

**October 7, 2015
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.**

Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) – Head Start
10100 Pioneer Boulevard, Conference Rooms 110/111
Santa Fe Springs, California 90670

PROPOSED AGENDA

- | | | | |
|-------|--|--------------------|---|
| 1. | Welcome and Introductions | | Sarah Soriano, Chair |
| noon | ▪ Opening Statement and Comments by the Chair | | |
| 2. | Approval of Minutes | Action Item | Debra Colman, Vice Chair |
| 12:10 | ▪ September 2, 2015 | | |
| 3. | Annual Self-Evaluation: Report to the California Department of Education | Action Item | Nellie Rios-Parra &
Ancelma Sanchez,
Co-chairs
Governance Work Group |
| 12:15 | | | |
| 4. | Using Research and Data to Inform Policy, Planning and Practice: Asking the Right Questions and Preparing Next Steps | | Sarah Soriano |
| 12:25 | ▪ Breakouts: Access/Inclusion
Quality
Workforce | | |
| 5. | Re-convene for Highlights: Top Three Things Each Work Group Wants to Know | | Debra Colman |
| 1:40 | | | |
| 6. | Announcements and Public Comment | | Debra Colman |
| 1:50 | | | |
| 7. | Call to Adjourn | | Sarah Soriano |

Next Meeting

Wednesday, November 4, 2015 ▪ 12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Head Start-State Preschool
10100 Pioneer Boulevard, Conference Room 109
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Child Care Planning Committee is to engage parents, child care providers, allied organizations, community, and public agencies in collaborative planning efforts to improve the overall child care infrastructure of Los Angeles County, including the quality and continuity, affordability, and accessibility of child care and development services for all families.



This page intentionally blank



Meeting Minutes – September 2, 2015

Members in Attendance: (41) Demitra Adams, Alejandra Berrio, Ana Campos, Edilma Cavazos, Bernadette Chase, Richard Cohen, Debra Colman, Diana Esquer, Lindsey Evans, Teresa Figueras, Mona Franco, Nora Garcia-Rosales, La Tanga Gail Hardy, Jennifer Kuida, Aolelani Lutu, Ritu Mahajan, Cyndi McCauley, Pat Mendoza, Micha Mims, Devon Miner, Tracy Moronatty, Melissa Noriega, Kelly O’Connell, Daniel Orosco, Laurel Parker, Emily E. Russell for Dianne Philibosian, Nellie Rios-Parra, Joyce Robinson, Julia Ruedas, Reiko Sakuma, Ancelma Sanchez, Kathy Schreiner, Janet Scully, Michael Shannon, Sarah Soriano, Fiona Stewart, Andrea Sulsona, Holli Tonyan, Jenny Trickey, Rhonda-Maria Tuival, and Sara Vasquez

Guests and Alternates: Kimberly Dobson-Garcia, Sally Durbin, Katie Fallin, Mark Funston, Cindy Giaimo-Ballard, Indrea Greer, Diana Hechinger, Janet Huerta, Peter Huffaker, Elsa Jacobsen, Kathy Malaske-Samu, Kelly Meyers-Wagner, Zaraya Ordonez, Nanette Rincon-Ksido, Catalina Sanchez, Susan Savage, JoAnn Shalhoub-Mejia, Viken Kazarian, Connie White, Lisa Wilkin, and Helene Zegarra

Staff: Michele Sartell

1. Welcome and Introductions

Sarah Soriano, Chair to the Child Care Planning Committee (Planning Committee), opened the meeting at 12:10 p.m. She welcomed members, alternates and guests, read the opening statement and then read the Planning Committee mission. Sarah thanked Richard Cohen and Andrea Joseph for the leadership over the past two year and the membership for their confidence in electing her as the new chair. Sarah mentioned her intent as leader to continue framing our work within the Strengthening Families Approach and building protective factors in children and families as the Planning Committee embarks on the theme of focus for this year, “using research and data to inform policy, planning and practice”.

Sarah noted that every five years, local planning councils (LPC) across the state are required to conduct an assessment of child care and development needs for their respective counties. Our needs assessment is due in 2016. She acknowledge the stellar panel of experts to help inspire and ignite our thinking around more than meeting our state mandate to considering our gains, questions we should be asking ourselves, and telling compelling stories.

2. Approval of Minutes

The Chair called for a motion to approve the minutes from June 3, 2015. Holli Tonyan made the motion to approve; the motion was seconded by Andrea Sulsona. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Public Policy Report

Michele Sartell, staff to the Planning Committee, began the report by introducing Devon Miner who has agreed to co-chair the Joint Committee on Legislation with a yet to be identified representative of the Policy Roundtable for Child Care and Development (Roundtable). Michele then referred members, alternates and guests to their meeting packets for the proposed *Public Policy Platform for the Second Year of 2015-16 Legislative Session* (the Platform). The Platform items are proposed



each year for inclusion in the County's legislative agenda, subsequently providing guidance to the Planning Committee and Roundtable on consideration of recommended pursuits of positions on priority legislation and budget items consistent with County policy to forward to the Board of Supervisors. Upon the Board of Supervisors adopting a pursuit of position on a piece of legislation and/or budget, the Planning Committee and Roundtable may submit letters to the respective legislative committee leadership and bill author.

Michele reviewed the items with the meeting participants and highlighted item 9 a new item to address facility development as follows:

9. Support efforts to expand the supply of appropriate early care and education through facility development in communities of unmet need.

Michele explained that last year, an item pertaining to facility development was removed from the Platform and therefore the updated County legislative agenda due to the concern that it could create unfunded mandates, particularly since the language tied support for expanding the supply of early care and education to including the services into city and county general plans. She relayed that the Joint Committee thinks it is important to include an item pertaining to facility development given the unmet need for services and the challenges faced across the County at both locating and preparing facilities for licensing. The hope is that the new language is more general while ensuring some attention to the need for facilities.

