



## Policy Roundtable for Child Care

Friday, November 12, 2010

10:00 a.m. – Noon

Conference Room 743

Hahn Hall of Administration

500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles



### Proposed Meeting Agenda

- |       |    |  |  |
|-------|----|--|--|
| 10:00 | 1. | Welcome and Introductions  | Terri Chew Nishimura<br>Chair          |
|       | a. | Comments from the Chair  |  |
|       | b. | Review of October 13, 2010 Minutes   | <b>Action Item</b>                     |
| 10:15 | 2. | Strengthening Families Leadership Summit:<br>Reflections and Comments from Participants  | Terri Chew Nishimura                   |
| 10:30 | 3. | Updating the Policy Framework for Child Care   | Jacquelyn McCroskey                    |
|       |    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discussion</li></ul>   |  |
| 11:15 | 4. | Policy Framework Objective: Identify opportunities for Los Angeles County to promote collaboration among service providers and advocates on behalf of needed legislative or regulatory changes   |  |
|       |    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Activity Related to Stage 3 Child Care</li></ul>   | Adam Sonenshein<br>Michele Sartell     |
| 11:30 | 5. | Updates  |  |
|       | a. | Update on Selected Proposals Presented to First 5 LA Commission  |  |
|       |    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ First 5 LA – East Los Angeles College Child Care Providers</li><li>○ Data Partnership</li><li>○ Improving Nutritional &amp; Physical Activity Environment in Child Care Settings</li><li>○ Early Care &amp; Education Workforce Initiative</li><li>○ Data Collection Plan for Countywide Advocacy and Planning</li></ul> | Jacquelyn McCroskey<br><br>Randi Wolfe |
|       | b. | Planning for Educare   | Whit Hayslip<br>Ruth Yoon              |
| 11:50 | 5. | Announcements and Public Comment   | Members & Guests                       |
| 12:00 | 6. | Call to Adjourn  |  |

#### Mission Statement

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

This page intentionally blank



## **Policy Roundtable for Child Care**

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

### **MEETING MINUTES**

**October 13, 2010  
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.  
Conference Room 743  
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration  
500 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, California**

---

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

##### **a. Comments from the Chair**

Ms. Terri Chew Nishimura, Chair of the Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable), opened the meeting at 10:15 a.m. Members and guests introduced themselves.

##### **1) Welcome to New Members**

Ms. Nishimura relayed that Ms. Reynolds served two terms as chair of the Child Care Planning Committee, from 2008-2010. With the adoption of the Committee's 2010-11 membership slate, Ms. Reynolds term as chair ended and Ms. Bobbie Edwards was elected as Chair of the Committee. On October 5, 2010, the Board of Supervisors appointed Ms. Edwards to the Roundtable.

On October 12, 2010, the Board of Supervisors appointed Mr. Adam Sonenshein as the Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP) representative. Mr. Sonenshein replaces Dr. Celia Ayala.

Ms. Nishimura welcomed the new members and extended her deep appreciation to the contributions made by both Ms. Reynolds and Dr. Ayala. Ms. Nishimura added that they should expect the Roundtable to enlist their help as needed!

##### **2) Strengthening Families Leadership Summit**

Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu referred members to their meeting packets for a copy of the Save the Date flyer for the Strengthening Families Leadership Summit scheduled for November 10, 2010. Participation in the event is by invitation only, however she asked for names of anyone interested in attending to let her know so that they may be invited as space allows. Persons representing networks will be encouraged to take back and share the knowledge gained at the summit with other systems in the county.

Because the event conflicts with the Roundtable meeting and a number of members have been asked to participate and serve as panelists, the November meeting of the Roundtable has been rescheduled to Friday, November 12, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. The meeting will be held at the Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration in Room 743.

### 3) Comments on the State Budget

Ms. Nishimura noted that the Governor has signed the state budget for 2010-11. Due to some significant cuts in child care and development, some members and guests are not in attendance as they are addressing service reductions and staff layoffs. The cuts are very deep and very serious! Ms. Nishimura deferred a further conversation to later in the agenda.

#### **b. Review of September 8, 2010 Meeting Minutes**

*Ms. Connie Russell made a motion to approve the minutes; Mr. Whit Hayslip seconded the motion. The minutes were approved on a unanimous vote.*

## **2. POLICY FRAMEWORK OBJECTIVE**

*Identify opportunities for Los Angeles County to promote collaboration among service providers and advocates on behalf of needed legislative or regulatory changes.*

#### **a. State Budget Update**

Mr. Adam Sonenshein reported that the budget for 2010-11 was passed by the legislature on Friday. The Governor line item vetoed CalWORKs Stage 3 effective November 1, 2010, which means lots of families will be without child care while working and attending school. Other notable cuts are:

- Fifty percent reduction to the Local Planning Councils (LPCs). According to Ms. Malaske-Samu, the LPC contract for Los Angeles County is critical to the operations of the Office of Child Care; as of the meeting, she was not sure whether the budget reduction would have staff implications.
- Approximately 21 percent cut to the Child Care Recruitment and Retention Programs. For Los Angeles County, this means that the Investing in Early Educators Program stipend amounts paid to early educators completing college coursework are likely to be reduced significantly. Consequent to the LPC and Stipend Program cuts, Ms. Malaske-Samu stated that the Office of Child Care will need to identify at least \$200,000 to keep afloat as is.
- Cuts to quality improvement activities based on the recommendation of the Legislative Analyst's Office to align with the federal Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) requirements. California spends a larger percentage of its CCDBG funds on quality improvement activities than required by federal law.
- A reduction in the reimbursement rates paid to license-exempt providers.
- A reduction in the Alternative Payment allowances for administration from 19 to 17.5 percent of their total budgets.
- Child development centers will have their reserves capped at five percent.
- The Governor vetoed augmentations to staffing for the Early Learning Advisory Committee.

Advocacy efforts in response to the elimination of CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care are moving quickly. Ms. Adela Arellano of the Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles (the Alliance) announced that the Alternative Payment (AP) Program agencies have begun sending Notices of Action to families informing them that their subsidized child care will end as of October 30, 2010. The AP Program agencies also are preparing to layoff approximately 400 staff countywide.

Community Voices is organizing parents to visit their legislators and participate in a rally on Friday, October 15, 2010. The Alliance and the AP Program agencies have been participating in conference calls with the California Department of Education/Child Development Division (CDE/CDD) to clarify issues. In addition, the Alliance and others are exploring how to best help families connect with other services and collect data. They are partnering with Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP) to explore transitioning families with four year olds, looking at strategies to track the number of families that may return to CalWORKs, and urging families to register on the Los Angeles Centralized Eligibility List (LACEL). Ms. Michele Sartell mentioned that families losing their Stage 3 Child Care will not receive the continuity of care priority; several members and guests find this a troubling change in CDE/CDD's position.

The long term strategy is to advocate for the reinstatement of CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care. According to Mr. Sonenshein, elected officials plan to start working on the budget upon the swearing in of new members.

Mr. Hayslip announced that Friday at LAUSD is called norm day when LAUSD accounts for the spaces available in all of its centers. After Friday, LAUSD will have a list of where spaces are available for children under five years old. Ms. Younglove stated that all of the Head Start Programs are required to have their programs fully enrolled by October 30<sup>th</sup>, although a small number may have openings after that date.

#### **b. Los Angeles County Legislative Agenda - 2011-12**

Mr. Sonenshein directed members and guests to their meeting packets for copies of the recommendations for the County's State and Federal Legislative Agendas for the coming year.

Next, Mr. Sonenshein reported on bills that were signed into law:

- Senate Bill 1831 (Simitian) incrementally moves the kindergarten start date up and creates transition kindergarten programs. Mr. Hayslip said the true impact of the bill will be experienced a year from this fall. Districts need to be ready to accept children, and that includes having guidelines in place. He added that there is some confusion in the child care community that school districts will be taking children away from their programs. This is not the case as these are children who already would have left to enter kindergarten. LAUSD has 36 pilots up and running with the help of a Packard grant. LAUSD has also tapped into the resources of Dr. Linda Espinoza and Dr. Carola Matera, experts in dual language learning to help facilitate their strong language approach. The Boeing Corporation is underwriting LAUSD's parent engagement piece. A year from next fall, LAUSD anticipates 4,000 children with November birthdates, resulting in a need for 175 classrooms, and then ramping to 500 classrooms by 2013. This is a big jump from their current pilot. LAUSD is developing curriculum materials, which are being considered as a model for districts across the state.

- Senate Bill 1440 (Padilla) will improve articulation between the community colleges and four year colleges.
- Assembly Bill 2084 (Brownley) makes changes to the beverages served in child development programs. This bill implements some of the positive changes that were made to beverages served in schools.

Mr. Hayslip suggested that an opportunity exists for school districts to use their Title 1 funds for early childhood; however, to make this happen would require external pressure. He mentioned that the Chicago Public Schools ended Title 1 programs that were not working and then redirected their funds to early care and education. The Sacramento County Office of Education also has done some work around using Title 1 funds for early childhood. The Joint Committee on Legislation volunteered to study efforts underway and develop advocacy strategies and guidelines on how local school districts could use the funds to serve their communities. Ms. Malaske-Samu asked Ms. Younglove if the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) could assist in raising awareness on how funds are used across the county and point out local examples of where there has been success.

