

OFJFS Child Care Child Care Advisory Council January 15, 2014

Introductions

Elaine Ward, Co-Chair

- Please make a change to the minutes from cannot to can and to the third bullet.
 - Gail Montana motions to approve minutes with correction, Julie Piazza-King seconds.
- The CCAC annual report is complete.

Eligibility and Authorization (See Handout)

David Smith, Not-for-Profit Representative

- Individuals are approved for Publicly Funded Child Care (PFCC) due to income and/or work or school required. In the past, it was interpreted as if you are not in work, school, or going back and forth between the provider then you are out of compliance. Since the swipe card, children are able to attend services at any time regardless of the caretaker's activity up to the authorization.
- When an individual loses eligibility for not participating in an approved activity, can you extend the authorization? In some cases you can, up to 30 days (i.e. layoff for 2 weeks).
- FMLA is not considered a qualifying activity to ODJFS.
- The goal is to get to the point where everyone has clear guidance on the rules and how they are treated.
- The counties should receive guidance to make this as clear as possible.
- *CCAC Comments:*
 - There is another category, full time plus, which is in excess of full time hours.
 - Within the document, 4a requires more committee discussion. If a parent loses their job and everything closes out, the parent can come under the system as reinstatement under a new Federal Poverty Level (FPL). However, if a county receives a report the parent is no longer working, the parent will receive 15 days or the case will terminate. If this is not verified, the case will close. If the parent were to lose a job, they would not receive 30 days to figure out what to do. A 30 day gap is usually a school situation. School should be covered for the 2 weeks off because verification will be submitted for the next quarter.
 - If there is a known gap that can be documented, the county can cover this.
 - The family would contact the county for alternate care if a college child care program closed for a few weeks for Christmas break.
 - The new college J-term may be more of a 6 week term, this is a new development. This can include only topics specific to that term. How will this impact long-term?
 - Counties notify individuals attending college up front they must submit this information.
 - The counties lost functionality around notification; they can either build the authorization based on the current term or end it. There is nothing to notify the parent so there is a system gap that does not notify a parent.
 - The provider should see the verification ending, as well as the parent, and they should encourage the parent to contact the county.

- The assumption was based on the Ohio Electronic Child Care (ECC) or Eligibility and Authorization (EA) change, but the categories of authorization were in place before ECC.
 - The intent with the policy was to allow this flexibility.
- If a family receives a second shift at work to change from part-time to full-time, a timely contact can be covered and changed. This all is determined by the family notifying the county timely. This will be verified and cannot be retro-active by the county.
 - The county only makes the change when it can be verified (i.e. schedule, letter).
- A guidance letter from the Department should be distributed based on this conversation so it is clear.
 - Regionally there should be a formal meeting to make items more clear versus a letter.
 - The child care manual should be reviewed to verify it is clear information from all sides, including the department.
 - This is in Chapter 16.
 - Jims comment, licensing rules, is different from this.
 - The rules may appear confusing because it state it must be related to the hours of schooling, yet we allow a part-time or full-time authorization. This can be change to be clear of the intent.
- This appears to be a guidance document piece.
- **The CCAC policy and rule committee will create a recommendation on guidance that is needed on this rule. It will be a manual piece that can always be referenced.**
- There is an issue with the definition of full-time care due to the large gap of time. It allows caretakers and parents to place children in care for a long time whether the parent may or may not be working. This should be a part of the policy consideration to break down full-time further (i.e. 25-40 and 40-60) to provide greater action. 60 hours a week with no increase of pay is a burden.
 - Keep in mind the Market Rate is based on the market. Requesting this change challenges the purpose of the Market Rate Survey.
 - The full time rate is the market of purchasing full time service. Some council members could not see the state paying more for 60 hours.
 - Michael can carry this comment to the Policy and Rule Committee.
- ODJFS' job is to help facilitate the committees in that all suggestions provide the committee with all pieces that are impacted when you review a policy (i.e. eligibility, payment, federal guidance all intertwined). We must review it from all angles and provide the most accurate information for the committee to debate.