The Chair called for a motion to approve the Public Policy Platform for the Second Year of 2015-16 Legislative Session. Laurel Parker made the motion to approve; the motion was seconded by Joyce Robinson. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Reflecting Back, Looking Ahead

Michele referred meeting participants to the document summarizing the results of the check in from the end of fiscal year 2014-15. She noted that most of the comments were positive, however a few items were raised by multiple members. Among the items were requests to occasionally provide reminders of the Planning Committee's mission and purpose and more opportunities to bring the work group efforts to the larger body. In addition, members and alternates expressed a desire for more action by the Planning Committee.

Michele suggested that a new format to the meetings may provide more opportunities for action as efforts are focused around activities that may guide and inform work related to the needs assessment due to the California Department of Education/Early Education and Support Division in 2016. The Planning Committee will continue to meet monthly; most will be working meetings around the needs assessment by work group – Access/Inclusion, Quality and Workforce – after initial business of the Planning Committee is completed, and then followed by announcement prior to close of the meeting. Quarterly, the group as a whole will meet for a presentation on a topic of interest, work group reports with opportunity for fuller discussions across work groups, and more. Michele noted that flexibility will be critical to allow for attention to emerging and timely issues, such as the State's plan to implement the new federal Child Care and Development Block Grant requirements and weighing in on First 5 LA's application for First 5 CA's IMPACT grant (in partnership with Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Head Start-State Preschool, Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP), Los Angeles County Office of Child Care and the Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles, among others).

5. Using Research and Data to Inform Policy, Planning and Practice

By way of introduction, Sarah referred members, alternates and guests to their meeting packets for brief bios prepared on each of the panelists – Peter Huffaker of CCR Analytics, Katie Fallin of First 5 LA and Susan Savage of the Child Care Resource Center – noting that each of them has overseen data and research efforts that have contributed to the field of early care and education. Their purpose was to lend their excitement, expertise and thoughtfulness to the Planning Committee's early thinking as we launch into our needs assessment work, comparing the supply with demand for child care and development services.

Each of the panelists was provided up to five minutes to answer four questions. The following is a synopsis of their comments to each of the four questions:

1) What can we gain from our data collection and analysis efforts? What makes it fun, insightful?

Diving into data reinforces a sense of curiosity and discovery. We know our communities better than others. Yet, will the data confirm what we know or surprise us? Engaging in data collection and analysis often leads to additional questions and deeper investigation that deepens our understanding. We use it to reflect on the past and it gives direction to the future, for example as we look ahead to implementation of the federal Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) requirements – will we be cutting slots if we increase quality?

2) What questions should we be asking as we embark on data collection and then when interpreting the data?

Questions are the most important part of the analysis and asking the right questions is what makes embarking on data efforts fun. With respect to the needs assessment, we want to know overall supply and demand as well as supply and demand by eligibility for subsidized services, characteristics of the eligible population, and supply and demand by transitional kindergarten/ kindergarten cohort (not just three to five year olds together). For the County, it may be interesting to look at the data by geographies smaller than zip codes, such as geocoding by census block. In addition, ask about special populations of children (i.e. special needs, child welfare, with parents working variable schedules) of whom we want to know more. Data can help us think strategically about the future. Data also can help us understand the funding landscape. How are we leveraging and maintaining funding? What about public school investments, i.e. Local Control Funding Formula and Title 1?

3) Who should we be reaching with our data and analyses?

There are three primary audiences for the needs assessment data: operators interested in starting or expanding services; politicians, policy makers and policy advocates; and organizations conducting their own need assessments. Grantees, groups embarking on strategic planning and others also may request data from the needs assessment. As such, it serves as a template for telling stories and learning more. With respect to politicians, consider presenting the data by electoral districts.

4) How do we make the data compelling/accessible to others? What should we consider in our presentation of the data (beyond our report to the California Department of Education (CDE))? How do we avoid simplification and losing important detail?

Each of the panelists recognized that the first audience for the needs assessment is the CDE, which uses the data to inform funding allocations across the state and within counties. They suggested considering presentation of the data for multiple populations. Policy makers are busy people, so the more succinct the better, with bullet points and simple graphics to tell the story. Data is dull without the story. Looking at the work of other local planning councils, San Francisco includes a discussion on funding streams, provides a basic overview of the early care and education landscape, and uses

lots of graphics/visuals. Others have added information on quality, so consider asking questions about the quality rating and improvement system implementation to include in the needs assessment. San Diego adds population projections, anticipating change over time and how the system might address the change. Data is obtained from multiple sources; it is important to not lose the detail of the data. The challenge is teasing out some of the detail, for example age groupings for preschool and transitional kindergarten.

A few questions and comments were posed following the presentation, beginning with a question about families receiving subsidized services and the potential consequences of wage increases. Child care and development is an ongoing value and benefit to the families and provides stability for the child. Susan referred to work at the Child Care Resource Center that has seen that parents who gain employment keep their jobs. With the recession, they did not see wages increase. Subsidized child care means the family is able to pay their bills, a more significant factor than wage increases. Peter added that this is a core question for families receiving vouchers and has not received much study other than Susan's efforts to look at it. Methodologically, it is hard to do, but she did it using the wait list. With respect to wait lists, it was mentioned that there exists a disconnect given programs with high poverty/density that cannot fill their spaces. It was suggested that using smaller categories than zip codes may provide some answers. Another member suggested comparing the upcoming findings with the needs assessment conducted five years ago.

6. Setting the Stage for the Needs Assessment

Ritu Mahajan, co-chair of the Access/Inclusion Work Group, introduced the plan for the break outs by the three work groups – access/inclusion, quality and workforce – to reflect on the panel discussion and the questions included in the meeting packets. In addition to the questions in the packets, Ritu asked how the needs assessment has been or could be useful, its relationship to implementation of our current strategic plan and what each work group might do to contribute to conducting the needs assessment.

The following summarizes the highlights raised by each of the work groups:

Quality – this work group considered current assessments and efforts underway to track children into kindergarten and beyond. The needs assessment is useful for advocacy efforts. The group noted that the needs assessment form submitted to the CDE is demographic heavy; as such suggested that there be a section in the narrative report on quality efforts.