### **3. UPDATING THE POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR CHILD CARE**

Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey distributed two items: *From Silos to Systems: Connecting Child Development and County Sponsored Services* and a draft document entitled *Updating the Child Care Policy Framework*. The documents will help guide the work of the County Department/Child Development Collaborative Committee on framing the next iteration of the Policy Framework, including reflecting the work of how County departments are implementing the Strengthening Families Approach philosophy. Dr. McCroskey acknowledged the important contributions of Mr. Michael Gray and Ms. Charlotte Lee, representatives from the Departments of Children and Family Services (DCFS) respectively, and the relatively new involvement of the Probation Department and Department of Mental Health.

Dr. McCroskey mentioned that the first ever policy framework on child care and development was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in January 2009. *From Silos to Systems* summarizes the initiatives and accomplishments to date as reported at the retreat. The policy framework is scheduled for an update in two years, so now is the time to discuss next steps. Dr. McCroskey, Ms. Terry Ogawa, Ms. Malaske-Samu and Ms. Sartell recently met with Mr. Nicolas Ippolito, Deputy to Supervisor Don Knabe, to explore the presentation of the revised policy framework to the Board of Supervisors upon completion. Mr. Ippolito relayed that Supervisor Knabe would be happy to carry the motion and support a public discussion on the item. Supervisor Knabe also supports expansion of the Roundtable to include representatives from the Department of Mental Health and Probation.

Dr. McCroskey stated the question: What is the next iteration of the policy framework that the Roundtable would like to see the Board of Supervisors adopt? She suggested that the work build upon existing efforts and define the work ahead that represents conversations across departments. She suggested identifying two to three major policy areas that relate to more than one department. Dr. McCroskey invited members and guests to submit ideas for the committee to consider and join in the work that will look at how to integrate activities. In the context of the budget cuts, she mentioned that half of the children in the county come to the attention of at least one County department each year.

Member and guest comments:

- Mr. Gray noted that a preliminary analysis of the 467 child deaths from 2008-10 found that 37 percent of the children were in the age range of birth to two years old. He wondered how many of the children may have been enrolled in an early care and education program and, if not, how many deaths may have been prevented. Mr. Gray has been meeting with the DCFS leadership to discuss integrating the Strengthening Families Approach into their in daily work. Specific to internal support programs, Mr. Gray would like to see the information integrated into their service objectives. Dr. McCroskey asked if it would be possible to glean information on whether and the type of early care and education programs the families may have participated in.
- Mr. Hayslip expressed his support for connecting families with high quality services, but noted that the services are not readily available. He suggested exploring how to partner with County departments to maximize resources, beginning with identifying the resources and making the connections. Dr. McCroskey acknowledged the need for two-way connections and shared her thoughts around partnering between the Los Angeles Unified School District's (LAUSD) Saturday clinics and the Department of Mental Health's contractors funded to provide mental health services as an example. Mr. Hayslip added that he has been meeting with representatives of Magnolia Place and the Early Development Screening and Intervention Initiative to explore co-locating services. He emphasized the importance of relationship-building.
- Ms. Malaske-Samu stated that a revised Policy Framework needs to be presented to the Board of Supervisors in January 2011. The November meeting will be devoted to the Policy Framework. In the meantime, a meeting of the County Department/Child Development Collaborative will be scheduled. She also will ask to be on Child Care Planning Committee agenda.

#### 4. UPDATES

##### a. Steps to Excellence Project (STEP)

Ms. Helen Chavez announced the following:

**Enrollments:** 480 applications to join STEP were received during the summer. Most of the applicants were outside of the pilot communities. Official enrollment is at 370. STEP has rated 165 programs to date and should hit 200 by December. STEP will continue to rate programs through June 2011.

**Recognitions:** STEP has received awards from the National Association of Counties, the California Association of Counties, and the Los Angeles County Quality and Productivity Commission.

**Evaluation:** Ms. Malaske-Samu has leveraged \$38,000 for a process evaluation of STEP. The Request for Qualifications will be released this month.

**Sustainability:** STEP's primary funders are First 5 LA, the Board of Supervisors and the CDE/CDD. In addition, LAUSD is using Title 1 funds to pay STEP for program ratings. STEP is seeking additional funding from First 5 LA to expand the pilot into the 14 place-based communities and pay for a full-time equivalent trainer. Another potential source of funds may be the money that the Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC) will use to fund pilot quality

rating systems across the state. Ms. Chavez is finalizing the STEP report and will soon have an executive summary to share with the ELAC.

**Staffing:** On a personal note, Ms. Chavez announced that she accepted a promotion within the Service Integration Branch (SIB) to work with the Education Coordinating Council. She expressed her pleasure in serving the Roundtable, stating that she has learned so much and is grateful for their contributions to STEP. In her new role, Ms. Chavez hopes to collaborate around connecting children to early care and education and helping those transitioning from the child welfare and juvenile justice systems.

b. Statewide Planning Efforts

Ms. Younglove distributed excerpts from the application that was submitted to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services on behalf of ELAC. She noted that the October meeting has been rescheduled to November 30. She briefly walked members and guests through the objectives of the grant that includes rolling out a quality rating and improvement system pilot project. The materials also include a list of the ELAC members. Once the money is committed, there may be some changes as ELAC refines the plan with more specificity. There is a state match requirement, which is listed on the last page of the handout.

c. Bridge Funding for CDE/CDD-contracted Programs

Ms. Laura Escobedo was asked to give an update on the plan for bridge funding to address future state budget delays. Ms. Escobedo reminded members that at the previous meeting there was a discussion on the need to develop a mechanism to assist CDE/CDD-contracted child development programs when faced with budget delays. She mentioned that Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Head Start made a request to First 5 LA for funding to assist their State Preschool Programs during the budget impasse. At that meeting, First 5 LA agreed to make a staff person available to participate in local efforts to establish a bridge funding mechanism. Ms. Escobedo has been working on this issue with representatives from the California Community Foundation and the Los Angeles Preschool Advocacy Initiative.

Ms. Escobedo stated that with the immediate crisis for passing of the budget now over, the focus is on issuing the allocations as quickly as possible. Given the data collected from contractors during the budget delay, easily a third of the 150+ contracts were significantly impacted, resulting in closed classrooms and/or sites. Now there are questions on whether programs will fully earn their contracts. In the meantime, work is underway to look at creating a bridge/loan fund. The goal is to have something to present by late spring. Ms. Escobedo concluded her comments by remarking on a ballot initiative that would, if passed, require a majority to pass the state budget. If the initiative passes, it may change the need to establish a local fund. Only three states require a two-thirds majority to pass a budget.

d. First 5 LA

Ms. Malaske-Samu reported that the First 5 LA Commission is scheduled to meet Thursday, October 14<sup>th</sup>. A number of Commissioners are introducing motions to augment First 5's countywide proposals. Ms. Nancy Au and Ms. Angie Stockwell will be introducing a motion to expand the countywide investment in the early childhood workforce. This proposal was developed by Ms. Randi Wolf at LAUP; Mr. Dennis has worked closely with the Commission members to craft a motion that will be successful and will provide a sizable investment in the

local early childhood workforce. The proposal is comprehensive and broad in vision and is designed to bring folks together.

The proposal includes six components:

- 1) Expand the LAUP stipend program to include persons working in programs other than LAUP.
- 2) Support the Child Care Resource and Referral (R&R) Agencies Gateway program, which provides training for license and license exempt providers, a Web based training calendar, and contracts courses with community colleges.
- 3) Support STEP expansion into all 14 Best Start communities, including training, technical assistance, and coaching in conjunction with the R&Rs Gateway program.
- 4) LACOE - Division of School Improvement
- 5) Higher Education – Teacher Quality Partnership
- 6) Workforce Initiative – Early Care and Education

The ask is for a substantial amount of money. Ms. Malaske-Samu hopes to report on the results of the proposal at the November or December meeting of the Roundtable. While the proposal is listed as an action item on the Commission agenda, typically items are presented in the first month and then voted upon in the next month. The goal is to push money out the door quickly, but still follow the process for public vetting and more. Ms. Malaske-Samu noted that there are lots of proposals on the agenda.

e. Planning for Educare

Mr. Hayslip announced that dates are scheduled for visits and exploration of Educare in Chicago and Omaha. The Chamber of Commerce and Compact LA are providing assistance and support. The Packard and Buffett foundations have awarded the planning grant. Technical assistance is needed for convening groups; Ms. Ogawa has agreed to handle the planning and convening process.

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

- LACOE Head Start is hosting a large resource fair in Exposition Park on November 23, 2010. Several vendors will provide on-site services, including flu shots by the Department of Public Health. Two thousand people are expected to attend. The fair is open to low income families with preschool children.
- First 5 LA is hosting a panel discussion on childhood obesity on November 8, 2010 from 8:30 to 10:30 a.m.
- First 5 LA has hired Ms. Carol Baker as its new Policy Department Director. Ms. Baker previously worked in Public Affairs. Ms. Kate Sachnoff said they are recruiting for three positions at the senior and junior analyst levels.

## **6. CALL TO ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 12 p.m.

**Commissioners Present:**

Ms. Bobbie Edwards  
Mr. Michael Gray  
Mr. Whit Hayslip  
Ms. Charlotte Lee  
Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu  
Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey  
Ms. Terri Chew Nishimura  
Ms. Connie Russell  
Mr. Adam Sonenshein  
Ms. Mika Yamamoto  
Ms. Ruth Yoon  
Ms. Sarah Younglove

**Guests:**

Ms. Adela Arellano, Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles  
Ms. Leila Espinoza, UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families & Communities  
Ms. Terry Ogawa, Education Coordinating Council  
Ms. Holly Reynolds, Fairplex Child Development Center  
Ms. Kate Sachnoff, First 5 LA

**Staff:**

Ms. Helen Chavez  
Ms. Laura Escobedo  
Ms. Michele Sartell

**Laundry List of Potential Recommendations**  
**For discussion and prioritization at the 11/12/10 Roundtable Meeting**

The following is a very long list of possible recommendations and strategies or activities that could be incorporated into the next iteration of the Child Care Policy Framework. Please review the whole list. It is organized by the Protective Factors – which will make a bit more sense in the context of the whole document.

