



**Policy Roundtable for Child Care**  
**Wednesday, March 9, 2011**  
**10:00 a.m. – Noon**  
**Conference Room 743**  
**Hahn Hall of Administration**  
**500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles**



**Proposed Meeting Agenda**

- |       |    |  |                    |   |
|-------|----|--|--------------------|---|
| 10:00 | 1. | Welcome and Introductions  |                    | Terri Chew Nishimura<br>Chair                           |
|       |    | a. Comments from the Chair   |                    |   |
|       |    | b. Review of Minutes   | <b>Action Item</b> |   |
|       |    | • February 9, 2011   |                    |   |
|       |    | • February 24, 2011  |                    |   |
| 10:15 | 2. | A Conversation   |                    | Antonio Gallardo<br>Chief Program Officer<br>First 5 LA |
| 10:40 | 3. | Progress on Updating the Child Care Policy Framework   |                    | Jacquelyn McCroskey                                     |
|       |    | • Review of Final Documents  |                    |   |
|       |    | • Proposed Time Line   |                    |   |
| 11:15 | 4. | Policy Framework Objective: Identify opportunities for Los Angeles County to promote collaboration among service providers and advocates on behalf of needed legislative or regulatory changes |                    |   |
|       |    | a. California Budget Issues  | <b>Action Item</b> | Adam Sonenshein<br>Michele Sartell                      |
|       |    | ○ Conference Committee Action on Child Development Items   |                    |   |
|       |    | b. Federal Budget Issues   | <b>Action Item</b> |   |
|       |    | ○ Child Care & Development Block Grant   |                    |   |
|       |    | ○ Head Start   |                    |   |
|       |    | ○ Early Learning Challenge Grant   |                    |   |
| 11:50 | 5. | Announcements and Public Comment   |                    | Members & Guests  |
| 12:00 | 6. | Call to Adjourn  |                    |   |

---

**Mission Statement**

The mission of the Policy Roundtable for Child Care is to serve as the official County body on all matters relating to child care, working in collaboration with the Child Care Planning Committee and the Children's Planning Council, to build and strengthen the child care system and infrastructure in the County by providing policy recommendations to the Board.

This page intentionally blank



## Policy Roundtable for Child Care

222 South Hill Street, Fifth Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Phone: (213) 974-4103 • Fax: (213) 217-5106 • [www.childcare.lacounty.gov](http://www.childcare.lacounty.gov)

### MEETING MINUTES

**February 9, 2011**  
**10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**  
**Conference Room 743**  
**Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration**  
**500 West Temple Street**  
**Los Angeles, California**

---

#### 1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

##### a. Comments from the Chair

Ms. Terri Chew Nishimura, Chair of the Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable), opened the meeting at 10:07 a.m. Members and guests introduced themselves.

- It was announced that Ms. Arlene Rhine is stepping down from the Roundtable after ten years. She will continue to stay busy as a volunteer with Washington County, Nevada's Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) program, working with homeless preschoolers.
- Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu relayed the regrets of Ms. Sarah Younglove, who has welcomed 63 federal auditors dispersed among the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Head Start sites.
- Ms. Nishimura, noting that the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Week of the Young Child is rapidly approaching, asked members to provide their ideas for recognizing the week. Members may send their brainstorming to Ms. Malaske-Samu; ideas will be presented at the March meeting. Ms. Nishimura added that NAEYC's Week of the Young Child is a great opportunity for publicity and marketing the activities of the Roundtable.

##### b. Review of Meeting Minutes

- **January 12, 2011**

*Ms. Bobbie Edwards moved to accept the minutes as written; Mr. Whit Hayslip seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.*

#### 2. PROGRESS ON UPDATING THE CHILD CARE POLICY FRAMEWORK

Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey directed members to their packets for the latest iteration of the Policy Framework. She highlighted the changes, reviewed the five goals and strategies, and recognized the success stories. Among the changes, she noted that a strategy under Goal Three supports Supervisor Antonovich's priority goal for supporting transition age youth under

the supervision of the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) and Probation move towards self-sufficiency. Dr. McCroskey also acknowledged the identification of new partners, such as the Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect (ICAN) Task Force on Pregnant and Parenting Teens to address the child care and development needs of parenting teens and some new opportunities, including placing University of Southern California (USC) social work interns with child care resource and referral agencies to help families with the range of issues they may encounter when attempting to access child care and development services. Relating to Goal Four, Dr. McCroskey relayed that Dr. Marvin Southard is interested in pursuing a conversation on the integration of mental health services with child care and development.

Dr. McCroskey asked members to ensure their comfort with the final draft of the document that will be sent to them soon. Representatives of the Roundtable will present the final draft to the County Children and Families' Well-being Cluster on March 2, 2011. Conversations are also underway with the Department of Public Social Services (DPSS), Probation and Public Health.

Next, members were referred to the draft cover letter to the Board of Supervisors that will accompany the document. The draft letter outlines specific actions for the Board members to consider and will be reviewed with Department heads before completed in final. The recommendations come without costs. With respect to timing given the County's attention on negotiations relating to the State budget, the Board continues to address all of their work. More importantly, the problem and the opportunities to address it should be expressed succinctly and in simple terms. In addition, the message should clearly state the consequences if action is not taken and the solutions.

Ms. Nishimura urged members to schedule appointments to prepare their respective Board Supervisors' Deputies before the document is presented to the Cluster. Ms. Malaske-Samu will prepare talking points and offered to accompany members to their meetings, however the Roundtable members need to initiate the meeting.

### **3. POLICY FRAMEWORK OBJECTIVE**

<i>Identify opportunities for Los Angeles County to promote collaboration among service providers and advocates on behalf of needed legislative or regulatory changes.</i>
--

#### **a. State Budget Issues**

Mr. Ron Morales, staff with the Chief Executive Office Intergovernmental and External Affairs (IGEA) Branch, began by thanking the members for their work. Mr. Morales provided an overview of the County's pursuit of position process on state budget items, which is different than in previous budget years given the magnitude of the fiscal crisis faced by the State. He explained that this year the Board of Supervisors adopted a motion on December 14, 2010 that requires County staff to engage in discussions with State Legislators and the Governor's office to mitigate the damage of the cuts and negotiate a budget that does the least amount of harm to County services. (See handout – page 5 of a memo to the Board of Supervisors dated January 12, 2011). Last Friday, Assembly Member Bob Blumenfield chaired a hearing on realignment in the Board of Supervisors' Board Room. Mr. Morales added that addressing realignment issues County program by County program is the biggest project of IGEA at this time. Mr. Morales referred members to a couple of other handouts – Realignment Proposal – Funding and a Sacramento Update dated February 7, 2011, which includes a position of support for AB 1, which would restore funding to CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care.

Mr. Morales was asked about the County's opportunity to negotiate on realignment. Mr. Morales clarified that the Governor has opened the door for the County to discuss it to the extent that a hearing on realignment was held in Los Angeles. Additionally, IGEA staff are in conversations with the Department of Finance. Mr. Morales said that Los Angeles County is taking the lead on this issue, which has traditionally been headed by the California State Association of Counties (CSAC). The Board of Supervisors is operating under a set of principles, which they will rely on to make decisions on whether to accept certain realignment proposals.