Workforce – this work group commented on the lack of workforce data in the current needs assessment. It was recommended that breaking down the ages of children into smaller categories matters in terms of education and training needed by the workforce, suggesting that supply and demand is connected to workforce. The work group also is interested in bringing business and other stakeholders to the table to augment existing data collection efforts. A number of other issues were raised, including the need to continue studying the minimum wage impacts as well as variable work schedules of parents and how their child care and development needs are being met.

Access/Inclusion – their discussion began with the usefulness of the needs assessment to apply for funds to open a facility to meet the demand and to help shape policies that impact facility development. This work group would like more specific facts on programs that serve children with special needs. In addition, they suggested that the needs assessment consider trends that may help with future planning.

The notes from each of the work groups will be provided as attachments to the minutes.

7. **Announcements and Public Comment**

- Richard Cohen announced an opportunity through Project ABC to send people to the University of Davis/Napa Infant-Parent Mental Health Post-Graduate Certificate Program. The program is attempting to reach multi-disciplinary sectors including early care and education, attorneys, occupational therapists and more. For more information, contact Richard by e-mail at rcohen@Childrensinstitute.org.
- Members, alternates and guests were referred to their packets for a summary stipends awarded in Cycle 16 of the Investing in Early Educators – Stipend Program and to the fact sheet announcing the release of Cycle 17, stating that applications are now available.

8. **Adjournment**

The Chair called for a motion to adjourn. Andrea Sulsona made the motion; Ancelma Sanchez seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

This page intentionally blank

**Mail this form to the LPC Consultant by
 November 15 of each year to:**
 Early Education and Support Division
 California Department of Education
 1430 N Street, Suite 3410
 Sacramento, CA 95814-5901

**LOCAL CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COUNCIL PROGRAMS
 SUMMARY OF SELF EVALUATION FINDINGS**

Agency: Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles Vendor Number: CLPC-4019

Agency Representative: Michele P. Sartell Title: Interim Child Care Planning Coordinator

Telephone Number: (213) 974-5187 Dates Reviewed: 10/7/2015

Compliance Items	KEY DIMENSIONS FROM CALIFORNIA <i>Education Code (EC)</i>	Compliant	Non compliant
1. <i>EC</i> Section 8279.3 and 8499.5(b)	Involvement in Local Priority Setting Process Parents, staff, Board of Supervisors, County Superintendent of Schools, LPC members, and the public at large participate in reviewing and evaluating core data elements and determine local priority areas of unmet child care and development services for all children.	X	
2. <i>EC</i> Section 8499.5	Governance and Administration Policies, needs assessments, comprehensive child care and development plans, and administration of LPC categorical programs meet statutory requirements.	X	
3. <i>EC</i> Section 8499.5	Funding Allocation and use of funds meet statutory requirements for allowable expenditures.	X	
4. <i>EC</i> Section 8499.3	Standards, Assessment, and Accountability Categorical LPC programs meet state standards for membership certification.	X	
5. <i>EC</i> Section 8499.3(f),(g)	Staffing and Professional Development Staff members and LPC members are recruited, trained, assigned tasks, and assisted to ensure the effectiveness of the program.	X	



Work Groups – 2015-16

<p>Access/Inclusion <i>Co-chairs:</i> Ritu Mahajan Cyndi McCauley</p> <hr/> <p>Demetra Adams Tonya Burns Ana Campos Joe Cortes Alicia Davis Kimberly Dobson-Garcia Lindsey Evans Alicia Fernandez Mark Funston Alexandra Izaguirre Kelly Meyers-Wagner Devon Miner Tracy Moronatty Kelly O'Connell Reika Sakuma JoAnn Shalhoub-Mejia Michael Shannon Steve Sturm Andrea Sulsona Julie Taren Jenny Trickey Kai-Ti Wang</p>	<p>Quality <i>Co-chairs:</i> Richard Cohen Laurel Parker</p> <hr/> <p>Bernadette Chase Diana Esquer Teresa Figueras Edith Garcia Nora Garcia-Rosales Cindy Giaimo-Ballard Indrea Greer La Tanga Hardy Diana Hechinger Janet Huerta Jenni Kuida Pat Mendoza Zoraya Ordonez Dianne Philibosian Nellie Rios-Parra Julia Ruedas Reiko Sakuma Ancelma Sanchez Catalina Sanchez Araceli Sandoval-Gonzalez Janet Scully Sarah Soriano Rhonda-Maria Tuivai</p>	<p>Workforce <i>Co-chairs:</i> Kathy Schreiner Fiona Stewart</p> <hr/> <p>Alejandra Berrio Edilma Cavazos Debra Colman Kevin Dieterle Rita Flores Mona Franco Edith Garcia Viken Kazarian Julia Love Aolelani Lutu Gay Macdonald Micha Mims Melissa Noriega Daniel Orosco Nanette Rincon-Ksido Ricardo Rivera Joyce Robinson Emily Russell Fiona Stewart Holli Tonyan Sara Vasquez Connie White Lisa Wilkin</p>
<p>Governance <i>Co-chairs:</i> Nellie Rios-Parra Ancelma Sanchez</p> <hr/> <p>La Tanga Hardy Jennifer Kuida Daniel Orosco Dianne Philbosian</p>	<p>Joint Committee on Legislation <i>Co-chairs:</i> Devon Miner, Child Care Planning Committee TBD, Policy Roundtable for Child Care and Development</p> <hr/> <p>Robert Beck Alejandra Berrio Linda Evans Elizabeth Gallion Nora Garcia-Rosales Sandra Gonzalez Tracy Moronatty Joyce Robinson Julia Ruedas Kathy Schreiner Sarah Soriano</p>	

This page intentionally blank



**Using Data and Research Inform Policy, Planning and Practice:
Asking the Right Questions and Preparing Next Steps
October 7, 2015**

Access/Inclusion Work Group Guiding Questions

Instructions: Identify a scribe to record the conversation and someone to briefly report highlights behalf of the group (other than co-chairs). The co-chairs will be responsible for keeping the conversations on track and within the allotted timeframe. Notes from the work group will be collected by staff at the close of the meeting.

