



Policy Roundtable for Child Care
Wednesday, June 12, 2013
10:00 a.m. – Noon
Conference Room 140
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 W. Temple Street, Los Angeles



Proposed Meeting Agenda

- | | | | | |
|-------|------|--|----------------|--|
| 10:00 | I. | Welcome and Introductions | | Jacquelyn McCroskey
Chair |
| | A. | Comments from the Chair | | |
| | B. | Review of May 8, 2013 Meeting Minutes | Action
Item | |
| | C. | Progress on Policy Framework Update | | |
| | D. | Nominating Committee Report | | Karla Pleitez Howell |
| | E. | Updating the Policy Roundtable for Child Care Ordinance | | Kathy Malaske-Samu |
| 10:20 | II. | Surpluses and Shortfalls in the Local Child Care Supply | | Laura Escobedo
Office of Child Care |
| | A. | Recommended Priority Areas for Increased Child Care Subsidies | | |
| | B. | The Child Care Bridge Fund as a Local Resource | | |
| 10:50 | III. | California Legislative and Budget Issues | | Adam Sonenshein
Michele Sartell |
| | A. | May Revise and Child Development Programs | | |
| | B. | Bills related to Child Development Services | | |
| | | ▪ SB 528, Yee Parenting and Pregnant Youth in Foster Care | | |
| | | ▪ SB 192, Liu Early Learning & Educational Support Act | | |
| | | • AB 641, Rendon Family Child Care Collective Bargaining | | |
| | | • AB 274, Bonilla Child Care and Development Services | | |
| | | ▪ AB 1152, Ammiano California School-Age Families Education (Cal-SAFE) Program | | |
| | | ▪ AB 1187, Mansoor Title IV-E & Subsidized Child Care | | |
| | C. | Federal Initiative | | |
| | | • Proposal to Strengthen Regulations for the Child Care and Development Fund | | |
| 11:50 | IV. | Announcements and Public Comment | | Members and Guests |
| 12:00 | V. | Call to Adjourn | | Jacquelyn McCroskey |

Mission Statement

The Los Angeles County Policy Roundtable for Child Care builds and strengthens early care and education by providing recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on policy, systems, and infrastructure improvement.

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

MEETING MINUTES

May 8, 2013

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Conference Room 743

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration

500 West Temple Street

Los Angeles, California

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey, Chair of the Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable), opened the meeting at 10:06 a.m. Members and guests introduced themselves.

A. Comments from the Chair

- Dr. McCroskey reminded members that they will approve a new Chair and Vice Chair at the annual retreat in July. As such, she asked for volunteers to serve on the Ad Hoc Nominating Committee, which typically meets via conference call. Ms. Karla Howell has agreed to chair the Committee. Anyone interested in serving on the Committee should contact Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu. Ms. Stacy Miller offered to serve on the Committee.
- Dr. McCroskey briefly reported on the First 5 LA Commission meeting held in April at which the Commissioners were asked to approve a Strategic Partnership with the Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles (CCALA) and the Office of Child Care to establish and operate a Los Angeles County Office of the California Early Care and Education Workforce Registry as a pilot for up to four years. Before the item was addressed, Executive Director Kim Belshé put forward that it be an information piece and therefore postponing the vote to the meeting scheduled for May 16, 2013.

For background, Ms. Malaske-Samu commented that other parts of the country are maintaining a database of personnel working in the field of child care and development, including information on their academic background and completion of professional development activities. As a tool, it is helping professionalize the field. In California, the City and County of San Francisco and First 5 LA have undertaken the development of a registry by creating the structure/database. They are now ready and looking for entities to implement the tool. Ms. Malaske-Samu indicated that there is strong interest in the field to capture and maintain information on professional development in a streamlined manner.

Mr. Dennis was asked to comment. As a member of the CCALA, he recused himself from the Commission discussion. When asked about it, he offered that CCALA is best suited to do it given that they have access to information on all of the licensed providers in the county. He added that it would be much more expensive to contract with another organization that does not already have access to this information. Additionally, CCALA has experience with

training and helping providers maintain records of the trainings they have completed. He will need to recuse himself from the discussion on May 16th as well. Others echoed the importance of creating the registry to the professional stature of the field.

B. Review of Meeting Minutes – April 10, 2013

Action: *Mr. Duane Dennis entered a motion to approve the minutes; Dr. Robert Gilchick seconded the motion. The motion passed with one abstention.*

C. Policy Framework Update

Dr. McCroskey reported that a Steering Committee has been formed and the following members have agreed to serve: Ms. Maureen Diekmann, Ms. Dora Jacildo, Dr. Sharoni Little, Dr. Sam Chan, and Ms. Nina Sorkin. The Steering Committee is scheduled to meet on May 23, 2013 from 10 a.m. to noon at the Service Integration Branch 5th Floor Conference Room located at 222 South Hill Street. A proposed meeting agenda will be sent prior to the meeting.

D. Other

- The June meeting of the Roundtable will be in Room 140.
- Ms. Malaske-Samu circulated an invitation to the event, “Leaders in Action – New Ideas”, the 11th annual leadership conference hosted by the Board of Supervisors, the Chief Executive Office, and the Quality and Productivity Commission. The invitation is purposefully extended to all members sitting on County Commissioners.

II. STREAMLINING THE SUBSIDIZED CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM: EXPERIENCES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE FIELD

Dr. McCroskey welcomed two truly distinguished speakers representing the perspectives of persons delivering subsidized child care and development services. Ms. Patrice Wong is the Executive Director of the Long Beach Day Nursery, one of the oldest full-day child care and development centers serving children from birth to five years old in Los Angeles County. Ms. Wong will speak from the perspective of a child care and development center operator and will share her thoughts on how the administration of center operations could be simplified.

Following Ms. Wong, Mr. Cliff Marcussen will share his thoughts on streamlining efforts underway and offer some of his additional suggestions. Mr. Marcussen is the Founder and Executive Director of Options – A Child Care and Human Services Agency.

A. A Center Director’s Point of View

Ms. Wong added that Long Beach Day Nursery recently celebrated 100 years of child care and development service to the children and families of Long Beach. She has been with the Nursery almost 11 years. She was asked to speak about some of challenges of administering the contracts they hold with the California Department of Education/Child Development Division (CDE/CDD).

For background, the contracts with the CDE/CDD need to be earned; they are not awarded as grants. Organizations receive a portion of their funding upfront, however they need to earn the

funds before additional payments are issued. Long Beach Day Nursery used to hold one contract to provide full-day, full-year services to infants and toddlers and preschool age children. Passage of legislation in 2008 consolidated center-based contracts serving preschool age children, resulting in a separate contract for infants and toddlers. Consequently, Long Beach Day Nursery now holds two contracts, which has resulted in more than doubling their contract management work. Ms. Wong noted that she does not object to paperwork. As a receiver of public funds, she believes it is appropriate and ensures that they are accountable and transparent in the use of those funds. However, administering two contracts creates a burden, particularly for a small organization such as Long Beach Day Nursery with state contracts totaling \$1 million and equal to a third of its operating budget compared to her colleagues, with \$5 to \$7 million contracts. Long Beach Day Nursery does not have contract managers. Rather the burden of the administrative work is spread across a thinner administrative team. While inefficient, the work needs to get done. Larger programs can afford a contract manager.

Among the challenges of managing contracts with the CDE/CDD is forecasting the need, including the number of children they anticipate serving and whether the children will be enrolled part-time, part-time plus, or full-time. Forecasting to maximize earnings is a challenge, particularly given the transiency of many low-income families. Efforts need to be made to balance contracts to ensure that they do not over- or under-earn their contracts. Ms. Wong did note that to their credit, the CDE/CDD allows windows to balance in January and May. Again, she added that balancing is an additional task now that they have two contracts. The goal is to earn the maximum of their contract each year. Long Beach Day Nursery is fortunate in that it has a strong fundraising arm, so over-earning the contract is less of a problem for them. For this fiscal year, Ms. Wong predicts that they will earn their preschool contract, while they are likely to over-earn their center contract serving infants and toddlers. She acknowledged the possible funds available for a transfer from another organization that will under-earn its contract, one way that colleagues in the community provide mutual support.

Ms. Wong recommends one contract and one set of task rather than two that more than doubles the work and requires separate balancing efforts. Again, she stated that the information the CDE/CDD requests is not unreasonable, e.g. reports on attendance, information on how they are earning their contracts. It is the process that is burdensome.

With respect to serving infants and toddlers, she stated that the issues are financial as opposed to administrative. The reimbursement rate for infants and toddlers is inadequate. The cost for administering just infant care due to the ratio of staff to children and best practices is \$450 per week. Long Beach Day Nursery loses about \$200 per child per week. As such, they serve infants and toddlers at only one of their two sites. While they have the capacity to serve 42 infants, they reduced their service 36 infants. Recently, they cut back further to serve 30 infants to achieve a more balanced budget. Mr. Marcussen added that every year infants and toddler spaces are disappearing in centers. Family Child Care Home Education Networks are an alternative for serving infants and toddlers. Last year, Assembly Member Bonilla introduced a legislation (AB 2286) to raise the reimbursement rate without increasing funding. Unfortunately it did not pass out of the Assembly Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. Wong was asked whether a tool exists to conduct forecasting and what could help with forecasting. She answered that the challenge of forecasting is with a population that is transient and subject to multiple changes, such as in employment, holding jobs in the service industry with changes in work hours, and attempts by families to cobble together multiple jobs. Long Beach Day Nursery is not even serving the lowest income families as is Head Start. Long

Beach Day Nursery also sees the lack of stability for middle income families. Mostly, Long Beach Day Nursery relies on history to make their forecasts.

Another question related to whether the CDE/CDD recognizes that programs are losing money on infants and if they attribute any value to infants enrolled in the program growing to the next level. Ms. Wong answered that most children starting at Long Beach Day Nursery as infants remain through their graduation from the preschool program. Every year the Board of Directors asks why they are providing infant care if they are losing money and, a few years ago, considered eliminating services for infants. Long Beach City College decided not to serve infants after building a new center with two classrooms for infants, which are now used as storage space. For Long Beach Day Nursery, it is a business decision to make the investment and cover their losses. She added that this is the first year that they had a hard time filling their tuition paying slots. The challenge is ongoing, however they are fortunate to have a nimble business model to recruit families. Regardless, tuition is market based rather than cost based, which means that there is still a gap between the tuition that non-subsidized parents pay and the cost. She added that Long Beach Day Nursery is now serving more middle income than low-income families, running counter to their long-term philosophy – 45 percent subsidized compared to 55 percent tuition paying families. In the past, 65 percent of the enrolled families were subsidized, while 35 percent were tuition paying.

B. Administering Multiple Programs and Contracts

Mr. Cliff Marcussen mentioned that he has a 40 year history of work with the CDE/CDD, 32 of those years in his current position. Options administers every type of contract available by the CDE/CDD, as well as contracts for Early Head Start, Head Start, Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP) and the Child and Adult Care Food Program. For the last 35 years, Mr. Marcussen has been working closely with the CDE/CDD on various projects and as such has an insider's view of the rules and regulations. His task was to provide perspectives within the context of CDE/CDD contracts.

The drivers:

- 1) **CDE/CDD and fiscal services** – CDE/CDD has been actively seeking opportunities to streamline and simplify over 15 years. Admittedly, the process is slow, however the commitment is there.
- 2) **Issue of consistency** – in the past, individual contractors were applying the rules differently. Rules should apply in the same way across programs. As a result, regulations and guidance initiated out of CDE/CDD were designed to create greater consistency on how programs serve parents.
- 3) **Fraud and erroneous payments** – the legislature and the Department of Finance (DOF) respond strongly to suggestions of fraud and errors in payments. Regardless of the validity, the perception has driven much of what has happened over past years.
- 4) **Federal rules** – federal funds reach local programs. Subsidized child care and development programs are subject to laws and regulations heavily influenced by the DOF.

Streamlining Efforts in process:

- 1) **Further contract consolidation** – CSSP consolidated contracts for part- and full-day State Preschool, allowing more flexibility, while consequently splitting contracts into two for programs administering a single contract inclusive of serving infants and toddlers and preschool age children. SB 192 (Liu), if passed, would allow for merging the center-based and CSSP contracts.

- 2) **Tracking absences as required by the AP Program** – there is no reason to track absences in addition to tracking attendance. Would recommend eliminating another provision that requires categorizing the absences, for example by excused and unexcused. Programs would still be required to verify attendance.
- 3) **Simplified fee assessment** – simplify administration for assessing parent fees.

Mr. Marcussen added that another area requiring streamlining is reporting on the enrollment of 11 and 12 year old children as it accomplishes nothing. He commented that it would take a change, but would likely be opposed by the legislature.

Proposed recommendations:

Mr. Marcussen admitted that contractors must comply with lots of rules and procedures, which make it very hard for a new organization to enter into the system. However, he stated that the complexity of the system is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future given that the legislature has not demonstrated support for wholesale change and the DOF would most likely oppose such change.