School Readiness (See Handout)

Jim Lindley, Proprietary Representative

- If there is a lack of Step Up To Quality (SUTQ) rated centers in the area, what does it take to make the obstacle go away?
- The obstacle listed at the bottom of the document raise other issues such as improve the process for authorizing a family to obtain child care. Can we approve children for one year of school for continuity of education, how do we increase the child care centers that take subsidized children (2500 or the 4300 take subsidized)?
- We must review why many centers are not taking publicly funded children (i.e. the state does not pay for holidays).
- Issue a temporary authorization for parents to search for employment.
- The PFCC children do not attend so how do you incentivize parents to bring their children in to receive the education? If a child is there 90-95% of the time, will the state pick up the copay?
- Propose give thought on how to proceed at the next meeting which issue should we discuss or remove?

- Sections 2 and 3 can be turned into a ranking sheet and ask questions to members in-between meetings. CCAC will group then rank the exercise to understand the priorities of the committee to tackle the issues.
- We must review what that eligibility looks like for families with preschoolers.
- **Jim will send the document to the committee for prioritization so the next CCAC meeting we can discuss more in depth to allow a large, defined agenda slot. Jim will also include areas to include items in number 1 that will drive 2 and 3.**

Ohio ECE Utilization

Stephanie Siddens, Ohio Department of Education (ODE)

Amy Story, CDJFS

- The counties are challenged in an attempt to funnel families that hit a wall by referring to ECE program, yet hear the program is not being utilized. This is a case by case basis. How can the committee help?
 - The county can contact ODJFS for specific reports if needed.
- The applicants for the grant have submitted their grant budgets and ODE is in the process of creating a data collection system to submit information on the programs (program, teacher and student level). ODE will implement an online survey in the next week that will be sent to all grantees to report progress on filling slots, indicate challenges and reason they feel they are not filling slots along with assistance needed. It would be helpful to know what programs are experiencing if you do have a grant and it can be articulated in the survey what common challenges are.
 - Frequently mentioned challenges include timeframes the grant was awarded, holidays and cold weather. Stephanie hopes by the next CCAC meeting more concrete data will be available.
- *CCAC Comments:*
 - The survey should also include what strategies have been helpful so from a system standpoint, we can replicate in other counties.
 - David Smith received five slots and advertised on Facebook. The slots were filled in three days along with a waiting list.
 - Our programs were 2-star rated slots and the school districts were able to ask for the number of slots they wanted, but we only received what the school district or 3-star rated programs did not want. The school district is holding slots and if they are not filled they will go unused.
 - The 3-star programs received priority as well as PFCC. Early childhood recipients were at the same level as SUTQ in prioritization; they had to have the EC grant and meet the requirements.
 - Is there a mechanism to push the unused slots this year? Currently, ODE is monitoring the slot use for programs and the awards are already made at each district and community so it cannot change. The new set of funding for FY2015 will go through a new award process similar to the previous process with the highest needs around states and each being asked to apply. We may be able to consider if there is any slot use that was not filled to determine if new awards are appropriate or not.
 - Are the school districts subbing to centers?
 - Yes. Any entity can sub-contract, but it must be a high quality (existing public preschool site or Step Up To Quality highly rated site).
 - The nature of the application and number of slots may have turned into a lottery process; it was not going to districts over 3-stars. It occurred both ways in a randomly, equitable way. Many districts in their application identified the community-based settings who they would partner with.

- What are the programs ideas for parents to get around the issue of losing a child in a slot? The program is sending flyers, a banner, but it is not working which may be because it is a part day program.
- The county has heard part-time does not work with a parents work schedule and it is not a comprehensive solution for their family.
- Families do not need to work to receive this incentive.
- In Cuyahoga County people arrived to receive these slots and were lost during the application process.