The recommendations are in purple and will clearly benefit from further massaging... Possible implementation strategies follow each recommendation. Please review both the recommendations and the strategies. Our discussion on Friday will involve prioritizing and eliminating items so that the “laundry list” becomes a focused list of goals and strategies that are ambitious but achievable over the next two years. As you consider the list – please also think about who our partners will need to be.

The following recommendations are put forth for adoption so that the innovative work to connect families receiving County services to high quality child development services begun in 2009 can continue and expand.

**1. Provide concrete support to families in times of need**

- a. Los Angeles County shall advocate for comprehensive services for children and families at the local, State and Federal level.

*Possible strategies:*

- i. Working w/, CEO/SIB, OCC or Roundtable (?) LAC CEO IGA will enlist public and private sector partners to aggressively advocate for the continuation and/or expansion of funding for high quality, comprehensive services which ensure the safety of children, their optimal development and strong families.
1. Direct service funds
    - a. the 111 Congress
      - i. Reauthorization of Federal Child Care and Development Block Grant, Head Start and Early Head Start
    - b. Beyond 111 Congress
      - i. Title 1
      - ii. IDEA
    - c. State funding
      - i. California Department of Education funding
      - ii. Cal WORKs child care & family support
      - iii. Community Care Licensing
      - iv. CA ELAC
  2. Infrastructure support
    - a. Federal - Early Learning Challenge Fund
    - b. CDE- Child Care Planning, Investing in Early Educators
  3. Other resources – IGR may not be involved
    - a. First 5, workforce, data projects, place-based and countywide –
    - b. CA 1<sup>st</sup> 5 – CARES?
    - c. City resources?

- b. Los Angeles County shall work collaboratively across its departments and with community partners to maximize the utilization of resources and the delivery of integrated services.

*Possible strategies:*

- i. Continue work to integrate services with *DCFS, Probation, DPSS, DMH, Public Health and, Parks and Recreation, & initiate work with the Library, Sheriff, and CSS & other municipal partners (e.g., cities, school districts, First 5 LA, community based agencies) (The question here is – do we continue working w/ the departments who have demonstrated interest, add other departments, or do something in between?)*
- a. *CEO/SIB, OCC or Roundtable (?) shall work with LAHSA and homeless advocates and service providers to identify opportunities to link &/or develop appropriate child development services with homeless service providers.*
- b. Working in conjunction w/ *CEO/SIB OCC Roundtable (?) DCFS shall expand its child development enrollment efforts to include Head Start, LAUP and CDE services.*

*Issues:*

- What is the role of R&R agencies in connecting families to services?
- What is the role of the CEL? How to ensure that families are reachable when services become available

- c. *CEO/SIB OCC Roundtable shall work with other DCFS family-centered services such as kinship caregivers; CalWORKs families w/ 2 children under 6 who are exempt from work requirements; CalWORKs homeless; DV; mental health; substance abuse to facilitate access to child development services*

*Issues:*

- HS, State Preschool, LAUP – as resources
- What is the role of the R&R & CEL in connecting families to services?
- Mental Health, DV, and Substance Abuse: do the contractors providing these services know of child development resources? Potential benefits to families?

**2. Provide concrete support to programs ...**

**Note:** Our efforts to this point have focused on how County departments connect to child development services. We have not tackled how to connect child development programs and their clients to County services. This goal is attempting to address that issue.

- a. *OCC, Roundtable, (?)* shall engage multiple outreach strategies to inform local child care networks of County services and support the development of relationships across disciplines.

*Possible strategies:*

- i. Support the development of the Educare child development center in the City of Bell as needed, including but not limited to basing County services in the center
- ii. Support LAUSD Saturday clinics – making County staff, such as health and mental health professionals available
- iii. *OCC &/or Roundtable (?)* shall coordinate a limited number of “get to know you sessions” where representatives from regional County offices tour a local child care provider and engage in a meet and greet to establish relationships, increase knowledge of resources.

### **3. Children’s Social and Emotional Competence**

*Possible strategies:*

- i. Continue and expand STEP for the purpose of improving child care quality in LA County.
- ii. Continue and expand the DCFS STEP collaboration
- iii. Mental Health consultation available to child development programs?
- iv. *OCC Roundtable (?)* shall work in partnership with DCFS, Probation, child welfare and child development advocates, legal services, and others to clearly define how children qualify as “at-risk of” abuse or neglect for priority subsidized child care services.
  - a. Engage CDE in a dialogue &/or develop legislation regarding the long term impacts of abuse, neglect and/or exploitation and the need for child development stable services
  - b. Identify opportunities to establish designated funding for child development services through existing children’s services funding (e.g., Title 1, Title IVE Waiver, etc.).
- v. Promote collaborative efforts between child development services and school districts.
  - a. Work with local school districts (including LAUSD and LACOE) to ensure timely and organized establishment of new Transition Kindergarten classrooms.

- b. Identify opportunities to establish clear articulation guidelines based on developmentally appropriate practice between new Transition Kindergarten classrooms, Kindergarten and elementary grades.

**b. Parental Resilience –**

- i. OCC and Roundtable, in conjunction with community partnerships shall outreach to parents on STEP and the value of high quality child development services –
- ii. *CEO/SIB OCC Roundtable* work with DCFS and Probation to review policies related to parenting foster teens to ensure they access child development services prior to emancipating from the child welfare system.
- iii. **Economic Self Sufficiency: waiting for language from Carrie**

**c. Knowledge of Parenting and Child Development**

Issue:

What are cost effective and innovative ways for a range of county departments to incorporate “knowledge of parenting and child development” into their work?

- i. Conduct STEP outreach – provide parents w/ information on assessing quality child care services and the importance of the early years for learning and social emotional well being
  - ii. Connect County departments to STEP
  - iii. CalWORKs, DMH, DPH - parenting resources?
  - iv. Role of CBOs
- d. Adopt the Strengthening Families Approach (SFA) and Protective Factors (PF) to provide common language and approach to serving children and families.**
- i. SFA/PF – provides an umbrella to organize and track “small but significant changes”, across disciplines that support families, prevent child abuse and promote optimum development of young children
  - ii. Evaluate/track/monitor?

## **Data Collection Plan for Countywide Advocacy and Planning**

This proposal would create a countywide infrastructure to be able to report on a variety of child and family variables. The goals would be to provide research on child care through all 13 agencies where data would then be collected, synthesized, analyzed and reported at one centralized location. Over time we would create the capacity to survey parents across the county as well as create a web-based system that would allow other organizations to use child care information in their planning processes.

Main components to be developed for the purposes of outreach, planning, advocacy, and measuring outcomes of subsidized child care:

1. Uniform databank on subsidized children, parents, and providers.
2. GIS mapping of data for visual representation of data (with protections of private data).
3. Survey of subsidized child care recipients and other parents with young children.
4. Outreach to potential data partners (i.e., Office of Child Care, LACOE, LAUP, etc.).
5. Dissemination: development of web-based system for large-scale dissemination of data (maintained data, GIS maps of data, and survey results) and community trainings on how to use the web-based tool.

This page intentionally blank



## County of Los Angeles Policy Roundtable for Child Care



Policy Brief

November 1, 2010

### GOVERNOR SIGNS 2010-11 BUDGET BILLS: IMPACT ON CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

#### Overview

Governor Schwarzenegger signed the 2010-11 State Budget bill on October 8, 2010 and 19 implementation bills on October 19, 2010. In signing the budget, the Governor exercised his line item veto authority<sup>1</sup> to achieve his goal of closing the \$19.3 billion budget gap, increasing the reserve from \$375 million to \$1.3 billion and pushing a comprehensive plan for pension reform.<sup>2</sup> The Budget, a combination of reductions, federal funds and other solutions, keeps spending relatively flat at \$86.6 billion for 2010-11, compared to \$86.3 billion for 2009-10.

The next section of this brief reviews the budget for child care and development services, drawing attention to those programs subjected to budget cuts or elimination, and briefly explores the implications of the budget reductions to these programs.

#### Child Care and Development Services

The Budget Act of 2010 (Senate Bill 870, Chapter 712) contains substantial cuts to child care and development programs. Table 1 on page two summarizes the revisions to child care and development services administered under the California Department of Education (CDE), Child Development Division and Learning Supports. Table 2 summarizes the Budget appropriations reserved to improve the quality and availability of child care and development services.

