Los Angeles County Child Care Planning Committee
Minutes: May 5, 2010 Location: Glendale USD Professional Dev Center
12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. 319 North Central Avenue
Glendale, CA 91203

Members in Attendance: (29) Rocio Bach, Lisa Wilkin, Sam Kirk, Kathleen Pompey, Susan McCombs, Patti Oblath, Diane Philibosian, Judy Sanchez, Peggy Sisson, Joy Cyprian, Mary Helen Vasquez, Ofelia Medina, Nurhan Pirim, JoAnn Shalhoub Mejia, Fiona Stewart, Patrice Wong, John Berndt, Sarah Soriano, Randi Wolfe, Peter Huffaker for Kate Andersen, Edilma Serna for Bobbie Edwards, Deborah Gatti, Gay Macdonald, Pat Mendoza, Karla Pleitez, Holly Reynolds, Moises Roman, Atalaya Sergi, and Anita Tetrault

Guests and Alternates: Ancelma Sanchez, Lou Orr, Elvie Matias, Ritu Mahajan, Kathy Schreiner, Madonna Cardenas, Melinda Felice, Veronica Torres, Adrienne Schoen Gunn, Ree Harris

Staff: Laura Escobedo

I. Welcome and Introductions

Holly Reynolds, Chair, opened the meeting at 12:15 p.m. She welcomed the group and thanked Glendale Unified School District for hosting the meeting and providing refreshments. She then requested that everyone introduce themselves. The Chair read the opening statement.

II. Approval of Minutes from the April 7, 2010 Meeting

The Chair called for a motion to approve the April 7, 2010 minutes. John Berndt moved to approve; Ancelma Sanchez seconded the motion. The Chair called for the vote. The motion was approved with no abstentions.

III. Office of Child Care Update

Laura Escobedo presented an update on the Los Angeles Centralized Eligibility List (LACEL). In the 12 months of 2009-2010, 41,708 families registered on the LACEL and over 10,000 children were enrolled in child development programs. She detailed the issues with LACEL, including: inaccurate data, not following procedures, and parents who do not understand the subsidized system and do not respond in effective ways. Parents are often confused when they are contacted by an agency different than the one that registered them. They are unaware of all the documentation they must have ready and they do not follow through in many cases.

The Office of Child Care is attempting to address many of the issues through: more frequent record updates, constant training of users, more information for parents, and training for community agency staff who work with low income parents. Other improvements involve software/system changes and regulation changes. Office of Child Care staff will be working with California Department of Education (CDE) to determine best practices and improvements. An advisory committee of CDE-funded agencies worked with LACEL staff for nine months to review and revise the LACEL Policies and Procedures, which are out for a 30 day review period. The Access and CEL Work Group will conduct a review of the LACEL as required by CDE.

IV. Legislation

Patrice Wong, Co-Chair of the Joint Committee on Legislation, presented two bills and federal budget items for which the Committee is recommending a support position.

The first bill is AB 2592, directing the CDE to implement a Quality Rating and Improvement System as developed by the Early Learning and Quality Improvement Advisory Committee. Sam Kirk moved to support the legislation as recommended by the Joint Committee; the motion was seconded by Fiona Stewart. Motion was approved with no abstentions.

The second bill is SB 1126, which would direct the Community Colleges and the California State University (CSU) system to develop early childhood education coursework articulation

between the two systems and would require exploring the appropriateness of awarding Bachelor of Arts (BA) degrees through Community Colleges. Sam Kirk moved to support the legislation as recommended by the Joint Committee; the motion was seconded by Randi Wolfe. Motion was approved with no abstentions.

The third item was a recommendation to support increased funding for the Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG) in the federal budget. Sam Kirk moved to accept the Joint Committee's recommendation; Judy Sanchez seconded the motion. The motion passed with no abstentions.

Finally, the Joint Committee recommended support for an increase in funding for Head Start and Early Head Start. John Berndt moved to accept the recommendation; it was seconded by Susan McComb. The motion passed with no abstentions.

V. Emotional Intelligence: Part 5, Social Skills

Dianne Philibosian opened by saying that almost everything we do requires some social skill and being aware of these skills is part of emotional intelligence. Social skills include: influence/persuasion; communication, which includes seeing beyond words; conflict management; leadership (guiding/developing consensus, inspiring others); and managing change. Social skills are critical in building bonds, developing trust, team building, and in any endeavor involving collaboration. Each table had a small discussion about examples of social skills. When the group reconvened, Holly thanked Dianne for leading our Child Care Planning Committee (Planning Committee) through the Emotional Intelligence exercises this year.

VI. Presentation: How Children Benefit From Subsidized Child Care

Susan Savage, Director of Research and Evaluation at the Child Care Resource Center (CCRC) in San Fernando, Santa Clarita, and Antelope Valleys presented her findings from a study they conducted in 2009. They surveyed families who were currently receiving subsidized child care through the Alternative Payment Program (APP) and families who were waiting for subsidized care on the LACEL. The two groups were alike in most demographic categories except that the APP families had a higher percentage of single parents. Both sets of families were asked about economic and social outcomes as a result of actually receiving subsidized care (APP) or that would result when care was obtained (LACEL).

Those receiving the subsidized care reported a greater extent of parent employment, family and economic stability, family social outcomes, and parent's positive perception of child's school readiness. Those parents not receiving subsidies reported that they expected these same outcomes. Those expectations were confirmed through the surveys of those receiving care. For example, 24.4% of LACEL families expect to be able to get a job or get a better job, while 25% of APP families reported that is what happened. LACEL families (7.4%) expected their children to develop socially if they had subsidized care; 7.9% of APP parents reported that the children had developed socially.

Susan finished by saying they wanted to conduct some longitudinal studies and include families outside of their particular service area.

VII. Public Comment and Announcements

Membership Work Group members reminded all that the deadline for 2010-11 membership applications was Friday and that nominations should be forwarded then as well.

VIII. Adjournment

The chair adjourned the meeting at 2:09 p.m.