



Division of Child Care and Development

Child Care Advisory Council

August 15, 2012

Lazarus A601 12:15pm-2:45pm

Check In (Introductions, Minutes, Sign in)

Chris Humphrey, Co-Chair

- Motion to approve the minutes by Teri Brannum and Paula Selway; minutes approved as written.

Committee Reports

Policy & Rule Committee

Michelle Albast, BCCD

- The committee discussed the move into phase 2 of the Chapter 12 licensing rules and alignment of the rules with the Ohio Department of Education (ODE).
- Chris Stoneburner was contracted to review all Job and Family Services (JFS) rules and comments from both JFS staff and the CCAC Policy & Rule Committee. Chris will remain within our timelines for the purpose of the I.T. work that must be completed within our systems.
 - Chris will remove as much information that are not basic regulation. For example, items reviewed will be background checks, terminology and definitions.
 - Chris will create a matrix to show how the rule appears today, the recommendations from the committee and internal teams, and Chris's proposal of how the rule should appear.
- ODE has a total of 12 rules and JFS has a total of 47 rules.
- The rules will go into clearance in October/early November.
- The committee recommends the JFS and ODE rules do not remain separate because it is not the best thing for children. The committee also recommends the creation of a goal that by 2025, one set of rules will be created. If this occurs, it will frame our work from here forward and we will continue to move toward our target.

IT Committee

Elaine Ward, Community Professional

- An update was provided on the CCIDS system and the schoolage utility.
- The change in copay assignment will now allow the copay to be spread across children in the family; JFS staff are currently working on this process.
 - The timeframe revolved around the copay change may be at least October but possibly further out. Currently, the IT and user (JFS staff) are testing.
 - JFS staff have narrowed down the cause of the glitch with the switch from summer schoolage and then back to schoolage.

- The RFCs the committee narrowed down were reviewed. Xerox has had the RFCs for 6 weeks and within the next 2-3 weeks an estimate should be returned; 4-9 months fixes/testing will occur. All efforts are being made to get the fixes as quickly as possible.
- RttT ELCG Projects are in the process of gathering information for all the system changes and projects are on schedule.
 - Project 12 (Assessment systems): the IT committee recommended more detail be shared on what the assessment system will look like. They would like more of a program view of this and to present this further at CCAC (possible September/October agenda item).
- The IT committee input will focus on an interface with providers and the county user. Advance notice will be provided on the items presented so the appropriate representation from the field can be brought to the CCAC IT committee meetings.
- CCAC stated there have been delays receiving a POS device and a delay for parents receiving a card once approved.
 - Some CCAC staff attendees find the cards are not mailed until AFTER the authorization begins; not when the authorization is given.
 - It is the provider's responsibility to stay on top of their rates and change them as they occur. This will remain 0 and will be paid accordingly.

Division Updates

Michelle Albast BCCD

- The Market Rate Survey has a 40.4% response rate for the online survey. OSU will send responses to JFS by October 15, 2012. The results will be analyzed and distributed to committees as received. OSU will also compare additional states.
 - The Market Rate Survey will be presented to CCAC in November/December based on timelines.
- Department leads have begun to think about the 14/15 budget. CCAC has previously asked how the committee can support and by the next CCAC, JFS will provide more concrete examples on how CCAC can support us through this budget period. Many goals will be around the grant work, maintain the level of services (same number of children, same settings, supporting those settings).
- Program Integrity work has been reviewing many items such as preventative (red flags, data analysis) and complaints (during inspections). JFS staff has met with our legal department and the inspector general regarding criminal accounts; this will allow for an appeal process as well.
 - Chapter 16 rules will go through clearance that contains program integrity pieces for comment.

Ohio's Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS)

