twice a year by applying directly with us.

We also have a robust educator scholarship program in partnership with the children's forum. We support scholarships for all educators in our community, including public school -early learning public school teachers,

Head Start teachers, all teachers that want to continue their professional development, teaching strategy goals.

We have a partnership with the United Way to support ongoing child assessments. It's important for teachers to understand how children are progressing in their classrooms, how they're developing and it helps them to be able to individualize instruction. That's a marker of a high quality program.

And then one of our program of the year, this year, at Champions, is our Jump Start program. This is early childhood infant mental health services, and this program really works to support children with challenging behaviors as well as providing teachers the tools to most effectively work with children and families for children that are experiencing challenging behaviors in the classroom.

And I think I'm going to -- we're going to show you the video for Families Forward. We showed this at Champions.

This was one of our programs of the year last year.
(Thereupon, a video was presented).
MS. SPECTOR: So the program is not free. You heard the mom mention that she pays, but she pays less. So this is an opportunity for families that you can see the income threshold for our program, Families Forward. So for a family of four, they're able to access our scholarship with an income of up to $\$ 79,500$. They are paying a co-payment of $\$ 70.00$ a week, and then it reduces in half for the second or the third child, so it's -- you know, it's $\$ 280.00$ a month as opposed to the average of 1200,1300 , $\$ 1400$ a month. So it's really significant when families are making choices about, you know, their economics and their work situation.

Next sifide.
So we currently -- I mentioned, we have a waitlist. We have over 1300 children on our waitlist right now. So these are families that are calling us,
e-mailing us, asking us when they're coming off the waitlist. Some of them are working and have other types of arrangements that may or may not be the best for their children. Others are waiting to go back to work or waiting to go to work. Everyone is in a different situation. So we're actively trying to work on our waitlist. We have almost 12 -- actually, I think, today we have more than 1200 children that are actively enrolled using our scholarships across 214 child care programs.

So we have 323 child care programs that are participating in Thrive by 5, but only our top high quality programs are able to accept scholarship children. So we have 214 out of the 323 that are eligible to accept the scholarships.

Can you show the next slide?
We're showing a map, so you can see that we have sites covering the entire County. So that was part of our goal, was access. We didn't want families to have to get out of their neighborhoods and out
of their communities to find quality child care. We want them to be able to stay in their community.

When we started Thrive by 5 , we had, 1ike, 70, maybe, options for families. And as we continued to invest in tiered payments and provide all of the supports to programs, we see the quality continuing to improve, and we have built already up to 214 that meet our standards for quality.

And then so how it works, another thing we're proud of that $I$ don't think we shared yet, next siide, is when families receive a letter from the Early Learning Coalition letting them know that they've been awarded a scholarship, mind you most of them have been at this point on the waitlist, some of them for a year, maybe, you know, it depends. They're very excited. They want to find a program right away. So they can come to the Children's Trust website. We have this find a program tab. If you want to check it out, when you get onto our website,
there's a big button that says find a program and they can just type in here -it's a very friendly map. They can type in their address, their zip code, the zip code where they live, where they work, wherever they're looking for care, and it will pop up the child care programs and it will indicate which of the child care programs are eligible to receive scholarships. And then $I$ know it's very small, but when they click on the little dot, it tells them the phone number, and, you know, the website and all the information they need to immediately reach out and find a program.

We're also -- oh, yeah, we're going to show the video? Yeah. Okay. We have one more video. We're also excited that we've been asked to present nationally. I'll let the video play first.
(Thereupon, the video was presented).
MS. SPECTOR: So I was saying, so this video obviously was about Ascend, our salary supplement program. We built this program from scratch. We met and searched
around the country for other models, and this is an innovative model. It's the only model we believe in the country that's taking into account professional development, longevity and competency. So we use the class score. And as you could hear educators are earning 2000, 2700. And you hear the owner saying that it's really impacting the retention rate and the teachers feel valued.

So we have been invited to present nationally on different pieces of Thrive by 5 , but most recently on Ascend and Families Forward. So these are just some of the places that we have presented lately and we continue to do so.

And then we also have published some of the work around Thrive by 5 in national journals, and I was -- had the honor of participating in a Webinar training session and had a written article with the Federal Reserve system around the impact of child care and some of the crisis, so thank you.

> I'm going to hand it to Natalia to
talk about some of our local efforts.
MS. ZEA: Thank you.
So as you can tell, we can't do this alone. I'm going to scooch over a little bit Rachel. I'm leaning there. Nice and close. So we know that we can't do this alone. The Children's Trust doesn't do this alone. Obviously we have some of our valued partners here at the table as part of this Board.

We also know that to have collaborative partnerships and public awareness helps to bring more advocacy. The early learning bills that have been filed are a good example of that. The more folks are educated on the issue, the more they try to strive to do something to solve it. This is why we convene some of our strongest partners in the area of advocacy, workforce development, economic development, and stabilization and philanthropy quarterly as part of this fiscal cliff collaborative, and bringing some familiar friends together and others who focus on economic issues to make sure
that we have the business community with us and some of the other economic development drivers with us, because this is ultimately an economic issue for our greater community.

Also, I 'd like to thank the associate director of public policy, Amanda Gorski, for her hard work on this. Next sifide.

So the Children's Trust staff also works closely with a wide array of invaluable partners. We're part of Mayor Levine Cava's Children's Commission, which really has a hyper focus on the early childhood space, and with this collaborative of partners as part of their steering committee and in co-chairing various subcommittees, we worked together to create the road map for child success allowing us to work together and reach beyond the Children's Trust world into the greater community.

We also are in the middle of developing community awareness and advocacy campaigns around some of these
early childhood issues. Some centered around the fiscal cliff issues that we've been talking about, but some also just making sure that parents and other caregivers are aware of the very basics of early childhood, and its incredible importance and the things that they can do at home, if they have their kids home, to help them.

We also played a significant role in Miami leadership local summit at Bilzin Sumberg offices. This was Miami Herald Miami Foundation collaborative, child care, K-12 education and the importance of keeping the fiscal cliff in mind as different employees are upscaling. Those were just some of the panels that Jim and other Trust staff participated in.

We also keep our community collaboratives informed that the community engagement team sits on to make sure that everyone is aware.

We also know policies of Miami-Dade's 36 municipalities, who are also key employers. Their policies matter. They
are important employers in our community, and we make sure that they are aware as well. We organized and presented a panel with partners from that fiscal cliff task force at the Miami Dade County League of Cities best practices conference to make sure that city managers, elected officials, and other government staff were aware of the importance of the fiscal cliff and the work that we're doing.