Mr. Marcussen offered the following points:

- 1) **Training to managers on the administration of CDE/CDD-contracts** – the primary source of trainings on administering contracts are the professional organizations, such as the California Child Development Administrators Association (CCDAA).
- 2) **Personal responsibility** – a new director or program administrator needs to seek the training and join a professional organization. The CDE/CDD is extremely understaffed and so not in a position to conduct trainings.
- 3) **Proposed role of Los Angeles County and the Roundtable** – support existing training efforts by identifying new directors and promoting the trainings; and 2) advocate for more training in Los Angeles County. Mr. Marcussen added that if the Roundtable is interested in developing and co-sponsoring trainings, the CCDAA and others would be willing to partner. In the short term, he suggested publicizing existing trainings.

C. Questions and Answers

- Cost of the training: \$95 is reasonable; it is unrealistic to offer the training for free.
- Simplifying family fees: 1) the 2012-13 budget imposed fees for part-day State Preschool. Efforts are underway to eliminate these fees, which have become a barrier to enrolling families. 2) for full-day, fees have always existed beginning at a certain income level. Fees are assessed on a daily basis, which is problematic as the fees will vary depending on the number of hours any child is in the program for the day. Each month, the organization must recalculate the fees. A suggestion - create a monthly fee and keep it the same each month, adjusted only in cases when family circumstances change. A move to monthly fees will result in some families in full-day programs paying a bit more and part-day a bit less. The benefit is that it would help families budget and, on the programmatic side, it would ease the tracking of the fees, thus reducing errors that may result from terminating families due to underpayments. Charging a monthly fee does not mean parents need to pay in full once a month; rather, programs could spread the fees over the month.
- Data collection – automated or paper based: Most organizations have automated data collection efforts on enrollment and attendance, but some still track attendance by hand.

The CDE/CDD has set rules and requirements for collecting data, but has not established a statewide system nor does the field want it. Some reports on the children are submitted via a web-based system hosted by the CDE/CDD and it is user friendly.

- Performance-based or compliance-based: Is there a way for CDE/CDD to collect performance-based data? What data is captured on childhood outcomes? The standard data reported to the CDE/CDD is attendance, enrollment and fiscal expenditures. The CDE/CDD does not collect outcome data. Centers are required to conduct Desired Results Developmental Profiles (DRDPs), however the tool is intentionally designed for teachers to look at the needs of children in classroom and plan their daily and weekly program so that it is individualized for the children. The data from the DRDPs can be rolled up by class and then used to guide an organization on the types of training needed in their work with children. The DRDP is not to be used as a programmatic assessment. Teachers do need help improving the quality of their program.

The reasons contracts are not renewed stem mostly from financial issues, failure to file an audit, misuse of funds or bankruptcy. Programs typically need to commit serious violations in their use of taxpayers' money to have their contract revoked. Contracts are not revoked due to issues of program quality. On occasion, mismanagement and program quality issues arise in that required activities are not completed, such as conducting assessments of the classrooms using the Environment Rating Scale or completing the DRDPs. If an organization is trying but is short of meeting the requirements, the CDE/CDD will work with them rather than defund them. One item raised is the inconsistency in completing program self-evaluations, which is dependent, in part, on the information provided by the organization's CDE/CDD consultant and the consultant's interpretation of requirements. As an organization, the focus can be on how to better use the tool.

- Challenges for organizations enrolling families with AP Program vouchers: the administration of the vouchers can be cumbersome to monitor and expensive. In some cases, a parent loses eligibility, but fails to inform the organization. Weeks may pass before the organization has been notified by the administrator of the AP dollars. Last year Long Beach Day Nursery lost \$80,000 due to this problem. Mr. Marcussen commented that this is another case of inconsistency across the state of how programs operate outside of the vision of the CDE/CDD. Management Bulletins were recently issued to inform providers on the proper procedures.
- Collecting outcome data of both trainees and children: Some of the training is directed to improving child outcomes and the impact of quality of services, however most training relates to compliance with the rules and regulations. More at issue, the subsidy payments are inadequate for ensuring the quality of the program. Most programs are subsidizing the quality components on the back of their underpaid staff and there are no funds to pay teachers for planning and assessment time. And, programs have not given teachers a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) raise in five years because programs have not received a COLA. Notably, the requirements tend towards how one manages the business whereas quality is marginalized. It was suggested that a place for academia is to help with outcome measures. Another suggestion for academic partners is to consider doing an analysis of what has gone on in field over the last five years and the fight to survive, suggesting that such a study could help form a policy agenda. From an organization standpoint, "cannot put the lights on, cannot provide quality". Ms. Wong referred to a cost of quality study conducted in Long Beach approximately eight years ago. The study could serve as a starting point for defining the financial needs of quality program. The study addresses, for

example, qualified staff paid at a commensurate level and with benefits. It was asked whether the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) could support this work. The answer – RTT-ELC money is not going to providers for the activities. A quality rating and improvement system (QRIS) can help with identifying the key components of quality and providing support to help programs achieve the standards through training and coaching. The small grants associated with the QRIS are not enough for any program to institutionalize the quality components. Is there a role for First 5 LA's research team to take a much broader look on how far programs are from quality and what it means for the children and families enrolled in the programs?

- Mental Health Services Act/Prevention and Early Intervention (MHSA/PEI) funds: The Department of Mental Health is working on a three year plan for the MHSA/PEI funds and 51 percent of the funds must be used to serve children and families. If quality includes meeting the needs of families, is there a mechanism for using these funds for mental health consultation in child care and development programs? Head Start could be a model for how mental health services are integrated the services into the overall program.

III. LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

A. Update on Medi-Cal Options and Realignment Proposals

Ms. Patricia Carbajal of the Chief Executive Office's Intergovernmental Relations and External Affairs (IGEA) provided an update on efforts underway to address the Governor's proposals for Medi-Cal expansion. As background, the Affordable Care Act (ACA) provides states with the option to expand Medicaid to individuals ages 65 years and young as of January 2014. Some states are refusing to do the expansion whereas California is committed to full expansion. To address the cost of expansion, the Governor has proposed two options – a county or a state option. With the state option, he is suggesting that the counties need to share the cost.

Counties are in agreement with the DOF that the state option is preferable, however the DOF is arguing that the state will still assume administration/implementation costs. The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) and the counties believe the DOF's cost estimates are too high. The Governor and the DOF are looking at the 1991 realignment funds as the county's contribution. These are monies that in part pay for indigent health care. The Governor believes that with the ACA, there will be less indigent care cost whereas counties expect ongoing have indigent care costs. If the state were to sweep the 1991 realignment funds, the funds would be put into the General Fund, which would then require some of the funds to go into Proposition 98. Rather than allowing this to happen, the Governor proposes the swap of certain programs to counties. Among the services identified verbally (not in writing) are child care and development, child support, and CalWORKs.

Ms. Carbajal directed members and guests to their meeting packets for a copy of the letter, "Protect the Health Care Safety Net", addressed to Senator Steinberg and Assembly Member Pérez from several statewide organizations and the County of Los Angeles describing their support for implementation of the ACA and full expansion of Medi-Cal, highlighting key policy positions and their concerns with the Administration's proposal to reduce funding for local county health care programs. Part of the message is protecting the realignment dollars. Ms. Carbajal stated that the groups signing on to the letter are in complete opposition to the realignment of programs, including child care and development. Los Angeles County and others engaged in conversations with the DOF through last week; the DOF agreed to look at

the proposal, but has made no commitments. The Governor's revised proposed budget for 2013-14 will be released on May 14th. There is an expectation that the Governor's position of realignment will remain in the May Revise as he seems intent on finding ways to have the counties pay for some of expansion. Ms. Carbajal noted that the legislature also is opposed to realignment. Ms. Carbajal was asked whether the County has taken a formal position opposing realignment; her answer was "yes".

B. Legislation of Priority Interest

1. SB 528 (Yee):

Ms. Michele Sartell reminded members that the County has identified a number of bills of interest, including three being monitored by the Joint Committee on Legislation on behalf of the Roundtable and Child Care Planning Committee (Planning Committee). Among the bills is SB 528 (Yee), which relates to pregnant and parenting teens under the supervision of Child Protective Services. One of the four provisions in the bill would provide priority for child care and development services to parenting foster youth who have not completed high school. The bill has been brought to the attention of IGEA who has drafted a preliminary analysis of impact regarding the additional provisions and has since asked the Office of Child Care to add to the analysis with respect to the child care and development piece. This bill also has captured the attention of a couple of Roundtable members. As such, she asked Ms. Carbajal to provide an update on the County's perspective to date on this bill.

Ms. Carbajal reported that the bill's provisions address reproductive health information for foster youth ages 12 and up, subsidized child care, and data collection. SB 528 was brought to the attention of a Board office by one of the bill's sponsors who then forwarded it to the IGEA. Also examining the bill are the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) and County Counsel, with most of their attention on the provision relating to providing information to foster youth on reproductive health. Concerns have been raised with respect to who would be providing the information, what is age appropriate, and the source of the information provided. The understanding is that the Children's Services Workers (CSWs) are reluctant to engage with the youth around reproductive health, suggesting that the public health nurses located in the DCFS office may be the more appropriate sources for the information. As such, the Department of Public Health also has been asked to look at the bill. Most recently, IGEA asked the Office of Child Care to give comment on the child care and development component. Ms. Sylvia Drew-Ivrie noted that the Commission on Children and Family Services voted to send a position of recommended support to the Board of Supervisors.

Positions on the bill could range from support, support if amended or remain neutral. The IGEA will consider the larger viewpoint, however it would be difficult to support if any department has a problem with the bill. At this time, the focus is on the concerns that the bill raises. In a week or two, IGEA will have a better idea of where the County stands. Regardless of the vetting process, the Board could take a motion to support the bill on its own. Last week, Mr. Philip Browning, Director of DCFS, met with Senator Yee on a number of bills.

Ms. Sartell next directed members and guests to their meeting packets for the handout entitled "California Legislation of Priority Interest - Status Update with Possible Recommended Positions". The three bills placed in front of the Roundtable for consideration have been identified as high priority bills by the Joint Committee on Legislation, however the Joint Committee at their April meeting was not yet ready to forward any suggested positions. Since

then, staff has identified the following three bills for considered positions by the Roundtable given the growing level of interest in the field around the bills, consistency with Roundtable interests and priorities, and the time it takes to process positions in order to receive a pursuit of position by the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Sartell summarized each of the three bills, noting respective concerns that may weigh on any recommended position suggested by the Roundtable. In addition, she indicated consistency on each bill with items in the Roundtable and Planning Committee's Public Policy Platform and approved County State Agenda for the First Year of the 2013-14 Session.

2. AB 274 (Bonilla): Modifications to Alternative Payment (AP) Program Administration

In brief, the bill is intended to streamline administrative processes related to tracking and verifying attendance of children enrolled in child care and development programs that are subsidized with AP vouchers. It would allow programs to maintain records electronically and request payments via direct deposit.

Questions/Discussion:

- Should time be spent on bills that are in suspense: most bills in the Appropriations Committee are moved to "suspense". The author and sponsors may work diligently to move the bill out to be heard, which can result in the bill continuing to move through the legislative process.
- Tracking attendance: Programs need to collect absences, complicated by the requirement of separating out excused from unexcused absences.

Action: Ms. Nina Sorkin entered a motion to send a recommended position of support on AB 274 to the Board of Supervisors; Ms. Terri Nishimura seconded the motion. The motion passed.

3. AB 1152 (Ammiano): California School-Age Families Education (Cal-SAFE) Program

AB 1152 would remove the California School Age Families Education Program (Cal-SAFE) from the list of categorical program for which funds may be used for other education purposes and retain the current funding level. Funding from school districts, charter schools and county offices of education selecting not to maintain or re-establish Cal-SAFE programs shall be restricted to expanding existing or establishing new Cal-SAFE programs.

Action: Mr. Robert Gilchick entered a motion to send a recommended position of support on AB 1152 to the Board of Supervisors; Mr. Duane Dennis seconded the motion. The motion passed with two abstentions.

4. SB 192 (Liu): Early Learning and Education Support Act

Ms. Sartell described this bill as mostly technical, however with some significant changes in current Education Code that are of likely interest to the Roundtable. As mentioned at the April meeting, SB 192 sets the stage for a high quality system by recasting the Child Care and Development Services Act as the Early Learning and Educational Support Act. She then summarized three proposed amendments of note:

- The bill would allow for the consolidation of the CSSP and Center-based contracts.
- The bill would prioritize expansion funds to programs operating direct classroom services located in attendance areas of elementary schools ranked in deciles 1 to 3 of the Academic Performance Index (API).
- The bill would require that the Child Care Resource and Referral (R&Rs) and AP Program agencies provide families – including families receiving CalWORKs Child Care – with consumer education to help them make informed choices regarding early learning and support services. The information is to include (but is not limited to) the types of early learning and educational support options, licensing requirements, Trustline requirements for exempt providers, quality indicators, and referrals to quality rating and improvement systems.

Questions/discussion:

- The most significant change is rebranding child care and development as early learning and educational support. It was suggested that rebranding is critical, given that many legislators still consider “child care” as mere babysitting.
- With respect to using the API rankings, the CDE/CDD does not want to create something separate, however has stated its commitment to integration of making funding decisions based on both the APIs and the current funding formula used by the Local Planning Councils and approved by the Superintendent of Instruction in making recommendations for allocating expansion funds.

