



Alameda County Child Care Planning Council
Public Policy Committee
August 2, 2017
MINUTES

“The mission of the Public Policy Committee is to support the mission of the Planning Council by monitoring and developing early care and education legislation, policies and regulations that impact children, families and ECE providers and recommending appropriate action to the Planning Council.”

Attendees:

Valerie Kane	SSA	John Garvey	First Five
Renee Herzfeld	4Cs of Alameda County, Chair, Planning Council	Phan Fong	Child Care Links
Margaret Jerene	Co-Chair, Public Policy First Five	Nancy Strohl	Steering Committee
		Pauline McCarthy	4Cs

Ellen Dektar, LPC Staff

Ongoing Action Items from May-July Meetings:

- At future meeting review the First Five School Readiness study as a group (one focus should be understanding access to preschool for different ethnic/racial groups).
- Margaret Jerene will bring data she has about Stage 1 to a future meeting.
- Margaret summarize concerns about LEA delicensing state preschools at a future meeting

August Action:

- Ask State Contractor’s to put discussion of LAO task force on licensing for school based preschools on their agenda; develop local recommendation and consider sharing proposal with Superintendent Monroe. Margaret and/or Ellen analyze difference in Title 5 and Title 22 regulations and practice. Include outreach to school districts such as Oakland Unified which was a proponent of the state budget language. Also research school district regulations/practice for TK classrooms.
- Share First Five data on AP voucher utilization statistics and maps *with Board of Supervisors*
- Consider endorsing NWLC NOW Campaign
- Recommend to the Steering Committee/September meeting that the County opt in to the new Foster Care Bridge program (see below for reasoning)
- Nancy Strohl will draft a letter to our federal representatives on ECE budget issues; Ellen will finish them and add data
- Consider arranging for Congressman Swalwell to do family child care for a day(Margaret recommends a Hayward family child care home) as a way of engaging him in ECE issues, since he’s a new dad he might be especially receptive
- First Five will check on how far we can disclose data about name of providers

I. Introductions and Announcements

Steering Committee members met recently with County Superintendent Monroe. She seems very open to conversation and takes her appointments seriously; she convenes monthly meetings of the School District Superintendents which could be an opportunity to mention ECE issues.

II. Report Out from State Contractors, Other ECEPC Committees

There were no major reports.

III. Review, Discuss and Possibly Take Action on Local, State and/or Federal Legislation and Budget

A. Foster Care Bridge Program

Nancy disclosed her January payment from LA First Five to organize planning for a foster care bridge program; so she will not be voting to support this issue; she is not trying to push the bridge program

Unofficially, California Department of Social Services will issue an All County Letter to guide the implementation of this new \$15.5 million/\$31 million annualized program in September; the County will determine child eligibility. In the past, Alameda County issued foster parents a \$350/month voucher for a limited time. No County match is required.

Steering Committee members want us to document our process in considering “Pros and Cons” of bills:
Pros:

- LPC goals are accessibility and quality---this fits with those. The program would provide more child care resources for foster families
- Gather data on 6 months and whether that’s enough time and then can argue for longer funds; these families are prioritized in law; they are really low income based on child needs
- Better navigation, etc.
- 6 months was not an ideal duration for the subsidy; it is what was needed to achieve a political compromise and to give families breathing room and the understanding they would work with the navigator to get more child care;

Cons:

- 6-12 months is not enough with a subsidy; families need more support

Two separate parts: Vouchers, and Navigation and Trauma Training for Child Care Providers

- A Resource and Referral Agency could not apply for navigation funds if County did not opt in
- DSS would administer voucher piece for families, and it may have navigation piece and/or contracts for navigators. It is still unclear how state and county Social Services and Resource and Referral (R and R) Network administration would align. There is clear language about R and R agencies developing MOUS with County Child Welfare agencies for navigation and coaching.

B. Federal budget letters:

National Women’s Law Center (NWLC) has appropriations ask that we can use as a model to ask for increased CCDBG funding; *Nancy will write a draft letter and send to Ellen and Margaret and Renee based on principles that the Planning Council previously approved; Ellen will finish the letter and add data.*

IV. First Five Presentation on Alameda County Alternative Payment Data

John Garvey with First five shared recent data on AP voucher utilization that was collected during the last two weeks of 2016

- It will be presented to 4Cs, BANANAS, Child Care Links and Davis Street



Alameda County Child Care Planning Council
Public Policy Committee
August 2, 2017
MINUTES

- John can also break it out by Stage 1, Stage 2, and other criteria
- QRIS uses data to prioritize zip codes for QRIS participation; he will overlay it with poverty data to see if high use coincides w data;
- F5 can also help what schools should collect School Readiness data; but there is a lot of mobility with children;
- Map also id's community organizations we can capitalize on to help increase public benefit outreach and take up rates
 - i. APs could request compiled data or their own data; Nancy recommended showing elected officials where their children are being served and incorporate Early Head Start (EHS) and Head Start (HS) data;
 - ii. F5 strategic plan is also trying to target support to high need neighborhoods
 - iii. They have provider information such as address and what type (family, friend and neighbor, licensed); child may be duplicated across agencies; age
- 1900 providers in 2016 claimed voucher; 1100 are family, friends and neighbors; roughly 570 are small and large family child care and 189 were at centers (Eyes on You and Kindercare are major voucher recipients)
- About 4,000 children claimed a voucher in 2016 (may be same kid across agency);
 - 1100 toddler
 - 2400 preschool
 - 200 of the children infant
 - 40% of infant and toddler across all providers
 - Ashland using a lot of family child care
 - The darker the color=MORE SITES serving kids
- Nancy posed a question about whether a preschool expansion would drain family child care supply of infant and toddler care because there would be incentives for them to provide preschool. Perhaps the AP data can be used to monitor neighborhood level supply of infant and toddler care and assure that it is not diminishing in conjunction with possible initiative expansion.
- This analysis will be annual but this first year of data was just three months
- We need to capture that AP is what helps with full time care; and large percentage of centers are 3 hour part day care, so we should capture the location of the centers and what ages are they serving;
- OUSD getting 90% of parents to report where kids went to preschool; F5 trying to get this to demonstrate impact of Quality Counts;
- Providers do not necessarily align with high child need; (Fruitvale);
- Are the providers in neighborhoods where there are low income children?

V. AB 833 Pilot

- No major update. Data system used by state contractors now accepts 2.9 as an age

VI. Next Meeting Agenda

- Platform revisions (add protections for immigrants), Licensing issue?

Next Meeting: Wednesday, September 6, 2017 9:30-11:30 **4Cs of Alameda County



**Alameda County Child Care Planning Council
Public Policy Committee
August 2, 2017
MINUTES**