Now, Trust staff also works closely with the Florida Department of Early Learning serving on the informal career pathway advisory committee. The Trust began our own informal pathway as part of Ascend. As you heard, Rachel's great work. And that's going to further assist early learning educators in a more equitable way, so it's not only focused on college credit and course work, so we're helping to lead the way statewide.

Next slide.
So we know that it's important, too, that there's some widespread awareness, so these are just a few -- these are a few of
the news outlets that we've been able to put out opinion pieces or secured news coverage to make sure that the voice of this work is being heard.

We're also talking with a few national media entities right now, who've expressed an interest, because they see what we're doing in Miami-Dade and they think it's working. And, you know, Rachel has been on countless calls with reporters and otherwise, but we think it's important. We're setting a stage here that the nation could follow.

Next sifide.
We know we can only improve and expand if we know the success of where we've been, so there are two active evaluations going on right now related to the QIS. One is a cross-sector evaluation, led by the U. M. Ideas Consortium with partners from the ELC, Miami-Dade County, MDCPS and the Trust. Now, Thrive by 5 is one of the resources that they're focusing on. They're doing a comprehensive look, though, at equitable
access to early learning resources, which includes other families supports, like TANF and WIC.

The second project is that we're looking at our supportive educators. We're looking at the impact of professional development scholarships and the salary supplement programs, all the great work that you just heard about in relation to support and retention. And the study is federally funded. It's getting underway right now.

Finally, last project is the development of a full scale evaluation plan for Thrive by 5 supported by fact. We're working with the policy equity group out of D.C. to create the plan, which could be funded by component to continue to unlock opportunities and help inform the policy changes that we need to see state wide.

Jim.
MR. HAJ: Natalia, thank you.
Just one note. A couple more slides.
One is just to show you where we've come
from.
In '16, when we started the planning group, we started moving Thrive by 5. In '18, with 20.5 million for the whole Thrive by 5, and we had five million in scholarships. And this last budget that you adopted, it was 13.9 million Thrive by 5 and 13 million in our scholarships.

Next slide, please. And go to the last one, the last slide.

So we can't do this alone. We work phenomenally with our partners, but we also knew if we build it, we'd have other funders to come in.

Natalia, Amanda, Rachel, Laurie, the whole group has been out the last year letting everybody know about the importance of early child care and seeking additional funding.

We are pleased at the last Board meeting we mentioned that the Mayor, Commissioner Hardemon and the rest of the commissioners approved three miliion dollars to add to our scholarships. We just found out Deluca is considering -- is
strongly considering it, and we're hoping to bring back in March an adoption of one million dollar donation to our scholarships. And we have Coral Gables community, Ocean Reef coming in at 5,000. And we also have hopefully, in the near future, we have announcements of some other private funders coming in to fund this much needed program.

Mr. Chair, that is it for the presentations. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: Great.
First of all, I want to thank the staff, because, as you can see, a lot goes on between Board meetings that doesn't end up directly on the agenda. Thank you, A11.

As I mentioned earlier, we're going to start today to try a consent agenda. Consent agenda is a mechanism, for those of you who aren't familiar, where resolutions with similar topics are grouped for the Board to review before the meeting so that they can be moved and voted on as a group.

Items on the consent agenda do not follow the traditional pattern we have used in meetings where we will speak about items, each item after it's introduced. So they're voted on as a group rather than being individually moved and discussed.

Before the meeting, we determined those directors who needed to recuse or would likely be recusing. If any director has to recuse on the specific resolutions that hasn't already recused, we should know it.

We have a quorum, 17 members, plus an additional six members now. So we have five recusals on the entire set of resolutions as of right now.

If the Board Member has a desire to discuss comment or has to recuse on a specific resolution on the consent agenda, then we would need to bifurcate that particular resolution, so it would be read into the record, voted on separately from the resolutions that are grouped as part of the consent agenda.

If any Board Member would like to
pull an item, they can do so at the beginning of the meeting. This is the first meeting we're doing this. If any yet -- we'll go over the resolutions, but if any member would like to pull one of the resolutions, I think Jim also mentioned this in his notice, we can do so before we start voting on the consent agenda.

It's my understanding that currently no director has requested to pull any of the resolutions. And, again, there are five directors in total, who have five positions or otherwise had to recuse from these resolutions. So they will not be able to vote on any of them that are packaged as part of the consent agenda.

Are there any questions?
BOARD MEMBER SALVER: Was this -- was this agenda published like this, just like in this format? Because it doesn't say that these items are consent agenda. And, you know, having a quarter of a century in government, $I$ don't think, you know, 10 or \$12 million worth of resolutions are
appropriate for a consent agenda format. Yeah, I know that in our town, the consent agenda aren't routine items in nature. They're interlocal agreements or, you know, things that are not materially affecting the budget. I mean, here, you know, we're talking about approving -- you know, we had a beautiful presentation, an in-depth presentation about the state of affairs, Tallahassee, you know, but, you know, I, for one, am kind of against taking all of these items all at once, you know, all 10 or $\$ 12$ million worth and doing it on a consent agenda item fashion.

So if I don't have a consensus among the Board for my feelings, I request that we pull any item that's over a million dollars and deal with it on a separate basis, each item by item.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: I would just comment, I'11 take other Board comments on it, but a million dollar or two million dollar item is routine here versus we have 30 million and 40 million dollar resolutions that if we package some of
them together, I would tend to agree.
BOARD MEMBER SALVER: Right, but those are typically, you know, how we're going to fund a certain program, you know, like a body of programming. Some, you know, like, Item No. 17, let's say, is, you know, for $2.2,2.3$ million bucks.

BOARD MEMBER ADAMS: Laura Adams. You know, one thing is that a lot of these resolutions are discussed, like, at the program and development committee. So I think if you have concerns about the individual resolutions, or where the money is going or the amount of it, you come to those meetings, 'cause that's kind of where we flesh out a little bit more in detail $I$ think what the actual projects are going to be.

And I think also just in consideration of how much, you know, other commitments that all the members of the Board have, I think we've tried to streamline as much as we can without glossing over the importance of these, just so that when we present these resos
to the Board at large, it's already been vetted. So perhaps coming into those meetings is one way to address your concerns.

BOARD MEMBER SALVER: Thank you for that, Laura, and I appreciate that. However, when Ken made his opening comments regarding the changes in the format of the meeting, he said that we're trying to be more transparent. And in my personal opinion, this is kind of contraindicated to that. It seems less transparent, because every -- you're saying that everything is done on a committee level and then brought to us for, like, a tacit type of an approval, I think that's less in the sunshine, because people would be more apt to go to our general Board meeting, which is held, you know, 10 times a year than go to an actual committee meeting. You know, there's a lot of committee members that don't even show up to the committee meeting much less the public.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: Any other
comment?
MS. KOBRINSKI: So just to clarify. Per the bylaws, any Board Member can request that an item be bifurcated. Are you requesting that those items be taken out?