Action: *Mr. Duane Dennis entered a motion to send a recommended position of support on SB 192 to the Board of Supervisors; Ms. Terri Nishimura seconded the motion. The motion passed with four abstentions.*

It was noted that on developing the recommended position papers that are forwarded to the Board of Supervisors, it be made clear that the positions support the current bill to ensure that the Roundtable is not providing support to a bill that is significantly altered, such as in a gut and amend. In addition, a request was made to include fiscal impact information with the bills presented for action.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

- Ms. Malaske-Samu referred members and guests to their meeting packets for a flyer announcing the upcoming Santa Monica Spring Policy Symposium scheduled for May 13-16, 2013.
- Ms. Malaske-Samu reminded members and guests of Dads & Family Day scheduled for Saturday, May 18, 2013 at the Robert F. Kennedy Community Schools Campus located at 721 South Catalina Street, Los Angeles. The event is being held in partnership by the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE), the Office of Child Care, LAUP and First 5 LA.
- The Child Care Resource Center is hosting the Annabelle Godwin Play Day on Saturday, May 18, 2013 from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at Los Angeles Valley College on the Campus Quad located at 5800 Fulton Avenue in Valley Glen.

- Dr. McCroskey offered as a suggested reading the article that appeared in The New Republic entitled “The Hell of American Day Care – An investigation into the barely regulated, unsafe business of looking after our children” by Jonathon Cohn (April 15, 2013). Mr. Dennis asked for a discussion on the article be added as an agenda item at a future meeting. The article is available at <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/112892/hell-american-day-care>.
- LAUP, the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) and the National Association of Young Children (NAEYC) are hosting a panel discussion on May 16, 2013 from 3:30 – 4:45 p.m. (ET) in Washington, D.C. Featured panelists include Dr. Celia Ayala of LAUP, Mr. Philip A. Acord of Children’s Home in Tennessee and Ms. Ronelle Nathaniel of Acelero Learning in New Jersey, with moderation by Dr. Steve Barnett of NIEER and Ms. Adele Robinson of NAEYC. Folks may tune in via a live webcast link hosted on LAUP’s website at www.laup.net.
- Children Now is launching their oral health work as it impacts children from birth to three years old. In addition, they are rallying support for the President’s early learning initiative.

V. CALL TO ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Commissioners Present:

Ms. Jeannette Aguirre	Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey
Ms. Carol Hiestand for Ms. Fran Chasen	Ms. Stacy Miller
Mr. Duane Dennis	Ms. Terri Chew Nishimura
Ms. Maureen Diekmann	Mr. Nurhan Pirim
Dr. Robert Gilchick	Mr. Adam Sonenshein
Ms. Dora Jacildo	Ms. Nina Sorkin
Dr. Sharoni Little	Dr. John Whitaker
Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu	

65 percent of members were in attendance

Guests:

Ms. Cristina Alvarado, Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles
Mr. Robert Beck, Department of Public Social Services/Child Care Program
Ms. Patricia Carbajal, Intergovernmental Relations and External Affairs/Chief Executive Office
Ms. Ellen Cervantes, Child Care Resource Center
Ms. Tessa Charnofsky, First 5 LA
Ms. Taylor Dudley, The Alliance for Children’s Rights
Mr. Cliff Marcussen, Options – A Child Care and Human Services Agency
Ms. Terry Ogawa
Ms. Faith Parducho, Department of Parks and Recreation – *Roundtable Appointment Pending*
Ms. Melina Sanchez, Children Now
Ms. Nancy Lee Sayre, UCLA Center for Improving Child Care Quality
Ms. Angela Vasquez, Advancement Project
Ms. Lena Ward, Department of Children and Family Services
Ms. Patrice Wong, Long Beach Day Nursery

Staff: Ms. Michele Sartell

This page intentionally blank

2013 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CHILD CARE NEEDS ASSESSMENT COMPARISON WITH 2011 RESULTS

1. Population Correction

There are fewer children 0-12 based on a recalibration using 2010 census data. The previous assessment (2011) used projections based on 2000 data. This “correction” in the data means reduced population sizes for each age group, and for specific income populations.

Age Group	2013	2011	% Change
All children 0-12	1,659,352	1,879,067	-11.7%
Infants/Toddlers (0-3)	381,380	437,884	-12.9%
Preschool-age	386,843	451,217	-14.3%
School-age	891,129	989,966	-9.9%

2. Workforce Participation

The percent of families where all parents are in the workforce increased for families with infant toddlers (+1.2%) and school-age children (+2.5%) while the percent of families with preschool-age children remained steady between 2011 and 2013.

Age Group	2013	2011
Infants/Toddlers (0-3)	49.5%	48.3%
Preschool-age	49.4%	49.4%
School-age	54.8%	52.3%

3. Likely Use of Licensed Child Care and Development Options

The rate at which families are likely to use licensed care, particularly center-based care, appears to have increased for families with children ages 0-5 as reported in the results of the Los Angeles County Health Survey (LACHS) conducted by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health (2012). The shift in likely use of center-based care is most prominent in the 0-3 population, which will put even greater pressure on the limited resources (facilities) available to serve this age group. There were increases in likely use of family child care as well for the 0-5 age group. These changes imply that fewer families would be looking to use license-exempt care for the 0-5 age group.

Age Group	2013		2011	
Infants/Toddlers (0-3)	67,908	(36%)	31,061	(22.2%)
Preschool-age	121,984	(63.8%)	141,333	(59.6%)
School-age	97,696	(20%)	102,516	(19.8%)

4. Half-day Preschool Programs

Despite the loss to subsidized half-day preschool, the ratio of served to un-served low-income children has improved. This is most likely explained by the decrease in the count of 3's and 4's. Most half-day programs (97%) in Los Angeles County are subsidized and specifically serve low-income families. Because of this, when we look at all 3's and 4's without regard to income, the current supply of half-day preschool enrichment programs is sufficient for only 51% of the population.

Age Group	2013	2011	% change
All Income levels			
3's and 4's	131,849	153,759	-14.2%
Number of half-day preschool spaces	66,592	80,016	-16.8%
Number/percent un-served	65,257 (49%)	73,743 (48%)	-11.5 %
Eligible for Subsidized Care			
3's and 4's	80,554	104,925	-23.2%
Number of subsidized half-day spaces	64,536	78,156	-17.4%
Number/percent un-served	16,036 (20%)	26,769 (25%)	-40.1%

5. Needs of Working Families (all incomes)

The biggest shortfall remains in the area of infant/toddler care. The decrease in percent of un-served children is due primarily to the recalibration of population numbers. For every age group there has been a decrease in available care, with the exception of infant center-based care, which gained a few hundred spaces. Because of the recalibration of general population counts, and despite a reduction in available spaces, the shortfall in available full-time preschool care has decreased from 245 in 2011 to 16% in 2013.

While both the shortfall in spaces for infants and toddlers and for preschool-age children has declined, the shortfall for school-age has increased. The shortfall in spaces for school-age children seems to stem both from a loss of family child care spaces (9.3%) and in a decrease in the number of available spaces through the After School Education and Safety (ASES) program, which is state funded, and the 21st Century Community Learning Centers, which has federal funding. The funds for these programs have not been reduced, however utilization of the funds has decreased.

Infants/Toddlers (0-3)	2013	2011	% Change
Population (in working families)	188,633	211,299	-10.7%
Number of center spaces	9,457	9,175	+3%
Number of FCC spaces	18,798	19,903	-5.5%
Number without licensed care options who are likely to use centers or FCC	122,611	150,664	-18.6%
Percent shortfall in needed spaces	65%	71.3%	

Preschool (3-5)	2013	2011	% Change
Population (in working families)	191,197	222,918	-14.2 %
Number of center spaces	122,658	130,656	-6.1%
Number of FCC spaces	37,748	39,004	-3.2 %
Number without licensed care options who are likely to use centers or FCC.	30,791	53,258	-42.2%
Percent shortfall in needed spaces	16%	24%	

School-age (6-12)	2013	2011	% Change
Population (in working families)	488,479	517,758	-5.6%
Number of center spaces	24,566	26,841	-8.5%
Number of FCC spaces	18,784	20,713	-9.3%
License-exempt centers	96,904	128,359	-24.5%
Number without licensed/license-exempt center care options	348,135	341,845	+1.8%
Percent shortfall in needed spaces	71%	66%	

This page intentionally blank

**California State Budget Proposals for 2013-14
Child Care and Development Services**

Budget Item	Governor's Proposal/May Revise	Assembly	Senate	Conference Committee
Restore and reinvest in child care and development - California State Preschool Programs	No proposal	\$250 million - \$100 million in Proposition 98 GF to expand State Preschool	\$30 million above Governor's budget in Proposition 98 GF to begin multi-year restoration to State Preschool in 2013-14	Restores State Preschool by \$30 million to increase number of slots <i>(State Preschool expansion: DOF opposed; LAO recommended Senate version)</i>
- General Child Care, AP, Migrant		- \$100 million to General Child Care and the Alternative Payment Program - \$57 million to CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care - \$4 million to preschool to backfill loss of family fee revenue		Approved reappropriation of \$10 million in unspent child care funds to expand additional slots: - GCC: \$7 million - AP programs: \$2.6 million - Migrant CC: \$400,000 <i>(Non-CalWORKs slots: opposed by DOF; LAO supported perhaps smaller amount)</i>
Shift child development programs from General Fund (GF) to Proposition 98 GF	No changes	Shifts child care programs from GF back into Proposition 98, thus increasing the guarantee by an additional \$768 million in 2013-14	No proposal	Senate version – maintain current structure by funding all programs except part-day, part-year preschool outside of Proposition 98 guarantee <i>(LAO estimates cost at \$768 million increase in 2013-14 minimum guarantee)</i>
CalWORKs Child Care Stage 2	Decrease funding by additional \$511,000 based on adjusted caseload estimates; adds to \$21 million reduction proposed in January Total budget = \$397.5 million	Reduce funding by \$11 million to reflect lower caseloads per LAO estimates; would fund at \$387 million	Fund Stage 2 at \$339 million (adopted LAO adjustment based on estimated caseload)	Senate version with updated Stage 2 amount of \$358 million Action date: 6/5/13
CalWORKs Child Care Stage 3	Decreases funding amount proposed in January by \$15.1 million to reflect updated caseload data. May Revise grows Stage 3 base by \$9.1 million in 2013-14 over State Budget Act level for 2012. Total base = \$143 million.	Fund Stage 3 at \$200 million, \$57 million above May Revise proposal	- Fund Stage 3 at \$200 million (approved LAO adjustment) - Approved Budget Bill Language (BBL) to capture contract under earnings to apply toward sequestration reductions	Conference compromise – fund full caseload based on LAO estimate of \$183 million Action date: 6/5/13

Budget Item	Governor's Proposal/May Revise	Assembly	Senate	Conference Committee
CalWORKs Caseload Adjustments	No proposal	Approved BBL to allow for mid-year adjustments of CalWORKs Stages 2 and 3 to reflect actual caseloads	No proposal	Assembly version Action date: 6/5/13 <i>(DOF concerned sets up Stage 3 as an entitlement program)</i>
Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide \$1.2 million in growth for State Preschool - Provide \$1.7 million in growth for General Child Development, Migrant Child Care and non-CalWORKs Alternative Payment Program 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preschool - Provide \$1,204,000 in Prop 98 GF to reflect a revised growth adjustment of .20 percent. - General Child Care - Provide \$1,666,000 in GF (Non-98) to reflect a revised growth adjustment of 0.20 percent. 	Growth of .2 percent applied to State Preschool, General Child Development, Migrant Care, Alternative Payment, and Child Development Allowance for Handicapped
Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA)	No proposal	Adopted placeholder Trailer Bill Language (TBL) to eliminate existing statutory provision that prohibits COLA adjustments. Also reject a proposal to permanently freeze income eligibility levels in statute.	No proposal	Adopt May Revision and defer decisions on future COLAs for child care programs
Parent Fees – Part-day Preschool	Proposes TBL to require California Department of Education (CDE) to report fee data for the State Preschool program	Adopted placeholder TBL to repeal family fees for Preschool programs and backfill fee revenue with Proposition 98 GF	Approved Governor's proposal	Maintains preschool fees and adopts fee reporting language <i>(Some conferees consider desirable, however schedule should be revised)</i>
Simplification of Family Fee Schedule	No proposal	Adopted placeholder TBL to allow for simplification of the family fee schedule	No proposal	Assembly version Action date: 6/5/12 <i>(monthly rather than daily fees, flat rates for part- and full-time)</i>
CA Preschool Plan	No proposal	\$341,000 General Fund and BBL to implement the plan to provide voluntary preschool for all children for one year prior to kindergarten	No proposal	Assembly version without funding; CDE work w/ stakeholders. (maybe federal funding??)