1. Audiences for the needs assessment:

- California Department of Education/Early Education and Support Division – informs funding allocation decisions
- Early care and education field (new and expanding)
- County Board of Supervisors and other elected officials (cities, state, federal)
- Philanthropies/grantees
- Advocates
- Communities, i.e. Best Start, Health Neighborhoods
- Others?

2. Identify data needs/wishes and potential sources of data:

- Setting the stage
 - o What do we want to know about the children and families of Los Angeles County?
 - o Funding landscape – federal, state, local
- What do we want to know about capacity (supply v demand)?

3. Policy considerations:

- What policy questions might we hope to answer?
- How will the data help inform efforts to shape policy (administrative as well as legislative)?

4. Accomplishing the Work:

- How can I and/or my organization contribute to the work?
- What is the role of our work group?



**Using Data and Research Inform Policy, Planning and Practice
September 2, 2015**

Inclusion/Access Work Group – Meeting Notes

1. In thinking about conducting the needs assessment, what is in it for you and/or your organization? How have you used data from the needs assessment in the past? How would you like to use it?
 - Grant writing in looking for new/additional funds, where to open a facility, change policies
 - Use to determine if there is inclusion, to find data on special needs populations
2. What ideas do you have for how we (the Planning Committee) might use the data from the needs assessment beyond meeting our mandated requirements? Who might be the audience(s) beyond CDE for the data?
 - Future plans for needs of county – what issue/trends do we see
 - Increase our ability to help parents
 - Audience Is legislature/policy makers
 - Use data to educate parents/parents could use data to lobby/speak in Sacramento
3. How might the needs assessment effort inform our work relating to [access, inclusion, quality, workforce]?
 - More specifics about children with special needs and whether facility offers services for them
 - mapping school districts for children with special needs – how well are the collaboratives working?
 - More specific information on working families who do not qualify for Head Start of California Department of Education/Early Education and Support Division (CDE/EESD) – contracted programs
 - Wrap around services for full-day
4. What can the [access, quality, workforce] work group contribute to conducting the needs assessment?
5. What are some first steps? What does the work group need to do its work?
 - Data gathering: LACOE, LAUSD, Office of Child Care – research from Urban Research. Who is serving whom?



**Using Data and Research Inform Policy, Planning and Practice:
Asking the Right Questions and Preparing Next Steps
October 7, 2015**

Workforce Work Group Guiding Questions

Instructions: Identify a scribe to record the conversation and someone to briefly report highlights behalf of the group (other than co-chairs). The co-chairs will be responsible for keeping the conversations on track and within the allotted timeframe. Notes from the work group will be collected by staff at the close of the meeting.

1. Audiences for the needs assessment:

- California Department of Education/Early Education and Support Division – informs funding allocation decisions
- Early care and education field (new and expanding)
- County Board of Supervisors and other elected officials (cities, state, federal)
- Philanthropies/grantees
- Advocates
- Communities, i.e. Best Start, Health Neighborhoods
- Others?

2. Identify data needs/wishes and potential sources of data:

- Setting the stage
 - o What do we want to know about the children and families of Los Angeles County?
 - o Funding landscape – federal, state, local
- What do we want to know about the workforce?

3. Policy considerations:

- What policy questions might we hope to answer?
- How will the data help inform efforts to shape policy (administrative as well as legislative)?

4. Accomplishing the Work:

- How can I and/or my organization contribute to the work?
- What is the role of our work group?

**Using Data and Research Inform Policy, Planning and Practice
September 2, 2015**

Workforce Work Group – Meeting Notes

1. How would we use the data in our workgroup
 - a. the ages of the children and where they are located could related to the knowledge needed for workforce
 - b. being able to break the age groups into smaller categories could be helpful to show (e.g., PITC, license capacity)
 - c. supply and demand issues: either there's a lack of capacity or lack of training and the needs assessment can help us with this
 - d. can we collect data about the workforce through the needs assessment?
 - e. How would we use that data?
2. How might we use the data beyond meeting our mandated requirements?
 - a. We can connect the needs of the workforce with the
 - b. Businesses: can we bring them into this; can we get them to help? Ordain ambassadors to go around to Rotary clubs or LA Chamber of Commerce
3. How might the needs assessment impact our work?
 - a. For our workgroup, we really need additional data – if there is unmet need, then there would be workforce issues (more people)
 - b. Is this where stories can come in? What happens to the families? Where do they go?
 - i. HT suggested that she
 - ii. District administrator has stories: funding has been diluted; a full time recruiter, full-time nurse, mental health consultant; they can barely get an assistant to meet their ratio; their program was CAL Safe funded; students under 26 years of age; they watch the infant while the student returns to school; used to have a full team
 - c. Joyce: looking at data some how some way about the workforce
 - i. Many items on the needs assessment have ramifications on the workforce; unmet need that we've seen for years and years, but we're not looking at why it's an unmet need (eg, high cost of care)
 - ii. Capacity: how much of capacity is being used for children's services because not all programs can be fully enrolled (e.g., can't find teachers that can work at the rate she can offer, so she had a classroom she couldn't open)
 - d. Peter: push toward \$15 minimum wage; can we collect some data on that to further push the issue
4. Micha: we have parents on those variable work schedules; they expect to get the full pay, but the parent can have the child in child care; paperwork is coming up missing; provider would like to serve the parent, but then they don't get paid; parent gets 31 hours per week broken up across the week; her care offers a morning schedule and they don't have another half day in the afternoon; how does the provider get paid for the hours when the parent doesn't need the hours the program offers
 - a. Harder for a parent to provide care
 - b. Harder for providers to offer care that suits



**Using Data and Research Inform Policy, Planning and Practice:
Asking the Right Questions and Preparing Next Steps
October 7, 2015**

Quality Work Group Guiding Questions

Instructions: Identify a scribe to record the conversation and someone to briefly report highlights behalf of the group (other than co-chairs). The co-chairs will be responsible for keeping the conversations on track and within the allotted timeframe. Notes from the work group will be collected by staff at the close of the meeting.