BOARD MEMBER SALVER: Yeah. I said everything over a miliion bucks, let's just vote on it separately.

And I'd like to know -- I'd also like to know who's recusing themselves on each item as well.

And then I think a couple of years ago, I had requested that every time we fund an organization, that at least on a fiscal year basis, that we are also disclosing the total amount to date for all programs, you know, for that organization. For instance, University of Miami, or the Early Learning Coalition, or, you know, BCC or whoever, you know, wherever we spend money. I'd like to know not only this item or, you know, this component of our budget, but I'd like to see, you know, how much money University
of Miami is getting, how much money FIU is getting, how much money the Early Learning Coalition is getting, how much United Way is getting, you know, for our fiscal year cumulative.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: Except to the extent that those are in the resolutions, I'm not sure we have that information available.

BOARD MEMBER SALVER: Well, I mean, it's just a matter of clicking, you know, the page, or in our checkbook and getting a subtotal, you know, for the fiscal year or whatever. I'm sure Bill can do that.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: So any resolution, you're requesting --

BOARD MEMBER SALVER: It's seven digits, let's vote on it separately.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: Anything over a million.

BOARD MEMBER SALVER: But quickly for Laura's sake.

BOARD MEMBER ADAMS: Not for my sake. It's (Inaudible) employee for 30 years.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: I don't think
it was a question of expedience, Isaac, I think as much as, again, these were presented as a group because of the similar nature of the subject and the fact that they are relative -- relative to the Trust budgets and the things that we do approve, they're relatively small.

So, yes, Pastor.
BOARD MEMBER DUNN: Yes, I concur with my colleague that it's a valid issue to raise. However, I believe it can be resolved amicably by getting an opinion from our County attorney. If she says we're good, then I think, you know, why should we -- why should we hesitate on it.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: Well, I think she said every director has the opportunity to pull any resolution from the consent agenda, so we'11 respect that. And Isaac will --

BOARD MEMBER DUNN: Okay. My question to that question -- to that comment, though, is, can one person make that determination for the whole Board or is that something that needs to be voted
on by consensus?
MS. KOBRINSKI: The language in the bylaws says any Board Member shall be entitled to request an item be bifurcated, so it doesn't require that the Board approve that.

BOARD MEMBER DUNN: So be it, okay, so be it.

BOARD MEMBER SALVER: And this is the first time we're doing it, Ken, right?

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: This is correct.

BOARD MEMBER SALVER: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: We talked about it last week.

BOARD MEMBER SALVER: I understand, but the agenda was not even published with the words "consent agenda item", and explaining to the public, you know, what a consent agenda item -- what a consent agenda is, and, you know, the implications of it.

So, you know, I'm not saying that I'm not open to discussion on this matter. I mean, for this particular meeting, I think
it wasn't published in a format that says these items shall be taken as a consent agenda item. So I think, therefore, we should really take each and everyone of them, you know, singly, and then really -if we're reformatting the meeting, let's reformat the agenda as well to make it very, very clear, you know, that we're voting in this manner.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: Isaac, we will pull the individual resolutions that are over a million dollars. I don't think that we can ask the question about whether it was published or not, but I think it's not relevant if we're going to pull the items from the agenda. So I'm sure we'11 announce it as a consent agenda. So I will turn then to (Inaudible).

BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: So point of clarification, because I think Pam will need to recuse.

MS. KOBRINSKI: Right. So you can vote --

BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: Do you want me to do as Vice Chair then?

MS. KOBRINSKI: There's still 2024-20 and 2024-21 that could be voted on a consent agenda, and There are no recusals on those.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: We'11 go through it, why don't you go through the first --

BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: The first two, correct, because Pam asked to recuse. So I wasn't expecting this, so bear with me. I wasn't prepared.

So as Vice Chair of the program, I'11 present the first two resolutions, because Pam has to recuse.

MS. KOBRINSKI: Do you want to take the consent agenda first? Those two items, Mr. Hardemon moved for it.

BOARD MEMBER HARDEMON: Yeah, I took a motion -- I move 2024-20 and 2024-21 to approve.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: Thank you. That's 2024-21 and 2024-20 together?

BOARD MEMBER HARDEMON: Correct.
CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: Let me read the two resolutions then that are being voted
on as a consent resolution together.
We have 2024-20, which is authorization to negotiate and execute a contract with Redlands Christian Migrant Association, RCMA, for a local match funding to drawdown federal state funds to subsidize early child care, in a total amount not to exceed $\$ 102,000$, for a term of 12 months, commencing October 1, 2024, and ending September 30, 2025.

And, in addition, we have Resolution 2024-21, authorization to negotiate and execute a contract with the University of Miami-Nova Southeastern University Center for Autism and Related Disabilities, CARD, or autism spectrum disorders diagnostic evaluation services, in an amount not to exceed $\$ 264,000.00$, for a term of

12 months, commencing October 1, 2024, and ending September 30, 2025.

I think we had a motion already to adopt those two. Do we have a second to that motion?

BOARD MEMBER DUNN: Second, Richard Dunn.

CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: Thank you.
All those in favor?
COLLECTIVELY: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: Any opposed?
The motions carry. And --
BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: I'11 do it, if you want me to.

Alright, so we'll first start with Resolution 2024-17, authorization to negotiate and execute contracts with the Early Learning Coalition of Miami-Dade, Monroe, Miami-Dade County Community Action and Human Services Department and the United Way of Miami-Dade for local match funding for the federal Early Head Start Child Care Partnerships, EHS-CCP grant, in a total amount not to exceed \$2,270,000.00, for a term of 12 months commencing October 1, 2024, and ending September 30, 2025.

Do I have a motion?
BOARD MEMBER GIMENEZ: I'11 move, Gimenez.

BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: And a second?
BOARD MEMBER ABRAHAM: I'11 second,

Abraham.
BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: And any recusals?

VICE-CHAIR HOLLINGSWORTH: Recusal, Hollingsworth. I work for the Early Learning Coalition.

BOARD MEMBER FERRADAZ: Recusal, Gilda Ferradaz. I serve on the ELC Board.

BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: Any other recusals? I'11 open it up for discussion. Any discussion? Questions?

BOARD MEMBER EXCEUS: I think for discussion. So would this be merging the gap that we spoke about earlier? I know we spoke about one of the resolutions, and you said that you would go back and talk about that in the presentation about the five percent and how it would be increased by the resolutions.