Ms. Esther Torrez asked whether the IGEA has determined the impact of realignment on child care and development services. Mr. Morales was also asked whether the County has taken a position on the special election that would include a ballot measure asking voters to support diverting Proposition 10 funds to Medi-Cal for children. On the latter, Mr. Morales answered that the County has not taken a position on items slated for the special election. The County's position is likely to be shaped by negotiations with the Governor. He illustrated with an example – the County has no mechanism to handle the release of state prisoners if they are returned to the local community and there is no room in our County jails. To answer the question about the proposal to realign child care and development, it is mentioned without any analysis in phase two of the Governor's proposed budget.

When again asked about the County's position on Proposition 10, Mr. Morales replied that the County does not have a position at this time. However, in the past, the County has opposed the diversion of Proposition 10 funds.

It was noted that if there is no special election, or if voters do not pass the ballot initiatives, the Governor and the Legislature will need to make an additional \$14 billion in cuts. The real concern is within human services and child development – a 70 percent versus a current proposed cut of 34.6 percent means that families definitely will not be served.

Mr. Morales committed to keep the Roundtable members apprised of the County's plans, including whether a pursuit position on the special election is taken and if the Board takes positions on specific measures.

Ms. Nishimura noted that with Mr. Adam Sonenshein in Washington, D.C., Ms. Michele Sartell would present the State Budget issues. Ms. Sartell referred members and guests to their meeting packets for a copy of the Proposed Request for Pursuit of Position on State Budget Items, which were distributed to members for review on last Friday. Ms. Sartell briefly stated the six items for the Roundtable's consideration as proposed positions to forward to the Board of Supervisors via the IGEA. (See the document, *Proposed Request for Pursuit of Position on State Budget Items* included in members' meeting packets.)

Members and guests commented on the Governor's 2011-12 budget proposals for child care and development as follows:

- **Localizing decision-making responsibilities with the County Offices of Education** due to lack of experience and potential administrative costs is of concern. Local counties should have a say on where child development should be locally administered.
- Child safety issues will arise in the absence of child development services for **11 and 12 year old children**. The Roundtable needs to address this. Alternative Payment (AP) Program agencies are meeting the needs of this age group during non-traditional work hours.

- Most of the families accessing subsidized child care and development programs earn incomes below the **60 percent of State Median Income (SMI)**. Changing the income eligibility ceiling perhaps should be locally driven since other counties may have more families earning incomes above 60 percent of SMI.
- A caution was stated to not oppose everything.
- Unclear how the \$90 million savings by **reducing the eligibility ceiling** would be distributed.
- Parents paying more of the burden will result in the use of more license exempt care. The California Department of Education/Child Development Division (CDE/CDD) has requested that all contractors report on the impacts of the **reduced Standard Reimbursement Rate (SRR) and requiring parents to pay more**.
- A question was raised about **restoring all funding for CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care**. It has been suggested elsewhere to partially restore the funding and use remainder for other child care and development programs. The rationale is based on many families enrolling their children in CDE/CDD-contracted programs or receiving Diversion Services through the Department of Children and Family Services (DPSS), leaving a smaller number of families requiring Stage 3 Child Care. On the other hand, the total caseload for Los Angeles County will not be known until June 2012. It was also reported that some agencies do not know what families who were receiving Stage 3 are doing and noted that some families have been receiving Stage 3 for 10 years. Was that the intent of Stage 3?
- Ms. Sartell reported that a consortium of California child development organizations have developed **alternative proposals**, including but not limited to: across-the-board cuts to all child care and development programs, including State Preschool and **CalWORKs Stage 1**, while not reducing reimbursement rates; capture unused job funding; modest increase in parent fees; maintaining CalWORKs welfare-to-work exemption for families with young children for one to two years; allow CDE/CDD-contracted programs to access Proposition 49 funds to serve school age children, and reduce the rate for exempt providers, among others.

Overall, members expressed concern with taking positions on the proposed budget items without establishing priorities and engaging in deeper discussions. There were also concerns raised about being locked into positions when circumstances change. It was generally agreed that saying no to all cuts would not be productive. Rather, Roundtable members discussed being strategic in their recommended pursuits of position.

*Ms. Torrez entered a motion to schedule a special meeting of the Roundtable to study the Governor's budget proposals and implications and, from there, formulate recommended pursuits of position; Ms. Charlotte Lee seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

The special meeting will be scheduled for Thursday, February 24<sup>th</sup> from 9:30 a.m. - noon or Tuesday, March 1<sup>st</sup> from noon – 3 p.m.

#### **4. Update on Educare Planning**

Ms. Terry Ogawa commented that while news on the budget side is rather dire, good work is underway related to developing an Educare site in Los Angeles County. Mr. Whit Hayslip and Ms. Ogawa introduced representatives of three partners committed to the launch of Educare in Los Angeles – Mr. David Crippens of United-LA and Chair of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) Bond Oversight Committee, Ms. Sonia Campos-Rivera of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, and Ms. Araceli Sandoval of Preschool California. Mr. Hayslip added that as local partners become engaged, different strengths are emerging, with the biggest strength around working together to integrate funding streams and services. Based on visits to sites in Omaha, Nebraska and Chicago, Illinois, Educare shows how to do it and how it can be replicated with community resources in a single place. The partners on board are helping to facilitate efforts to leverage and braid funds. Mr. Hayslip continued by stating that by design Educare works with the entire child development community through its professional development center in addition to having a center-based component.

Mr. Hayslip then introduced Mr. Crippens, representing the LAUSD Bond Oversight Committee. Mr. Crippens commented on the \$40 million in bond funds recently approved by the Board of Education, \$12 million of which will support the development of the Educare facility. He referred to Ms. Ruth Yoon's presentation at a meeting he attended on how bond money can be used in an integrated manner. Mr. Crippens stated that in the past, the building would be one thing with education as a separate function. Educare is model of integrating both the facility and the program and confirms the relevance of early education as the beginning of the pipeline for children's later success.

Mr. Hayslip commented that the Ounce of Prevention has not experienced a community coming together quite the same as in Los Angeles, which is also unique given the early commitment of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce as a partner. Ms. Campos-Rivera spoke about her visit with the group to Omaha and Chicago. She stated that the need is evident in Bell/Cudahy. In addition, she is enthusiastic about Educare's role in shaping public policy. Ms. Campos-Rivera added that Educare is a beacon for job creation, strengthening the workforce, and a hub for the entire family. She also is excited that the center will work towards serving as a model for dual language learners.

Mr. Hayslip noted that the Educare will be unique in that none of the other centers have taken a lead on dual language learning in child development centers. Another area in which the Los Angeles program will be unique is in its integrated services and taking an inclusive view of all children. In this, Mr. Hayslip expects Los Angeles will create the model for the nation by serving a broad range of needs. Health care services will also be integrated into the site, according to Mr. Hayslip as he acknowledged Dr. Bergen Nelson as interested in helping.