1. Audiences for the needs assessment:

- California Department of Education/Early Education and Support Division – informs funding allocation decisions
- Early care and education field (new and expanding)
- County Board of Supervisors and other elected officials (cities, state, federal)
- Philanthropies/grantees
- Advocates
- Communities, i.e. Best Start, Health Neighborhoods
- Others?

2. Identify data needs/wishes and potential sources of data:

- Setting the stage
 - o What do we want to know about the children and families of Los Angeles County?
 - o Funding landscape – federal, state, local
- What do we want to know about quality?

3. Policy considerations:

- What policy questions might we hope to answer?
- How will the data help inform efforts to shape policy (administrative as well as legislative)?

4. Accomplishing the Work:

- How can I and/or my organization contribute to the work?
- What is the role of our work group?

This page intentionally blank



AT A GLANCE – STATUS OF LEGISLATION REACHING THE GOVERNOR’S DESK – FIRST LEGISLATIVE SESSION OF 2015-16

Action	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	County Position	Status (As of 10/8/15)
California Assembly Bills					
1	AB 47 (McCarty)	Preschool for All Act of 2015	Early Edge California		Enrolled: 9/16/15 <i>Governor's Desk</i>
Chapter 292	AB 53 (Garcia)	Child passenger safety seat – rear facing requirements			Approved by Governor September 21, 2015
Vetoed	AB 74 (Calderon)	Incremental implementation to unannounced annual inspections of child care and development facilities			Vetoed by the Governor September 30, 2015 Veto message, in part: “Earlier this year, the 2015-16 Budget Act increased the frequency of inspections of licensed child care facilities to once every three years. Further increasing the frequency of these inspections may be a worthy goal, but the cost of this change should be considered in the budget process.”
Chapter 476	AB 271 (Oberholte)	Allows electronic maintenance of records by California Department of Education (CDE)-contracted programs and digital signature	CAPPA		Approved by Governor October 4, 2015
Chapter 514	AB 433 (Chu)	CalWORKs allowance for deceased child of a qualified family	Western Center on Law and Poverty		Approved by Governor October 6, 2015
Chapter 373	AB 762 (Mullin)	Toddler program considered extension of the infant center or preschool license, without the need for a separate license	California Head Start Association (CHSA), California Association for the Education of Young Children (CAEYC)		Approved by Governor September 30, 2015
Chapter 563	AB 833 (Bonta)	Would authorize Alameda County to develop an individualized county child care subsidy plan as a pilot project until 1/1/2021.	Alameda County Early Care and Education Planning Council		Approved by Governor October 7, 2015
Chapter 567	AB 982 (Eggman)	Would expand the list of entities that can identify a child in need of child care and development services to include a local educational agency liaison for children and youth experiencing homelessness, a Head Start program, or a transitional shelter.	National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth		Approved by Governor October 7, 2015

Action	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	County Position	Status (As of 10/8/15)
Chapter 414	AB 1207 (Lopez)	Mandated child abuse training requirements targeted to child care facilities	Child Care Law Center		<i>Approved by Governor October 1, 2015</i>
Chapter 486	AB 1387 (Chu)	Civil penalties			<i>Approved by Governor October 4, 2015</i>
California Senate Bills					
Chapter 35	SB 277 (Pan & Allen)	Immunization requirements for enrollment of children in schools, including child care and development programs	Vaccinate California	Support	<i>Approved by Governor June 30, 2015</i>
Chapter 546	SB 358 (Jackson)	Equitable wages and disclosure of wages			<i>Approved by Governor October 6, 2015</i>
	SB 456 (Block)	Would make threatening with a firearm at a school-sponsored event a misdemeanor or felony; definition of school is inclusive of preschool	San Diego County District Attorney's Office		<i>Vetoed by Governor 9/8/15</i> Veto message, in part: "While I'm sympathetic and utterly committed to ensuring maximum safety for [CA's] school children, the offensive conduct covered by this bill is already illegal." <i>In Senate Consideration of Governor's veto pending</i>
	SB 548 (De León) (Co-author: Assembly Speaker Atkins)	Orientation training for family child care providers	SEIU State Council, AFSCME, AFL-CIO		Enrolled: 9/16/15 <i>Governor's Desk</i>
	SB 579 (Jackson)	Sick leave provisions to attend child care program and school activities	Child Care Law Center, Legal Aid Society-Employment Law Center		Enrolled: 9/3/15 <i>Governor's Desk</i>
Watch	SB 792 (Mendoza)	Immunization requirements of staff and volunteers working in child care and development programs	Health Officers Association	Support	Enrolled: 9/10/15 <i>Governor's Desk</i>
California Budget Bills (including Trailer Bills)					
Chapter 10	AB 93 (Weber)	Budget Act of 2015 (includes child care and development items)			<i>Approved by Governor June 24, 2015</i>
Chapter 13	AB 104 (Committee on Budget)	Education Finance: education omnibus trailer bill			<i>Approved by Governor June 24, 2015</i>
Chapter 20	SB 79 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review)	Human Services (TBL) – inclusive regulatory compliance of licensed child care facilities			<i>Approved by Governor June 24, 2015</i>
Chapter 11	SB 97 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review)	Budget Act of 2015 amendments (includes child care and development items)			<i>Approved by Governor June 24, 2015</i>
Chapter 321	SB 101 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review)	Amends Budget Act of 2015 – appropriations of funding for preschool programs based on need			<i>Approved by Governor September 22, 2015</i>



October 5, 2015

Jeannette Aguirre

Maria Calix

Sam Chan, Ph.D.

Fran Chasen

Duane C. Dennis

Maureen Diekmann

Robert Gilchick, M.D., M.P.H.

Jennifer Hottenroth, Psy.D.

Karla Pleitez Howell, Esq.

Carollee Howes, Ph.D.

Dora Jacildo

Dawn A. Kurtz, Ph.D.

Sharoni D. Little, Ph.D.