MS. SPECTOR: This resolution is supporting Early Head Start Child Care Partnership, drawing down the federal funds. So these are the families that are below -- actually a 100, 120 percent of the federal poverty, but they may or may
not be working, so this is getting at some of what Dr. Abraham was asking. This is getting at some of the families that are in that income bracket, but don't qualify for school readiness, but they're not working or they're not in school.

MR. HAJ: Just indirectly, the money that we're using here, it does answer what Dr. Abraham brought up. Also that we're bringing down $\$ 28,000,000.00$ for federal and state money for $2 .--$ or 3.6 overall, brings out $\$ 28$ miliion federal, state for additional slots in Miami-Dade County.

BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: Thank you for that. Just to add to, I guess one thing just to throw out there to staff, what I was kind of thinking is, we're getting these funds to increase slots, even for those in poverty, but how do we engage them more, 'cause they're not -- they're not, right -- we're creating the spots, but then it sounds like a lot of them are not getting the services that they are eligible for. So that's just something I think as a board and staff, we can think
about how to increase participation and engagement, right? Is that your question?

BOARD MEMBER EXCEUS: Yes, 'cause I know we spoke about there being no waiting 1ist. So I was just imagining, how would that help the families who need the help that are unaware of applying that they are eligible?

MS. SPECTOR: Well, okay, there is a waiting list for Early Head Start.

BOARD MEMBER EXCEUS: So that would be under this one?

MS. SPECTOR: This one, yes, there is a very big waiting list. Where there's not a waiting list are those families that are working for -- that are making too much to qualify for the federal child care subsidy. We have a waiting list on our Families Forward, which is the next step. And then these families that are not working that would qualify are also on waiting list. So, advocacy, I know, you know, as grants come out, as the Federal Government releases grants, I know that all of our partners are actively seeking
the opportunity to serve more children. And to, Dan, your point, I think, yes, $I$ guess our partners at the Early Learning Coalition are going to -- I think they already are constantly reaching out to try to get families to apply for School Readiness to get everyone, because they're giving money back. If they don't serve the children, they have to give the money back, so I know they're actively recruiting families.

BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: Thank you.
BOARD MEMBER DUNN: If I could say it, like my mother used to say it, she used to say, "Ricky, we're too poor to be rich and too rich to be poor." Nobody know about that.

BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: Anyone want to follow that? Any other questions? Comments?

Okay, with that, all in favor? COLLECTIVELY: Aye.

BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: Any opposed?
Resolution passes.
Moving onto 2024-18, authorization to
negotiate and execute a contract with the Early Learning Coalition of Miami-Dade/ Monroe ELC for local match funding for the State of Florida School Readiness program match grant in a total amount not to exceed $\$ 1,230,000.00$ for a term of 12 months commencing October 1, 2024, and ending September 30, 2025.

Do I have a motion?
BOARD MEMBER DUNN: So moved, Richard Dunn.

BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: A second?
BOARD MEMBER GERSTEIN: (Inaudible).
BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: Any recusals?
VICE-CHAIR HOLLINGSWORTH: Recuse, Hollingsworth. I work for the Early Learning Coalition.

BOARD MEMBER FERRADAZ: I serve on the Board of the Early Learning Coalition. BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: Any discussion? Questions?

Hearing none, all those in favor?
COLLECTIVELY: Aye.
BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: Any opposed?
Resolution passes, and I'll turn it over
to Pam.
VICE-CHAIR HOLLINGSWORTH: Thank you, Dan.

Resolution 2024-19, authorization to negotiate and execute contract renewals with six providers, identified herein, for early childhood community research demonstration projects within high need communities in a total amount not to exceed \$1,939,358.00, for a term of 12 months, commencing October 1, 2024, and ending September 30, 2025, with one remaining contract renewal.

May I have a motion, please?
BOARD MEMBER EXCEUS: Aye,
Jacqueline.
VICE-CHAIR HOLLINGSWORTH: Thank you.
And a second?
BOARD MEMBER SALVER: Second, Salver.
VICE-CHAIR HOLLINGSWORTH: Are there any recusals?

BOARD MEMBER BAGNER: Bagner, employed by FIU and they're one of the research partners on one of these projects.

VICE-CHAIR HOLLINGSWORTH: Thank you. Other recusals?

Hearing no further recusals, the floor is open for discussion, feedback from the Directors.

Hearing no comments, all those in favor?

COLLECTIVELY: Aye.
VICE-CHAIR HOLLINGSWORTH: Are there any opposed? Resolution carries.

Resolution 2024-22, authorization to negotiate and execute a contract renewal with -- the screen is jumping around on me. Thank you. I actually have it right here I think. We're on 2022, correct?

Resolution 2024-22, authorization to negotiate and execute a contract renewal with the University of Miami Miller School of Medicine U.M., in an amount not to exceed $\$ 1,500,000.00$, for a comprehensive early intervention -- for comprehensive early intervention services for children with mild developmental delays, who do not meet eligibility requirements for the Individuals with Disabilities Education

Act, IDEA, parts $B$ or $C$, for a term of 12 months, commencing October 1, 2024, and ending September 30, 2025.

May I have a motion, please?
Board MEMBER GIMENEZ: So moved, Gimenez.

VICE-CHAIR HOLLINGSWORTH: Thank you.
And a second?
BOARD MEMBER PRESCOTT: Second.
VICE-CHAIR HOLLINGSWORTH: Thank you.
Are there any recusals? Hearing no recusals, the floor is open for discussion, feedback, from the Directors.

Hearing none, all those in favor?
COLLECTIVELY: Aye.
VICE-CHAIR HOLLINGSWORTH: Are there any opposed? Resolution carries.

Resolution 2024-23, authorization to waive the formal competitive procurement process and to amend Resolution 2023-38, in the current contract with the Blossom Group Florida, LLC, for youth development services, starting from January 23, 2024, to the end of the contract term, August 14, 2024, in order to add a
subcontractor, Los Pinos Nuevos Christian Corp, and to provide youth development services to 30 elementary school students rather than high school students.

May I have a motion, please?
BOARD MEMBER GERSTEIN: So moved.
VICE-CHAIR HOLLINGSWORTH: Thank you.
And a second.
BOARD MEMBER ABRAHAM: Second,
Abraham.
VICE-CHAIR HOLLINGSWORTH: Thank you.
Are there any recusals? With no recusals, the floor is open for discussion, feedback from the Directors. With no comment, all those in favor? COLLECTIVELY: Aye.

VICE-CHAIR HOLLINGSWORTH: Are there any opposed? Resolution carries.

And, Mr. Chair, that concludes it.
CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: Thank you, Pam.
I'11 turn it over to Jim for your report.

MR. HAJ: Mr. Chair, thank you.
Quarterly reports on page 23 , and you also have the monthly media highlights the
great work of communications team, pages 24 through 30.