Budget Item	Governor's Proposal/May Revise	Assembly	Senate	Conference Committee
Federal Sequestration Reduction Plan)	Governor proposed to allocate reductions to quality programs (\$1.4 million GF) and Stage 3 (\$14.5 million GF)	Appropriate \$1.4 million to backfill lost federal sequestration cut to quality programs	Rejected Governor's proposal; approved BBL to redirect unspent contracts to backfill for sequestration cuts and provided GF to further backfill beyond redirected contract amounts. Reduce quality projects by \$1.4 million GF	Approved \$15.8 million GF to augment child care programs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GCC: \$11.1 million - AP programs: \$4.1 million - Migrant CC: \$621,000 Approve compromise BBL to direct DOF and CDE to allocate potential federal sequestration reductions proportional to GF augmentations made to these three programs
Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the date that the CDE must submit their annual report to the Legislature and the Administration from March 1 to May 1, to align with the availability of federal reporting information - Request that Item 6110-001-0890 be increased by \$3,875,000 and Item 6110-200-0890 be decreased by \$209,000 to more accurately reflect actual and projected expenditures for the federal RTT-ELC grant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fund at \$11.3 million, of which \$10.1 available for allocation to local regional leadership consortia - Report due to Legislature and Administration on May 1 of each fiscal year
21 st Century Community Learning Centers	January proposal reduced budget by \$22.38 million to reflect one-time carryover from prior years payable from the federal trust fund		Provide net increase of \$10.8 million to reflect the addition of \$10.7 million in one-time carryover funds and an increase of \$128,000 to reflect updated federal grant amounts	Reduces budget by \$11.5 million. Of \$132.4 in funding allocation, \$10.1 million \$10.7million provided in one-time carry-over funds to support existing program

Budget Item	Governor's Proposal/May Revise	Assembly	Senate	Conference Committee
Realignment as part of Medi-Cal Expansion	Proposes State-based option for expansion inclusive of shift of responsibility for certain human service programs to the counties. Proposes that "over time, counties assume greater responsibility for CalWORKs, CalWORKs-related child care programs and CalFresh administration costs. Counties would be responsible for the coordination of all client services and would have opportunities to reinvest caseload savings and revenue growth in CalWORKs and related child care programs based on their local needs." Shift applies to CalWORKs Stages 1, 2 and 3.	Rejected all programmatic aspects of human services realignment proposal	Rejected programmatic aspects of human services realignment proposal	Negotiations between Counties and Administration resulting in preliminary compromise – no programmatic realignment in latest proposals
California School Age Families Education (Cal-SAFE)	Proposes to eliminate most educational categorical programs inclusive of Cal-SAFE under new Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF); Cal-SAFE funds would be swept into LCFF for local discretion			
CalWORKs Child Care Stage 1	\$332.8 million (or \$399.2?) \$278.9 million for direct services \$53.9 million for administration	Approved Governor's proposal	Approved Governor's proposal	

Next Steps:

- Conference Committee members: Senator Mark Leno (Chair), Assembly Member Bob Blumenfield (Vice Chair), Assembly Member Jeff Gorell, Assembly Member Holly Mitchell, Assembly Member Nancy Skinner, Senator Kevin de León, Senator Bill Emmerson, and Senator Loni Hancock
- Deadline for Legislature to pass the budget – June 15th
- Deadline for the Governor to adopt the budget – June 30th

June 4, 2013

To: Manuel Rivas

From: Kathleen Malaske-Samu and Michele P. Sartell

POSITION REQUEST FOR AB 274 (BONILLA): CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

The Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable) is recommending that the Board of Supervisors adopt a "Support" position on AB 274, authored by Assembly Member Bonilla. Attached for your consideration is the bill analysis.

This bill would add to and amend the Child Care and Development Services Act with the intent of streamlining administrative processes related to tracking and verifying attendance of children enrolled in child care and development programs that are subsidized with Alternative Payment (AP) program vouchers. In addition, the bill would allow programs to maintain attendance and other records electronically and provide a mechanism for contractors to receive payments via direct deposit. The bill is consistent with County policy as follows:

1.3 Child Care and Development

6. Support the streamlining of California Department of Education/Child Development Division (CDE/CDD) administrative processes to expand access for low-income families, ensure continuity of care, and promote flexible use of early care and education funding to meet the needs of families.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Kathy Malaske-Samu by e-mail at kmalaske@ceo.lacounty.gov or by telephone at (213) 974-2440 or Michele Sartell by e-mail at msartell@ceo.lacounty.gov or by telephone at (213) 974-5187.

KMS:MPS

Attachment

cc: Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey, Roundtable Chair
Ms. Lesley Blacher

This page intentionally blank

COUNTY OFFICE OF LOS ANGELES/POLICY ROUNDTABLE FOR CHILD CARE
OFFICE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

BILL ANALYSIS

AB 274 (BONILLA): CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES: Would require child care providers receiving payment from the Alternative Payment (AP) program to submit to the AP program a monthly attendance record or invoice for each enrolled child. The record or invoice serving as documentation of care provided based on needs certified by the AP program is to include dates and times of attendance and the signature, under penalty of perjury, of both the parent or guardian of the child and the child care provider. The bill also specifies the meaning of "attendance" for purposes of reimbursing the providers through the AP program. Would allow providers to maintain monthly attendance and other records in the original hard copy format or electronically. Payments to the AP contractor may be made via direct deposit at the financial institution of the contractor's choice.

Introduced and Amended Dates: Introduced: February 11, 2013
Amended: March 19, 2013
Amended: April 10, 2013
Amended: April 24, 2013
Amended: May 24, 2013

OCC Analyst: Michele P. Sartell
(213) 974-5187

Status: Senate
To Committee on Rules for assignment

Sponsor: California Alternative Payment Program Association
(CAPPA), Northern Directors Group

Support: BANANAS, Child Care Resource and Referral of Northern Alameda County, Contra Costa Child Care Council, Family Resource and Referral Center of San Joaquin County, Solano Family & Children's Services, Valley Oak Children's Services

Opposition: None listed

Summary:

This bill would add to and amend the Education Code relating to child care and development services as follows:

- Require authorized child care providers to submit to the Alternative Payment (AP) program a monthly attendance record or invoice that documents the care provided for each child who received services based on need certified by the AP program.

- The monthly attendance record or invoice is to include the dates and times of attendance, which is to be verified at the end of each month by single signature, under penalty of perjury, by the parent or guardian of the child receiving services and the child care provider.
- Clarifies the meaning of “attendance” for purposes of reimbursement to providers through the AP program by adding: hours of service provided that are broadly consistent with certified hours of need; for families with variable schedules, the actual days and hours of attendance up to the maximum certified hours; and for license-exempt providers that provide part-time services, the actual days and hours of attendance. Existing Education Code defines “attendance” to include excused absences of children due to illness, quarantine, illness or quarantine of their parent, family emergency, or to spend time with a parent or other relative as required by a court of law or that is in the best interest of the child.
- Would not require contractors to track absences.
- Establishes the intent of the Legislature to simplify the attendance recording process, thus the change would not require the adoption of implementation regulations.
- Would authorize the AP programs and providers to maintain records electronically including, but not limited to, child immunization records, parental job verification records, parent income verification, and parent school or training verifications and attendance records.
- On or after the date on which the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) determines that the Financial Information System for California (Fi\$Cal Project) has been implemented within the California Department of Education (CDE), would require the SPI at the request of the contractor to request the Controller to make payments via direct deposit by electronic funds transfer through the Fi\$Cal Project into the contractor’s account at their financial institution of choice.

Analysis

In Los Angeles County, there are 12 agencies (inclusive of the eight Child Care Resource and Referral (R&R) Agencies and the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS)) that hold a contract with the CDE to administer the AP Program. The AP program, with vouchers, subsidizes child care provided primarily in private centers, family child care homes or by license-exempt providers such as a family, friend or neighbor.

Current processes for administering the subsidized child care and development system are cumbersome and do not reflect technological advances. Regulations require parents to sign in and sign out their children at drop off and pick up each day. Providers, in turn, are required to submit periodic reports including the daily records showing the days and hours of enrollment and attendance, total days of operation, and a report on the revenues and expenditures relating to both subsidized and non-subsidized children to the AP program. The AP programs and providers are required to maintain attendance and other records for five years. The regulations are unclear whether the records need to be kept in their original form, electronically, or in an alternative format. This bill would clarify and streamline processes for tracking and verifying each child’s attendance and reduce the amount of paperwork required as an invoice for reimbursement. In addition, it would specify that records may be maintained electronically, thus reducing the administrative burden of maintaining hard copy files of documents.

Lastly, AP programs are paid with paper checks sent through the U.S. mail. Checks may be of relatively large amounts and are at risk of being delayed or lost through the mail, thus delaying payment to the contractors. Direct deposit will help ensure that payments are received and in a timely manner.

In summary, AB 274 is intended to simplify administrative processes related to tracking and verifying attendance of children enrolled in child care and development programs that are subsidized with AP vouchers. It would allow programs to maintain attendance and other records electronically and provide a mechanism for contractors to receive payments via direct deposit.

Recommended Position for Board Approval

The Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable) recommends a position of “support” for AB 274 that, if passed, will create greater efficiencies in the administration of subsidized child care and development services, particularly in the AP program. This position is consistent with County policy as follows:

1.3 Child Care and Development

- 6. Support the streamlining of California Department of Education/Child Development Division (CDE/CDD) administrative processes to expand access for low-income families, ensure continuity of care, and promote flexible use of early care and education funding to meet the needs of families.

Completed by: _____ Date: _____

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

This page intentionally blank

June 10, 2013

To: Manuel Rivas

From: Kathleen Malaske-Samu and Michele P. Sartell

POSITION REQUEST FOR SB 192 (LIU): EARLY LEARNING AND EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES

The Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable) is recommending that the Board of Supervisors adopt a "Support" position on SB 192, authored by Senator Liu. Attached for your consideration is the bill analysis.

This bill would amend areas of the Education Code relating to child care and development services by: recasting the Child Care and Development Services Act as the Early Learning and Education Support Act and renaming center-based programs as "direct classroom services"; streamlining the delivery of direct classroom programs through the simplification of contracts; requiring that the Child Care Resource and Referral (R&Rs) and Alternative Payment (AP) Program agencies provide families, including families eligible for CalWORKs Child Care, with consumer education to help them make informed choices regarding early learning and support services; and prioritizing expansion funds to programs operating direct classroom services located in attendance areas of elementary schools ranked in deciles 1 to 3 of the Academic Performance Index (API).

As noted in the attached analysis, the field has raised concerns relating to allocating expansion funds based on API rankings. In response to issues raised by the field, the CDE/CDD has drafted amendment language that would require adding the API rankings to the currently methodology for determining communities of priority based on zip code, census tract and school district data.

The bill is consistent with County policy as follows:

1.3 Child Care and Development

1. Support efforts to enhance the quality of early care and education that set high standards for all services and program types and address the needs of all children, including those with disabilities and other special needs, and their families.
6. Support the streamlining of California Department of Education/Child Development Division (CDE/CDD) administrative processes to expand access for low-income families, ensure continuity of care, and promote flexible use of early care and education funding to meet the needs of families.
9. Support efforts to ensure that vulnerable children and their families have access to consistent, uninterrupted subsidized early care and education services.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Kathy Malaske-Samu by e-mail at kmalaske@ceo.lacounty.gov or by telephone at (213) 974-2440 or Michele Sartell by e-mail at msartell@ceo.lacounty.gov or by telephone at (213) 974-5187.

KMS:MPS

Attachment

cc: Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey, Roundtable Chair
Ms. Lesley Blacher

This page intentionally blank

COUNTY OFFICE OF LOS ANGELES/POLICY ROUNDTABLE FOR CHILD CARE
OFFICE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

BILL ANALYSIS

SB 192 (LIU): EARLY LEARNING AND EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES: Would recast the Child Care and Development Services Act as the Early Learning and Educational Support Act and rename center-based programs as “direct classroom services”. Would streamline the delivery of direct classroom programs through the simplification of contracts. Would require that the Child Care Resource and Referral (R&Rs) and Alternative Payment (AP) Program agencies provide families, including families eligible for CalWORKs Child Care, with consumer education to help them make informed choices regarding early learning and support services. In addition, would prioritize expansion funds to programs operating direct classroom services located in attendance areas of elementary schools ranked in deciles 1 to 3 of the Academic Performance Index (API).

Introduced and Amended Dates: Introduced: February 7, 2013
Amended: March 12, 2013
Amended: April 3, 2013
Amended: April 16, 2013
Amended: May 28, 2013

OCC Analyst: Michele P. Sartell
(213) 974-5187

Status: Assembly
Held at Desk

Sponsor: Superintendent of Public Instruction

Support: Advancement Project, CA Child Development Administrators Association, Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles, CA Teachers’ Association, Child Care Law Center, Child Development Resources, Children Now, Compton Unified School District, Early Edge CA, LA Area Chamber of Commerce, Options, San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council

Opposition: None listed

Summary:

This bill would make a number of amendments to the Education Code relating to child care and development services as follows:

- Recast the Child Care and Development Act as the Early Learning and Educational Support Act.

- Re-define center-based programs as “direct classroom programs” to serve children from birth to 13 years old including, but not limited to services for infants and toddlers, preschool age children, school age children and migrant children.
- Require the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to streamline the delivery of direct classroom programs through the simplification of contracts.
- Require that the Child Care Resource and Referral (R&Rs) and Alternative Payment (AP) Program agencies provide families with consumer education to help them make informed choices regarding early learning and support services. The R&Rs and APs would be required to provide the same information to families eligible to receive CalWORKs Child Care. The information is to include (but not limited to):
 - Information regarding how to select services that meets the needs of the parent and child.
 - Information on licensing requirements and procedures for centers and family child care homes.
 - Trustline requirements for homes and providers exempt from licensure.
 - A range of possible early learning and educational support options from which a parent may choose.
 - Information on available care subsidies and eligibility requirements.
 - Quality indicators, including provider or educator training, accreditation, staff stability, group size, ratio of children to staff, environments that support healthy development of children, parent involvement, and communication between parent and provider.
 - Information on quality rating and improvement systems, where available.
- Prioritize expansion funds to programs operating direct classroom services located in attendance areas of elementary schools ranked in deciles 1 to 3 of the Academic Performance Index (API).

