



Action Items for the 4/17/15 Planning Council Meeting

Action Item #1: Support AB 47 (McCarty)

Recommended by the Public Policy Committee

Background: This bill requires the California Department of Education to issue a report on how to expand state preschool. This bill would require the Department of Education to report to the Legislature and Department of Finance, by June 1, 2016, a plan for expanding the state preschool program to all eligible low-income children who do not have access to one year of state preschool or transitional kindergarten. The bill would require the report to contain an analysis of the need for new facilities for the state preschool program in order to provide access to all eligible children.

Pros: A report would sustain a public discussion about the need to plan for and/or expand ece.

Cons: This bill requires a report, not actual funds which are what is truly needed.

Next Steps: Request official County support and lobbyist support in Sacramento.

Action Item #2: Support AB 74 (Calderon)

Recommended by the Public Policy Committee

Background: Currently licensed child care programs may be visited only once every five years by state Community Care Licensing. This bill would require annual visits, which is aligned with new federal CBDG regulations which will be operable in 2016.

Pros: The infrequency of licensing visits can mean that unsafe conditions are not caught and corrected the entire time a child is in a licensed early care and education setting.

Cons: This would require significant funding increases, and some are concerned that all other federal funds dedicated to quality would be redirected away from effective programs and intermediaries that support quality. The goal should be to grow and not supplant the funds available for these functions.

Next Steps: Request official County support and lobbyist support in Sacramento.

Action Item #3: Support AB 188 (Garcia)

Recommended by the Public Policy Committee

Background: Child care intermediaries, such as Alternative Payment programs, Resource and Referral Agencies, and the Local Planning Councils, just like ece providers, need better funding to do their work. This bill increases the allowable reimbursable amount included in contracts for Alternative Payment programs for child care. Specifically, this bill: adds a 3% reimbursement rate for making eligibility determinations to the allowable reimbursable amount for an alternative payment program contract.



Pros: This bill would bring reimbursement rates for Alternative Payment programs closer to the 1991 rate of 25% from the current 17.5%.

Cons: With limited funds, an increase to one part of the system could mean lack of funds to support increases in other areas.

Next Steps: Request official County support and lobbyist support in Sacramento.

Action Item #4: Support AB 762 Integrated Child Care Licenses (Mullin)

Recommended by the Public Policy Committee

Background: California is one of the only two states in the country which have separate infant-toddler and preschool licenses. Many states mandate the standards required in California but without requiring two licenses. Waivers are allowed to allow Toddlers to stay until 30 months, but is time consuming and subject to local Community Care Licensing staff availability.

Pros: Proponents assert the intent of two licenses is good, but result in siloed programs that do not recognize transitional considerations and force providers to arbitrarily move children out of one classroom and into another based on birthdates, to the exclusion of other needs. They say one license could allow them to fill slots more rapidly and not have to force other families out of a center because their child is no longer allowed to be with younger children.

Cons: Some might argue that the existing two licenses are the best way to assure age appropriate programs.

Next Steps: Request official County support and lobbyist support in Sacramento.

Action Item #5: AB 833 (Bonta)

Recommended by the Public Policy Committee

Background: Since 2003 and 2005 (respectively), current law has allowed the County of San Mateo and the City and County of San Francisco to participate in individualized county child care subsidy plans with Title 5 child development contract funding, which allows them more flexibility to modify reimbursement rates for state contracted programs to reflect their high cost of living relative to other California counties. They are required to achieve a two percent increase in child days of enrollment compared to a baseline year. These pilots expire on July 1, 2018, with a detailed phase out for San Francisco between 2016 and 2018. This bill expands the pilots to include Alameda County.

Pros: Alameda County has been sending back contract funds that as a result of this pilot could be retained and used to sustain or expand programs.

Cons: This flexibility might be well utilized by more than just three counties.



Next Steps: Request official County support and lobbyist support in Sacramento.

Action Item #5: SB 763 (Leno)

Recommended by the Public Policy Committee

Background: This bill requires manufacturers of certain products for infants and children to disclose on a label whether or not the products contain flame retardant chemicals. Product examples are bassinets, booster seats, car seats, changing pads, play mats, high chair pads, nursing pillows, nap mats, mattresses etc.

Pros: Growing evidence shows that fire retardant chemicals have serious human and environmental health impacts, including cancer, decreased fertility, hormone disruption, lower IQ and hyperactivity. A typical household can contain up to several pounds of these chemicals. Child care providers use many children's products in ece settings, and this can impact the health of staff as well as children.

Cons: Opponents maintain that fire retardants do more to protect children than harm them.

Next Steps: Request official County support and lobbyist support in Sacramento.

Action Item #6: Approve AB212 Plan for Fiscal Year 2015-16

Recommended by State Contractors and Early Care and Education Committee

Background: The Planning Council has administered the AB212 contract since it was signed into law over 15 years ago. The Legislature has made funding available for child development staff retention activities to improve the retention of qualified child development employees that work directly with children in state-subsidized, Title 5, child development programs. This funding is allocated to Councils based on the percentage of state-subsidized, center-based child care funds in the County. Last year we received \$638,077 to implement this program. Each year we are required to submit a plan to the state for how we will use AB212 funds for the following year.

Proposal:

- Continue to offer a AB212 Conference providing quality improvement training aligned with QRIS goals and other provider training needs
- Continue to offer CLASS coaching and learning communities;
- Continue to Provide CalSAC Trainer and Trainings specializing in School Age population;
- Continue to incentivize professional development continuum of learning;
- Continue to target funding to support QRIS efforts;
- Continue to provide flexible use of a (smaller) portion of training funds to meet individual agency needs.

Pros: Continuing to align our efforts will create a more seamless system for providers. Using more of our funds to support evidence-based tools and practices is more likely to lead to improved quality and better child outcomes.

Cons: AB212 agencies will have less flexibility in designing training that meets their individual agency needs.

Next Steps: With Council approval staff will complete the plan and submit to the State by the end of April.