Ms. Araceli Sandoval of Preschool California expressed her organization's high commitment to bringing Educare to Los Angeles. She sees Educare as a beacon of quality that meets the needs of the community. She also had the opportunity to go on trip, however a bit ahead of the LA team as she also went with the Santa Clara team. Ms. Sandoval found the trip informative - to see the interactions between the staff and children and accessibility to programs outside of center. In Omaha, the community center is open to corporations to host meetings, which exposes them to the work of the center, leading them to become future supporters. Ms. Sandoval was surprised by the large Spanish-speaking population in Omaha, however thought the focus on nutrition was narrow and did not necessarily speak to the larger needs of dual language learners and addressing cultural issues. On the other hand, Ms. Sandoval is impressed with the focus on research and measuring children's success. She

sees the partnership with a university an essential component of Educare. Mr. Hayslip concluded the guests' comments by mentioning that at a recent LAUSD roundtable, there was a discussion on the P-3 (prenatal to third grade) movement. Educare is in a position to model and connect to the K-12 system. They want integration with elementary schools and want families to feel they have a home where they are welcome.

## **5. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

## **6. CALL TO ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

### **Commissioners Present:**

Mr. Duane Dennis  
Ms. Bobbie Edwards  
Ms. Ann Franzen  
Ms. Michael Gray  
Mr. Whit Hayslip  
Ms. Dora Jacildo  
Ms. Charlotte Lee  
Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu  
Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey  
Ms. Terri Chew Nishimura  
Ms. Arlene Rhine  
Ms. Connie Russell  
Ms. Esther Torrez  
Ms. Mika Yamamoto  
Ms. Ruth Yoon

### **Guests:**

Ms. Sonia Campos-Rivera, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce  
Ms. Ellen Cervantes, Child Care Resource Center  
Mr. David Crippens, United-LA  
Ms. Leticia Colchado, Department of Public Social Services, Child Care Program  
Ms. Jennifer Cowan, First 5 LA  
Ms. Mary Hammer, South Bay Center for Counseling  
Ms. JoAnn Hemstreet, Public Counsel  
Ms. Sylvia Drew Ivie, Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office (CEO)  
Mr. Ron Morales, CEO Intergovernmental Relations and External Affairs  
Ms. Bergen Nelson, University of California Los Angeles  
Ms. Terry Ogawa, Educare Consultant  
Ms. Kate Sachnoff, First 5 LA  
Ms. Araceli Sandoval, Preschool California

### **Staff:**

Ms. Laura Escobedo  
Ms. Michele Sartell



## Policy Roundtable for Child Care

222 South Hill Street, Fifth Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Phone: (213) 974-4103 • Fax: (213) 217-5106 • [www.childcare.lacounty.gov](http://www.childcare.lacounty.gov)

### **SPECIAL MEETING – PROPOSED 2011-12 STATE BUDGET - MINUTES**

February 24, 2011

9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

222 South Hill Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room  
Los Angeles, California 90012

---

#### **1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

- **Purpose of the Meeting**

Ms. Terri Nishimura, Chair of the Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable), opened the meeting at 10:00 a.m. Members and guests introduced themselves.

Ms. Nishimura commented on the climate in Sacramento as legislators attempt to address the unprecedented budget deficit. As such, she stated that the purpose of this special meeting is to arrive at recommendations for pursuits of positions on child care and development items that have been identified for significant reductions in the Governor's proposed State Budget for 2011-12 to submit to the Board of Supervisors.

- **Setting the Process for Action**

Ms. Nishimura emphasized the need to develop a plan of action and then asked members their preference for taking action – through consensus or simple majority. Acknowledging the expedited budget process and the possibility for ongoing modifications, members agreed to the importance of moving forward with recommending positions. Members chose to use their current practice of initiating motions and deciding by majority.

- **Key Assumptions**

See the meeting agenda for the key assumptions.

#### **2. SETTING PRIORITIES AND PROCESS**

Ms. Martha Flammer, staff with the Intergovernmental and External Affairs (IGEA) Branch of the County's Chief Executive Office (CEO) working in Sacramento, relayed that the Board of Supervisors (the Board), looking at the magnitude of the state budget deficit, understands that Los Angeles County will be absorbing certain cuts. The Board is working with the legislature to address cuts in a way that is least harmful to constituents. By illustration and with respect to CalWORKs, an impact analysis by Assembly and Senate districts developed by the County's Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) shows that 34,000 families with 60,000 children are currently participating in CalWORKs. In addition, a video featuring families has been made. The County is not advocating one way or the other with respect to a position, rather the effort is relying on providing impact analyses.

Mr. Ron Morales, also of IGEA, distributed a copy of a page from a memo sent to the Board on January 12, 2011 that iterates the Board's motion from December 14, 2010 stating that the County will pursue a partnership with the Governor and the Legislature on State funding

reductions to Los Angeles County. He also provided copies of letters to the Governor and the Assembly and Senate leadership from the Board consistent with this approach. Chief Executive Officer William T Fujioka met with the largest county CEOs to address issues of significance for urban counties as a separate effort to address the cuts. Mr. Morales suggested that the Roundtable members refer to the materials in formulating their policy recommendations. In response to a question regarding proportionality of cuts, Mr. Morales stated that in general urban counties have larger needs in terms of population and numbers, and tend to have larger numbers of low-income populations compared to smaller counties. Los Angeles County is demonstrating that the cuts may impact our population disproportionately even as it provides services. Policy wise, the efforts of Mr. Fujioka and others are to provide hard facts and numbers so as not to be perceived as political, but fact-based.

Mr. Morales was asked to clarify the method for the Roundtable's pursuit. He replied that the Roundtable has the capacity to make policy recommendations to the Board and ask for their motion to address issues. He added that in addition to the principles outlined in the memos, the County has a legislative agenda.

In conclusion, Mr. Morales stated the guiding principle is the County's willingness to assume its fair share of cuts, but it is not willing to accept a disproportionate share of cuts. The next question asked, "Is the strategy to accept a particular package, i.e. Assembly or Senate versions, or to accept components?" Mr. Morales said that things are moving quickly – the Joint Conference Committee was holding its hearing simultaneously to the Roundtable meeting. Positions moving forward are supporting or opposing budget committee positions. Ms. Flammer added that the final budget will not be approved until after the May revise, so there is still time to weigh in. She noted that the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) reported this week that revenues are higher than estimated. Another issue is the proposal to eliminate the redevelopment agencies, of which the Board may consider taking a position. Currently, the Board is providing technical assistance so the Legislature will have the full knowledge needed to make decisions.

### **3. GOVERNOR'S 2011-12 PROPOSED BUDGET ON CHILD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

Ms. Michele Sartell referred members and guests to their materials for a copy of the *Matrix of Governor's Proposals for State Budget 2011-12 and Responding Alternative Proposals* prepared for the meeting. She briefly reviewed the Governor's proposals to the child care and development budget items targeted for reductions or elimination compared to the responding Senate and Assembly versions of the budget. Selected Roundtable members were then asked to talk about the impact that the budget proposals would likely have on their respective programs.