The bill contains additional changes intended to reflect existing practices, including expanding the definition of migrant agricultural workers and specifying the minimum adult to child ratios to be maintained in direct classroom programs.

Analysis:

Recasting “child care and development” to “early learning and educational support”

Changing the name of the Act and references throughout from “child care and development” to “early learning and educational supports” reflects the growing knowledge about the value of high quality early learning environments for young children while preserving the provisions that promote families’ self-sufficiency through access to affordable services.

Direct classroom programs and consolidation of contracts

The State’s system of subsidized child care and development is comprised of multiple program types, including: General Child Development for infants and toddlers and school age children; the California State Preschool Program (CSPP), providing part-day services to three and four year old children; Migrant Child Care, serving children of agricultural workers; the Alternative Payment (AP) programs, a voucher-based system that allows families to select services among licensed programs as well as license-exempt providers (family, friend or neighbor); and Family Child Care Home Education Networks. The system is administered by the California

Department of Education/Child Development Division (CDE/CDD), which contracts directly with local organizations and school districts to directly serve children of eligible families. In Los Angeles County, 147 school districts and organizations hold contracts with the CDE/CDD to provide child care and development services to children from low-income families. The CDE/CDD also administers CalWORKs Child Care Stages 2 and 3.

Of the 129 organizations and school districts with center-based programs throughout Los Angeles County, 73 hold two (or more if they also administer, for example, a voucher-based contract such as the AP program) contracts with the CDE/CDD; the remaining 56 either have a single contract for General Child Development or for CSPP.

In 2008 then Governor Schwarzenegger approved AB 2759 (Chapter 308) to create CSPP, established to provide both full- and part-day services to prepare three and four year old children for kindergarten. The program consolidated five former child development programs – the preschool portion of General Child Care, part-day State Preschool, full-day State Preschool, part-day Prekindergarten and Family Literacy (PKFL), and full-day PKFL programs. CSPP provided organizations the flexibility to transfer funding between contract types and enabled them to offer a seamless delivery of services. One of the unintended consequences, however, was that organizations managing a single contract for serving children from birth to five years old, were now required to manage two contracts. The change not only doubled the management work associated with two distinct contracts, it also eliminated the flexibility that organizations were allowed to balance their budgets between the preschool and the more cost intensive infants and toddlers portions of their contract. A separate contract for serving infants and toddlers resulted in increased risk that organizations would not earn their full contract and would potentially have to return money to the State. SB 192 would expand upon the funding flexibility of AB 2759 to provide CDE/CDD-contracted organizations with continued flexibility and local control in order to serve families based on individual community needs.

Provision of consumer education to families

The CDE/CDD contracts with eight child care resource and referral (R&Rs) agencies covering distinct geographic areas of Los Angeles County; each of the R&Rs also holds an AP program contract along with four other agencies, including the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS). The R&Rs help families by assessing their needs for child care and development services, providing them with referrals to programs that are most likely to meet those needs, and offering a variety of support and educational services. Additionally, the R&Rs recruit and train prospective providers and offer ongoing professional development opportunities. Amendments to the Education Code would ensure that parents seeking referrals to child care and development programs, including families eligible for the AP program and CalWORKs Child Care, receive comprehensive consumer information that enable them to make informed decisions regarding high quality early learning and support services that support children's growth and development and contribute to school readiness. Currently, the Education Code provides very minimal guidelines for assisting families with their search. This bill would standardize and codify into law activities many of the R&Rs already perform and extend this level of service to families eligible for CalWORKs Child Care.

Allocation of expansion funds based on API rankings

The bill would require that when funding becomes available, priority be given to programs operating classrooms in the attendance area of elementary schools ranked in deciles 1 to 3, inclusive, of the Academic Performance Index (API). Existing Education Code requires the

CDE to disburse expansion funds for child care and development programs based on a formula approved by the SPI and used by the local child care and development planning councils (LPCs) to identify priorities for allocating funds to underserved areas. Priorities are determined by sub-county areas, including but not limited to zip codes, census tracts and school districts.

Concern has been raised by the field that reliance on rankings of elementary schools may limit funding to already saturated areas as is often the case with part-day State Preschool, while neglecting areas of high need in low-income neighborhoods where API scores are not between 1 and 3. Furthermore, decile rankings do not remain static. Stakeholders representing the LPCs and child care and development programs have been in discussions with the CDE regarding using the API rankings to augment rather than supersede the existing methodology for determining priority areas of need that are used to inform the allocation of expansion funds as they become available to ensure that funds are reaching communities with the greatest gaps for services. As of this writing, the CDE has drafted amendment language to this effect.

Recommended Position for Board Approval:

The Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable) recommends a position of “support” for SB 192 that, if passed, will reflect updated references from child care and development to early learning and education support, streamline center-based contracts, and ensure that parents receive consumer education that will help them make informed choices regarding high quality early learning and support services. With respect to the allocation of expansion funds based on API scores, the Roundtable and others will continue to work with the CDE on integrating this methodology with the existing formula for identifying communities of need as approved by the SPI. This position is consistent with County policies as follows:

1.3 Child Care and Development

1. Support efforts to enhance the quality of early care and education that set high standards for all services and program types and address the needs of all children, including those with disabilities and other special needs, and their families.

6. Support the streamlining of California Department of Education/Child Development Division (CDE/CDD) administrative processes to expand access for low-income families, ensure continuity of care, and promote flexible use of early care and education funding to meet the needs of families.

9. Support efforts to ensure that vulnerable children and their families have access to consistent, uninterrupted subsidized early care and education services.

Completed by: _____ Date: _____

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

COUNTY OFFICE OF LOS ANGELES/OFFICE OF CHILD CARE
OFFICE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

BILL ANALYSIS

SB 528 (YEE): DEPENDENTS: CARE AND TREATMENT: MINOR AND NONMINOR DEPENDENT PARENTS: Would amend certain sections of the Education Code relating to child care and development services and the Welfare and Institutions Code relating to dependents of child protective services. The bill has four primary objectives: 1) to give priority for subsidized child care and development services to parenting foster youth who have not completed high school; 2) to ensure that dependent minors, ages 12 years and older, understand and are able to exercise their rights to reproductive health care and are provided with age appropriate and medically accurate information; 3) to declare the intent of the Legislature to ensure that complete and accurate data is collected on minor and non-minor dependent parents and their children; and 4) to provide minor and non-minor dependent parents access to social workers or resource specialists trained on the needs of and available resources for pregnant and parenting dependent minors and non-minors and make available to the minors specialized conferences that inform the development of their case plan.

This analysis addresses the proposed amendment specific to subsidized child care and development services for dependent parenting minors and non-minors.

Introduced and Amended Dates:

Introduced: February 21, 2013
Amended: April 1, 2013
Amended: April 15, 2013
Amended: May 8, 2013

OCC Analyst:

Michele P. Sartell
(213) 974-5187

Status:

Senate Committee on Appropriations
Hearing: May 20, 2013

Sponsors:

Children's Law Center of California
Public Counsel
The John Burton Foundation
The Alliance for Children's Rights

Support:

Advancement Project, CA Alliance of Child & Family Services, CA Attorneys for Criminal Justice, CA Federation of Teachers, CA Public Defenders Assoc., CA Women's Law Center, Children's Advocacy Institute, Citizens for Choice, Dependency Legal Group of San Diego, East Bay Children's Law Offices, Every Child Foundation, Family Care Networks, Feminist Majority, First Place for Youth, Five Acres, GUC Berkeley Home Start, Larkin Street Youth Services, Legal Services for Children, National Center for Youth Law, St. Anne's, and more

Opposition:

CA ProLife Council, CA Right to Life Committee

Summary:

This bill would amend Section 8263 of the Education Code pertaining to the administration of subsidized child care and development services as follows:

- By adding parenting foster youth under 21 years of age as an eligibility criteria category for federal and state subsidized child development services.
- Would establish foster youth or non-minor dependent parents as a demonstrated need for subsidized services.
- Would provide a family in which one or both parents are foster youth or non-minor dependents under 21 years of age second priority enrollment as space becomes available. If two or more families are in the same priority in relation to income, the parenting foster youth or non-minor dependent parent shall receive a higher priority for admission.

In addition, it would amend Section 16002.5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code as follows:

- Would require child welfare agencies, local education agencies, and child care resource and referral agencies to make reasonable and coordinated efforts to ensure that minor parents and nonminor dependent parents who have not completed high school have access to school programs that provide onsite or coordinated child care and that minor dependent parents are given priority for subsidized child care.

Analysis:

Existing law provides that a family is determined eligible for subsidized child care and development services if they meet at least one of the following: a) a current aid recipient, b) income eligible, c) homeless, or d) child is recipient of child protective services or identified as being abuse, neglected or exploited, or at risk of being abused, neglected or exploited. The family meets the criteria of demonstrated need for child care and development services a) because the child is identified by a legal, medical, or social services agency, or emergency shelter as a 1) recipient of protective services or 2) being neglected, abused or exploited or at risk of neglect, abuse of exploitation, or b) because the parents are 1) engaged in vocational training leading directly to a recognized employment, paraprofession, or profession, 2) employed or seeking employment, 3) seeking permanent housing for family stability, or 4) incapacitated.

Priority for federal and state subsidized child care and development services is given first to neglected or abused children who are recipients of child protective services or are at risk of neglect or abuse as documented by a legal, medical or social services agency. Second priority is given equally to income eligible families beginning with granting admission first to families with the lowest gross monthly income in relation to family size. A child with exceptional needs is to be admitted first if two or more families are in the same priority related to income.

Currently, minor and nonminor dependent parenting teens are likely to meet the income eligibility¹ criteria and demonstrate a need for subsidized child care and development services

¹ The income eligibility cap for subsidized child care and development services is 70 percent of State Median Income (SMI).

as long as they have not yet graduated and are attending high school. While the income received by the foster parent on behalf of the parenting teen and her child will be counted as income in meeting the income eligibility criteria, it is usually low enough that the teen parent will be ranked within the lowest income categories.²

It is important to consider the issue of prioritizing populations for child care and development services from the perspective of the California Department of Education/Child Development Division (CDE/CDD)-contracted organizations. Most, if not all, CDE/CDD-contracted organizations maintain waiting lists from which to draw families as funding and space becomes available. To fully earn their contracts, organizations must maintain full enrollment and therefore notify families beginning with those identified as having priority and lowest income first of opportunities for enrollment as space becomes available. According to program operators, families with the highest ranking are also the most difficult to reach, either due to change of addresses and/or telephone numbers or failure to respond by the deadline. Furthermore, the families with the highest ranking or an established priority often lack the documentation (i.e. child's immunization record and birth certificate, verification of work or school) necessary to successfully enroll their child in a timely manner.

Administrative adaptations would be required at both the programmatic and contractor levels. Child care and development programs would need to change their applications to capture data specific to this added population as it would be reportable to the CDE/CDD. In turn, the CDE/CDD would need to change its reporting forms and database to track both the added eligibility category and information verifying demonstrated need. In addition, child protective services (i.e. the Department of Children and Family Services) would need to ensure that the parenting foster youth or non-minor dependent has the required documentation to verify eligibility as a priority population. Moreover, the young parent also needs to collect and maintain the documentation required to enroll his/her child.

Recommended Position for Board Approval:

The Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable) has not considered a position on SB 528. Based on a review by the Office of Child Care staff, we consider the proposed amendments to the Education Code relating to child care and development services as unnecessary given that currently minor and non-minor dependent parents are likely to receive a high ranking based on their limited income. Ultimately, creating priorities for additional populations should be accompanied by greater investments to ensure the availability of spaces. Regardless of priority, there is still no guarantee that the parenting dependent minors and non-minors will receive subsidized child care and development services because of the limited funding allocated for these services.

Alternatively, the Office of Child Care would encourage a system be put in place that would support the young parents in navigating the subsidized child care and development system including: identifying their need; seeking appropriate programs and adding their names to waiting lists; readiness to enroll and actual enrollment; and successful participation and compliance with the program once enrolled.

² There are 61 ranks adjusted for family size. All families within a rank have the same priority.