Janene Kehl, Division of Child Care

Lisa Baker, Ohio Department of Education

- The new draft standards were distributed to all CCAC attendees.
- Three different rating systems:
 - The Building Block approach requires a program to meet all the requirements of one step to move to the next.
 - The Points approach requires points to be achieved based on certain standards and the total number of points would determine your quality rating.
 - The Combination approach is the new model for Ohio. The lower levels will still utilize the building block approach and programs must meet all lower level standards to move to a higher rating. The higher levels will then utilize the points approach to gain a higher rating.
- ODE's onsite monitoring, IMPACT, is based on a compliance level not a quality level.
 - 1300 is the number of newly related, already funded programs participating through JFS and ODE.
- Highly rated programs would be considered a star 3, 4, and 5. The mandatory requirement to receive funds is not tied to the highly rated; it is tied to being a star level 1, 2 or 3. The mandatory requirement to receive funds is tied to a program being rated, not a particular star level.
 - Still reviewing financially how much more a 3,4,5 star may be.
 - 4035 currently licensed, 60% serve PFCC. The numbers have been outlined by the type of program with JFS.
 - There is a difference regarding speaking to the grant vs. legislation. Legislation states programs must participate in the system if you receive PFCC but the grant goals must be thought about.
- Incentive dollars were a part of the grant, in addition to the current budget, and budgeted to cover additional quality achievement; the current QAA dollars still fund the rated centers.
 - ODE programs will not be eligible to receive QAA awards. ~~within the quality funds and those that serve subsidized children will not receive these funds.~~
 - In two years, a conversation must occur if additional funds must be received around 2015.
- The program standards have been shared with internal JFS staff, a focus group, and R&R partners. The main purpose of this standards review is to gather the feedback of CCAC. Please state any comments or leave any additional comments. These comments will then be taken back and shared with the workgroup to make any revisions as appropriate.
 - The domains were completed for Centers and ODE only. The review of family child care will begin in January.
- 4 Domains (replacing benchmarks): Early Learning and Development, Staff Education and Professional Development, Administrative and Leadership Practices, and Family and Community Partners. The Early Learning and Development column was reviewed as an example of how the new model will work.
 - Step One: Programs must meet everything across ALL (these are not domains, the domains are the columns across the top. I would say something like: Programs must meet all standards within each of the domains;; Classroom Environment,

Child Screening and Assessment, Curriculum and Family & Community Partnerships.

- Step Two: Programs must meet everything in Step One and the standards in Step Two: completing self assessment, purchase screening tool and training staff to administer, attaining the curriculum and each teacher has access to the curriculum.
- Step Three: Programs must meet everything in Steps One and Two and the standards in Step Three; taking self assessment and identifying areas of improvement and creating an action plan to think about adult/child interaction, ensuring all children receive developmental screening and referrals are completed within a cycle using formal and informal methods, programs implement curriculum within the program.
- Step Four and Five: Additional standards were added: teacher documents progress on the actions completed for improvement, evidence the assessment results are used and shared with families twice a year, and program updates and rotates materials and thinks of needs of children's while doing so, and teachers written plans reflects need and interests of children and developmental needs. For each of these standards that a program meets, they will earn a specified amount of points.
- Across each of the 4 domains, point totals are displayed. Early Learning and Development contains the highest point value based on how research supports the area and domains. Programs must score a point in each domain to obtain a 4 or 5 star rating and ratio/ accreditation are additional points along with the 4 domains.
- If a program is a 1 star, they must renew annually. A 4 or 5 star rated must renew every 3 years with perhaps an annual progress report that is completed each of the 2 years without a renewal visit to show the program's continuous improvement plan. 2-3 star rated programs must renew every 2 years.
 - Licensing visits will continue and staff are working out the implementation plan and policy around licensing and SUTQ such as what they would look like, who will do it and key items to review.

CCAC Standards Comments Only

- **New Combination Model**
 - CCAC likes the flexibility especially for the 4 and 5 star ratings. This creates more paths to quality. Once you hit the base there are different things to do. How can this be verified? And will the same flexibility still live in the verification process especially in family and community? JFS must target families different. It may be easy for providers to have this model and the rules guidance document be very similar in format.
 - JFS/ODE has an implementation group. They will review the verification process and how to verify this and the technology system. Please voice ideas around verification while thinking of standards.
 - The guidance document will go into more detail of defining terms, and describing evidence that a program needs to demonstrate it meets a standard.