Kathleen Malaske-Samu

Jacquelyn McCroskey, D.S.W.

Stacy Miller

Terri Chew Nishimura, MA, OTR/L

Faith Parducho

Nurhan Pirim

Nina Sorokin

Esther A. Torrez

John Whitaker, Ph.D.

Keesha Woods

Ruth M. Yoon

To: Olivia Rodriguez
Intergovernmental Relations and External Affairs

From: Vincent Holmes, Interim Staff
Service Integration Branch

Michele P. Sartell, Program Specialist III
Office of Child Care
Service Integration Branch

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
STATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA FOR SECOND SESSION OF
2015-16 – CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT ITEMS**

This memorandum responds to the request for review and update of the County's State Legislative Agenda for the second year of the 2015-16 legislative session. For reference, attached to this memorandum is the Child Care Planning Committee (Planning Committee) and Policy Roundtable for Child Care and Development (Roundtable) Public Policy Platform – Second Year of 2015-16 Legislative Session (Platform).

For background, each year the Planning Committee and Roundtable review the Platform, which delineates the County's legislative agenda items for child care and development (sub-section 1.3) with examples of efforts that may be addressed by proposed legislation or state budget. The Platform was considered by the Planning Committee on September 2, 2015 and then was approved by the Roundtable on September 9, 2015. The Roundtable recommends referencing the availability of the Public Policy Platform document in the material presented to the Board of Supervisors and be made available to the general public through the County and/or Office of Child Care website.

The remainder of this memo reiterates sub-section 1.3 Child Care and Development as listed in the County's current State Legislative Agenda, recommending that the items be retained as written with one addition. The Planning Committee and the Roundtable recommend adding item 9 to address facility development. A rationale for the addition is summarized following the proposed agenda item.



1.3 Child Care and Development

1. Support efforts to enhance the quality of early care and education that set high standards for all services and program types and address the needs of all children, including those with disabilities and other special needs, and their families.
2. Support efforts to develop and implement a statewide quality rating and improvement system and a system to adjust reimbursement rates based on demonstrated quality.
3. Support efforts to develop and sustain a well-educated and highly skilled professional workforce prepared to serve the culturally and linguistically diverse child and family populations of Los Angeles County.
4. Support efforts to ensure the health and safety of all children cared for in licensed early care and education facilities as afforded by timely, regular, and frequent on-site monitoring by the California Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division (CCLD).
5. Support efforts to adequately fund high quality early care and education services for all children from low and moderate income families.
6. Support the streamlining of California Department of Education administrative processes to expand access for low-income families, ensure continuity of care, and promote flexible use of early care and education funding to meet the needs of families.
7. Support proposals designed to prevent, detect, investigate and, when appropriate, prosecute fraud in subsidized child care and development programs.
8. Support efforts to ensure vulnerable children and their families have access to consistent, uninterrupted subsidized early care and education services.
9. Support efforts to expand the supply of appropriate early care and education services through facility development in communities of unmet need.

Rationale for item 9: In prior years, an item addressing facility development for child care and development was included in the County's legislative agenda, suggesting that the services be integrated into city and county plans. Last year, based on a recommendation put forth by Regional Planning, the item was removed as it was determined inconsistent with County policy to avoid potential unfunded mandates. Attempts were made to modify the language without success, including referring to the County's work to integrate early care and education in its draft revised general plan as a model for cities. Unfortunately, the proposed changes were not accepted.

Nevertheless, facility development to meet the need for early care and education services for Los Angeles County's children and families, especially those most in need, is a critical issue as demand continues to outweigh supply. Additional factors contributing to the need for facility development include the availability of funding in the State budget over the last two years to expand access for low-income families to the California State Preschool Program (CSPP) as well as a lesser amount of funds to expand access for subsidized infant and toddler services. Concurrently, the Board of Supervisors motion on March 17, 2015 to support or pursue legislation to clarify priority for subsidized early care and education services to children involved in the child welfare system and provide priority for children of parents under the supervision of child welfare system contributes to the demand for additional spaces as funding becomes available.

Memo to Olyvia Rodriguez
October 5, 2015
Page 3

By including the above item in the public policy platform we are underscoring the importance of supporting early care and education facilities development in communities with a severe shortage of these services.

In closing, thank you for this opportunity to weigh in on the County's State Legislative Agenda. If you have any questions regarding the recommended change, please contact Michele by e-mail at msartell@ceo.lacounty.gov or by telephone at (213) 974-5187.

Attachment

VH:MPS

Cc: Cheri Thomas, Service Integration Branch/Chief Executive Office
Renita Bowlin, Office of Child Care, Service Integration Branch
Sarah M. Soriano, Chair, Child Care Planning Committee
Sharoni Little, Ph.D., Chair, Policy Roundtable for Child Care and Development

This page intentionally blank



PUBLIC POLICY PLATFORM
Second Year of 2015-16 Legislative Session

Introduction

The Child Care Planning Committee (Planning Committee) and Policy Roundtable for Child Care and Development (Roundtable) promote policies designed to increase the availability of and access to affordable, high quality early care and education programs for all children and their families of Los Angeles County. This public policy platform presents current and emerging policy issues in early care and education that are consistent with the County of Los Angeles State Legislative Agenda for the Second Year of the 2015-16 Legislative Session. The platform delineates each of the County's legislative agenda items in **bold** followed by examples of efforts that may be addressed by proposed legislation and/or the proposed state budget.

Platform Issues

1. Support efforts to enhance the quality of early care and education that set high standards for all services and program types and address the needs of all children, including those with disabilities and other special needs, and their families.

Such efforts should include, but not be limited to:

- Addressing the early care and education needs of children from birth through age 12, including infants and toddlers, preschool and school age children, and children with disabilities and other special needs up to age 22, and their families.
- Enhancing the quality of centers, family child care homes, and license-exempt care providers.
- Promoting a strengthening families approach to meet the needs of children at risk for abuse, neglect or sexual exploitation or under the supervision of the child welfare system and children of families under the supervision of Probation.
- Integrating early identification and intervention systems that recognize and respond early to young children who may be at risk for disabilities and other special needs.
- Developing policies that encourage collaboration between early care and education programs and locally-funded projects and public agencies that foster child and family well-being through the provision of coordinated services.
- Incorporating optimal health promotion policies and procedures as an integral component that contributes to the overall quality of early care and education services and programs.
- Engaging parents as their child's first teachers and partners in promoting their child's optimal growth and development.