Board retreat will be next month, February 22nd, Thursday, from 8:30 to 12:30.

And our Champions, as Ken mentioned, we have some great honorees this year. Our Champions for Children event will be Thursday, April 11th at the Doubletree, at the Hilton in Miami Airport.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRPERSON HOFFMAN: Thank you.
One last comment. As we talked about in prior meetings, board retreats are really important. A lot of the initiatives that we're talking about today came out of a prior Board retreat. So please do make an effort to attend. It's February 22nd, 8:30 a.m. It will substitute for a Board meeting. I don't think we have other agenda items at this point, but please make every effort to attend. Thank you. Meeting is adjourned.
(Thereupon, at 5:37 p.m., the meeting was adjourned).
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|  | 84:19 | $\text { kinds [1] }-26: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { least }[4]-16: 19,17: 2, \\ & 28: 7,71: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Iong-term [3] - 14:23, } \\ & \text { 20:16, 20:17 } \end{aligned}$ |
| interested [1] - 9:5 | es [1]-1:23 | known [2] - 22:16 | leave [3] - 16:3, 30:25, | longevity [1] - 57: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { interesting [2] - 14:17, } \\ & \text { 19:21 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { January [3] - } \\ 87: 1,90: 13 \end{array}$ | $25: 8$ | $40: 22$ | look [10] - 24:21, 27:1, |
| interim [1] - 15:8 | Jessie [4] - 6:13, 6:24, | knows [2] - 6:24, 12:5 Kobrinski [1] - 1:25 | leaving [6] - 16:7, | $34: 21,34: 22,35: 14$ |
| interlocal [1] - 68:7 <br> International [1] - 4:3 | $6: 25,8: 6$ | KOBRINSKI [5] - 71:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 8,16: 11,16: 2 \\ & 16: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 37:18, 45:16, 45:21, $48: 19,63: 3$ |
| intervene [1] - 48:9 | $\begin{array}{r} \operatorname{Jim}[10]-6: 18,8: 4, \\ 22: 9,38: 21,45: 5 \end{array}$ | $74: 5,75: 25,76: 4$ | led [1] - 62:2 | looked [1] - 12:11 |
| intervention [7] - | $45: 13,60: 20,63: 25$ |  | left [1] - 2:5 | looking [9] - 20:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 46: 8,47: 10,47: 14, \\ & 48: 1,48: 5,85: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $67: 9,87: 24$ | $13: 20,14: 6,14:$ | legally [1] - 35:8 | 28:7, 28:10, 32:12, |
|  | job [6] - 16:4, 16:7, | 21:17, 23:13, 27:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { legislation [2]-26:17, } \\ & 38: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 3,35: 7,56: 9, \\ & 63: 8,63: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| interventions [6] - | 16:8, 16:9, 16:11, | $30: 23,45: 9,50: 1$ | legislative [1] - 40: | looks [5] - 2:3, 21:15, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 39:2, 41:11, 42:10, } \\ \text { 42:21, 42:23, 43:1 } \\ \text { interviewing [1] - 46:1 } \end{gathered}$ | jo | 50:6, | legislators [1] - 21:1 | 28:16, 29:16, 34:3 |
|  | John [1] - 37:16 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { legislature }[3]-20: 23, \\ & 32: 18,40: 3 \end{aligned}$ | Lorena [1] - 90:8 <br> IORENA [1] - 90:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { introduce }[2]-13: 18 \text {, } \\ & \text { 21:19 } \\ & \text { introduced }[2]-34: 5 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | join [1] - 4:22 <br> Jones [1] - 39: |  | Leichter [2]-9:14, | Los [1] - 87:4 |
|  | journals [1] - 5 | lack [3] - 12:11, 15:21, | 10:2 | lose [2]-20:15, 42:15 |
|  |  | 31:1 | Leigh [1] - 1:25 | loss [1] - 30:24 |
|  | journey [1]-7:13 Jr [1] - 3:21 |  | lends [1] - 22:24 | Lourdes [4]-1:14, |
|  | Jr [1] - 3:21 |  | LEON [1] - 5:9 | 1:16, 41:1, $48: 8$ |