Ms. Ruth Yoon reported that Los Angeles Unified School District's Early Childhood Education (LAUSD/ECE) program, under the Governor's proposal to cut subsidies by 34.6 percent to California Department of Education/Child Development Division (CDE/CDD)-contracted programs while requiring them to continue serving the same number of children, would likely significantly reduce access to services. Several of LAUSD/ECE's 102 centers providing full day services would close, resulting in a shift from serving 12,000 children full-day to serving 500 children. In addition, LAUSD elementary schools serve 5,400 children in part-day California State Preschool Programs (CSPPs). Ms. Yoon announced that the Board of Education recently approved a budget plan with a \$408 million reduction, which included eliminating the School Readiness Language Development Program (SRLDP). The SRLDP is

a license-exempt part-day oral language program serving 13,000 preschool age children. LAUSD/ECE has not yet conducted an analysis on the Assembly or Senate proposals for ten or 13 percent respectively across-the-board cuts, however Ms. Yoon predicts that these cuts would be more manageable. Since so much of the LAUSD Early Childhood Education workforce is non-permanent staff (probationary and substitutes), distribution of Reduction in Force (RIF) notices have been minimal.

Ms. Yoon's comments led to a brief discussion on the Head Start and Early Head Start Program expansions due to American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds. LAUSD has 120 Head Start slots, which can be braided with their CSPPs. An additional 320 full-day Head Start slots would revert to part-day. The 88 Early Head Start slots fully funded by ARRA would be eliminated.

Ms. Dora Jacildo mentioned that Children Today's programs would not be impacted because their population is so poor and therefore would not pay family fees. Children Today serves a transient population that is in and out of eligibility. As a result, the organization cannot consistently bill the state because families are not consistently participating in approved activities. Any reduction in their CDE/CDD contract would be made up in other ways. Ms. Jacildo stated that their position however, is across-the-board cuts without reducing the reimbursement rate. Of greater concern is the number of families likely to become homeless. The Long Beach community already is saturated, creating challenges to meet the needs given the size of the population. She also noted that homeless families are expected to abide by the same rules as housed families. In the end, state funding is not a priority. Rather, Children Today questions whether it makes sense for them to have a CDE/CDD contract.

Ms. Pat Wong, Executive Director of Long Beach Day Nursery (LBDN) and Co-chair of the Joint Committee on Legislation representing the Child Care Planning Committee, added that LBDN is just a tick above Children Today, although families are not as poor. As such, LBDN could not survive by imposing co-pays that families cannot afford. Instead, LBDN would close a center and return their contract. On the other hand, a ten percent or 13 percent cut would be manageable, resulting in juggling resources and increasing fundraising. She added that because LBDN is a small agency, the administrative tasks to manage the Governor's proposed changes would be onerous and not make fiscal sense. Another move would be to serve middle and higher income families, which would be a major change in the philosophy/core of the organization.

Mr. Michael Gray, speaking to the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) Alternative Payment (AP) Program remarked that they recently received a reduction in their contract. If it is reduced further, DCFS would need to absorb the cuts and would serve fewer children.

Mr. Duane Dennis stated the main issue for the AP Program agencies would be the reduction in AP administrative and family support costs from 17.5 percent to 15 percent of their contracts. Already, the AP Program agencies have seen their administrative costs reduced from 20 percent to 19 percent to the current 17.5 percent. Mr. Dennis stated that an AP Program cannot operate at 15 percent and be expected to serve the same number of children. Both Ms. Ellen Cervantes of the Child Care Resource Center and Mr. Dennis commented on the scope of services provided as administrative and family support costs. Administration suggests indirect costs, which is approximately eight percent of the budget to cover human resources activities, the finance department, facilities, and executive staff – the infrastructure needed to operate a business. The remaining costs support case management, which

encompasses determining eligibility for subsidized services in a timely manner, conducting family needs assessments, reviewing time sheets and processing payments, tracking fraud, and more. If administrative costs are reduced, more programs will be found deficient and activities such as overseeing fraud will be impossible. Caseloads are likely to double from 150 to 160 per staff member to 300. For families, case management is important to helping them navigate complicated program requirements, maintaining their eligibility, and ensuring that they are benefitting from the program. Staff are required to do more for poor families than other families.

Mr. Adam Sonenshein spoke to the proposal to reduce federal funded quality improvement programs. The current recommendation is to eliminate those programs funded solely by ARRA. One proposal being vetted is to require the legislature to work with the CDE/CDD and the child development field to determine programs important to the infrastructure. Mr. Sonenshein also mentioned an idea to zero out funding for a particular quality program without eliminating it from being on books. He added that there is discussion to rather than accept cutting ARRA funded programs, reassess what is funded. Ms. Florence Nelson of Zero to Three listed some of the types of quality programs funded: 1) infrastructure (i.e. Local Planning Councils (LPC)); 2) training and professional development (WestEd: Program for Infant-Toddler Care (PITC)); and 3) building capacity. She suggested that by type may be a way of looking at long standing programs and their demonstrated impact.

Mr. Sonenshein also commented on the proposals to significantly divert funding that goes to the Proposition 10 Commissions to Medi-Cal and other services for children. Speaking to the redirection of \$1 billion in state and local commission reserves, for First 5 LA it means looking at those funds that have not been allocated against those that have been allocated but are not yet locked into a contract. Ms. Flammer commented that the Joint Conference Committee has not yet discussed Proposition 10. She said that if folks want to fight for it, they can make that attempt; however it will be challenging to reverse the Assembly and Senate actions.

Mr. Dennis added that the lion's share of First 5 LA funds is not contracted due to its new strategic plan around place-based funding. Hence, the issue is the unexpended funds. As example, money has been allocated to Best Start by action of commission, however there are no contracts. Currently, there is \$500 million in unallocated reserves across the state that may be swept without delving into allocated programs. Those funds encumbered by multi-year contracts would continue. It was noted that in all of First 5 LA contracts there is a clause that if First 5 loses funding, the contract is up for re-negotiation.

Ms. Melina Sanchez of the California Community Foundation asked if an opportunity exists to drop the dollar amount. Ms. Flammer responded that the only strong opposition currently is from First 5. Ms. Fran Chasen, representing the Southern California Association for the Education of Young Children (SCAEYC), relayed that the California Department of Developmental Services (DDS) requested and received \$50 million from First 5. Ms. Nelson stated that the diversion of funds would not need to go on the ballot if all county commissions agree to the transfer to save the long-term view. In reply to the question of whether the State can take the funds without the agreement of First 5, Ms. Flammer shared her understanding that the Legislature does not need the agreement of First 5 because it is a one year take. A position suggested is that the swept funds taken be reallocated to the county from which it is taken for Medi-Cal. Ms. Flammer suggests shopping the idea with County departments. Additional comments offered: Los Angeles receives 35 percent of the state allocation and has the larger reserve disproportionate to other commissions. Adding to the suggested position, a compromise could be to keep the funds in county for services designated by the Governor.