- Elimination of CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care

The Governor reduced \$256,000,000 in State General Funds from CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care “to help bring ongoing expenditures in line with existing resources and to build a prudent reserve”. The remaining balance of \$128,823,000 in federal funds (of which \$18.7 million is American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds) will support the program through October 2010, when the services are terminated.<sup>3, 4</sup>

**Impact:** According to the Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles, 17,100 children ages birth through 12 years old of 11,700 families in Los Angeles county will lose their child care services as of November 1, 2010 due to the elimination of CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care. The estimated 6,000 providers – largely licensed centers and family child care homes - serving these families are at risk of reducing or closing their operations. Ramifications will also ripple through the 13 organizations that administer the funds – the ten Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies and three additional organizations with Alternative Payment Programs – resulting in an estimated 400 layoffs.<sup>5</sup>

Since the Governor signed the budget, the legislative leadership and community advocates have been working diligently to develop strategies to restore funding for CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care. Speaker of the Assembly John Pérez and President Pro Tempore of the Senate Darrell Steinberg plan to introduce a bill on December 6, 2010 that would restore \$250 million of the vetoed funds; the remaining \$6 million is discretionary funds put forward from the Assembly budget. In the meantime, the California and local First 5 Commissions have been asked to cover the transitional period beginning November 1, 2010 until the bill is signed. The bill would include a promise to reimburse the funds forwarded by the Commissions.<sup>6</sup> On

**Table 1. Fiscal Impact of Budget Act of 2010 - Child Care and Development Services**

Program	2009-10 Budget Act			Budget Act of 2010			Change
	State/CCDF <sup>7</sup>	ARRA <sup>8</sup>	Total	State/CCDF <sup>9</sup>	ARRA <sup>10</sup>	Total	
<b>Child Development Division</b>							
State Preschool <sup>11</sup>	\$438,913,000		\$438,913,000	\$379,518,000		\$379,518,000	-\$59,395,000
General Child Development	\$779,849,000	\$17,347,000	\$797,196,000	\$758,374,000	\$17,347,000	\$775,721,000	-\$21,475,000
Migrant Child Care	\$36,246,000	\$3,087,000	\$39,333,000	\$30,579,000		\$30,579,000	-\$8,754,000
Alternative Payment (AP) Program	\$258,811,000	\$15,743,000	\$274,554,000	\$251,770,000	\$18,830,000	\$270,600,000	-\$3,954,000
CalWORKs Stage 2 (AP)	\$439,620,000	\$36,272,000	\$475,892,000	\$394,670,000 <sup>12</sup>	\$36,272,000	\$430,942,000	-\$44,950,000
CalWORKs Stage 3 (AP)	\$393,373,000	\$18,905,000	\$412,278,000	\$109,918,000	\$18,905,000	\$128,823,000	-\$283,455,000
Resource and Referral Programs	\$19,438,000		\$19,438,000	\$18,688,000		\$18,688,000	-\$750,000
Extended Day/Latchkey <sup>13</sup>	\$5,000,000		\$5,000,000				-\$5,000,000
Handicap Allowance	\$2,011,000		\$2,011,000	\$1,940,000		\$1,940,000	-\$71,000
California Child Care Initiative	\$250,000		\$250,000	\$250,000		\$250,000	
Quality Improvement	\$51,552,000	\$18,783,000	\$70,335,000	\$47,115,000	\$18,783,000 <sup>14</sup>	\$65,898,000 <sup>15</sup>	-\$4,437,000
Centralized Eligibility List	\$7,900,000		\$7,900,000	\$7,900,000		\$7,900,000	
Local Planning Councils	\$6,637,000		\$6,637,000	\$3,319,000		\$3,319,000	-\$3,318,000
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$2,439,600,000</i>	<i>\$110,137,000</i>	<i>\$2,549,737,000</i>	<i>\$2,004,041,000</i>	<i>\$110,137,000</i>	<i>\$2,114,178,000</i>	<i>-\$435,559,000</i>
Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA)	0		0	0		0	
Growth	0		0	0		0	
<i>Subtotal COLA and Growth</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$0</i>	
Child Care Facilities Revolving Fund	\$5,000,000		\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000		\$5,000,000	
<i>Child Care and Development Services Total</i>	<i>\$2,444,600,000</i>		<i>\$2,554,737,000</i>	<i>\$2,009,041,000</i>		<i>\$2,119,178,000</i>	
<b>Learning Supports</b>							
After School Education and Safety Program	\$546,898,000		\$546,898,000	\$550,000,000		\$550,000,000	\$3,102,000
21 <sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers	\$169,371,000		\$169,371,000	\$174,034,000		\$174,034,000 <sup>16</sup>	\$4,663,000
Cal-SAFE Child Care	\$24,778,000		\$24,778,000	\$24,778,000		\$24,778,000 <sup>17</sup>	0
Pregnant Minor Programs	\$13,327,000		\$13,327,000	\$13,327,000		\$13,327,000 <sup>18</sup>	0
<i>Learning Supports Total</i>	<i>\$754,374,000</i>		<i>\$754,374,000</i>	<i>\$762,139,000</i>		<i>\$762,139,000</i>	<i>\$7,765,000</i>
<b>Child Care and Development and Learning Supports Grand Total</b>	<b>\$3,198,974,000</b>	<b>\$110,137,000</b>	<b>\$3,309,111</b>	<b>\$2,771,180,000</b>	<b>\$110,137,000</b>	<b>\$2,881,317,000</b>	<b>-\$427,794,000</b>

▪ Quality Improvements

Table 2. Quality Improvement Detail			
Program	2009-10 <sup>19</sup>	2010-11 <sup>20</sup>	Change
Schoolage Care and Resource and Referral	\$1,930,629	\$2,002,671	\$72,042
Infant and Toddler Earmark	\$10,873,244	\$11,342,626	\$469,382
Quality expenditures to be defined	\$2,969,000	\$664,000 <sup>21</sup>	-\$2,305,000
CalWORKs Careers in Child Development	\$4,000,000	\$3,591,000	-\$409,000
Training for license-exempt providers	\$2,500,000	\$1,250,000	-\$1,250,000
DSS contract for licensing inspections	\$8,000,000	\$12,300,000 <sup>22</sup>	Federal only
Trustline Registration Workload	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	0
Health and Safety Training	\$500,000	\$500,000	0
Health Hotline	\$300,000	\$231,000 <sup>23</sup>	Until 10/1/10
Preschool Education Projects <sup>24</sup>		\$114,000	Until 10/1/10
Child Dev Permit Matrix Prof Growth Advisors		\$63,000	Until 10/1/10
Child Care Recruitment and Retention Programs	\$15,000,000	\$11,825,000	-\$3,175,000
Child Development Training Consortium	\$320,000	\$320,000	0

October 28<sup>th</sup>, the First 5 LA Commission voted to grant three months of transition funding for CalWORKs Stage 3 eligible families for their children ages birth to five years old.<sup>25</sup>

- **Local Planning Councils (LPCs)**

The budget for the LPCs was slashed in half. New language requires the LPCs to meet their mandated requirements to the extent possible and with data that is readily available.<sup>26</sup>

**Impact:** The LPCs - a collaboration of subsidized and non-subsidized child care and development providers, county departments, health and human services agencies, regional centers, employers, local and state commissions, child care resource and referral programs, parents, and other stakeholders - are critical partners to the child care and development infrastructure. In addition to coordinating statewide efforts at the community level to identify needs and address gaps in services, the LPCs have been successful at leveraging significant resources from other sources to enhance and expand the child development system through quality improvement activities, training, workforce development and outreach to underserved populations. The significant cuts to the LPCs are likely to result in staffing reductions or, in smaller counties the elimination of staff, and impair the LPCs' ability to meet their federal mandates to leverage and guide the distribution of resources to meet the needs of families for high quality child care and development services.

- **Reduction to Child Care Recruitment and Retention Programs**

The budget for the Child Care Recruitment and Retention Programs was cut by just over 21 percent, from \$15 million to \$11.825 million.

**Impact:** In Los Angeles County, the Investing in Early Educators Program awards stipends to early educators serving mostly low-income families eligible for subsidized child care and development services and earning college units that informs their work with children and families and contributes to a degree in child development. The Investing in Early Educators Program also offers ongoing training and professional development opportunities relating to improving learning environments, conducting and using developmental screening tools for early identification and intervention of children with special needs, and working effectively with infants and toddlers. As a result of the budget cut to the programs, stipend amounts may be reduced by 25 to 50 percent. During 2009-10, early educators were awarded \$1,100 for completing three units or \$2,100 for completing six units; early educators earning an Associate of Arts, Bachelor or Master degree were eligible to receive an additional \$250 to \$750 depending on their degree attainment. In addition, fewer trainings will be offered on a quarterly basis.

- **Cap on Center-based Reserve Accounts**

Centers will be limited to a reserve account balance that is five percent of the sum of the contract maximum reimbursable amount. To achieve the cap, the Superintendent of Public Instruction is to offset the 2010-11 apportionments with funds maintained in the contractor's center-based reserve account within the child development fund as of June 30, 2010 and to continue until the reserve account balance is at five percent.<sup>27</sup> Previously, there had been no limit on the size of the reserves for center-based child development centers.

**Impact:** These are funds that have been earned by the organizations and are used to keep their doors open and staff paid during delayed budgets. Many organizations exhausted their reserves **and** their lines of credit during this year's longest budget delay in history. As a result,

classrooms were closed (some to never re-open) and staff received lay-off notices. Since the budget was signed, programs are scrambling to enroll so that they may fully earn their contracts by the end of the budget year. Organizations also use their reserves to support major capital projects such as facility playground renovation and repair.

- **Reduction to Administrative Cost Allowance – Alternative Payment (AP) Programs**

Voucher-based contractors administrative and support services allowance has been reduced from 19 to 17.5 percent of their contract amount for a savings of \$17.1 million.<sup>28</sup>

**Impact:** Thirteen organizations, including the ten Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, administer the AP Program funds. As a result of the reduction in their administrative budgets, the AP Program organizations may be forced to scale back some of their support services offered to child care and development programs.

- **Quality Funding**

Funds allocated for quality improvements have been adjusted to the federal minimum requirement, resulting in the reductions to some quality improvement activities (i.e. see the Child Care Recruitment and Retention Programs addressed earlier in this document) and elimination of some smaller programs. States receiving federal funding for child care and development services are required to allocate four percent of those funds for quality improvement activities; California has consistently exceeded the federal requirement.