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 - 2013

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 6/11/13)
California Assembly Bills								
Watch	AB 41 (Buchanan)	<i>Expresses legislative intent to enact legislation to create the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2014, if approved by the voters, as a state general obligation bond act that would provide funds to school districts, county superintendents of schools, county boards of education, CA Community Colleges, CA State University, and University of CA, including Hastings College of the Law, to construct and modernize education facilities.</i>						Introduced: 12/7/12 Amended: 3/14/13 Amended: 4/1/13 Assembly Committee on Education
New	AB 241 (Ammiano)	Would regulate the wages, hours and working conditions of domestic work employees, including child care providers. Would require domestic work employers to secure payment of workers' compensation. Excludes from "Domestic Work Employee" persons exempt from licensing requirements if child care is subsidized per the Child Care and Development Act.	California Domestic Worker Coalition	Curtis Notsinneh 916.319.2017		ACLU, Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, CFT, CA Immigrant Policy Center, CA Labor Fed, AFL-CIO, CA NOW, CA Nurses Assoc/Natl Nurses Org Committee, CA Rural Legal Assistance Foundation, Coleman Advocates for Children & Youth, Coalition for Immigrant Rights, MALDEF, Nat'l Council of La Raza, and many, many more	CA Association for Health Services at Home, CA Chamber of Commerce, Home Care Association of America, Northern California Chapter, The Accredited Family of Home Care Services, and many more	Introduced: 2/6/13 Amended: 3/19/13 Amended: 5/24/13 In Senate Committee on Rules

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 6/11/13)
	AB 260 (Gordon)	Authorizes County of San Mateo to make permanent the individualized county subsidy plan developed as a pilot project and due to sunset 7/1/14. <i>From 7/1/16 to 7/1/18, the City and County of San Francisco would be required to phase out the individualized county child care subsidy plan and, beginning 7/1/18, implement the state's requirements for child care subsidies. As of 7/1/16, children enrolling for the first time for subsidized child care in the City and County of San Francisco (SF) shall not be enrolled in the pilot project. The City and County of SF is to submit a report summarizing the impact of the plan on child care needs of working families, evaluating the pilot project's operation between FY 2011-12 and FY 2013-14 and provide a recommendations on whether the pilot project should continue as a permanent program.</i>	San Mateo County Board of Supervisors, City & County of San Francisco	Ellen Hou 916.319.2024		CAPPA, CA Child Care Coordinators Association, CSAC, CWDA, SF Child Care Planning & Adv Council, San Mateo Co Child Care Partnership Council, San Mateo Co Office of Ed, Urban Counties Caucus		Introduced: 2/7/13 Amended: 4/24/13 In Senate Committee on Education Hearing: 6/19/13
1	AB 273 (Rendon)	Would enact the CA Partnership for Infants and Toddlers Act of 2013 and require the SPI by 3/1/14 to apply to the CA Children and Families Commission for funding from <i>moneys</i> received by the Commission pursuant to the California Children and Families Program. Funds to be used to make supplemental grants of \$2,500 <i>annually</i> per child available to qualifying general child care and development infant and toddler contracting agencies to provide enrolled children and families an array of support services.	Early Edge California (formerly Preschool California), California Child Development Administrators Association, ZERO TO THREE	Stacy Reardon 916.319.2063		CAPPA, Children Now, Fight Crime: Invest in Kids CA, Kidango, LA Area Chamber of Commerce, Options - A Child Care and Human Services Agency, Special Needs Network		Introduced: 2/7/13 Amended: 3/19/13 Amended: 4/8/13 Assembly Committee on Appropriations Suspense File

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 6/11/13)
1	AB 274 (Bonilla)	<p>Would require child care providers receiving payment under the Alternative Payment (AP) program to submit a monthly attendance record or invoice for each enrolled child. Record to document hours of care <i>provided based on need certified by the AP program. Monthly attendance record to include dates and times of attendance and require verification of attendance by single signature, under penalty of perjury, by both the parent or guardian of the child receiving the services and the child care provider. Specifies the meaning of "attendance" for reimbursement purposes. Expresses intent of Legislature to simplify attendance recording process.</i> Monthly attendance records as well as other records may be maintained in the original format or electronically. Payments to AP contractors may be made via direct deposit at the financial institution of the contractor's choice <i>on or after the date on which the SPI determines that the Financial Information System for California has been implemented.</i></p>	CAPPA, Northern Directors Group	Katie McCoy 916.319.2014		BANANAS, Child Care R&R of Northern Alameda County, Contra Costa Child Care Council, Family R&R Center of San Joaquin County, Solano Family & Children's Services, Valley Oak Children's Services		<p>Introduced: 2/11/13 Amended: 3/19/13 Amended: 4/10/13 Amended: 4/24/13 Amended: 5/24/13</p> <p>In Senate Committee on Rules</p>

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 6/11/13)
2	AB 290 (Alejo)	Would require director or teacher of child development center or family child care home to receive at least one hour of childhood nutrition training as part of the preventive health practices course(s). Content to include age-appropriate meal patterns based on the most current Dietary Guidelines for Americans. Training also to include information about reimbursement <i>rates</i> for the US Department of Agriculture's Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACF) <i>and direct providers to the CACFP Unit of the Nutrition Services Division of the CDE for detailed information on eligibility and enrollment.</i> Would become effective for licenses issued on or after 1/1/2015.	California Food Policy Advocates	Erika Bustamante 916.319.2030		Advancement Project, AFSCME, AFL-CIO, Bay Area Family Child Care Providers' Support Group, CFT, CA Pan-Ethnic Health Network (CPEHN), CTA, CA WIC Association, Child Care Food Program Roundtable. Children and Families Commission - First 5 San Bernardino, Choices for Children, Community Child Care Council (RC's) of Alameda County, Crystal Stairs, First 5 Fresno County, State Public Affairs Committee (SPAC)		Introduced: 2/11/13 Amended: 5/20/13 In Senate Committee on Human Services Hearing: 6/11/13
Watch	AB 308 (Hagman)	Would require school districts, county offices of education or charter schools to return to the State Allocation Board monies received from the state school facilities funding program for purchase, modernization or construction if selling or leasing their property unless it is leased or sold to a school district, county office of education or agency that will use the property exclusively for the delivery of child care and development services.		Curtis Raulinaitis 916.319.2055				Amended: 5/6/13 Amended: 5/20/13 In Senate Committee on Education Hearing: 6/19/13
1	AB 364 (Calderon)	Would require the CA Department of Social Services (CDSS) to conduct unannounced visits to licensed community care facilities, <i>inclusive of residential care facilities for the elderly</i> , no less than once every two years (an increase from the current once every five years).		Courtney Jensen 916.319.2057		CA Police Chiefs Association, CFPA, CWDA, LeadingAge CA		Introduced: 2/14/13 Amended: 4/1/13 Assembly Committee on Appropriations Held under submission

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 6/11/13)
	AB 391 (Wieckowski)	Would make technical, non-substantive changes to the law regarding denying, suspending or revoking a license. Amended to address pupil instruction/personal finance for grades 7-12.		Dharia McGrew 916.319.2025				Introduced: 2/15/13 Amended: 3/14/13
3	AB 547 (Salas)	Would add career exploration to list of possible activities that may satisfy the academic assistance element of the 21 st Century Community High School After School and Enrichment for Teens program. The strength of this element would be amongst criteria for selecting participating grantees. Defines career exploration as activities that help pupils develop the knowledge/skills relevant to their career interests and reinforce academic content.	Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI), Children Now, Partnership for Children and Youth	Marisol Jimenez 916.319.2032		Aspirant, Bay Area Community Resources, CA School-Age Consortium, CA State PTA, CTA, Children Now, Partnership for Children and Youth, Pro-Youth/HEART, THINK Together, and more		Introduced: 2/20/13 Amended: 4/11/13 In Senate Committee on Education Hearing: 6/12/13
3	AB 626 (Skinner & Lowenthal)	Would require After School Education and Safety (ASES) programs meals as well as snacks served to students conform to federal nutrition standards. Would allow food service expenses to be charged directly to the cafeteria account funds. Would specify food and beverages that may be sold to pupils before and after school. Amends provisions relating to food and beverages sold as part of fundraising event. <i>Additional amendments apply to expenditures for lease or purchase of cafeteria related equipment.</i>	SPI	Tony Bui 916.319.2015		CA Black Health Network, CA Chiropractic Association, CFPA, CA Optometric Association		Introduced: 2/20/13 Amended: 4/10/13 Amended: 4/23/13 Amended: 5/7/13 Amended: 5/15/13 In Senate Committee on Education Hearing: 6/19/13

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 6/11/13)
1	AB 641 (Rendon)	<i>Would authorize family child care providers to choose a provider organization to act as their exclusive representative on matters relating to benefits, grievances, payment procedures relating to child care subsidy programs, and more. Would also establish a Family Child Care Parent Advisory Committee to advise and make recommendations to the Governor and the provider organization.</i>	SEIU, AFSCME	Bill Wong 916.319.2063		California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO		Introduced: 2/20/13 Amended: 3/19/13 In Senate Committee on Rules
Watch	AB 646 (Cooley)	Would express intent of Legislature to affirm the employer-education partnership model of a regional P-20 council as a desired structure in CA to help align preschool, K-12, community college, 4-year college, and graduate and professional education programs and funding to advance strategic educational and economic outcomes.	NextEd	Brendan Repicky 916.319.2008				Introduced: 2/21/13 Assembly Committee on Education
	AB 760 (Dickenson)	Would re-fund the Early Mental Health Intervention (EMHI) that provides mental health services to children in kindergarten up to third grade via a tax on ammunition. <i>Amendments to findings and declarations.</i>	Children Now			CA Black Health Network, CA Council of Community MH Agencies, CA Immigrant Policy Ctr, CA Pan-Ethnic Health Network, CA School Health Ctrs Assoc, CA Tax Reform Assoc, Children's Advocacy Institute, CDF-CA, The Children's Partnership, Coalition Against Gun Violence, LA County Ed Foundation, LA Trust for Children's Health, and more.	CA Association of Firearms Retailers, CA Chapters of Safari Club Intern'l, CA Rifle and Pistol Assoc, CA Sportsman's Lobby, CA Waterfowl Assoc, NRA, Nat'l Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc., Outdoor Sportsmen's Coalition of CA, Shasta Co Sheriff Bosenko, State Bd of Equalization Member Runner, and more	Introduced: 2/21/13 Amended: 3/19/13 Assembly Committee on Revenue and Taxation Hearing: Cancelled

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 6/11/13)
1	AB 812 (Mitchell)	Would amend existing sections of the Education Code relating to contracts between the California Department of Education (CDE) and its contractors for child care and development services. Amendments would strengthen the regulations regarding termination and suspension and appeals. Would add to the Education Code, requiring the CDE to provide an appeal procedure to resolve a dispute between the CDE and a contracting agency. <i>Technical amendments.</i>	SPI	Elise Gyore 916.319.2054		AFSCME, CCALA		Introduced: 2/21/13 Amended: 4/22/13 Amended: 5/7/13 Amended: 5/15/13 In Senate Committee on Rules
Watch	AB 835 (Muratsuchi)	Would allow the Department of Housing and Community Development, with agreement from the borrower, to amend the terms of a loan to certain entities for the purchase, development, construction, expansion, or improvement of child care and development facilities or microenterprise loans made available to small or large family child care homes or licensed child care and development facilities serving up to 35 children.	Harbor City/Harbor Gateway Boys and Girls Club	Brett Williams 916.319.2066		Boys and Girls Club of the South Bay		Amended: 3/14/13 In Senate Committee on Human Services Hearing: 6/25/13
3	AB 1016 (Quirk-Silva)	Would require the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to issue a foreign language teaching credential for the sole purpose of providing foreign language instruction as part of an after school program voluntarily maintained by the school district. Would allow a high school pupil to demonstrate proficiency in one or more languages other than English, for purposes of the State Seal of Bilingualism award, by successfully completing four years of foreign language instruction from the credentialed person as part of the after school program.		Gina Frisby 916.319.2065				Introduced: 2/22/13 Assembly Committee on Education

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 6/11/13)
1	AB 1152 (Ammiano)	Would exempt the California School Age Families Education Program (Cal-SAFE) from any new education financing proposal that would eliminate categorical education programs beginning with the 2013-14 fiscal year and all subsequent fiscal years. Funding from school districts, charter schools and county offices of education selecting not to maintain or re-establish Cal-SAFE programs shall be restricted to expanding existing or establishing new Cal-SAFE programs.	California Child Development Administrators Association	Wendy Hill 916.319.2017		CA Family Resource Assoc, CDPI, Options, Planned Parenthood Affiliates of CA, Mar Monte & Pacific Southwest. PACE, SF Adolescent Health Working Group, Santa Barbara USD Cal-SAFE Program, Teen Success, many individual Cal-SAFE participants	California Association of School Business Officials, Riverside County Superintendent of Schools	Introduced: 2/22/13 Assembly Committee on Appropriations Held under submission
3	AB 1178 (Bocanegra)	Would establish the CA Promise Neighborhood Initiative to develop a system promise neighborhoods throughout the state to support children's development from cradle to career. Would specify services to be provided to the participating neighborhoods. CDE to designate 40 CA promise neighborhoods by January 1, 2016, selecting from applications that meet eligibility criteria and demonstrate that they will create a comprehensive, integrated continuum of solutions for community revitalization. <i>Amendments provide clarification and specificity to the requirements for selecting eligible entities and implementing a promise neighborhood award.</i>				Chula Vista Promise Neighborhood, Los Angeles Unified School District, Youth Policy Institute		Introduced: 2/22/13 Amended: 4/23/13 Assembly Committee on Appropriations Hearing: Cancelled