#### **4. ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS TO GOVERNOR'S PROPOSALS FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

See the matrix for proposals being offered by the child development field.

#### **5. THE ROUNDTABLE'S RESPONSE**

See the matrix for the Roundtable's recommended positions in response to the Governor's 2011-12 budget proposals for child care and development items.

#### **6. NEXT STEPS**

Ms. Nishimura thanked members and guests for their focus and hard work.

#### **7. CALL TO ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 12 p.m.

#### **Commissioners Present:**

Ms. Maria Calix  
Mr. Duane Dennis  
Ms. Ann Franzen  
Ms. Michael Gray  
Ms. Dora Jacildo  
Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu  
Ms. Terri Chew Nishimura  
Mr. Adam Sonenshein  
Ms. Esther Torrez  
Ms. Ruth Yoon

#### **Guests:**

Mr. John Berndt, Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Head Start-State Preschool  
Ms. Ellen Cervantes, Child Care Resource Center  
Ms. Fran Chasen, Southern CA Association for the Education of Young Children (SCAEYC)  
Ms. Martha Flammer, Chief Executive Office/Intergovernmental Relations and External Affairs (CEO/IGEA)  
Ms. Carol Hiestand, SCAEYC  
Mr. Ron Morales, CEO/IGEA  
Ms. Florence Nelson, Zero to Three  
Ms. Melina Sanchez, California Community Foundation  
Ms. Angie Stoke, The John Tracy Clinic  
Ms. Julie Taren, City of Santa Monica  
Ms. Mary Helen Vasquez, Children's Bureau/Magnolia Place  
Ms. Patricia Wong, Long Beach Day Nursery

#### **Staff:**

Ms. Michele Sartell

This page intentionally blank

County of Los Angeles Child Care Planning Committee and Policy Roundtable for Child Care  
 Joint Committee on Legislation

LEGISLATION BEING CONSIDERED BY THE CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE – 2011 – ACTIVE BILLS

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 3/8/11)
<b>LEGISLATION BEING CONSIDERED BY THE CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE - 2011</b>								
<b>California Assembly Bills</b>								
Inactive	AB 1 (Pérez)	<i>Would reappropriate \$118 million in unobligated balances appropriated in the Budget Act of 2009 and from the federal Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) and would also appropriate \$115.5 million from the General Fund to the California State Department (CDE) for CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care services. Funding would cover Stage 3 child development services retroactive to October 31, 2010.</i>	Superintendent of Public Instruction Torlackson	Gail Gronert 916.319.2046				Introduced: 12/6/10 Amended: 1/14/11 Assembly Inactive File
	AB 123 (Mendoza)	<i>Would expand the provision regarding the charge of misdemeanor against persons entering school grounds or the adjacent who are disruptive to also apply to persons who willfully or knowingly create disruptions with intent to threaten the immediate physical safety of any pupil in preschool, kindergarten or 1<sup>st</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grades.</i>	Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)	916.319.2056				Introduced: 1/10/11 Committee on Public Safety Hearing: 3/15/11
	AB 245 (Portantino)	<i>Would require the CDE to pay direct contractors via direct deposit by electronic fund transfer in to the contractor's account at their financial institution of choice. Would require Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to enter into agreements with one or more financial institutions participating in the Automated Clearing House to establish a program for direct deposit fund transfer.</i>		Diane Shelton 916.319.2044				Introduced: 2/3/10 Committee on Education

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 3/8/11)
	AB 419 (Mitchell)	Would require, at a minimum, an annual inspection of child development centers to ensure the quality of care provided. Would require, at a minimum, inspections of family child care homes once every two years to ensure the quality of care provided. Initial application and renewal fees for licenses would increase by 10%. Would eliminate the \$200 correction fee, replacing it with a re-inspection fee of \$100 when inspection of facility necessary to ensure the violation has been corrected.	Child Care Resource and Referral Network (CCRRN), Preschool CA	Tiffani Alvidrez 916.319.2047				Introduced: 2/14/11 Committee on Human Services
	AB 596 (Carter)	Would require the California Department of Education (CDE) to collaborate with welfare rights and legal services to develop and adopt regulations and other policy statements to provide CalWORKs recipients of child care the same level of due process and procedural protections as afforded to public assistance recipients.	Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organization	Esther Jimenez 916.319.2062				Introduced: 2/16/11 Committee on Education
<i>Spot Bill</i>	AB 614 (Bonilla)	Would make technical, non-substantive changes to the new law shifting kindergarten admission dates and enrolling children to a school district transitional kindergarten program.		Mariana Corona 916.319.2011				Introduced: 2/16/11

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 3/8/11)
	AB 823 (Dickenson)	Would establish the Children's Cabinet of California to include the SPI, Sectary of CA Health and Human Services, and head of each agency and department within the state that provides services or has jurisdiction over the well-being of children. Duties to include promoting and implementing information sharing, collaboration, increased efficiency, and improved service delivery among and within the state's child serving agencies, departments and organizations.	Children Now	Celia Mata 916.319.2009				Introduced: 2/17/11
	AB 884 (Cook)	Would require any law enforcement entity notified of registration of a sex offender who has committed a sex crime against a child under 14 years old to provide notice to all persons living within 1000 feet of the residence of the convicted offender; notice to also go to all schools and child development centers and services within the area of the offenders residence.	More Kids	Tim Itnyre 916.319.2065				Introduced: 2/17/11
<i>Spot Bill</i>	AB 1199 (Brownley)	Would require the CDE to extend funding available conduct an evaluation of the centralized eligibility lists maintained and administered by the Alternative Payment (AP) Program agencies in each county to determine their success in enabling families to obtain information on available child care program and to obtain care. Evaluation to be completed by January 1, 2013 for submission to Legislature.		Gerry Shelton 916.319.2087				Introduced: 2/18/11
<i>Spot Bill</i>	AB 1312 (Smyth)	Would make technical, non-substantive changes to provisions relating to the development of standards for the implementation of quality child care and development services.		Kevin O'Neill 916.319.2038				Introduced: 2/18/11

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 3/8/11)
<b>California Senate Bills</b>								
	SB 12 (Corbett)	Would appropriate \$250 million from the General Funds to the State School Fund for the restoration of CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care		Djbril Diop 916.651.4010				Introduced: 12/6/10 Committee on Education
<i>Spot Bill</i>	SB 30 (Simitian)	Would make technical, non-substantive changes to the law regarding kindergarten admission. Clarifies dates of admission for each year from school year beginning 2011-12 through school year beginning 2014-15, apportionment of funds for children enrolled in transitional kindergarten, admission of children to kindergarten when reach five years old during the school year, and definition of transitional kindergarten.		Cory Jaspersen 916.651.4011				Introduced: 12/6/10 Committee on Rules
<i>Spot Bill</i>	SB 174 (Emmerson)	Would make technical, non-substantive changes to provisions relating to the licensure and regulation of community care facilities.		Teresa Trujillo 916.651.4037				Introduced: 2/7/11 Committee on Rules
	SB 309 (Liu)	Would define as a child an individual between 18 and 22 years old with developmental disabilities who is still enrolled in school and has an individual education plan (IEP or an individual transition plan. The individual would be classified as a school age for purposes of continuing in a child development center with a license to serve school age children	Ability First	Andi Lane 916.651.4021				Introduced: 2/14/11 Committee on Human Services
<i>Spot Bill</i>	SB 429 (DeSaulnier)	Would make technical, non-substantive changes to provisions relating to distribution of federal funds to the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers.		Indira McDonald 916.651.4007				Introduced: 4/16/11 Committee on Rules