Family Child Care (FCC)

Michael Batchelder, AFSCME

Todd Barnhouse, OCCRRRA

Kelly Smith, OCCRRRA

Amy Story, CDJFS Representative

Sandra Foster, CDJFS Representative

- CCAC Discussion:
 - What extent will there be staff capacity at county/state level for applications in SUTQ during July? There is also an unknown regarding the number intending to apply and at what level. Family child care providers must be fully informed regarding the kickoff of SUTQ July 1st and how to prepare to apply if interested.
 - Staff should review information in the registry to see the point levels on the Career Pathways Level (CPL) to know who will be eligible at each star level based on CPL.
 - A formal survey should be send to Type B Homes to determine their interest level in applying.
 - General information about SUTQ should be distributed to increase interest such as regional meeting/training and what the R&Rs will distribute. AFSCME would like to participate in the regional meetings.
- It is helpful for the CCAC and committees to have recommendations prepared for ODJFS.
 - Is the policy chair planning to bring a formal recommendation for surveys?
 - The CCAC must think of the councils and committee as an advising group. It is not about what ODJFS plans to do; it is regarding what the council and committee would like ODJFS to be aware of.
- A large percentage of the FCC population is being prepared for SUTQ, but the county staff currently have a high caseload. What is the capacity to accommodate county visits and SUTQ on top of additional duties?
 - ODJFS must make sure the counties are educated about the process. ODJFS SUTQ staff does not provide technical assistance to the providers; that is the contract with the Resource and Referral agencies and ODE's Statewide Support Teams. ODJFS must collect information to understand the assumption from the providers and counties. What we know, 3-4-5 star rated programs requiring the OCOT must be a validated tool before it can be expanded.
- Will this be an open enrollment for all Type Bs regardless of capacity?
 - The only requirement is to regulate people in a specific timeframe. The QRIS has not had timeframes. There are internal goals for movement, but each year we make an assumption and estimate on people and when. SFY15 does not have enough money to give an increase to all 4,000 providers and we do not anticipate that many providers coming in during year one.
- OCCRRRA believes it will be staggered; there are those anxious to participate.
- There will be overview training sessions. These were completed with the 5-star rollout and it will be targeted to FCC. OCCRRRA starts with about 10%, 400 Type B Homes. Some R&Rs are working with them closely and using items that work in specific areas to support the efforts.

- OCCRRA will build start up kits that will contain all the materials you need to meet the standards as part of your participation in a cohort. This was a large incentive; it helps the program understand the resources that must be in place.
- There is an understanding with R&Rs and the provider to commit to this rating process.
- Promotional flyers for marketing and targeting Type B homes will be created. The survey should include educational items to determine whether the interest in applying is possible. Michael would like to collect additional information.
- *CCAC Comments:*
 - Asyia believes 1/3 of providers are ready. Whitney has 14 type B homes that are ready.
 - Promotional items that may be missing from this flyer should be sent to Todd, Kelly or Donna.
 - Caution around uninformed eagerness.
 - A type B provider can license and opt out of SUTQ. We have 4x as many type B providers.
 - Are all FCC in the state of Ohio in the registry? 6000 FCCs are within the registry but, they are not required. Pulling the data would not determine if they are live cases.
 - Pam feels strongly to pull data from the registry specific to geographic. In addition, a recommendation should be made to create a survey for all licensed FCC to pull data on educational background, interest in SUTQ, and level prepared. The survey should include the standards and ask the provider “where they fall”.
 - Recommendation to bring back sample survey questions to review and registry information.
 - Why not build the readiness scan as survey monkey and send to the providers to capture what they are?
 - CCAC should recommend the ideas, but we must first discuss from a communications standpoint what makes the most sense. The standards are not finalized so the providers are unaware of the final standards; an overview presentation is not created. If we intend to receive quality feedback, formal documents must be completed and available before they can complete a survey before they determine how read they are (i.e. structure assessment or readiness). It would be helpful to have a recommendation on what to consider.
 - A timeline is needed. This can be created by the policy committee or the union to show what ODJFS completed.
 - The recruitment for TA cohorts is another layer to gauge interest.
 - Perhaps the recommendation is around a timeframe to cover the timing issue- can the department come up with a staging recognizing the group is interested in baseline data for participation?
 - **Will a group be willing to complete some work with ODJFS before the February CCAC and take into account what was discussed today? It can be brought back to the next meeting- Pam, Whitney, Michael, Asyia, Sandra, Gail.**
 - It appears as though there is not a defined process; if the requirements are not out- how do you know who is going to apply?
 - The union should be aware of the curriculum and education of their programs so they can advocate.
 - 40% of Family Child Care are union members; it does not represent the whole field. Everyone that is impacted by the policy must be represented.
 - It makes sense for ODJFS to send out what the Type B providers want to know.
 - This is the state’s project and if they would like to identify who is orchestrating it, the state should message this for the purpose of their project.
 - It would be helpful for CCAC to understand the baseline data gathering and then the committee can create added recommendations.