| low [8] - 12:12, 30:14, | 51:9, 51:12 | mentioned [12] - 9:24, | 69:2, 69:10, 71:11, | 8:10, 11:20, 14:12, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30:18, 30:25, 31:7, | Medicine [1] - 85:22 | 26:14, 41:4, 45:5, | 72:23, 75:15, 80:15 | :17, 27:20, 30:2, |
| 44:22, 44:23, 49:25 | meet [5]-22:1, 36:17, | $5: 13,48: 9,50: 10$ | mind [5]-2:20, 17:22, | 30:9, 40:23, 43:7 |
| lower [1] - 38:22 | 8:6, 55:13, 86:2 | :25, 64:24, 65:21, | 32:1, 55:20, 60:18 | $\text { 64:1, 80:10, } 88:$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { lowest }[3]-22: 15 \text {, } \\ & 31: 2,38: 12 \end{aligned}$ | Meeting [1]-1:6 meeting [23]-2:3, | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 67:10, } 88: 9 \\ \text { merging [1] - 79:16 } \end{array}$ | Mindingall [2] - 2:22, $43: 16$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MS [23] - 5:9, 22:9, } \\ 24: 14,25: 2,26: 25, \end{gathered}$ |
| Lucie [1] - 33:25 | 2:17, 5:3, 5:14, 11:6, | met ${ }_{[4]}-6: 12,9: 18$, | Mindy [1] - 1:18 | 30:10, 40:19, 41:7, |
|  | 4:24, 66:2, | 48:16, 57 | minimum [4]-23:3, | 13, 42:16, 43:3, |
| M | 66:10, 67:5, 67:6 | metric [1] - 38: | 31:12, 32:7, 51:10 | 45:3, 53:7, 56:25, |
| ma'am [1] - 41:7 <br> mail [1] - 8:19 <br> mailing [1] - 54:4 <br> major ${ }_{[2]}$ - 13:6, 20:7 <br> majority [1] - 50:12 <br> managers [1] - 61:10 <br> manner [1] - 75:12 <br> map [4]-47:1, 54:24, <br> 56:6, 59:22 <br> mapping [1] - 45:24 | 70:12, 70:22, 70:24, | MIAMI [1] - 90:6 | minutes [2]-5:13, | :5, 71:5, 74:5 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 1,75: 3,75: 9, \\ & 88: 23,89: 2,89: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Miami [40] - 4:10, } \\ 4: 20,8: 2,21: 25 \end{array}$ | $5: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 25,76: 4,76: 18 \\ & 79: 23,81: 12,81: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $90: 11,90: 12,90: 15$ | 23:23, 24:3, 24:17, | 16:18 | multiple [2] - 35:25, |
|  | meetings [6] - 11:3, | $24: 20,24: 24,25: 5,$ | missing [2]-16:13, | 49:7 |
|  | 65:18, 66:6, 69:18, | 25:6, 26:21, 27:25, |  | municipalities [1] - |
|  | 70:6, 88:17 | 28:5, 28:24, 29:5, | model [2] - 57:5, 57:6 | 61:2 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { MEMBER }[85]-2: 8, \\ 5 \cdot 185 \cdot 227 \cdot 12 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 6,32: 24,34: 12, \\ & 43: 14,50: 10,60: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\text { models }[1]-57: 4$ mom [1] - 53:8 | N |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 11,8: 16,10: 9 \\ & 10: 11,10: 13,10 \end{aligned}$ | $60: 15,60: 16,61: 1,$ | Monday [1] - 1: |  |
|  | $10: 17,10: 21,24: 12$ | $23,72: 4,77: 17$ | money [10]-20:2, | name [2] - 2:18, 7:24 |
| March [1] - 65:5 | 24:15, 25:15, 26:19, | 8:14, 78:15, 78:17, | 72:4, 72:5, 80:10, | named [1]-3:2 |
| Maria [1]-1:19 | 26:24, 27:12, 28:12, | 80:16, 83:5, 85:21, | $80: 14,82: 11,82: 12$ | Nancy [1]-1:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Marissa [2] - 9:14 } \\ & 10: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 14,29: 17,29: 23, \\ & 29: 25,30: 3,30: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 88:13, 90:19 } \\ \text { Miami-Dade [24] } \end{gathered}$ | Monroe [2] - 78:15, | natalia [1] - 64:1 <br> Natalia [2] - 58:3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mark [3] - 9:4, 9:10, } \\ & 9: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 8,40: 17,40: 21, \\ & 40: 25,41: 8,42: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 25,23: 23,24: 3, \\ & \text { 24:17, 24:20, 24:24, } \end{aligned}$ | monster [1] - 19:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 64: 18 \\ & \text { nation }[3]-28: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
| marker [1] - 52:13 | $42: 17,43: 6,43: 11,$ | 25:5, 25:6, 26:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { month }[9]-7: 25,18: 2, \\ & \text { 26:6, 26:8, } 36: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $31: 3,62: 16$ |
| market [1] - 31:6 | 43:24, 67:22, 69:5, | 27:25, 28:5, 29:6, | 50:4, 53:18, 53:20, | national [5] - 13:1, <br> 17:12, 36:16, 57:21, |
| match [ 5$]-47: 15$, $77: 8,78: 17,83 \cdot 6$, | $\begin{aligned} & 69: 11,70: 8,71: 10 \\ & 72: 13,72: 20,72: 24, \end{aligned}$ |  | 88:6 | 17:12, 36:16, 57:21, 62:9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 77: 8,78: 17,83: 6, \\ & 83: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 72:13, 72:20, 72:24, } \\ & 73: 1,73: 12,73: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 62:11, 62:25, 78:14, } \\ & 78: 15,78: 17,80: 16, \end{aligned}$ | monthly [2]-50:3, | 62:9 National [1] - 90:8 |
| materially [1] -68:8 | 74:10, 74:12, 74:16, | 83:5, 90:19 | months [7]-16:1, | nationally [2]-56:22, |
| math [1] - 38:18 | 74:19, 75:22, 76:2, | MIAMI-DADE ${ }_{[1]}$ | 77:12, 77:22, 78:21, | 57:15 |
| Matt [2] - 9:11, 9:25 | 76:11, 76:21, 77:1, | 90:6 | 83:10, 84:14, 86:5 | nature [2] - 68:6, 73:7 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { matter }[3]-61: 3, \\ 72: 14,75: 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78: 2,78: 9,78: 25 \\ & 79: 2,79: 3,79: 5, \end{aligned}$ | Miami-Dade's [1] - 61:1 | Morris [1] - 6:3 | near [1] - 65:9 <br> NEASMAN ${ }^{2}$ - $-7: 12$, |
| 72:14, 75:2 <br> Matthew [1]-1:12 | 79:10, 79:12, 79:15, | $\begin{gathered} 61: 1 \\ \text { Miami } \end{gathered}$ | most [11]-18:24, $35 \cdot 12,39 \cdot 3,40 \cdot 2$ | 8:11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { maximum }[3]-32: 14, \\ & 47: 16,47: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 17,81: 6,81: 14, \\ & 82: 15,82: 16,82: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 77: 17 \\ \text { michele [1] - 43:7 } \end{array}$ | 40:5, 40:12, 46:6, 49:9, 52:21, 55:20, | Neasman [1] - 6:6 neatest [1] - $38: 7$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mayor [2] - 59:15, } \\ & 64: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 1,83: 13,83: 15 \\ & \text { 83:16, 83:17, 83:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Michele }[15]-21: 15, \\ & 21: 16,21: 18,21: 19, \end{aligned}$ | 57:16 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { need [17] - 17:17, } \\ \text { 18:25, 19:1, 19:3, } \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { McFarland [2]-21:2, } \\ & 34: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 83:23, 84:2, 84:18, <br> 84:22, 84:25, 86:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:20, 21:22, 22:4, } \\ & \text { 22:7, 26:13, 30:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { motion [11] - 5:16, } \\ 6: 2,10: 6,76: 22, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 16,20: 10,25: 9 \\ & 29: 19,32: 11,38: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| MDCPS ${ }_{[1]}-62: 25$ | 86:12, 87:9, 87:12 Member [5] - 6:6, | $41: 1,42: 15,45: 10$ | 77:24, 78:1, 78:24, | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 3,56: 17,63: 23, \\ & 66: 23,75: 24,81: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { mean }[6]-15: 4,27: 12, \\ & 32: 8,68: 9,72: 13, \\ & 75: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Member [5] - 6:6, } \\ & \text { 66:20, } 67: 3,71: 6, \\ & 74: 6 \end{aligned}$ | Michele's [2]-26:1, $50: 20$ <br> microphone [1]-2:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 12,84: 17,86: 7, \\ & 87: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { 66:23, 75:24, 81:9, } \\ \text { 84:11 } \\ \text { needed [2] - 65:12, } \end{array}$ |
| meaningful ${ }_{[1]}$ - 49:21 | member [4]-6:16, | middle [2]-18:10, | move [7] - 10:9, 16:14, | 66:11 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { means }[7]-14: 23, \\ 15: 3,23: 23,25: 8, \end{gathered}$ | 11:17, 21:21, 67:8 members [9] - 3:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 60: 1 \\ & \text { might }[5]-2: 24,21: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 10,40: 11,40: 13, \\ & 76: 22,78: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { needs }[5]-39: 9, \\ 39: 17, ~ 48: 4, ~ 48: 8, ~ \end{array}$ |
| 31:21, 33:13, 34:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 7,10: 19,11: 12, \\ & \text { 11:13, 66:16, 66:17, } \end{aligned}$ | 25:5, 31:24, 44:1 | moved [8]-5:18, | 74:3 |
| mechanical [1]-2:11 | 11:13, 66:16, 66:17, 69:24, 70:25 | Migrant [1] - 77:7 <br> mild [1]-86:1 | $5: 23,66: 2,66: 9,$ | negotiate [7] - 77:6, 77:15, 78:13, 83:4, |
| 65:23 | Members [3]-1:10, | Miller [1] - 85:21 | 76:20, 83:13, 86:8, | 84:8, 85:15, 85:20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { media }[3]-13: 2,62: 9, \\ & 88: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 9:6, 11:9 <br> mental [1]-52:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { million [21] - 20:4, } \\ & 23: 21,35: 19,64: 7, \end{aligned}$ | moves [1] - 37:24 <br> moving [6] - 23:15, | neighborhoods [1] - 55:3 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { median }[9]-18: 1, \\ 22: 23,33: 2,33: 3, \end{gathered}$ | ```mention [5]-2:20, 43:13, 45:10, 50:1, 53:8``` | $\begin{aligned} & 64: 8,64: 10,64: 11, \\ & 65: 1,65: 6,68: 3 \\ & 68: 16,68: 20,68: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 2,45: 18,48: 13 \\ & 64: 6,83: 3 \end{aligned}$ | Nelson [1]-1:19 never [2]-2:20, 32:1 new [3]-7:23, 10:18, |