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 6/11/13)
1	AB 1187 (Mansoor)	Would require the CDSS to amend its foster care state plan to authorize the use of designated state child care and development funds administered by the CDE and ASES funds, in addition to county funds, as the nonfederal match for specified child care for children receiving child protective services, foster children, and children at risk of abuse and neglect.	County of Orange	Saulo Londono 916.319.2074	916.319.2074	County of Orange Board of Supervisors		Introduced: 2/22/13 Assembly Committee on Human Services
Watch	ACA 2 (Nestande & Olsen)	Assembly Constitutional Amendment resolution pertaining to the required apportionments of state aid to school districts, county offices of education, charter schools, and community college districts. <i>Technical amendment.</i>						Introduced: 12/18/12 Amended: 4/16/13 Assembly Committee on Education
New	ACR 45 (Weber)	Would urge the State Legislature, SPI and Governor to restore budget funding to early care and education programs and to support efforts to fund and implement a Quality Rating and Improvement System <i>and other programs that support</i> early care and education. In addition, would urge the legislature to commit to improving public understanding of the role that early care and education plays in securing an educated and stable workforce. Bill has a number of co-authors.		Crystal Quezada 916.319.2079		CAPPA, CCCRRN, CCALA, CCRC, Connections for Children, First 5 LA, KinderCare Learning Centers, LACOE, MAOF, and more		Introduced: 4/11/13 Amended: 5/2/13 Amended: 5/20/13 Amended: 6/10/13 Adopted by Assembly 5/20/13 Senate Floor
New	AJR 16 (Bonilla)	Would urge Congress to enact President Obama's budget proposal to increase funding for preschool and early learning. In addition, would urge the SPI to prepare a plan for making CA competitive for future increases in federal funding to preschool and early learning programs. <i>Amended version reflects added co-authors.</i>	Early Edge CA (formerly Preschool CA)	Katie McCoy 916.319.2014		CA County Superintendents Educational Services Association, CTA, CA School Employees Association		Introduced: 4/1/13 Amended: 5/6/13 Adopted by Assembly 5/1/13 Senate Floor

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 6/11/13)
California Senate Bills								
Spot bill	SB 154 (Berryhill)	Would make technical, non-substantive changes to the law regarding licensing of community care facilities.						Introduced: 1/31/13 Senate Committee on Rules
1	SB 192 (Liu)	Would recast the Child Care and Development Services Act as the Early Learning and Educational Support Act, and would establish as its intent for providing a comprehensive early learning and educational support system that promotes access to safe, high quality early learning and educational support programs. The bill would consolidate early education center-based contracts, prioritize expansion funds to programs operating direct classroom services located in attendance areas of elementary schools ranked in deciles 1 to 3 of the Academic Performance Index (API) and require that the Child Care Resource and Referral (R&Rs), and Alternative Payment Program agencies provide families with consumer education to help them make informed choices regarding early learning and support services. <i>Amendments included removing the requirement for the CDE to develop and post a certified list of high quality early learning and education support resources on their website,</i>	SPI	Darcel Sanders 916.651.4025		Advancement Project, CCDAA, CTA, CCLC, Child Development Resources, Children Now, Compton Unified School District, Early Edge CA, LA Area Chamber of Commerce, Options, San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council		Introduced: 2/7/13 Amended: 3/12/13 Amended: 4/3/13 Amended: 4/16/13 Amended: 5/28/13 In Assembly Held at Desk

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 6/11/13)
	SB 252 (Liu)	<p>Would authorize a pregnant woman to satisfy welfare to work provisions of Cal-WORKs by participating in a voluntary maternal, infant and early childhood home visitation program or another home visiting program for low-income Californians approved by the U.S. DHHS, subject to receipt of a federal waiver. Applicants and recipients of CalWORKs to be provided with information about paid family leave benefits, unemployment and pregnancy disability leave. Would require Employment Development Department to make certain training and information regarding paid family leave available to employees of the CDSS and county human services agencies.</p> <p>Further clarifies exemption from welfare to work activities due to pregnancy.</p>	Western Center on Law and Poverty			American Association of University Women (AAUW) CA, AFSME, CFL-CIO, Asian Law Alliance, Breastfeed LA, CA Association of Food Banks, CA Black Health Network, CA Catholic Conference, CA WIC Association, Lutheran Office of Public Policy – CA, Sacramento Housing Alliance		<p>Introduced: 2/12/13 Amended: 4/1/13 Amended: 4/15/13 Amended: 5/28/13</p> <p>In Assembly Held at Desk</p>
Watch	SB 301 (Liu)	Expresses intent of Legislature to enact legislation that would create the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2014 to authorize an unspecified sum of state general obligation funds to provide aid to school districts, county superintendents of schools, community colleges, the University of California, the Hastings School of Law, and the California State University to construct and modernize education facilities.						<p>Introduced: 2/15/13</p> <p>Senate Committee on Rules</p>

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 6/11/13)
3	SB 443 (Walters)	Would include "organized resident camp" and "organized day camp" within the definition of "organized camp". Would require the camps to provide written verification of accreditation by the American Camp Association or the Boy Scouts of America or develop a written operating plan and file the plan with the local health officer at least 30 days prior to operation of the camp. Would require camps to have adequate staff to operate the program including but not limited to <i>compliance with specified staff training and supervision regulations and a qualified program director present during operating hours of the camp.</i>	California Collaboration for Youth, California State Alliance of YMCAs	Michelle Clarke 916.651.4037		American Camp Association in CA, AstroCamp, Camp Fire, Catalina Island Camps, Inc., Catalina Island Marine Institute, Channel Islands YMCA, Tom Sawyer Camps, Tumbleweed Day Camp, Yosemite Sierra Summer Camp, YMCA of San Diego County, and more	CA Park and Recreation Society	Introduced: 2/21/13 Amended: 4/16/13 In Assembly Held at Desk
1	SB 464 (Jackson)	Would enact the Healthy Eating and Physical Activity Act and add it to the Child Care and Development Services Act. Would establish nutrition and physical activity standards for early childhood education, infant, and after school programs. Would express legislative intent to encourage all child care providers to implement educational programs that provide parents with physical activity and nutritional information relevant to the health of their children.	California State Alliance of YMCAs	Concepcion Tadeo 916.651.4019				Introduced: 2/21/13 In Senate Committee on Education

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 6/11/13)
1	SB 528 (Yee)	<p>Would amend Education Code by adding parenting foster youth under 21 years as an eligibility category for subsidized child development services and with a demonstrated need for the services. <i>A family in which one or both parents are foster or non-minor dependents under 21 years old to be given 2nd priority enrollment (in relation to income).</i></p> <p>Would require child welfare agencies, local education agencies, and R&Rs to make reasonable and coordinated efforts to ensure that minor and non-minor dependent parents who have not completed high school have access to school programs that provide onsite or coordinated child care and that minor parents are given priority for the services. Additional provisions proposed in the bill would 1) <i>authorize</i> a dependent minor's social worker, if the child is 12 years or older, to inform the minor of their rights to consent to and receive certain health services, including information on reproductive health care, 2) ensure that data is collected on pregnant and parenting minor and non-minor dependents and their children, and 3) <i>provide</i> minor and non-minor dependent parents with access to social workers or resource specialists trained in their needs and the available resources and that case plans are developed and updated through a team decision making process. Amendments clarify and further define the requirements relating to items 1-3.</p>	Children's Law Center of California, The John Burton Foundation, Public Counsel, Alliance for Children's Rights	Alicia Lewis 916.651.4008		<p>ACLU, Advancement Proj, Aspiranet, Bay Area Youth Ctrs, Black Women for Wellness, CA Adolescent Health Collaborative, CA Alliance of Child & Family Svcs, CAPP, CA Attorneys for Criminal Justice, CFT, CA Latinas for Reproductive Justice, CA Public Defenders Assoc., CA State PTA, CA Women's Law Center, Children's Advocacy Inst, Citizens for Choice, Crittenton Services for Children and Families, Dependency Legal Group of San Diego, East Bay Children's Law Offices, Every Child Foundation, Family Care Networks, Feminist Majority, First Place for Youth, Five Acres, GUC Berkeley Home Start, Larkin Street Youth Svcs, League of Women Voters, Legal Svcs for Children, NCYL, National Council of Jewish Women, Seneca Family Agencies, St. Anne's, UCSF Research Director, Janet Malvin, Ph.D., USC School of Social Work, WestCoast Children's Clinic, Youth & Family Progs, WCLP, and more</p>	CA ProLife Council, CA Right to Life Committee	<p>Introduced: 2/21/13 Amended: 4/1/13 Amended: 4/15/13 Amended: 5/8/13 Amended: 5/28/13</p> <p>In Assembly Committee on Human Services Hearing: 6/18/13</p>

Level of Interest	Bill Number (Author)	Brief Description	Sponsor	Contact	County Position	Support	Oppose	Status (As of 6/11/13)
New	SB 766 (Yee)	Would require staff of ancillary child care center to be: registered as a trustline provider. In addition, would require ancillary centers to comply with requirements relating to provider-child ratios, ensure the presence, at all times, of at least one provider who is 18 years or older, and ensure that at least one provider present at the center has received training in health and safety inclusive of pediatric first aid and cardiopulmonary resuscitation. (Ancillary centers are those that are ancillary to principal business activity (i.e. health club) and that provide day care services for the children of the clients or customers of the business.) <i>Technical amendments.</i>		Sara Rogers 916.651.1524				Amended: 4/1/13 Amended: 4/18/13 Amended: 4/25/13 Senate Committee on Appropriations Held under submission
Watch	SCA 3 (Leno)	Constitutional amendment that would allow a school district, community college district or county office of education, to impose, extend or increase a parcel tax upon approval of 55% of voters voting on the proposition. Currently, approval of 2/3 of the voters is required. <i>Amendment clarifies allowance of exemption to persons receiving public disability benefits whose annual income does not exceed 25 percent of the federal poverty level.</i>	California School Boards Association; California School Employees Association (CSEA), AFL-CIO			Assoc of CA School Admins; CA Assoc of School Business Officials; CA Coalition for Adequate School Housing; CA County Superintendents Educational Services Association; CFT, Small School Districts' Association; and many school districts	Apartment Assoc of Greater LA, Apartment Assoc CA Southern Cities, Assoc Builders & Contractors of CA, Association of CA Life, Health, & Insurance Cos; CA Ambulance Assoc, CA Apartment Assoc; and many more	Introduced: 12/3/12 Amended: 5/21/13 Committee on Elections & Constitutional Amendments Hearing: 6/18/13
California Budget Bills (including Trailer Bills)								
	AB 73 (Blumenfield)	2013-14 Budget						Introduced: 1/10/13
	AB 74-113 (Committee on Budget)	Budget Act of 2013 spot bills – pending content						Introduced: 1/10/13
	SB 65 (Leno)	2013-14 Budget						Introduced: 1/10/13
	SB 66-105 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review)	Budget Act of 2013 spot bills – pending content						Introduced: 1/10/13

To obtain additional information about any State legislation, go to 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 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 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	HHSA	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
CFPA	California Food Policy Advocates	MALDEF	Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund
CHAC	California Hunger Action Coalition	NASW	National Association of Social Workers
CIWC	California Immigrant Welfare Collaborative	NCYL	National Center for Youth Law
CSAC	California School-Age Consortium	PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric Company
CSAC	California State Association of Counties	SEIU	Service Employees International Union
CTA	California Teachers Association	SPI	Superintendent of Public Instruction
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:¹

Committee on Rules	Bills are assigned to a Committee for hearing from here.
Consent Calendar	A set of non-controversial bills, grouped together and voted out of a committee or on the floor as a package.
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.

¹ 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.

STATE LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR 2013 (Tentative)

Dec. 03, 2012	2013-14 Organizational Floor Sessions
Jan. 1, 2013	Statutes take effect (Art. IV, Sec. 8(c)).
Jan. 7, 2013	Legislature reconvenes (J.R. 51(a)(1)).
Jan. 10, 2013	Budget Bill must be submitted by Governor (Art. IV, Sec. 12(a)).
Jan. 21, 2013	Martin Luther King, Jr. Day observed.
Jan. 25, 2013	Last day to submit bill requests to the Office of Legislative Counsel.
Feb. 18, 2013	Presidents' Day observed.
Feb. 22, 2013	Last day for bills to be introduced (J.R. 61(a)(1), J.R. 54(a)).
Mar. 21, 2013	Spring Recess begins upon adjournment (J.R. 51(a)(2)).
Mar. 29, 2013	Cesar Chavez Day observed.
Apr. 1, 2013	Legislature reconvenes from Spring Recess (J.R. 51(a)(2)).
May 3, 2013	Last day for policy committees to meet and report to fiscal committees fiscal bills introduced in their house (J.R. 61(a)(2)).
May. 10, 2013	Last day for policy committees to meet and report to the floor nonfiscal bills introduced in their house (J.R. 61(a)(3)).
May. 17, 2013	Last day for policy committees to meet prior to June 3 (J.R. 61(a)(4)).
May. 24, 2013	Last day for fiscal committees to meet and report to the floor bills introduced in their house (J.R. 61(a)(5)). Last day for fiscal committees to meet prior to June 3 (J.R. 61(a)(6)).
May. 27, 2013	Memorial Day observed.
May. 28 - 31, 2013	Floor session only. No committee may meet for any purpose (J.R. 61(a)(7)). This deadline APPLIES TO ALL bills, constitutional amendments and bills which would go into immediate effect pursuant to Section 8 of Article IV of the Constitution (Art. IV, Sec. 8(c); J.R. 61(i)).
May 31, 2013	Last day for each house to pass bills introduced in that house (J.R. 61(a)(8)).
Jun. 3, 2013	Committee meetings may resume (J.R. 61(a)(9)).
Jun. 15, 2013	Budget Bill must be passed by midnight (Art. IV, Sec. 12(c)(3)).
Jul. 4, 2013	Independence Day observed.
Jul. 12, 2013	Last day for policy committees to meet and report bills (J.R. 61(a)(10)). Summer recess begins at the end of this day's session, provided the Budget Bill has been passed (J.R. 51(a)(3)).
Aug. 5, 2013	Legislature reconvenes from Summer Recess (J.R. 51(a)(3)).
Aug. 30, 2013	Last day for fiscal committees to meet and report bills (J.R. 61(a)(11)).
Sep. 2, 2013	Labor Day observed.
Sep. 3 - 13, 2013	Floor session only. No committees, other than conference committees and Rules Committee, may meet for any purpose (J.R. 61(a)(12)). This deadline APPLIES TO ALL bills, constitutional amendments and bills which would go into immediate effect pursuant to Section 8 of Article IV of the Constitution (Art. IV, Sec. 8(c); J.R. 61(i)).
Sep. 6, 2013	Last day to amend bills on the floor (J.R. 61(a)(13)).
Sep. 13, 2013	Last day for any bill to be passed (J.R. 61(a)(14)). Interim Recess begins upon adjournment (J.R. 51(a)(4)).
Oct. 13, 2013	Last day for Governor to sign or veto bills passed by the Legislature on or before Sept. 13 and in the Governor's possession after Sept. 13 (Art. IV, Sec. 10(b)(1)).