**Impact:** The quality dollars are critical to improving the delivery of child care and development services beyond the basic health and safety requirements. California has traditionally used its quality investments to support professional development activities, improve the quality of infant and toddler care, offer stipends to early educators continuing their education, and provide technical assistance for enhancing classroom environments. The reduction in funds at this time is counter-intuitive to efforts currently underway to develop a statewide quality rating and improvement system.

- **Early Learning Advisory Council Activities**

The Governor cut an augmentation of \$503,000 to support additional staff positions and associated committee expenses. Instead, he revised the budget providing \$439,000 and two time-limited positions until July 2013 per the agreement with the California Children and Families Commission, making the funds available to the California Department of Education to support the ELAC activities.<sup>29</sup> In addition, he deleted a provision describing legislative intent to use a portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds for the ELAC to study the feasibility of implementing a data system with information on children from birth to five years old, stating that the language is inconsistent with the approved grant application for funds.

- **Reduction to Regional Market Rate (RMR) for License-exempt Providers**

The Budget reduces the reimbursement rate for license-exempt providers from 90 to 80 percent of the rates paid to licensed family child care providers.<sup>30</sup> This change affects voucher-based programs inclusive of Alternative Payment and CalWORKs Stage 1 and 2 Child Care for a total savings of \$31,100,000.<sup>31, 32</sup>

**Impact:** As a result of the reduction in the RMR, license-exempt providers may impose a cost to the families to cover the difference or the family may need to secure the services of a family, friend or neighbor willing to accept a lower reimbursement rate. License-exempt providers have significantly lower overhead and do not meet licensing requirements.

- **Community Care Licensing Division, Department of Social Services**

Community Care Licensing received a small augmentation of \$18,866,000 for 2010-11, bringing its total budget up to \$2,117,690,000.<sup>33</sup>

**Impact:** It is unclear whether the augmentation to the Community Care Licensing Division will have any impact at this time. Currently, licensing is woefully underfunded, resulting in visits to child care and development programs once every five years unless a complaint against a program has been issued or a program is on probation. As of mid-September, Community Care Licensing suspended certain operations including hosting orientation sessions, processing of licensing applications, and staff training due to budgetary constraints.

### **For More Information on 2010-11 Budget Bills: Impact on Children and Families**

A number of organizations have developed overviews and analyses of the 2010-11 Budget as it impacts health and human services for children and families, including child care and development as follows:

California Budget Project

[www.cbp.org](http://www.cbp.org)

Child Development Policy Institute

[www.cdpi.net](http://www.cdpi.net)

Legislative Analyst's Office

[www.lao.ca.gov](http://www.lao.ca.gov)

Western Center on Law and Poverty

[www.wclp.org](http://www.wclp.org)

### ***Endnotes:***

<sup>1</sup> The Governor vetoed \$963 million in General Fund spending, of which \$256 million is in funding to child care and development programs. (Legislative Analyst's Office. *Major Features of California's 2010-11 Budget*, October 12, 2010).

<sup>2</sup> *California State Budget 2010-11 Summary*, October 8, 2010.

<sup>3</sup> *California State Budget 2010-11 Summary*, October 8, 2010.

<sup>4</sup> The California Department of Education has issued Management Bulletin 10-10 with instructions to CalWORKs Stage 2 and 3 contractors on implementation of the Governor's veto of funding for CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care. According to the Bulletin, "Because the Governor eliminated funding for CalWORKs Stage 3, the provisions of California Education Code Section 8263(c) regarding continuity of care do not apply for the families being terminated." The Bulletin continues by suggesting that families be registered on their respective county's Centralized Eligibility List (CEL) and be informed as to how the CEL works. (Management Bulletin 10-10. *CalWORKs Stage 3 Elimination of Funding*. October 2010.)

<sup>5</sup> Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles. *CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care Elimination – Over a \$400 Million Economic Impact on Los Angeles County*. October 11, 2010.

<sup>6</sup> Letter from the California Legislature to the Local First Five Commissions c/o First 5 Association of California, October 25, 2010.

<sup>7</sup> SBX8 1, Chapter 1: Budget Act of 2009: Revisions, Approved: July 28, 2009; Item 6110-196-0001.

<sup>8</sup> SBX8 1, Chapter 1: Budget Act of 2009: Revisions, Approved: July 28, 2009; Item 6110-198-0890.

<sup>9</sup> SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010; Item 6110-196-0001.

<sup>10</sup> SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010; Item 6110-198-0890.

<sup>11</sup> Of this amount, \$50 million is available for the Prekindergarten and Family Literacy (PKFL) Program, of which \$5 million is for wraparound care to children enrolled in State Preschool. The Superintendent of Public Instruction may assign priority to children enrolled in PKFL Programs.

<sup>12</sup> A total of \$201 million in unobligated Proposition 98 funds since 2005 have been re-appropriated to the California Department of Education (CDE) for allocation by the Superintendent of Public Instruction for funding CalWORKs Stage 2 Child Care for 2010-11. Of the swept funds, \$23 million reflects unspent preschool and child development funds, \$5.8 million in unspent CalWORKs Stage 2 and 3 Child Care funds, \$500,000 of unspent IDEA Early Education funds, and \$53.5 million in unspent ASES Program funds. SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010; Item 6110-494.)

<sup>13</sup> Latchkey was eliminated in 2009-10 Budget; funds provided services through August 31, 2009. Legislative intent provided for children displaced by the elimination of the program receive services under the state's subsidized child care, After School and Education (ASES), or both. (SBX8 1, Chapter 1: Budget Act of 2009: Revisions, Approved: July 28, 2009; Item 6110-196-0001, Schedule 1.5(i), 30.10.020.920 and Provision 16.)

<sup>14</sup> Of the ARRA funds appropriated for quality improvement, \$5.2 million is designated to improve the quality of infant toddler care, and \$1.7 million to improve the quality of care for children from birth to five years old.

<sup>15</sup> See Table 2 for breakdown of quality improvement allocations.

<sup>16</sup> SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010; Item 6110-197-0890(1).

<sup>17</sup> SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010; Item 6110-198-0001(3). This amount is in addition to the \$19.8 million for Cal-SAFE Academic and Support Services (Item 5110-198-0001(1)).

<sup>18</sup> Funds are available for child care as well as academic and supportive services. (SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010; Item 6110-198-0001(2).)

<sup>19</sup> SBX8 1, Chapter 1: Budget Act of 2009: Revisions, Approved: July 28, 2009; Item 6110-196-0001, Provisions 3 and 4.

<sup>20</sup> SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010; Item 6110-196-0001, Provisions 3 and 4.

<sup>21</sup> One-time federal funding available for 2010-11. Remaining funds are to be used for child care and development quality expenditures as identified by the CDE, with approval of the Department of Finance. (Item 6110-196-0001, Provision 3(c).)

<sup>22</sup> The budget relies completely on federal funding for this item. (Item 6110-196-0001, Provision 3(d).)

<sup>23</sup> Item 6110-196-0001, Provision 3(d) allocates \$75,000 for Health Hotline activities, \$81,000 for the infant-toddler specialist for the Hotline, and \$75,000 for technical assistance to providers for facility development until October 1, 2010.

<sup>24</sup> Includes but not limited to those operated by public television stations in Redding, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Jose, Los Angeles, Fresno, San Diego, and Eureka. Funds available until October 1, 2010. (Item 6110-196-0001, Provision 3(e).)

<sup>25</sup> First 5 LA. *First 5 LA Moves to Avert Child Care Crisis*, October 28, 2010.

<sup>26</sup> SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010; Item 6110-196-0001, Schedule 1.5(n), 30.10.020.015 and Provision 16.

<sup>27</sup> SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010; Item 6110-196-0001, Provision 15(a). If the targeted savings of \$83,100,000 is not achieved through this effort, the California Department of Education may conduct quarterly analyses of fiscal and attendance reports for the 2010-11 fiscal year for all contracts and may adjust the contract maximum reimbursable amounts due to the underutilization of funds to reach the savings. Item 6110-196-0001, Provision 15(b).

<sup>28</sup> *California State Budget 2010-11 Summary*, October 8, 2010.

<sup>29</sup> SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010; see veto message related to Item 6110-001-0001, Provision 22(a, b).

<sup>30</sup> SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010; Item 6110-196-0001, Provision 1(c).

<sup>31</sup> CalWORKs Stage 1 Child Care reduction is \$12.4 million; \$18.7 million reduction in remaining voucher-based programs. (*California State Budget 2010-11 Summary*, October 8, 2010.)

---

<sup>32</sup> While there were proposals introduced throughout the budget negotiations that would have resulted in other changes to the reimbursement rate, this was the only change. The cost of licensed child care services provided through the voucher-based programs, including Alternative Payment, will continue to be reimbursed at the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile of the rates charged by providers offering the same type of child care for the same age of the child in that region based on the 2005 Regional Market Rate Survey. Item 6110-196-0001, Provision 1(b).

<sup>33</sup> Item 5180-151-0001 (1). Senate Bill 1630 had proposed increasing the budget for licensing by \$79.7 million, however the Governor used his line item veto to reduce the augmentation by \$60.8 million.

This page intentionally blank



## County of Los Angeles Policy Roundtable for Child Care



*Policy Brief*

*November 12, 2010 (Draft)*

### STATUS OF CALWORKS STAGE 3 CHILD CARE

On October 8, 2010, Governor Schwarzenegger eliminated funding for CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care by line item veto when he signed the 2010-11 State Budget. Immediately following passage of the budget, legislators and advocates across the State have engaged in actions intended to help families weather the immediate crisis of losing their child care and development services and ultimately restore funding to the CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care Programs. This addendum provides a brief overview of the CalWORKs Stages of Child Care, the impact of the Governor's action, and the status of recent actions to ensure that families who have successfully transitioned to self-sufficiency are able to continue working with the security that their children are in safe and stimulating child care and development programs.