- The guidance document will define the renewal of an ODE teaching license.
- CCAC debates the value of points and how much programs should get.
- Providers struggle with reading from the bottom up while trying to understand the building blocks. It is hard to understand organizationally.
 - For ease to providers it should be formatted as: Step 1, review and implement then move to step 2 and so forth. The current format is more complicated than it needs to be and harder for people who are unfamiliar with the system to pick it up and implement it. The benchmark page is tricky for some too.
 - Invert it to start with step 1 at the top.
- **Does it make sense as standards move up from a Step 1, 2, 3 and extra points in the Early Learning and Development domain? Are there large discrepancies?**
 - Ratio and group size should be within the point range of Early Learning and Development.
 - In the guidance document please add evidence based curriculum. There is a great disparity from funding streams what evidence based is.
 - How long can someone stay at the same level and what is the intention?
 - No rule or statute will be made to state programs cannot stay there.
 - Can we identify or is there funding for moving programs up levels and supporting current programs? Providers should have the flexibility to determine based on the philosophy of their program or budget what is obtainable and know this level is or is not so the provider will then have the flexibility create their own pathway.
 - CCAC likes the combination system.
 - CCAC is concerned with step 1 and the criteria for subsidy/eligibility down the road. For example, the provider is in step 1 for a while and looks at the domain regarding curriculum and continue to use the same curriculum for years; that does not seem to be the intent for this new model/rating.
 - Formative assessment- what is the expectation in steps 3, 4, 5? Could a program use it at step 1 or 2? Or if not, are there other assessments that will be suggested so someone does not pick something that deemed inappropriate?
 - Going to age 15 will start to incorporate High School; this is asking them to go into a licensed child care for High School programs. 21st Century Grants require licensure where applicable and this would change it into a licensed situation for High School level at age 15.
 - Relationships are the foundation and there are no relationships within these domains; it is in important first step. If you cannot fund degreed teachers, everyone can begin with relationships.
 - Review relationship interactions, NAEYC relationship standard.
 - ODE positive child outcomes should be added.

- Physical environment should be added NAEYC standard; this is a good foundation for programs.
- Family and community partnerships- Annie Casey foundation meeting with the Federal Department of Education are coming out with a frame work regarding parent and family engagements. Is this embedded in the last domain or is it something to look at when it comes out? It was indicated this may be required to those who received the grant.
 - A request to the federal officer was submitted to get an answer on this, who are they for? Population? Birth-6? If there are ideas to incorporate we will.
- An assessment for schoolagers, is that appropriate for secondary provider vs. the school system? Step 3 does not require screening but we are requiring the assessment.
 - What type of assessment for schoolage kids?
- Should this domain be called Learning and Development vs. Early Learning and Development since we are speaking of schoolagers? Early Learning refers to early childhood which is fine when taking out schoolage. It is an early childhood provider's job to assess elementary.
- **Staff Education and Professional Development:**
 - PD on the 20 clock hours and approved specialist trainings every 2 years should be addressed within the system so SUTQ can be approved electronically or talk about adding in programs. Can we make this faster for SUTQ approved training or create a way to state if you have a master's degree it is automatic?
 - All hours have to be SUTQ approved? It would be approved training. Once you take a training there doesn't seem like new SUTQ training material is coming out. What do you do once you get all the trainings?
 - Accessibility of training- rural areas do not have the same opportunities as metro and they need to participate to receive subsidized care; keep this in mind when developing the PD.
 - Regarding Family child care- right now for SUTQ one must be registered with OPDN but when documents are sent in it is not shown on the site. A provider called and asked where the documents were and it was communicated they did not know what to do with family child care; it is sitting in a box. How will they keep up with everyone is the system?
 - When you register for a class, it automatically goes into the site with ones OPDN number and automatically credits and providers do not need to send in that paperwork.
 - Staff dedication to schoolage- is there an option appropriate for schoolage children in the pathway levels 2 and 3?

- Pre-requisite training is very difficult for people to understand and hope it will be simplified.
- Required hours- if someone is attending or taking college credit courses this will be stipulated in the companion document.
- **Administrative and Leadership Practices domain:**
 - Will there be clarification on the annual PD plan around how ‘annual’ is defined? Will it be by hire date? Program defined? School year? Calendar year? It has been a challenge under the current system.
 - It would be helpful to centers that have a large number of staff to do it as an annual year as opposed to calendar or hire date; staff can be all over the map. If there is a training opportunity available because it aligns with our program needs, we will want to send them but at times it will not count due to the anniversary date being days down the road. It is not practical; move forward to a better plan with budgeting for programs too.
 - Going by hire date is hard to budget for.
 - The word leadership is listed but there is no requirement for leadership. The word leadership must be kept but standards should be within that which will help the leaders of programs develop their own skills, articulate a vision for their program, and coach their teams. There is plenty of great business practice language that can be used.
 - Concerned with administrative practices in regards to benefits and compensation. For example, one provider’s partner is Lorain Community College and they provide most of the teachers; they have not participated in SUTQ because of their student teacher staff and students and do not receive benefits. Can something be added if staff are not regular paid staff or a community college exception? Community colleges are not involved in SUTQ because of ratio and benefits.
 - Student teachers cannot be paid because they do not have a license. Exception for a community college is necessary; they want to be rated the best and they cannot offer the benefits.
 - This also applies for career center students.
 - Student teachers do work at programs and cannot be counted into ratio.
 - JFS will look at this issue when it comes to the list with allowances of benefits. Also, we will work with 2 and 4 year coalition to see how their members can work into the benefits.
- **Family and community partnerships**
 - Find it odd points are given to identify a family’s preferred means of communication; it seems very basic.
 - Consider adding points for programs that develop a relationship with community schools so when a child transfers from Pre-k to kindergarten they can share their assessment with kindergarten teachers so there is a smoother transition.