2014

Jan. 1	Statutes take effect (Art. IV, Sec. 8(c)).
Jan. 6	Legislature reconvenes (J.R. 51 (a)(4)).

This page intentionally blank

ADMINISTRATION FOR
CHILDREN & FAMILIES

<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/press/hhs-announces-actions-to-improve-safety-and-quality-of-child-care>

HHS announces actions to improve safety and quality of child care

May 16, 2013

Helping to answer President Obama's call to ensure quality early education for every American child, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) proposed today a new regulation for public comment that will better ensure children's health and safety in child care and promote school readiness. Under the proposed rule, states, territories and tribes would be required to strengthen their standards to better promote the health, safety and school readiness of children in federally funded child care.

Millions of working parents depend on child care and assume certain safety requirements are already in place for their children, but standards vary widely across the states. Many states do not enforce even basic standards such as fingerprinting, background checks and first aid training for providers. This puts our children at risk.

"Many children already benefit from the excellent care of high-quality child care providers who are meeting or exceeding the proposed requirements," said HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius. "However, too many children remain in settings that do not meet minimum standards of health and safety. These basic rules ensure that providers take necessary basic steps to shield children from an avoidable tragedy."

The proposed rule would only apply directly to child care providers who accept Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) funds. More than 500,000 providers serve about 1.6 million low-income children through CCDF. Many more children would benefit, however, because the providers also serve non-CCDF children.

Under the proposed rule, states would require that all CCDF-funded child care providers:

- Receive health and safety trainings in specific areas
- Comply with applicable state and local fire, health and building codes
- Receive comprehensive background checks (including fingerprinting)
- Receive on-site monitoring

The rule would also require states to share information with parents through user-friendly websites about provider health, safety and licensing information. While some states already post health and safety reports online, the new rule would bring all states up to this standard.

"Parents know the needs of their own children," said Shannon Rudisill, director of the Office of Child Care. "However, parents don't always have enough information to help them make the right choice when choosing

a child care provider. This proposal would give parents the necessary tools to choose quality care that fully meets their needs.”

While the proposed rule establishes new minimum standards, it also recognizes the need for innovation and flexibility and allows states and communities to tailor their specific approaches to best meet the needs of the children and families they serve. The rule would not change or impede a state’s ability to license child care providers as they see fit.

The administration continues to work with Congress to reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant, which was last reauthorized in 1996. This rule does not take the place of reauthorization, but rather proposes long overdue reforms to better ensure that low-income working families have access to safe, high-quality child care that is essential for healthy early childhood development.

HHS is requesting the public’s input on this proposed regulation. The comment process, which lasts for 75 days, allows for feedback on the proposed rule.

The proposed rule will be on public display today at <https://www.federalregister.gov/public-inspection> (<https://www.federalregister.gov/public-inspection>). Once it is published in the Federal Register, the public can view it and submit comment at: <http://www.regulations.gov/> (<http://www.regulations.gov/>).

For more information about HHS’ child care programs, please visit <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/occ> (<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/occ>).

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

June 4, 2013

Increasing Access to High-Quality Early Childhood Education in California

The President believes we need to equip every child with the skills and education they need to be on a clear path to a good job and the middle class. That education has to start in the earliest possible years to prepare our children for later success in school and in life. To ensure these opportunities are available to all, President Obama has put forward a comprehensive early learning proposal to build a strong foundation for success in the first five years of life. These investments – made in partnership with States and fully paid for in the President’s budget – will help close America’s school readiness gap and ensure that America’s children enter kindergarten ready to succeed:

- ***Providing High-Quality Preschool for All.*** In partnership with the States, President Obama’s Preschool for All proposal would provide every four-year-old child with access to high-quality preschool, while also incentivizing States to adopt full-day kindergarten policies. Providing a year of free, public preschool for every child is an important investment in our nation’s future, providing our children the best start in life while helping hard-working families save thousands each year in costs associated with early care and education. This proposal would invest \$75 billion over 10 years without adding a dime to the deficit.

Under the President’s proposal, California is estimated to receive \$334,300,000 in the first year it participates in the Preschool for All program. This funding, combined with an initial estimated state match of \$33,400,000, would serve about 40,857 children from low- and moderate-income families in the first year of the program alone.*

- ***Investing in High-Quality Infant and Toddler Care.*** In order to increase high-quality early learning opportunities in the years before preschool, a new \$1.4 billion competitive Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership grant program would support communities that expand the availability of early learning opportunities with child care providers that meet high Early Head Start quality standards, growing the supply of high-quality child care for children from birth through age 3.

About 39,400 children in California from birth to age three are currently served by the Child Care and Development Block Grant. Through Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships, more of these children will have access to high quality early care and education.

- ***Expanding Effective Parent and Family Support.*** Quality education begins at home as parents support their child’s learning and development. As part of a comprehensive early learning agenda, the President proposes \$15 billion over 10 years to extend and expand voluntary home visiting programs. These programs allow nurses, social workers, parent educators, and other professionals to connect families to services, supports, and tools that positively impact the health, development, and education of their children.

Under the President’s proposal, California is estimated to receive \$20,900,000 in the first year it participates in the expanded Home Visiting program. Each year, 138,337 low-income mothers in California give birth to a new baby and may benefit from these voluntary services.**

* These figures estimate the funds a State could receive in the first year if it chooses to participate in the Preschool for All program. The estimate is based on the State’s current population of four-year-olds in families at or below the 200 percent federal poverty level. Estimates will vary based on the scope of the State’s preschool expansion and the cost of providing high-quality preschool services.

This estimate assumes that States will expand to 20 percent of their eligible four-year-olds in the first year at a per child cost of \$9,000 a year. The federal share of the total cost is calculated at 90 percent, which is the regular match rate the State would receive in the first year. Please note that this estimate is designed to be illustrative only and does not attempt to represent how the Department of Education would determine actual first year awards.

** This figure estimates the funds a State could receive in the first year of an expanded Home Visiting program. The estimate assumes \$15 billion of total funding over 10 years and assumes the same proportion of total funding is allocated for statutory set-asides, formula and competitive grants as in FY 2012 and States received an equal amount of competitive funding. Please note that this estimate is designed to be illustrative only and does not attempt to represent actual first year awards. The methodology and criteria for funding allocations beyond FY 2014 has not yet been determined.

California could get \$350 million for preschool under federal proposal

June 4th, 2013 | [10 Comments](#) |

By [Lillian Mongeau](#)

0



A boy paints at an easel set up in his state-funded preschool classroom in East Palo Alto. March 2013. Credit: Lillian Mongeau, EdSource Today

California could nearly double its spending on public preschool with an influx of federal funding if the president's proposal to significantly increase the money available for early childhood programs passes Congress, according to **data released by the U.S. Department of Education** on Tuesday.

Since President Barack Obama's **State of the Union address in January**, early learning has become the centerpiece of the administration's education policy agenda. The president has proposed a federal program, funded by an increased tobacco tax, that would partner with states to expand access to and quality of public preschool programs for low- and moderate-income 4-year-olds. The program would also provide funding for expanded infant and toddler care. Both initiatives would cost \$75 billion in new early learning funds over the next decade.

If approved for participation in the Preschool for All program, California would be eligible for an additional \$334 million in federal preschool funding with a required state match of \$33.4 million, according to federal estimates. The U.S. Department of Education estimates that this would allow the state to serve an additional 41,000 children. The department did not specify if these children would be served by a full- or half-day program. In 2011-2012, California spent \$386 million to provide half-day state preschool to more than 200,000 children.

The information released Tuesday offers the first glimpse at what individual states could expect to receive under the president's proposal – which faces significant obstacles in a fractured Congress. The funding estimate is based on a state's current population of 4-year-olds in families living at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty line, or \$47,100 annually for a family of four. California ranks near the top of all states on that measure, with nearly 1.4 million qualifying 4-year-olds, **according to Children Now**, a national organization advocating for more public funding for children's issues.

The current state program is not fully funded. Only about half of eligible 4-year-olds are enrolled, said Deborah Kong, the federal policy analyst at Early Edge California, an advocacy organization focused on increasing services for children from infants to age 8. “We’re not even serving the number of kids who are eligible,” she said. “Any sort of dent we can make in that 50 percent would be huge.”

The president’s proposal, called Preschool For All, would make another \$20.9 million available to California for home-visiting programs. The programs send nurses, social workers or other professionals to the homes of low-income parents of infants and toddlers to teach parents about early language acquisition, nutrition and safe sleeping habits.

States would not be required to accept the federal money or participate in the program, and questions remain over how it would be implemented.

The president’s proposal requires states to put up some matching funds to qualify for federal preschool money, and it’s not clear if the money California currently spends on preschool programs would count toward the state’s match. Nor is it clear if California’s current state preschool program will meet the quality standards the federal government plans to require from states receiving funding. Roberto Rodriguez, the president’s adviser on education, said Tuesday that he could not yet comment on upcoming legislation that might clarify these issues.

The administration did outline the quality standards states must meet in order to participate in the Preschool for All program in a **budget justification document** sent to Congress in mid-April. California’s state preschool program currently meets about half of the quality requirements, so it is difficult to tell if the state would qualify for participation in the program in year one. The administration estimates that only 12 to 15 states will meet the standards initially. The budget request also calls for competitive grants to help states bring their programs into compliance and to begin to receive their portion of the Preschool for All money.

U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan said Tuesday that spending money on early childhood education is “an investment, not an expense.” The proposed expansion of publicly funded preschool is expected to be hotly debated when legislation attempting to enact the president’s plan reaches the floor of the House and Senate later this summer. The proposal would increase the federal tax on tobacco products from \$1.01 to \$1.95 per pack.

This story was updated on June 5, 2013 at 12:13 p.m.

Going deeper

- **Fact sheets** from the U.S. Department of Education estimating how much money states are likely to receive under the proposed expansion
- **New America Foundation report** on the administration’s outline of quality standards for states wishing to participate in Preschool for All.
- EdSource coverage of **Obama’s proposed expansion** of early learning programs

First 5 LA Welcomes You To a Panel Discussion On President Obama's Early Childhood Education and Home Visitation Vision for Children: Opportunities and Implications for California

Friday, June 14th

9:30 am-11:30 am

(Registration and refreshments at 9 am)

Location

First 5 LA, 750 N. Alameda St., Los Angeles

- How do investments in early childhood education and home visitation programs help close achievement gaps and improve children's health outcomes?
- What must California do to support and be prepared for President Obama's plan?
- What are the policy opportunities and barriers to restoring and expanding quality early childhood education?
- How can First 5 County Commissions' investments in early education and home visitation be leveraged to support the vision presented in the President's plan?

• **Welcome**
• **Kim Belshé**
• **Executive Director**
• **First 5 LA**

• **Moderator**
• **David Johns**
• **Executive Director**
• **White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for African Americans**

• **Panelists**
• **Linda Asato**
• **Executive Director**
• **California Child Care Resource and Referral Network**

• **Moira Kenney, Ph.D**
• **Executive Director**
• **First 5 Association**

• **Deborah Daro, Ph.D**
• **Senior Research Fellow, Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago**



To RSVP, please register at First5LAJune14.eventbrite.com For more information, please email mgutierrez@First5LA.org. Space is limited so please RSVP right away.

First 5 LA is located adjacent to Union Station, just opposite the Metropolitan Water District Building. There is no validated parking, although a number of parking lots are available. Attendees are encouraged to use public transportation (both the Red and Gold Line trains terminate at Union Station).

**FIRST 5
LA**

Champions For Our Children
www.First5LA.org