#### Overview of CalWORKs Child Care

CalWORKs recipients participating in welfare to work activities that lead to employment and self-sufficiency are eligible for child care for their children from birth up to 12 years old and for their children with special needs and severe disabilities up to 18 years old.

Until recently, there were three stages of child care:

**Stage 1:** Begins when a parent enters a County-approved welfare-to-work program or employment and continues serving them for up to six months or until their work and child care are stable. Families may continue to receive Stage 1 Child Care assistance if there are insufficient funds in Stage 2.

**Stage 2:** Available to families receiving welfare and with stable employment. Families are eligible for Stage 2 Child Care for up to 24 months after they stop receiving cash aid.

**Stage 3:** Until recently, supported families as they moved off welfare and into self-sufficiency and had exhausted their up to 24 months of eligibility for Stage 2. Families continued to receive Stage 3 Child Care until they no longer meet the income eligibility requirements or their children exceeded the age limit.

#### Governor's Veto of CalWORKs Stage 3

On October 8, 2010, Governor Schwarzenegger eliminated funding for the CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care Program when he signed 2010-11 State Budget for a savings of \$256 million.<sup>1</sup> Approximately one week later, families began receiving Notices of Action that their child care services would be terminated effective November 1, 2010 and were encouraged to register on their County's Centralized Eligibility List (CEL). Almost simultaneously, Notices of Action were sent to families preparing to transition from CalWORKs Stage 2 to Stage 3 Child Care. State policy prohibits these families from receiving priority for continuity of care<sup>2</sup>, which would otherwise allow a family to be picked up relatively quickly by another subsidized child care and development program. Rather, they would be listed based on income (lowest income first) with other families already registered on the CEL.

According to the Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles, 17,200 children ages birth through 12 years old of 11,700 families in Los Angeles county were due to lose their child care services as of November 1, 2010 due to the elimination of CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care. The estimated

6,000 providers – largely licensed centers and family child care homes – serving these families were also at risk of reducing or closing their operations. The 13 organizations that administer the funds – the ten Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies and three additional organizations with Alternative Payment Programs – would also experience consequences resulting in an estimated 400 layoffs.<sup>3</sup>

### **Status of Recent Actions for Transitional Aid to Families and Restore CalWORKs Stage 3**

Since the Governor signed the budget, the legislative leadership and community advocates have been working diligently to develop strategies to: 1) restore funding for CalWORKs Stage 3; 2) establish bridge funding to cover the child care costs of families eligible for CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care until cuts are restored; and 3) delay implementation of the cuts.

#### **1) Legislation to Restore Cuts**

Legislative leaders President Pro Tempore of the Senate Darrell Steinberg and Speaker of the Assembly John Pérez have crafted a bill to be introduced as soon as the legislature reconvenes in early January 2011. The bill proposes a transfer of \$250 million in General funds to the Department of Education to fully fund CalWORKs Stage 3 for 2010-11, retroactive to November 1, 2010. The remaining \$6 million is an allocation of Assembly discretionary funds put forth by Speaker of the Assembly John Pérez.

#### **2) Bridge Funding**

In the meantime, the California and local First 5 Commission have been asked to cover the cost of CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care during the transitional period beginning November 1, 2010 until the bill is signed.<sup>4</sup> To date, 31 County First 5 Commissions have approved funding for CalWORKs Stage 3 eligible families for their children ages birth to five years old. First 5 LA approved \$15 million for services provided from November 1, 2010 through January 31, 2011. On November 3, 2010, the Board of Supervisors approved a mechanism for the funds to go to the 13 organizations that administer the Alternative Payment Programs, which also manage the CalWORKs Child Care funds.<sup>5</sup> Unfortunately, no clear funding stream has been identified to date to bridge the funding gap for school age children up to 12 years old.

#### **3) Delay of Implementation**

On October 29, 2010, the Public Interest Law Office, the Child Care Law Center, Western Center on Law and Poverty and Public Counsel filed a motion on behalf Parent Voices Oakland and four Stage 3 parents to halt the termination of CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care.<sup>6</sup> Alameda Superior Court Judge Wynne Carvell issued a temporary restraining order and set a full hearing on the matter for November 4, 2010.<sup>7</sup> On November 5, 2010, the Judge blocked the elimination of CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care funding to allow for time to screen families' eligibility for other subsidized child development programs and ordered the CDE to rescind the notice stating that the child care support had ended due to lack of funding. A hearing date is set for November 23, 2010 to determine whether to prevent termination of Stage 3 Child Care funding beyond the immediate stay.<sup>8</sup> The defendants on the case are the California Departments of Education and Social Services.

#### **Endnotes:**

<sup>1</sup> *California State Budget 2010-11 Summary*, October 8, 2010.

<sup>2</sup> California Department of Education. *CalWORKs Stage 3 Elimination of Funding*. Management Bulletin 10-10, October 2010.

<sup>3</sup> Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles. *CalWORKs Stage 3 Elimination of Funding*. October 2010.

<sup>4</sup> Letter to Local First Five Commissions from Speaker of the Assembly John A. Pérez and President Pro Tempore of the Senate Darrell Steinberg, October 25, 2010.

---

<sup>5</sup> Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. Supplemental Agenda for Wednesday, November 3, 2010. Retrieved on November 4, 2010 from <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/Agenda/AgendaHome.asp>.

<sup>6</sup> Fitzharris, T. *Judge Orders Temporary Halt to Implementation of Stage 3 Funding Cut*. CDPI Information Bulletin. November 1, 2010.

<sup>7</sup> Order Granting Interim Relief signed by Judge Wynne Carvill, October 29, 2010.

<sup>8</sup> Fitzharris, T. *Judge Orders Temporary Reinstatement of Stage 3 Care Pending Revised Notice to Recipients*. CDPI Information Bulletin. November 5, 2010.

This page intentionally blank



# Strengthening Families through Early Care and Education™

## Preventing Child Abuse and Neglect and Promoting Optimal Child Development through Early Care and Education



Office of Child Care

A quarterly publication of the Los Angeles County Office of Child Care and the Los Angeles County Office of Education ♦ Fall 2010  
 Head Start-State Preschool intended to further collaboration between County Departments serving young children birth to five years old and high quality child care and development programs.

### Welcome Message

A movement is underway to infuse a new way of working with children and families who come into contact with our County systems. The Strengthening Families Approach, developed by the Center for the Study of Social Policy (CSSP), is a conceptual framework for preventing child abuse and neglect and promoting optimal child development. Child care and development programs that adopt the Strengthening Families Approach build their work around the five research-based protective factors and therefore are valuable resources for families engaged with County systems.

The Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Head Start-State Preschool Program and the Los Angeles County Office of Child Care are partnering with the Department of Children and Families Services (DCFS), the Probation Department and other County departments to rethink our relationship with families, frame a common language, and identify opportunities for building strengths in the families we serve. One way we are accomplishing this effort is by connecting young children with high quality child care and development programs.

This is the first in a series of newsletters designed to reinforce our joint efforts and provide County department staff with resources to help families navigate the often complicated child care and development system. Each issue will further the dialogue on the Strengthening Families Approach with ideas for integrating the Protective Factors into your everyday work with the children and families you serve and highlight a child care and development program with information on how to access it.

#### INSIDE THIS ISSUE

Welcome Message

Strengthening Families Approach™

Early Head Start and Head Start

Connecting Families to Child Care and Development Programs

### The Strengthening Families Approach™

#### A New Way of Working with Children and Their Families

In 2001, the Center for the Study of Social Policy (CSSP) introduced the *Strengthening Families Approach™* (SFA), a new conceptual framework and approach for preventing child abuse and neglect and promoting optimal child development through early care and education programs.<sup>1</sup> The SFA focuses on all families, occurs in trusted organizations within community where families already are, and is measurable through the growth of protective factors and family strengths. The SFA recognizes parents as their children's first and primary protectors, fundamental to children's optimal development. Moreover, it is grounded in relationships with families and communities across systems as vehicles of change.

#### Protective Factors

Research has shown that five protective factors reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect and promote children's optimal development by giving parents the tools they need to parent effectively, even during times of stress. Briefly, the Protective Factors are:

**Parental resilience:** The ability to cope and bounce back from all types of challenges

**Social connections:** Friends, family members, neighbors, and other members of a community who provide emotional support and concrete assistance to parents.

**Knowledge of parenting and child development:** Accurate information about raising young children and appropriate expectations for their behavior.

**Concrete support in times of need:** Financial security to cover day-to-day expenses and unexpected costs that come up from time to time, access to formal supports like cash aid, health insurance, and food, and informal support from social networks.

**Social and emotional competence:** A child's ability to interact positively with others and communicate his or her emotions effectively.

#### Strengthening Families and Child Care and Development Programs

The Strengthening Families Approach is consistent with the work occurring in high quality child care and development programs, often notable for the intensity of the relationships that exist between the early educators and parents. Daily contact between parents and their child's primary teacher are common features as children are dropped off and picked up, opportunity times to check in, reinforce the child's participation and the parent's positive parenting skills, and address concerns or questions that may arise. Most importantly, for families that are stressed, the child development staff are another set of eyes and can respond quickly to early warning signs. As such, child care and development programs serve as resources, connecting parents to other services and community-based organizations as the need arises and facilitating mutual support among the enrolled families.



