



Action Items for the 3/17/17 Planning Council Meeting

Action Item 1: AB 273

Recommended by the Public Policy and Executive Committee

Background: Performance Measure # 1—access to ECE and Platform #2 (legislation that significantly impacts ECE access). This bill would add to the categories of need that enable parents to qualify for state subsidized child care programs (vouchers and centers). It would allow parents to qualify who are enrolled in educational programs for English as a second language learners or to attain a high school diploma or general education development certificate.

Pros: Counties vary in whether they allow parents to qualify under these criteria. Putting this eligibility criteria in state law would assure access to child development programs for a population clearly trying to advance economically.

Cons: Broadening eligibility could intensify demand for spaces.

Next Steps: Support the legislation, send letter of support, ask County to also support.

Action Item 2: AB 300 (Caballero, Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz), AB 377 (Solano), AB 435 (Thurmond)(Contra Costa)

Background: Performance Measure #1 and #3 Expand access to quality care; and Platform #2 (legislation that significantly impacts ECE access). Last year Alameda County obtained permission from the state to pursue an “individualized County subsidy plan” following a decade of pilots in San Francisco and San Mateo counties. It is currently being implemented and anecdotal information so far suggests that it is allowing more ECE access to high need families. Over the past several years, as a courtesy, all of the counties interested in pilots have supported each other’s legislation, which included Alameda County support for Santa Clara’s pilot request last year that was signed by the Governor. This year, six other counties are requesting pilot programs, which would bring the total pilot counties to nine, and a higher percentage of the state’s 58 counties.

Pros: Also, AB 433 will be amended to include “clean up” provisions for AB 833 for Alameda County—to expand our pilot to Alternative Payment programs. The current pilots have been able to retain local contract funds and expand access to families as well as provide higher reimbursement rates to providers which is a key strategy to preserve the ECE supply. They have been able to accomplish this without additional state funding requests. Several of the counties requesting pilots this year cite evidence that without the pilot they will lose contractors in the short term. The LPC has also supported AB 60 which seeks to raise the statewide income threshold to 85% which is currently made possible in Alameda County by our pilot status.

Cons: Some in the ECE field are opposed to continuing to expand pilots and feel that counties developing local solutions with unspent state contract funds jeopardize chances for statewide reforms such as those proposed in AB 60 which would entail new state funding to allow families to remain in programs up to 85% of the State Median Income (SMI) which Alameda County is now implementing due to the Alameda County pilot.



Next Steps: Support the legislation, send letter of support, ask County to also support.

Action Item 3: AB 1164 (Thurmond) Foster Care Bridge Program

Recommended by Public Policy Committee

Background: Performance Measure #1 (Access for foster families) and Platform #2 and #3 (family centered, inclusive, developmentally and culturally appropriate practices). This bill is the outgrowth of a multi year conversation spearheaded partially by Los Angeles County child care advocates and Senator Holly Mitchell to better meet the child care needs of children in the foster care system. They recently held a hearing in Sacramento to try to build bridges between organizations supporting child care and foster care families. This bill provides time limited child care vouchers for foster parents, child care navigators housed at Resource and Referral agencies for foster parents, and directs the Resource and Referral agencies to provide trainings for child care staff on working with children who have experienced trauma. Last year's work, this bill and ongoing work will be partially supported by Children Now.

Pros: This bill has the potential to "increase access to quality care for a vulnerable population. Last year the Planning Council supported a similar proposal that was advanced in budget language.

Cons: This bill would enable only a short term subsidy.

Next Steps: Approve letter, send letter of support, work with Social Services Agency to request County support through PAL Committee.

Action Item 4: Support Framework for Federal Letter to Elected Officials

Recommended by the Public Policy Committee

Background: Performance Measure#1. Access to ECE. All federal domestic spending would be threatened with President Trump's intention to significantly increase defense spending or alternate priorities. A block grant of Head Start to the states is also possible and there is some discussion of deregulating child care programs. Our federal representatives need to have tools in hand that localize the impact of potential policies and give them capacity to articulate their specific opposition.

Pros: This letter could serve as a ready response tool to frame our position on federal issues for federal elected officials. We could then localize and add current data to give them feedback on specific policy proposals that are being made.

Cons: Some people might feel that this is too general.

Next Steps: Approve letter, send it to federal elected officials as needed with localized information.

Action Item 5: SB 18 (Pan) Bill of Rights for Children and Youth

Recommended by the State Contractor's Committee



Background: A few local jurisdictions have approved a Children’s Bill of Rights as a tool to call policy makers’ attention to children’s needs. This bill is an attempt to raise the importance of supporting children’s needs at the state level. It states a number of children’s rights and the intent by 1/1/22 to develop policy solutions, and quantify and obtain the funds needed to support the rights stated in the legislation.

Pros: This is a great tool to remind policy makers about the importance of supporting work for low-income children.

Cons: It is a very idealistic and perhaps ultimately difficult to fund bill.

Next Steps: Approve bill, send letter to state elected officials, submit to County for County support.

Action Item 6: Annual Zip Code Priorities

Background: Performance #1. The Early Care and Education Planning Council annually submits an updated plan to the California Department of Education, Early Education Support Division about the implementation of AB 212 at the local level. The 2017-2018 Plan was developed to align with Alameda County’s Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS) known as Quality Counts and to account for the proposed 25% budget reduction.

Pros: Continuous alignment with Quality Counts supports increased efficiencies and seamless delivery to participating programs. Additionally, not adjusting for the 25% budget reduction may cause the state to reject the Plan.

Cons: Participating programs will continue to have multiple reporting requirements to various auspices for overlapping quality improvement efforts

Next Steps: Support the AB 212 Plan Change and forward to the California Department of Education by the March 31, 2017 deadline

Action Item 7: Annual Zip Code Priorities

Recommended by the Early Care and Education Program

Background: Performance Measures #1, 2 and 3. The Early Care and Education Planning Council annually submits updated zip code priorities based on local, state and federal data. The Planning Council is required to develop local funding priorities to the California Department of Education’s Early Education and Support Division for the distribution of any new state general child care (e.g. infant/toddler and school-age) and new preschool funding based on direct impact indicators of Priority 1, 2 or 3.



Pros: This allows the County to identify gaps and needs of services and target funding resources accordingly each year.

Cons: Some communities once identified at a higher priority may no longer fit the criteria from one year to the next.

Next Steps: Support the identified zip code priorities to the California Department of Education and submit by the May 30, 2017 deadline.