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 3/8/11)
	SB 486 (Dutton)	Subject to voter approval, would amend the California Children and Families Act of 1988 by eliminating the percentage allocations in various accounts for expenditure by the First 5 California Commission. Funds would be transferred to the General Fund for appropriation to the Healthy Families and Medi-Cal programs. Ultimately, would abolish the state and county First 5 Commissions.		Anissa Nachman 916.651.4031				Introduced: 2/17/11 Committees on Health and Government and Finance
	SB 614 (Kehoe)	Would amend the After School Education and Safety (ASES) Program Act of 2002 to specify that opportunities for physical activity may include age- and gender-appropriate self-defense and safety awareness training. Current and new grant recipients would have priority for receiving funding if offers these opportunities. In addition, up to 5% of annual grant amount for each grant recipient may be used for training program staff on self-defense and safety training.		Ted Muhlhauser 916.651.4039				Introduced: 2/18/11 Committee on Education
	SB 634 (Runner)	Would delete all provisions of the law requiring the provision of transitional kindergarten while maintaining the changes in admissions dates for entering kindergartners.		Jennifer Louie 916.651.4017				Introduced: 2/18/11 Committee on Education
	SB 737 (Walters)	Would authorize programs administered by a city, county or nonprofit organization in the After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Program to operate up to 60 hours per week (up from 30 hours per week) without obtaining a license or special permit. Would modify definition of "organized camps" and require them to develop and submit plan to local health officer.	YMCA	Garth Eisenbeis 916.651.4033				Introduced: 2/18/11

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 3/8/11)
<b>California Budget Bills</b>								
	AB 92 (Blumenfield)	2011-12 Budget						Introduced: 1/10/11 Amended: 2/28/11 Committee on Budget
	SB 68 (Leno)	2011-12 Budget						Introduced: 1/10/11 Amended: 2/28/11 Senate Budget and Fiscal Review
	SB 69 (Leno)	2011-12 Budget						Introduced: 1/10/11 Amended: 2/28/11 Amended: 3/7/11 At Desk

To obtain additional information about any State legislation, go to [www.leginfo.ca.gov/bilinfo.htm](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/bilinfo.htm); for Federal legislation, visit <http://thomas.loc.gov>. To access budget hearings on line, go to [www.calchannel.com](http://www.calchannel.com) and click on appropriate link at right under "Live Webcast". For questions or comments regarding this document, contact Michele Sartell, staff with the Office of Child Care, by e-mail at [msartell@ceo.lacounty.gov](mailto:msartell@ceo.lacounty.gov) or call (213) 974-5187.

**KEY TO LEVEL OF INTEREST ON BILLS:**

- 1: Of potentially high interest to the Child Care Planning Committee and Policy Roundtable for Child Care.
- 2: Of moderate interest.
- 3: Of relatively low interest.
- Watch: Of interest, however level of interest may change based on further information regarding author's or sponsor's intent and/or future amendments.

\*\* Levels of interest are assigned by the Joint Committee on Legislation based on consistency with Policy Platform accepted by the Child Care Planning Committee and Policy Roundtable for Child Care and consistent with County Legislative Policy for the current year. Levels of interest **do not** indicate a pursuit of position. Joint Committee will continue to monitor all listed bills as proceed through legislative process. Levels of interest may change based on future amendments.

**KEY:**

ACLU	American Civil Liberties Union	CCALA	Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles
AFSCME:	American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees	CTC	Commission on Teacher Credentialing
CAPPA	California Alternative Payment Program Association	CWDA	County Welfare Directors' Association
CAEYC	California Association for the Education of Young Children	DDS	Department of Developmental Services
CAFB	California Association of Food Banks	DHS	Department of Health Services
CCCCA	California Child Care Coordinators Association	DMH	Department of Mental Health
CCRRN	California Child Care Resource and Referral Network	First 5	First 5 Commission of California
CCDAA:	California Child Development Administrators Association	HHS	Health and Human Services Agency
CDA	California Dental Association	LCC	League of California Cities
CDE	California Department of Education	LAC CPSS	Los Angeles County Commission for Public Social Services
CDSS	California Department of Social Services	LACOE	Los Angeles County Office of Education
CFT	California Federation of Teachers	LAUSD	Los Angeles Unified School District
CHAC	California Hunger Action Coalition	MALDEF	Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund
CIWC	California Immigrant Welfare Collaborative	NASW	National Association of Social Workers
CSAC	California School-Age Consortium	NCYL	National Center for Youth Law
CSAC	California State Association of Counties	PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric Company
CTA	California Teachers Association	SEIU	Service Employees International Union
CCLC	Child Care Law Center	TCI	The Children's Initiative
CDPI	Child Development Policy Institute	US DHHS	US Department of Health and Human Services

**DEFINITIONS:<sup>1</sup>**

Committee on Rules	Bills are assigned to a Committee for hearing from here.
First Reading	Each bill introduced must be read three times before final passage. The first reading of a bill occurs when it is introduced.
Held in Committee	Status of a bill that fails to receive sufficient affirmative votes to pass out of committee.
Inactive File	The portion of the Daily File containing legislation that is ready for floor consideration, but, for a variety of reasons, is dead or dormant. An author may move a bill to the inactive file, and move it off the inactive file at a later date. During the final weeks of the legislative session, measures may be moved there by the leadership as a method of encouraging authors to take up their bills promptly.
On File	A bill on the second or third reading file of the Assembly or Senate Daily File.
Second Reading	Each bill introduced must be read three times before final passage. Second reading occurs after a bill has been reported to the floor from committee.
Spot Bill	A bill that proposes nonsubstantive amendments to a code section in a particular subject; introduced to assure that a bill will be available, subsequent to the deadline to introduce bills, for revision by amendments that are germane to the subject of the bill.
Third Reading	Each bill introduced must be read three times before final passage. Third reading occurs when the measure is about to be taken up on the floor of either house for final passage.
Third Reading Analysis	A summary of a measure that is ready for floor consideration. Describes most recent amendments and contains information regarding how Members voted on the measure when it was heard in committee. Senate floor analyses also list support or opposition by interest groups and government agencies.
Third Reading File	That portion of the Daily File listing the bills that is ready to be taken up for final passage.
Urgency Measure	A bill affecting the public peace, health, or safety, containing an urgency clause, and requiring a two-thirds vote for passage. An urgency bill becomes effective immediately upon enactment.
Urgency Clause	Section of bill stating that bill will take effect immediately upon enactment. A vote on the urgency clause, requiring a two-thirds vote in each house, must precede a vote on bill.
Enrollment	Bill has passed both Houses, House of origin has concurred with amendments (as needed), and bill is now on its way to the Governor's desk.