Strengthening Families is a trademark of the Center for the Study of Social Policy. The information for this article was drawn from resources posted on the Strengthening Web site located at [www.strengtheningfamilies.net](http://www.strengtheningfamilies.net). The Web site provides an array of resources available as free downloads.

# Early Head Start and Head Start Programs

## Comprehensive Services for Pregnant Women, Infants and Toddlers, and Preschoolers

The Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) operates the largest Head Start/Early Head Start program in the country serving over 25,000, 0-5 year old infants, toddlers, preschoolers and pregnant women through contracts with 27 private non-profit organizations and school districts. An additional 22 private non-profit organizations and school districts receive federal funds directly to provide Early Head Start and Head Start services to families in distinct communities throughout Los Angeles County.

### Eligibility

To be eligible, children must meet age requirements and their families must meet income requirements. For Head Start, a child must be at least three years old by the date used to determine eligibility for public school in the community in which the program is located. Early Head Start programs serve pregnant moms and children birth to age three. Both programs serve the neediest children in the community and, therefore, the family must meet the Federal Income Poverty Guidelines. Head Start is also mandated to serve categorically eligible children, including children in families who receive public assistance, are homeless or in the foster care system. Families deemed categorically eligible do not need proof of income.

### Child Development and Comprehensive Services

Head Start provides the child a safe and stable environment and a chance to succeed as they grow and develop. Head Start operates half-day consistent with the school year or full-day/full year in center-based or home-based programs.

Head Start serves the entire family with a range of comprehensive services. Upon enrollment, families are assessed for the following services:

- Educational Services
- Health (medical and dental)
- Nutrition
- Mental Health
- Disabilities Services
- Community Services

### Family Engagement

Parents are encouraged to serve on Parent Committees and Policy Councils, allowing them with opportunities to participate and play a role in the policies and procedures of the program. Parents are also encouraged to assist with classroom activities and may serve in other capacities to support program implementation.

### Emerging Model—Connecting County Families with Early Head Start and Head Start

Early Head Start and Head Start programs offer comprehensive services for the entire family and, therefore, may serve as a complement to the services provided by DCFS and other County departments. With this in mind, LACOE Head Start is partnering with other Early Head Start/Head Start organizations throughout the county and the DCFS to facilitate the enrollment of foster children in Head Start and Early Head Start programs. DCFS child care eligibility workers or children's services workers (CSWs) identify foster children from birth to five years old who are not currently receiving child development services for enrollment in Early Head Start or Head Start. LACOE receives direct referrals from DCFS and, based on the service area where the child resides, sends the referral application to the appropriate organization, which then schedules an appointment with a family with an offer of enrollment. To learn more about this partnership, call (562) 940-1770.

### How to Connect

Families may call 1.877.PRE.K.KID (877-773-5543). The Child Care Resource and Referral (R&Rs) Agencies also provide referrals to Early Head Start and Head Start Programs. (see box below).

## Connecting Families to Child Care and Development Programs

### Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies (R&Rs)

Ten R&Rs provide families with children from birth to 13 years old with referrals to licensed child care and development programs – centers and family child care homes – throughout Los Angeles County. The R&Rs also register low-income families eligible for subsidized child care and development services on the Los Angeles Centralized Eligibility List (LACEL). Families call, toll-free, 1.888.922.4453 to be connected to the R&R near their home, place of employment, or school.

### Los Angeles Centralized Eligibility List (LACEL)

The LACEL helps connect families to subsidized child care and development programs as funds and openings become available. Programs funded by the California Department of Education/Child Development Division enroll families from the LACEL; some Early Head Start and Head Start Programs and Los Angeles Universal Preschools (LAUP) enroll families from the LACEL as well. To register on the LACEL, families contact their local R&R (see above). Be sure families ask to register on the LACEL.



### Office of Child Care

Within the Service Integration Branch  
Chief Executive Office  
County of Los Angeles  
222 South Hill Street, 5th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
(213) 974-4103  
[www.childcare.lacounty.gov](http://www.childcare.lacounty.gov)

### Head Start-State Preschool

Los Angeles County Office of Education  
10100 Pioneer Blvd., Suite 325  
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670  
(562) 940-1770

### Newsletter

Editor: Michele Sartell  
Contributor: Luis Bautista



### Office of Child Care Web Site

Visit the Office of Child Care Web site at [www.childcare.lacounty.gov](http://www.childcare.lacounty.gov) for links to resources on:



- Child Care and Development Services for Employees, Parents and Teen Parents
- Los Angeles Centralized Eligibility List (LACEL)
- Navigating the Child Care and Development System
- Children with Special Needs
- Helpful Links and Resources





Published on *National Women's Law Center* (<http://www.nwlc.org>)

[Home](#) > [What You Can Do](#) > [Child Care and Head Start Funding Call-In Day](#) > [Child Care and Head Start Funding Call-In Day](#)

---

# Child Care and Head Start Funding Call-In Day

**Call 1-888-460-0813 on November 15**

Join us in taking action and telling Congress to move forward and fund essential child care programs and Head Start, as well as the Early Learning Challenge Fund, by calling 1-888-460-0813 on November 15.

When Congress returns for a "lame duck" session on November 15, it will need to complete a final appropriations bill for fiscal year 2011 that will determine funding levels for early childhood programs. Congress will have a short time—just two weeks until the Continuing Resolution (CR) enacted at the end of September expires—to act in order to prevent funding cuts for the Child Care and Development and Block Grant (CCDBG), Head Start, and Early Head Start, among other essential programs. They will also have to decide whether to fund the Early Learning Challenge Fund, a new initiative that would encourage states to compete for funding to help to build stronger early childhood systems.

Monday, November 15 is your chance to call your members of Congress to ensure that these child care and Head Start funds are not cut. As many as 300,000 children could lose child care and Head Start if Congress passes an appropriations bill that reduces funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant and Head Start. Join us in taking action and telling Congress to move forward and fund these essential child care programs as well as the Early Learning Challenge Fund by calling 1-888-460-0813 on November 15.

---

**Source URL:** <http://www.nwlc.org/action/child-care-and-head-start-funding-call-day>

This page intentionally blank



# Adopting 12-Month Subsidy Eligibility

Impacts on Children, Families, and State Child Care Programs

1200 18th Street NW • Suite 200 • Washington, DC 20036 • p (202) 906.8000 • f (202) 842.2885 • www.clasp.org

October 2010

## About this Paper

Child care subsidies make quality child care more affordable, support the healthy development of children, and help low-income parents access the child care they need to go to work or to school to support their families.

Under federal regulations, states have a great deal of flexibility in setting child care policies to promote access to child care assistance. Adopting 12-month subsidy eligibility, with limited interim reporting requirements, is one strategy states can implement to promote sustained access to subsidies and continuous care arrangements for children. This paper lays out the associated impacts of adopting an annual redetermination policy on children, parents, and state subsidy systems.

## Additional Resources

Visit [www.clasp.org](http://www.clasp.org) for additional CLASP child care and early education resources on child care subsidies, Head Start and Early Head Start, state pre-kindergarten programs, and other birth to five early education efforts.

By Danielle Ewen and Hannah Matthews

Child care costs are particularly burdensome for poor and low-income families, who pay a significantly higher share of their income for care than do upper-income families. For families struggling to find and retain employment, child care can be an obstacle that keeps them from economic success.

The Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG, also known as the Child Care and Development Fund or CCDF) is designed to help families working, or in training or education, to receive assistance paying for child care. According to the most recent data, 92 percent of families receiving child care subsidies need help because parents are working or are in education or training programs.<sup>1</sup>

Children and families benefit when they have access to stable, continuous child care arrangements. Parents retain employment needed to support their families and young children benefit due to consistent care that fosters healthy development. During the current economic recession, consistent child care arrangements can provide a secure environment for young children whose families are struggling more than ever to make ends meet. High-quality child care helps children learn and develop skills they need to be successful in school and in life.

Although receiving a subsidy can help parents stay connected to the workforce and promote stable care for young children, research has found that the duration of subsidy use for recipients is often short.<sup>2</sup> A multitude of factors, both internal and external to the subsidy system, likely affect subsidy duration. Contributing factors within the subsidy system are a state's eligibility redetermination and interim reporting policies.

Under federal CCDBG regulations, states have a great deal of flexibility in setting policies to promote access to child care assistance. Authorizing subsidies for longer periods can help families have sustained access to child care settings. Twenty-two (22) states currently set their maximum length of eligibility at 12 months.<sup>3</sup> In many cases, families are required to report changes, such as changes in employment or income that would impact their eligibility status between periods of redetermination. Failure to report can result in families losing their subsidy, depending on state rules.

A number of states are considering changing subsidy rules to allow for 12-month eligibility, and some have recently changed their policies. This is consistent with annual redetermination periods in other federal programs including Head Start and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). This paper lays out the associated impacts of adopting an annual redetermination policy on children, parents, and state subsidy systems.

### **Continuity in Child Care Arrangements Supports Healthy Development**

Creating a secure and trusting relationship between children and their caregivers is critical for children's healthy development.<sup>4</sup> When a child care arrangement is stable, or without disruptions, it better lends itself to developing secure attachments between young children and their caregivers. Multiple factors can cause instability in child care arrangements, including those internal and external to families. For example, families may be dissatisfied with a child care arrangement and choose to use another one, there may be a breakdown in an arrangement as a result of a change in the provider's schedule or a change in the parent's work schedule, or the family may experience a change in employment, work schedules, or income. In some cases, multiple factors may occur simultaneously, or trigger additional factors, which lead to multiple causes in changes in arrangements.<sup>5</sup> For low-income families receiving subsidies, the loss of a subsidy often results in the loss of child care. Extending redetermination periods for child care assistance to 12

months, with limited interim reporting requirements, could help promote a continuous child care arrangement for families.