- **Review:**
- SPARK program.
- Required schools guide.
- Ready schools resource.
- Administrative, the little piece seems more connected to community partners.
 - Looking at it saying that's the administrative task to leaders to pull those community partners into the program.
- Ratio and group size for infants and toddlers: a 3-10 category or 3-12 category should be added to the 4 points.
 - Maximum group size in a 3 is 10 for infants; it's because of 1-5 and 2-12 in our licensing rules.
- Accreditation 5 points is way too low. An NAEYC accreditation receives an analysis of the points; if you are understaffed you get 3 points but talking with families 4x a year you get 4 points and the cost of those points are tremendous.
 - It should be at least 25points and we know you don't have that point spread on any of it. It's a year self study because the actual part you give to the accreditation.
- Varying point system for different accreditations (NAEYC or something less stringent).
- Does the accreditation have to cover your entire student body? For example, have only schoolage group accredited do I get 5 points? Or must I have to have them all? NAEYC goes through kindergarten but a schoolage classroom is not included.

Check Out

Chris Humphrey, Co-Chair

- AFSCME union sponsored child care conference will occur October 5-7, 2012 in Painesville. AFSCME hopes JFS can attend.
- **Next meeting: September 19th.**
 - Possible agenda items: child assessment system.

Child Care Advisory Council August 15, 2012 Attendance

Key: Present Absent

Members			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Chris Humphrey, Chair, Community Professional		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Alicia Leatherman, Division of Child Care	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pam Perrino, Community Professional
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tracy Bope, Fairfield CDJFS	<input type="checkbox"/>	Julie Piazza-King, Not for Profit
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Teri Brannum, Community Professional	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Terri Raneri, Type A <i>phone</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marjorie Crouse, Parent <i>phone</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Renee Saam, Allen CDJFS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Nicky Foster, Proprietary <i>phone</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Paula Selway, Not for Profit
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sandra Foster, Cuyahoga CDJFS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	David Smith, Not for Profit
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Asyia Haile, Type B	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sarah Stertzbach, Parent
<input type="checkbox"/>	Tasha Johnson, Not for Profit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Amy Story, Hamilton CDJFS <i>phone</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Joseph Krasno, Stark CDJFS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lolita Wallace, Franklin CDJFS <i>phone</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Louanna Leonard, Proprietary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Elaine Ward, Community Professional
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gail Montana, Type B	<input type="checkbox"/>	Kate Watson, Parent
Ex-Officio Members:			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Katrina Bush, DODD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Diane Saunders, ODE
<input type="checkbox"/>	Melissa Courts, ODH	<input type="checkbox"/>	James Scott, ODE, Head Start
<input type="checkbox"/>	Marlene Fields, ODE	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jan Sokolnicki, Commerce
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marla Himmeger, ODMH <i>phone</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ron Johnson, State Fire Marshall		
ODJFS, DCC Staff:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cara Lee, BCCD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Stephanie Shafer, CCAS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Michelle Albast, BCCD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Stacey Zack, DCC
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rachael Moore, BCCD	<input type="checkbox"/>	Janene Kehl, DCC
Guests:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Alesha Washington, CFC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Julie Thorner, OACCP
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Todd Waldron, Creative Child Care	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Whitney Scarberry, Licking County JFS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Beth Tsveflcoff, Ohio Alliance of YMCA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Karen Lampe, Creative World Child Care
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Becky Ciminillo, YMCA of Central Ohio	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Todd Barnhouse, OCCRRA	<input type="checkbox"/>	