| 10:19 <br> news $[2]-62: 4,62: 5$ <br> next $[23]-5: 2,7: 25$, <br> 15:5, 15:13, 17:4, <br> 17:24, 18:16, 19:8, <br> 21:13, 30:11, 32:17, <br> $34: 14,34: 15,34: 16$, <br> $53: 24,54: 23,55: 17$, <br> $59: 12,61: 25,62: 17$, <br> $64: 12,81: 22,88: 6$ <br> Next $[1]-46: 25$ <br> nice $[1]-58: 8$ <br> Nicole $[1]-1: 17$ <br> Nobody $[1]-82: 19$ <br> nominated $[2]-9: 6$, <br> $9: 12$ <br> Nominating $[1]-8: 15$ <br> nominating $[1]-9: 19$ <br> nomination $[3]-9: 9$, <br> $9: 20,10: 6$ <br> nominees $[1]-9: 17$ <br> none $[2]-83: 25$, <br> $86: 17$ <br> Norie $[1]-1: 13$ <br> normal $[1]-16: 17$ <br> Norman $[1]-1: 16$ <br> Norton $[1]-1: 19$ <br> note $[1]-64: 2$ <br> notice $[1]-67: 10$ <br> Nova $[1]-77: 17$ <br> November $[2]-5: 13$, <br> $8: 23$ <br> Nuevos $[1]-87: 4$ <br> number $[12]-16: 5$, <br> $18: 18,24: 22,27: 7$, <br> $28: 16,32: 14,34: 22$, <br> $40: 6,46: 24,47: 24$, <br> $51: 6,56: 15$ <br> numbers $[4]-18: 19$, <br> $29: 9,30: 20,44: 22$ <br> news [2]-62:4, 62:5 <br> next [23]-5:2, 7:25, <br> 15:5, 15:13, 17:4, <br> 17:24, 18:16, 19:8, <br> 21:13, 30:11, 32:17, <br> 34:14, 34:15, 34:16, <br> 53:24, 54:23, 55:17, <br> 59:12, 61:25, 62:17, <br> 64:12, 81:22, 88:6 <br> Next ${ }_{[1]}$ - 46:25 <br> nice [1] - 58:8 <br> Nicole [1] - 1:17 <br> Nobody [1] - 82:19 <br> nominated [2] - 9:6, <br> 9:12 <br> Nominating ${ }_{[1]}-8: 15$ <br> nominating ${ }_{[1]}-9: 19$ <br> nomination [3]-9:9, <br> 9:20, 10:6 <br> nominees [1] - 9:17 <br> none [2]-83:25, <br> 86:17 <br> Norie [1] - 1:13 <br> normal ${ }_{[1]}$ - 16:17 <br> Norman [1] - 1:16 <br> Norton [1] - 1:19 <br> note [1] - 64:2 <br> notice [1] - 67:10 <br> Nova [1] - 77:17 <br> November [2]-5:13, <br> 8:23 <br> Nuevos [1] - 87:4 <br> number [12]-16:5, <br> 18:18, 24:22, 27:7, <br> 28:16, 32:14, 34:22, <br> 40:6, 46:24, 47:24, <br> 51:6, 56:15 <br> numbers [4]-18:19, <br> 29:9, 30:20, 44:22 <br> obstacles [1] - 13:6 <br> obtain [1] - 11:12 <br> obtaining $[1]-3: 15$ <br> obviously [5] - 18:4, <br> 27:23, 45:11, 57:1, <br> 58:11 <br> Ocean [1] - 65:8 <br> October [7] - 8:20, <br> 77:12, 77:22, 78:22, <br> 83:10, 84:14, 86:5 <br> OF [3] -90:2, 90:5, 90:6 <br> offers [1] - 49:20 <br> Office ${ }_{[1]}-1: 24$ <br> officer [1] - 8:21 <br> officers [2] -9:22, | 10:7 <br> offices [1] - 60:15 <br> official $[1]$ - 42:20 <br> officials [1] - 61:11 <br> offset [3]-36:24, <br> 37:5, 40:13 <br> old [1] - 38:11 <br> onboard [1] - 7:25 <br> once [2]-22:21, 68:15 <br> one [52]-2:5, 9:8, <br> 10:23, 10:24, 13:5, <br> 13:18, 16:5, 16:19, <br> 16:21, 17:8, 17:9, <br> 17:20, 19:20, 26:3, <br> 28:23, 28:25, 31:2, <br> 32:5, 32:6, 32:9, <br> 33:14, 34:23, 37:2, <br> 38:7, 41:13, 44:6, <br> 45:19, 49:2, 52:15, <br> 53:4, 56:21, 62:22, <br> 63:1, 64:2, 64:3, <br> 64:13, 65:6, 67:8, <br> 68:14, 69:12, 70:6, <br> 74:1, 79:18, 80:18, <br> 81:15, 81:16, 84:15, <br> 85:1, 85:2, 88:16 <br> ones [2]-35:12, 40:12 <br> ongoing [2]-26:4, <br> 52:8 <br> open [6] - 17:19, 75:2, <br> 79:13, 85:7, 86:15, <br> 87:16 <br> opening [1] - 70:10 <br> operating [1] - 35:8 <br> opinion [3] - 62:5, <br> 70:14, 73:15 <br> opportunities [2] - <br> 23:16, 63:22 <br> opportunity [4] - <br> 11:16, 53:10, 73:21, 82:4 <br> opposed [9]-6:1, 10:17, 53:19, 78:7, 83:1, 84:2, 85:13, 86:20, 87:21 <br> Optimist [1] - 4:19 <br> options [1] - 55:8 <br> order [2] - 47:15, 87:3 <br> organization [3] - <br> 7:18, 71:18, 71:22 <br> organized [1] - 61:6 <br> originally [1] - 6:12 <br> Orlando [2]-1:20, <br> 14:10 <br> otherwise [2]-62:14, 67:17 <br> outgrown [1] - 24:10 <br> outlets [1] - 62:4 <br> outstanding [5] - 3:3, <br> 3:23, 4:17, 6:14, | ```13:23 overall [2]-46:12, 80:14 Overtown [1] - 28:21 overview [1] - 12:18 own [4]-4:18, 36:9, 36:10, 61:18 owner [1] - 57:11```P <br>  <br> p.m $[3]-1: 3,89: 3$ <br> package $[1]-69: 3$ <br> packaged $[1]-67: 20$ <br> packets $[1]-5: 15$ <br> page $[2]-72: 15,88: 2$ <br> pages $[2]-88: 4,90: 14$ <br> Pam $[9]-9: 13,9: 24$, <br> $25: 4,50: 10,75: 23$, <br> $76: 12,76: 17,84: 4$, <br> $87: 23$ <br> Pamela $[1]-1: 8$ <br> pandemic $[2]-23: 5$, <br> $51: 8$ <br> panel $[1]-61: 6$ <br> panels $[1]-60: 20$ <br> parent $[4]-31: 10$, <br> $32: 6,32: 9,33: 14$ <br> parents $[16]-16: 2$, <br> $16: 6,16: 12,16: 18$, <br> $16: 22,18: 6,19: 18$, <br> $31: 9,31: 13,31: 23$, <br> $32: 2,32: 3,32: 5$, <br> $40: 10,50: 22,60: 7$ <br> part $[16]-16: 14,27: 3$, <br> $35: 18,36: 15,37: 6$, <br> $38: 24,42: 3,45: 20$, <br> $55: 1,58: 12,58: 25$, <br> $59: 15,59: 19,61: 18$, <br> $67: 1,67: 20$ <br> part-time $[1]-16: 14$ <br> participate $[2]-38: 10$, <br> $39: 10$ <br> participated $[1]-$ <br> $60: 21$ <br> participating $[3]-$ <br> $30: 16,54: 18,57: 23$ <br> participation $[1]-$ <br> $81: 4$ <br> particular $[2]-66: 24$, <br> $75: 3$ <br> partner $[2]-13: 22$, <br> $49: 9$ <br> partners $[13]-46: 2$, <br> $48: 17,49: 10,58: 12$, <br> $58: 22,59: 15,59: 19$, <br> $61: 7,62: 24,64: 15$, <br> $82: 3,82: 6,85: 2$ <br> partnership $[2]-$ | ```51:24, 52:7 Partnership [1] - 79:25 partnerships [1] - 58:15 Partnerships [1] - 78:19 parts [1]-86:4 passed [2]-34:10, 35:5 passes [3]-10:18, 83:2, 84:3 past [4]-16:1, 16:19, 26:8, 32:10 Pastor [1] - 73:11 pathway [2]-61:17, 61:18 pattern [1]-66:5 Paudel \([1]-1: 20\) paying [1]-53:15 payment [3]-49:15, 49:18, 53:15 payments [1]-55:10 pays [2]-53:9 Peggy [1]-2:25 Pelham [2]-3:21, 3:25 people [6] - 19:4, 29:10, 50:12, 50:23, 50:24, 70:21 Per [1] - 71:6 per [3]-18:2, 36:5, 36:6 percent [43]-12:5, 13:9, 16:2, 16:18, 17:2, 22:19, 22:23, 23:9, 24:2, 24:6, 24:10, 24:17, 24:23, 25:1, 25:13, 26:22, 27:7, 27:16, 27:19, 28:1, 28:4, 28:6, 28:8, 30:15, 30:24, 31:16, 31:20, 33:11, 33:12, 33:16, 33:17, 33:19, 34:3, 35:2, 37:23, 37:25, 43:4, 46:18, 46:19, 47:19, 50:19, 79:21, 80:2 percentage \([7]\) - 24:19, 24:25, 25:17, 26:20, 27:18, 28:11, 38:24 percentages \({ }_{[1]}\) - 44:23 percentile \({ }_{[1]}-38: 12\) Perfect [1] - 30:10 performance \({ }_{[1]}\) - 38:3 performing [2] - 41:19, 41:20``` | ```perhaps [1] - 70:5 permanently [1] - 19:15 Perrine [1]-28:22 person [1] - 74:1 personal [1] - 70:14 perspective \({ }_{[2]}\) - 20:15, 44:13 phenomenally \({ }_{[1]}\) - 64:15 philanthropy [1] - 58:25 phone [1] - 56:15 physician [1] - 39:19 piece \({ }_{[1]}\) - 47:1 piecemeal [1]-13:13 pieces [3]-38:7, 57:15, 62:5 Pierce [1] - 34:19 Pinos [1] - 87:4 pivoted [2] - 12:1, 12:13 pivoting [1] - 12:10 place [2]-22:13, 22:15 places [2]-28:22, 57:18 plan [4]-17:1, 39:13, 63:18, 63:20 planning [2] - 19:25, 64:5 plans [1] - 20:9 play [1] - 56:23 played \({ }^{[1]}\) - 60:13 pleased [2] - 42:2, 64:23 plot [1] - 36:9 plus [1] - 66:16 point [11]-19:22, 26:1, 26:7, 28:25, 44:6, 44:9, 46:14, 55:21, 75:22, 82:5, 88:25 pointed [1]-23:13 points [1] - 44:3 policies [2] - 61:1, 61:3 policy [6] - 17:14, 20:24, 37:18, 59:10, 63:19, 63:23 poor [3]-44:10, 82:18, 82:19 poorest [1] - 28:24 pop [1] - 56:10 popping [1] - 11:22 portion [1] - 36:7 position [4]-9:7, 9:8, 9:9, 9:12 positions [3] - 8:22, 9:16, 67:17``` |
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