2. Support efforts to develop and implement a statewide quality rating and improvement system and a system to adjust reimbursement rates based on demonstrated quality.

Such efforts should include, but not be limited to:

- Providing parents with clear, concise information on the quality of early care and education settings.
- Fostering the engagement of parents that promotes their child's optimal healthy growth and development and learning.
- Incorporating early learning standards that are research-based, culturally responsive to children from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, aligned with existing regulatory systems and local quality initiatives, recognize and respond to the individual needs of children in group settings, and attend to families' needs for comprehensive services.
- Building an infrastructure of technical assistance, financial supports and training, all of which are tied to defined quality standards, to help early care and education programs achieve and maintain high quality services.

3. Support efforts to develop and sustain a well-educated and highly skilled professional workforce prepared to serve the culturally and linguistically diverse child and family populations of Los Angeles County.

Such efforts should include, but not be limited to:

- Focusing on teachers and other members of the workforce gaining skills and demonstrating competencies in the following areas: how to provide instructional support to children, best practices in working with dual language learners, proficiency in recognition and response to children with disabilities and other special needs, health and nutrition best practices, engaging parents and guardians, and expertise on the spectrum of child development from birth through early adolescence. Workforce practice must be based on established early care and education research.
- Offering coursework and instruction responsive to a multi-lingual, multicultural workforce, including but not limited to providing content in students' home language and offering classes during non-traditional hours.
- Expanding early childhood educators' access to higher education through stipend programs, grant funds and loan forgiveness programs, higher compensation when they attain post-secondary degrees, and benefits (i.e. health insurance and retirement plans).
- Facilitating child development or early childhood education coursework coordination and articulation between the community colleges and California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) systems.
- Supporting efforts to enhance the quality of the license-exempt care workforce and facilitating connections between license-exempt care and the larger system of early care and education.

- Supporting alignment of teacher requirements under Title 22 with teacher requirements under Title 5.

4. Support efforts to ensure the health and safety of all children cared for in licensed early care and education facilities as afforded by timely, regular, and frequent on-site monitoring by the California Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division (CCLD).

Such efforts should include, but not be limited to:

- Increasing to, at a minimum, annual inspections of centers and family child care homes.
- Advocating for, at a minimum, annual unannounced inspections of all licensed facilities.
- Providing that CCLD is sufficiently funded, staffed and held accountable to meet the standards, conduct timely reviews of licensing applications and responses to complaints, and provide technical assistance and resources to current and future licensees.
- Ensuring that costs of obtaining and renewing the license (or licenses for programs with multiple sites) is reasonable and not an extraordinary burden to the licensee's cost of doing business.

5. Support efforts to adequately fund high quality early care and education services for all children from low and moderate income families.

Such efforts should include, but not be limited to:

- Expanding access to high quality subsidized services for all eligible children, including infants and toddlers and children with disabilities and other special needs as well as preschool and school age children.
- Increasing levels of reimbursement in the Standard Reimbursement Rate (SRR) and the Regional Market Rate (RMR) to compensate providers for the true cost of high quality services.
- Prioritizing funds targeted to infants and toddlers to meet the growing demand for high quality services.
- Increasing funds for expansion of high quality full-day, full-year services for all ages.
- Offering tax incentives to businesses to provide or subsidize employee's early care and education services.
- Ensuring that the income ceiling for eligibility for State subsidized care reflects the current State Median Income (SMI), adjusted by region if appropriate.

- Opposing proposals that would reduce subsidized rates based on geographic location.

6. Support the streamlining of California Department of Education administrative processes to expand access for low-income families, ensure continuity of care, and promote flexible use of early care and education funding to meet the needs of families.

Such efforts should include, but not be limited to:

- Allowing administrative efficiencies such as multi-year contracting, grant-based funding, and waivers on program rules and regulations to allow flexibility of services based on community and family needs.
- Establishing a 12-month annual eligibility redetermination to allow for more stable enrollments for early care and education programs and continuous services for children and their families.
- Ensuring agencies have the capacity to connect with and serve the most vulnerable and the most difficult-to-serve families.
- Maintaining affordable family fees that do not exceed eight percent of gross family income.
- Maintaining part-day State Preschool as a free, comprehensive early care and education program.
- Allowing for various systems that serve vulnerable and low-income children and families to streamline administrative functions and share information in order to facilitate the enrollment of children in subsidized early care and education programs and to participate in joint data collection efforts.

7. Support proposals designed to prevent, detect, investigate and, when appropriate, prosecute fraud in subsidized child care and development programs.

8. Support efforts to ensure that vulnerable children and their families have access to consistent, uninterrupted subsidized early care and education services.

Such efforts should include, but not be limited to:

- Making sure that California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) families have access to child care and education services, ensure that participating families are afforded the time and information needed to evaluate their child care and education options and make sound choices, and that allow parents to pursue or maintain employment.
- Promoting, facilitating and supporting consistent and continuous participation of children under the supervision of the child welfare system and Probation and their families in high quality programs that promote healthy child development and support effective parenting.

- Ensuring that all subsidized children – infants and toddlers, preschool age, and school age children – and their families have access to consistent and continuous high quality early care and education services that partner with parents to promote children’s healthy growth and development and prepare them for school and life, and meet the needs of families.
- Addressing the needs of pregnant and parenting teens to ensure their access to high quality early care and education services that support their academic goals, promote positive and effective parenting skills, and contribute to their child’s healthy growth and development.
- Facilitating access to high quality early care and education programs that are responsive to the unique needs of children and families experiencing homelessness.

9. Support efforts to expand the supply of appropriate early care and education services through facility development in communities of unmet need.