---

<sup>1</sup> Definitions are taken from the official site for California legislative information, Your Legislature, Glossary of Legislative Terms at [www.leginfo.ca.gov/guide.html#Appendix\\_B](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/guide.html#Appendix_B).

## STATE LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR 2011 (Tentative)

Jan. 1	Statutes take effect (Art. IV, Sec. 8(c)).
Jan.3	Legislature reconvenes (J.R. 51(a)(4)).
<b>Jan. 10</b>	<b><i>Budget must be submitted by Governor (Art. IV, Sec. 12(a)).</i></b>
Jan. 21	Last day to submit bill requests to the Office of Legislative Counsel.
Feb. 18	Last day for bills to be introduced (J.R. 54(a)) (J.R. 61(b)(4)).
April 14	Spring Recess begins at end of this day's session (J.R.51(b)(1)).
Apr. 25	Legislature reconvenes (J.R. 51(a)(2)).
May 6	Last day for policy committees to hear and report to Fiscal Committees fiscal bills introduced in their house (J.R.61(b)(5)).
May 13	Last day for policy committees to hear and report non-fiscal bills introduced in their house to Floor (J.R. 61(b)(6)).
<b>May 15</b>	<b><i>Governor to release May Revise of Proposed Budget</i></b>
May 20	Last day for policy committees to meet prior to June 6 (J.R. 61(a)(4)).
May 27	Last day for Fiscal Committees to hear and report to the Floor bills introduced in their house (J.R. 61(b)(8)). Last day for Fiscal Committees to meet prior to June 6 (J.R. 61(b)(9)).
May 3-June 3	Floor Session only. No committee may meet for any purpose (J.R. 61(a)(7)).
June 3	Last day to pass bills out of house of origin (J.R. 62(b)(10)).
June 6	Committee meetings may resume (J.R. 61(b)(12)).
<b>June 15</b>	<b><i>Budget must be passed by midnight (Art. IV, Sec. 12(c)).</i></b>
July 8	Last day for policy committees to meet and report bills (J.R. 61(b)(13)).
July 18	Summer Recess begins at the end of this day's session if Budget Bill has been enacted (J.R. 51(b)(2)).
Aug. 18	Legislature reconvenes (J.R. 51(b)(2)).
Aug. 26	Last day for Fiscal Committees to meet and report bills to Floor (J.R. 61(b)(14)).
Aug. 29-Sept 9	Floor session only. No committees, other than the Committee on Rules or conference committees, may meet for any purpose (J.R. 61(b)(15)).
Sept 2	Last day to amend bills on the Floor (J.R. 61(b)(16)).
Sept 9	Last day for each house to pass bills (Art. IV, Sec 10(c)) and (J.R. 61(b)(17)). Interim Study Recess begins at end of day's session (J.R. 51(a)(4)).
Sept. 30	Last day for Governor to sign or veto bills passed by Legislature before Sept. 1 and in Governor's possession on or after Sept. 1 (Art. IV, Sec.10(b)(2)).
<b>Oct. 11</b>	<b><i>Last day for Governor to sign or veto bills passed by Legislature on or before Sept. 11 and in the Governor's possession after Sept. 11 (Art. IV, Sec.10(b)(1)).</i></b>

### 2011

Jan. 1	Statutes take effect (Art. IV, Sec. 8(c)).
Jan. 3	Legislature reconvenes (J.R. 51 (a)(4))

### 2012

Jan. 1.	Statutes take effect (Art. IV, Sec. 8(c)).
---------	--

This page intentionally blank



## Policy Roundtable for Child Care

### Matrix of President Obama's Fiscal Year 2012 Budget<sup>1</sup> and H.R. 1, the Continuing Resolution Child Care and Development and Related Issues



Program	President's Proposal	H.R. 1, Continuing Resolution	PRCC Recommendations
<b>Early Head Start/Head Start</b>	<p>Would increase funding from the FY 2010 level (excluding ARRA funds) by \$865 million, to \$8.1 billion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Additional funding maintains ARRA investments so children will not lose services</li> </ul>	Would cut funding by more than \$1 billion (approximately 15% of total budget)	<p><b>Motion:</b> Mr. Adam Sonenshein moved to oppose funding cuts to the Early Head Start/Head Start Program, the CCDBG, 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLCs, Even Start, Title 1 and Pell Grants as proposed in H.R. 1; Mr. Duane Dennis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.</p>
<b>Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG)</b>	<p>Would increase funding by \$1.3 billion for a total of \$6.3 billion including an increase of \$800 million in discretionary funds (appropriated annually; do not require state match) and \$500 million in mandatory funds (requires state match)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Additional funding enables program to maintain services provided under the ARRA-funded expansion</li> </ul> <p>Would increase set-aside for quality improvement activities from \$271 million to \$373 million, of which \$137 million would be for activities to improve the quality of infant and toddler care (up from \$99.5 million)</p> <p>Would increase set-aside for child care resource and referral and school age activities from \$18.96 million to \$25.7 million</p> <p>Funding for Child Care Aware toll-free line would remain at \$1 million</p>	Would cut funding for the remainder of 2011 by \$39 million (in addition to loss of ARRA funds)	<p><b>Motion:</b> Mr. Adam Sonenshein moved to support the President's 2012 budget proposals for programs listed in this document; Mr. Dennis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.</p>
<b>Early Learning Challenge Fund (ELCF)</b>	Would provide \$350 million to establish the new ELCF that would offer incentives to states through competitive grants to improve the quality of their early learning systems		

<sup>1</sup> Introduced by February 14, 2011. Proposed \$3.73 billion budget for Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2012, which begins October 1, 2011.

Program	President's Proposal	H.R. 1, Continuing Resolution	PRCC Recommendations
<b>Child Nutrition Programs</b>	Would increase funding by \$1.343 billion; includes Child and Adult Care Food Program		
<b>Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit</b>	<p>Would increase the credit for families earning up to \$130,000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Families earning up to \$75,000 would be eligible for tax credit equal to 35% of qualified child care expenses, with percentage phasing down to 20% for families earning \$103,000 or more</li> <li>- For families earning \$50,000, change could increase maximum credit from \$1,200 to \$2,100</li> <li>- Would not make credit refundable, so families with little or no federal tax liability would continue to receive little or no benefit</li> </ul>		
<b>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Infants and Families (Part C)</b>	Would receive an increase of \$50 million, to \$489 million		
<b>IDEA Preschool Grants (Section 619, Part B)</b>	Would fund at FY 2010 level, \$374 million		
<b>21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (CLCs)</b>	<p>Would increase funding from \$1.66 billion to \$1.266 billion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would be part of realignment and reorganization of several education grant programs</li> </ul>	Would reduce funding by \$1 million	
<b>Child Care Access Means Parents in School</b>	Would remain funded at \$16 million		
<b>Even Start</b>	Would consolidate with other literacy programs in new Effective Teaching and Learning to receive \$383 million in funding; Even Start eliminated as separate program	Would eliminate Even Start, but provides no alternative	
<b>College and Career-Ready Students (Title 1 to Local Education Agencies - Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA))</b>	<p>Would increase funding by \$300 million over current funding level, for a total of \$14.8 billion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Encourages districts and school to use flexibility to invest funds in high quality early childhood programs for eligibility children, joint professional development for school staff and early educators, and coordination of early learning programs in schools and community-based organizations</li> </ul>	Would cut ESEA funding, including nearly \$700 million in Title 1 grants to schools	