- ODJFS has discussed better understanding around county certification qualifications other than certification to understand potential training.
- Pam suggests review the registry information; collect the level of type B providers, place into organized cohorts where they may fall into as they apply in SUTQ. This will be more intentional with the support around regional meetings.
- The survey can identify the capacity and commitment to enter the system.
- The issue with SUTQ is FT hours 25-60. This should be 22.5. The swipe card has cut down the hours leaving funds part-time. The program is having a hard time stabilizing an operation due to payment drops and 3-star rating is difficult because a degreed teacher will not work for minimum wage.

Committee Report Out

IT Committee

Amy Story, CDJFS

- We have 3,999 licensed type B Homes. Lost in the transition 400 Limited's.
- Michael is concerned with the loss of providers and he would like to know the breakdown amongst Limited's, revocations, and issues with type Bs filling slots. Any information would be helpful.
- ODJFS is looking at children authorized and utilizing FCC from the last week of December to the first week to see a net loss of children served. A large caveat with this data is you cannot assume it's all lost, there were over 200 providers that did not have authorizations for a long time.
- There will be future communication regarding the W9s.

Policy & Rule Committee

Julie Piazza-King, Community Professional

- Changes for the application for child care went through clearance in November and the information in the field has changed.
- The field guide for licensing specialist is in process. The inspection protocol trainings are being planned.
- All daycamps must be accredited by ACA to receive PFCC. Although approved daycamps were removed, they must still register as a daycamp.

Union Updates

Michael Batchelder, AFSCME

- Trouble shooting with the transition and sending information.

Check Out

Elaine Ward, Co-Chair

- Next Meeting: February 19, 2014
- Agenda:
 - PD Discussion
 - Small Group FCC Recommendations
 - School Readiness- Ranking Sheet by Jim Lindley

Child Care Advisory Council January 15, 2014

Members in Attendance:	Members Not in Attendance:
Elaine Ward, Community Professional	Teri Raneri, Type A
Teri Brannum, Community Professional	Kate Watson, Parent
Jim Lindley, Not-for-Profit	Kelly Mettler, CDJFS
David Smith, Not for Profit	
Louanna Leonard, Proprietary	
Sandra Foster, Cuyahoga CDJFS	
Amy Story, CDJFS	
Julie Piazza-King, Not for Profit	
Danielle Burnette, CDJFS	
Whitney Scarberry, CDJFS	
Beth Pinherio, CDJFS	
Pam Perrino, Community Professional	
Asyia Haile, Type B	
Lolita Wallace, Franklin CDJFS	
Tasha Johnson, Not for Profit	
Gail Montana, Type A	
Paula Selway, Not for Profit	
Sarah Stertzbach, Parent <i>PHONE</i>	
Marjorie Crouse, Parent <i>PHONE</i>	
Ex-Officio In Attendance:	Ex-Officio Not in Attendance:
Diane Saunders, ODE	Marlene Fields, ODE
Melissa Courts, ODH	Marla Himmeger, ODMH
	Ron Johnson, State Fire Marshall
ODJFS Child Care Staff in Attendance:	
Michelle Albast, Child Care	Donna Stickel, ODJFS
Stacey Zack, Child Care	
Stephanie Shafer, CCAS	
Alicia Leatherman, ODJFS	
Jeffery Van Deusen, ODJFS	
Guests in Attendance:	
Rose Walt	Jeanette Selbe
Donna Gibson	Karen Lampe <i>PHONE</i>
Michael Batchelder, AFSCME	Carol Robinson
Julie Stone <i>PHONE</i>	Maureen Boggs <i>PHONE</i>
Kim Tice	Sandy Oxley <i>PHONE</i>
Kim Haulck	
Carlisa Johnson	