Such efforts should include, but not be limited to:

- Facilitating the cost effective construction or renovation of early care and education facilities in communities with unmet needs for these services.

Proposed

This page intentionally blank



Home / Specialized Programs / Child Development / Contractor Information

Management Bulletin 15-10

Early Education and Support Division

Subject: Fiscal Year 2015–16, Request for Applications California State Preschool Program Expansion Funds

Number: 15-10

Date: October 2015

Expires: November 2015

Authority: The Fiscal Year 2015–16 California Budget Act (Chapter 11, Statute of 2015), Item Numbers 6110-194-0001 and 6110-196-0001 provides line item funding. The Budget includes a total of 7,030 slots available for California State Preschool Program (CSPP) expansion funds.

Attention: Executive Officers and Program Directors of any early education and support program or entity interested in applying for California State Preschool Program funding

Important Dates

Event	Date
CSPP Application and Instructions Announced	October 1, 2015
Bidders Conference	October 13, 2015
Application Due Date	November 24, 2015

Purpose

The California Department of Education (CDE) Early Education and Support Division (EESD) announces the availability of CSPP funds as follows:

- 5,830 full-day/full-year slots to be awarded to successful Local Education Agency (LEA) applicants.
- 1,200 full-day/full-year slots to be awarded to successful non-LEA agency applicants.

CSPP funds will be used to provide services for age eligible three and four-year-old California children. CSPP age eligible definitions are as follows:

- Three-year-old children are children who will have their third birthday on or before September 1, of the fiscal year they are being served.
- Four-year-old children are children who will have their fourth birthday on or before September 1, of the fiscal year they are being served.

The intent of this Request for Funding Application (RFA) is to expand full-day/full-year CSPP services statewide. The RFA funding opportunity is available to existing CSPP contracted agencies, to existing contracted agencies that do not have a CSPP contract, or to new agencies without EESD program contracts. Funding preference shall be provided to underserved areas as identified by the Local Child Care and Development Planning Council at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/documents/lpcpriorities2015.xls>.

Statutory and Regulatory Background

Each applicant will be required, as a condition of the contract with the CDE, to adhere to the Funding Terms and Conditions (FT&Cs), the program requirements, the CDE Audit Guide, and any other requirements incorporated into the contract, in addition to all other applicable laws and regulations. The California *Education Code (EC)* Title 1, Division 1, Part 6, Chapter 2, sections 8235–8237 authorizes the Superintendent of Public Instruction to administer CSPPs. *California Code of Regulations*, Title 5 (5 CCR), Education Chapter 19, sections 18001–18003 provide general provisions for awarding funding. Pursuant to 5 CCR Section 18272, the EESD requires each agency to maintain a developmental profile that identifies the emotional, social, physical, linguistic, and cognitive growth of each child served; and to use the profile to plan and conduct age and developmentally appropriate activities. Program contractors must maintain appropriate staffing ratios in accordance with 5 CCR, Section 18290. All pertinent information can be found at the CDE Laws, Regulations, and Requirements Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/lr/>.

EC Section 8208 defines “Local Educational Agency” as a school district, a county office of education, a community college district, or a school district on behalf of one or more schools within the school district. Direct funded charter schools will be considered a LEA.

These funds are intended to increase the availability of CSPP services to eligible children. CSPP services should be provided based on the needs of families in the community being served. In accordance with existing law, priority will be given to applicant agencies that will be serving the highest percentage of four-year-old children.

Application Submission Requirements

The CSPP Expansion RFA and other attachments can be found on the CDE Funding Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r2/cspp15rfa.asp>.

- The CSPP Expansion RFA Priorities for the 5,830 slots are as follows:

LEA applicants providing full-day/full-year services

LEA applicants providing part-day/part-year services

Non-LEA applicants providing part-day/part-year services

- The CSPP Expansion RFA Priorities for 1,200 slots are as follows:

Non-LEA applicants providing full day/full year services

Agencies considering submitting a CSPP Expansion RFA must complete and submit all required documentation on or before November 24, 2015, to the following address:

**California Department of Education
Early Education and Support Division
ATTN: FUNDING AND AGENCY SUPPORT UNIT
1430 N Street, Suite 3410
Sacramento, CA 95814-5901**

Applicants must mail or personally deliver applications. The EESD will not accept electronic versions, files on computer discs, or facsimile applications. **Application packages must be received at the address listed above on or before 6:00 p.m. November 24, 2015.**

It is solely the applicant's responsibility to carefully review the RFA information and requirements before submitting an application for funding. Failure to follow the submission requirements will disqualify the application.

If you have any questions regarding the information in this management bulletin, please submit your questions by e-mail to CSPPRFA_FY1516@cde.ca.gov.

Return to Top

This Management Bulletin is mandatory only to the extent that it cites a specific statutory and/or regulatory requirement. Any portion of this Management Bulletin that is not supported by a specific statutory and/or regulatory requirement is not prescriptive pursuant to California Education Code Section 33308.5.

Questions: Early Education and Support Division | 916-322-6233

Last Reviewed: Wednesday, September 30, 2015

Share this Page



Recently Posted in Child Development

[Management Bulletin 15-10](#) (added 30-Sep-2015)

Management Bulletin 15-10 announces the FY 2015-16 California State Preschool Expansion RFA.

[State Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care](#) (added 29-Sep-2015)

The State Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care (SAC) is a governor-appointed leadership body that ensures statewide collaboration among early childhood programs that will help to define future policy for children birth to kindergarten.

[2016-18 CCDF State Plan 12-month Eligibility](#) (PDF) (added 29-Sep-2015)

Twelve-Month Eligibility summary for the 2016-18 Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) State Plan.

[CCDF 2016-18 State Plan License Exempt](#) (PDF) (added 29-Sep-2015)

License-exempt monitoring webinar for the 2016-18 Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) State Plan.

[CCDF 2016-18 State Plan Professional Development](#) (PDF) (added 29-Sep-2015)

Professional Development information for the 2016-18 Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) State Plan.

[More Recently Posted Items](#)