<b>Program</b>	<b>President's Proposal</b>	<b>H.R. 1, Continuing Resolution</b>	<b>PRCC Recommendations</b>
<b>Pell Grant</b>	Would maintain maximum Pell Grant award of \$5,500; also maintains Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG) program, which provides up to \$4,000 to lowest-income Pell recipients	Would eliminate additional \$5.7 billion in discretionary funding for Pell grants, cutting maximum award by over \$800 per student; would eliminate funding for SEOG grants	
<b>Investing in Innovation</b>	Would provide \$300 million for competitive grants; improving early learning is one of several priorities under consideration for 2012 grant competition		
<b>Promise Neighborhoods</b>	Would provide \$150 million and allow the Secretary of Education to give priority to applicants that propose to implement a comprehensive system of early learning and development		
<b>Race to the Top</b>	Would allocate \$900 million  - Among priorities, improved early learning outcomes to be considered for state competitive grant funding		
<b>Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education Programs</b>	Proposes \$385 million in three separate programs to focus on improving teaching and learning, including comprehensive literacy, for students from preschool through 12 <sup>th</sup> grade.		

For questions regarding this document, contact Michele Sartell, staff with the Los Angeles County Office of Child Care, by e-mail at [msartell@ceo.lacounty.gov](mailto:msartell@ceo.lacounty.gov) or call (213) 974-5187.

This page intentionally blank

## INVESTING IN EARLY LEARNING

President Obama remains committed to an early learning agenda that supports a continuum of learning beginning at birth and continuing through third grade. A robust body of research demonstrates that high-quality early learning programs and services can improve health, social-emotional, and cognitive outcomes, can improve school readiness across a range of domains, can close and even prevent achievement gaps, and are among the most cost-effective investments along the educational pipeline. These programs can also be an important component of school reform because they prepare children to thrive in school, putting them on the path to graduate high school and be ready to succeed in college and a career.

The President's 2012 budget request includes major investments in a number of programs that will fund grants that seek to improve the quality of and access to early learning programs and services across all settings, especially for high-need children:

- **\$350 million for the new Early Learning Challenge Fund**, President Obama's proposal to make competitive grants to challenge States to establish model systems of early learning for children, from birth to kindergarten entry, including children with disabilities and English learners. These model systems would promote high standards of quality and a focus on outcomes across all settings to ensure that more children enter school ready to succeed.
- **\$489 million for Early Intervention Programs for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities**, \$50 million more than the 2011 CR level in formula grants to help States implement statewide systems of early intervention services to assist all eligible infants and toddlers with disabilities from birth through age 2 and their families through IDEA Part C. These funds would increase the average State allocation by almost \$1 million, help States serve an estimated 360,000 infants and toddlers, and encourage States to extend early intervention services to children through age 5. Additionally, this request would allow the Department to award up to \$4.4 million for State Incentive Grants (since the request is above \$460 million) to facilitate a seamless system of services for children with disabilities from birth until kindergarten.
- **\$374 million for Preschool Grants for Children with Disabilities**, in formula grants to help States make a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment available to all children with disabilities ages 3 through 5. This program provides over 730,000 young children with disabilities additional supports to help ensure that they succeed in school.
- **\$150 million for Promise Neighborhoods**, to support projects that significantly improve the educational and developmental outcomes of children and youth in our most distressed communities and to transform those communities by providing a cradle-to-career continuum of ambitious, rigorous, and comprehensive education reforms, effective community services, and strong systems of family and community support – with high-quality schools at the center. The Secretary may give priority to applicants that propose to implement a comprehensive local early learning system as part of the applicant's cradle-to-career continuum.

In addition, the Department is proposing new and continued investments in programs that can improve the school readiness of young children and lay the foundation for success for children in kindergarten

through third grade. Funds from the following programs may be spent on children who are in preschool through third grade:

- **\$14.8 billion for College- and Career-Ready Students** (formerly Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies). Since the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1965, Title I funds have been available to provide services to eligible children birth to school entry. The Administration encourages districts and schools to use this flexibility to invest Title I funds in high-quality preschool programs for eligible children, joint professional development for school staff and the early learning workforce, and coordination with early learning programs and services.
- **\$600 million for School Turnaround Grants**, which would make available formula grants to States, to support States and districts as they implement rigorous interventions in their persistently lowest-performing schools. The Administration believes that high-quality early learning programs can be an important element of school reform, and school interventions may include locally designed plans that recognize and meet a broad range of student needs from preschool through grade 12, including improving the school readiness of young children.
- **\$300 million for Investing in Innovation**, which provides competitive grants that expand the implementation of, and investment in, innovative and evidence-based practices, programs and strategies that significantly improve student achievement and close achievement gaps. These grants can support activities that develop or expand innovations for improving early learning outcomes. Improving early learning outcomes is one of several priorities under consideration for the 2012 grant competition.
- **\$900 million for Race to the Top**, which would create and drive educational improvement in States and districts by providing a financial incentive for system-wide reform and innovation. States and districts will be held to ambitious performance targets while providing them flexibility to use funds in a manner that supports their reforms. The Secretary will consider giving priority to projects that are designed to improve early learning outcomes.

Additional investments in programs that can benefit young children include:

- 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (\$1.27 billion)
- Assessing Achievement (\$420 million)
- Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education programs (\$835 million)
- English Learner Education (\$750 million)
- Excellent Instructional Teams programs (\$3.25 billion)
- IDEA Grants to States (\$11.7 billion)
- Indian Education - Demonstration Grants for Indian Children (\$19 million)
- Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (\$100 million)
- Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students (\$365 million)

*The Department of Health and Human Services is also investing in programs that benefit young children by requesting significant increases in funding for the following programs:*

- **\$8.099 billion for the Head Start program**, which provides grants to local public and private non-profit and for-profit agencies to promote school readiness by enhancing the social and cognitive development of children through the provision of educational, health, nutritional, social and other services to disadvantaged children and families. This request maintains the historic expansion in Head Start and Early Head Start under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, allowing the program to serve approximately 968,000 of our nation's most vulnerable children and families.
- **\$6.344 billion for the Child Care and Development Fund**, which provides grants to States for child care subsidies for low-income families who are working. This request would increase funding over the previous year by \$1.3 billion, allowing the Administration to continue to maintain child care for 1.7 million children, enhance health and safety standards, improve the quality of care, and support state systems that empower parents to select high-quality care.