To promote continued participation in programs that support children's development, the federal government has long encouraged states to align eligibility for children participating in child care assistance programs and Head Start, Early Head Start and state pre-kindergarten programs.<sup>6</sup> Aligning child care with other school readiness programs matches priorities in place at the federal level to create more coordinated state early childhood systems. This priority is reflected in the new Race to the Top program,<sup>7</sup> which funds State Early Childhood Advisory Councils, and the proposed Early Learning Challenge Fund. It is also reflected in recent statements from the Secretaries of Education and Health and Human Services:

"The President has looked to HHS and the Department of Education to develop a coordinated and seamless plan to get children off to great starts, and to help families and communities to break cycles of poverty." —U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius

"... We need to build a more coordinated system of early care and education, and to focus on key improvements to teaching and learning in the early grades. Through our collaboration with our partners at HHS, we have begun to tackle this challenge by identifying the key elements of high quality early learning programs, and studying what works to improve and sustain outcomes once children reach school." —U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan<sup>8</sup>

Children in high-quality child care demonstrate better school outcomes, including higher vocabulary scores, math and language abilities, and success in school.<sup>9</sup> Ensuring children have uninterrupted access to child care settings can help facilitate this learning and development.

### **Impact of Adopting 12-Month Subsidy Eligibility**

### Impact on Program Costs

When coupled with reduced interim reporting requirements, extending redetermination periods for subsidy eligibility is likely a cost-saving policy change. States incur a staffing cost at the point of redetermination, often at four or six months. Under a 12-month redetermination policy, the staffing cost at the four- or six-month juncture is eliminated. If interim reporting is limited as well, states will incur savings in reduced staff-time processing reports related to what may be only minimal changes in employment or income. States could use administrative savings to offset any technology or other costs associated with implementing the new policy.

States have documented cost savings in extending redetermination periods. A 2008 Colorado State Auditor report found that six-month redetermination and family reporting requirements were costly to administer and overly burdensome on participants in the subsidy system.<sup>10</sup> Michigan adopted a 12-month redetermination period in response to staff shortages because the state found that a longer eligibility period reduced staff burden associated with processing paperwork.<sup>11</sup>

### Impact on Families' Access to Subsidies

Research on child care assistance has found both low take-up rates of subsidies and short durations of subsidy receipt, suggesting that it is difficult for families to obtain and retain subsidies. The process of obtaining and retaining subsidies can be unduly complex or burdensome. There may be multiple steps in accessing a subsidy, including in-person visits to subsidy offices and paperwork and documentation requirements.<sup>12</sup> State policies on what parents must report, such as changes in work hours and/or income, while receiving a subsidy vary. Recertification requirements, which may include an additional in-person visit, also vary. Apart from their interactions with the subsidy system, the lives of low-income workers are often chaotic, juggling shift work or employment spells. No single policy change in the subsidy system will ameliorate all of the difficulties low-income parents face accessing child care assistance; yet, policies that reduce families' burden likely will support both higher take-up and longer duration of subsidy

receipt. To that end, such policy changes also support sustained parental employment.

Adopting annual redetermination, therefore, may not only be cost effective, but may also reduce the burden of redetermination on eligible families so they continue receiving assistance. At the point of redetermination, families may leave the subsidy system, even when they remain employed and eligible for assistance.<sup>13</sup> The reasons families may lose their subsidies vary, though research suggests it is related to the complexities and frequency of the redetermination process rather than changes in family income, hours, or employment structure.<sup>14</sup> Working parents may be unable to take time off from work for in-person visits to subsidy agencies to file necessary paperwork, or they may be unclear about the steps required to recertify their eligibility. Requiring copious documentation makes the process overly difficult for parents as well as for agency staff.<sup>15</sup> An Urban Institute study of several midwestern state child care subsidy programs found implementing a 12-month redetermination period, at least for some families, to be one strategy for easing the complexity in some states.<sup>16</sup>

An Oregon study found entering a redetermination period to be a key factor for families exiting the subsidy system. The study found that families in their last month of eligibility (in this case, three or four months) were more than two and a half times as likely to leave the subsidy system than at any other time. Based on analysis of employment and earnings data at the time of their exit and 12 months later, these parents were likely still eligible for subsidy at the time of their exit.<sup>17</sup>

Low-income workers often have episodic work experiences.<sup>18</sup> Extending eligibility for parents even during spells of unemployment, supports work because it helps parents be able to look for a job. Moreover, extended eligibility also provides continuity of care for children during inconsistent parental work spells.

Whether an eligible family receives 12 continuous months of child care assistance or two consecutive six months of assistance, it has the same effect on the overall operation of the child care program. No other child can use that slot during that period. If more families become eligible but

the state does not have enough resources to add new slots, a waiting list will grow regardless of how long families are determined to be eligible. Whether a family is evaluated for eligibility at six months or 12 makes no difference to the overall number of slots paid for in the subsidy program, but it does matter tremendously for the family. While extending eligibility may limit the number of new families entering the system, that number is already limited by financial constraints in any state that does not guarantee subsidies to all eligible families. Moreover, research has found significant reentry to the subsidy system.<sup>19</sup> In many cases “new” families are just returning to the system after a subsidy termination. Longer eligibility would support these parents and their children and avoid the administrative burden for agencies that must process new authorizations.

### Impact on Improper Payments and Accountability

A common concern about extending redetermination periods and limiting interim reporting requirements has been the increased federal focus on improper payments. States are responsible for ensuring that federal funds are used for eligible families. It is possible, however, to design state policies so parents remain eligible for subsidies for longer periods and have fewer interim reporting requirements without increasing improper payments.<sup>20</sup> Improper payments only happen when payments are made for services contradicting state or federal eligibility or payment policies. If the state policy allows a family to be eligible to continue receiving a subsidy without reporting a change, the family is not being paid improperly. Admittedly, however, there may be continued tension in state policies between monitoring for improper payments and improving access and retention for families.

State policymakers also may be concerned that extending redetermination periods will allow non-working individuals to access subsidies while working families are placed on a waiting list. If a 12-month authorization period is granted and a parent loses a job during that period, for example, the state may allow the parent to keep their subsidy while they search for a job. There are several important issues to consider for states. The state

may choose a 12 month redetermination period but require parents to report job loss, allowing the state to choose whether to continue providing assistance to those families. However, in many states, job search, often for extended periods, is an activity that makes families eligible for child care assistance. Therefore, as long as the state eligibility policy allows for the period of job search, the parent is not receiving an improper payment. States may also consider extending eligibility periods for only some families. For example, Kansas targets the granting of annual redetermination to families with more stable work histories.<sup>21</sup>

Given the limited funding for child care subsidies, it is understandable that policymakers would be reluctant to allow parents to retain subsidies during unemployment spells. However, it is important to recognize how the subsidy is still supporting the goal of work by helping the parent find a new job. Broadening definitions of work to include job search and accommodating parent’s fluctuating employment is particularly important during the current economic climate when it may take individuals longer to secure work.

### What Are Appropriate Interim Reporting Requirements?

States policies on interim reporting vary significantly, but they generally require reporting when a change in the family occurs that relates to eligibility. Such changes include income, family size, marital status, the number of days of care or the reason for care. The Office of Child Care offered states flexibility in a Policy Interpretation Question (PIQ) in 1999, which remains current:

The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act does not prescribe a specific eligibility period for families receiving CCDF-funded child care. Nor does the Act address the frequency of, or need for, redetermining eligibility once it is established.

In the implementing regulations, ACF left the Lead Agency flexibility to establish its eligibility process.<sup>22</sup>

In the Urban Institute report *Designing Subsidy Systems to Meet the Needs of Families: An Overview of Policy Research Findings*, Gina Adams recommends many specific state policies that support families. She also provides a rationale for implementation. Adams lists the following as measures of interim reporting policies:

- simplify what needs to be reported,
- make it easier for families to report,
- identify alternative ways of getting information on changes in family circumstances, and
- only adjust subsidies with some changes that are reported.<sup>23</sup>

### Several states have taken steps to limit the interim reporting burden for families:

- Delaware recently revised its interim reporting requirements and has limited the need for reporting to very few situations. All families remain eligible for 12-month assistance unless the following occurs: the child moves out of or is removed from the parent's/caretaker's home; the child moves out of state; the child is deceased; or the parent/caretaker does not cooperate with child support requirements. Additionally, the child care parent fee will not change during the authorization unless the parent/caretaker in a single parent home loses his or her job or one or both parents in a two parent home loses his or her job.<sup>24</sup>
- Oklahoma requires parents to submit new information when the following occur during the 12-month period: there is an expected or reported change in the days and hours child care is needed; there is an anticipated change in income; or protective or preventive child care is approved.
- Pennsylvania allows families to stay in the program if their income increases without interim reporting. The family reports changes at the planned redetermination period. The state also allows continued eligibility without required interim reporting for 60 days due to involuntary loss of work or the parent's completion of an education or training program.

### Specific implementation of interim reporting that support families include ideas such as:

- Give families blanket eligibility regardless of changes in status if families are participating in Head Start, Early Head Start or state pre-kindergarten, as recommended by federal guidance.<sup>25</sup>
- Require families to submit information only if they have significant increases in income (eg, 10 percent or more to their base salary.) In these cases, decreases may not be reported (unless/until they would change the co-payment) and job loss may or may not be reported. Illinois uses a 20 percent change in income measure. According to the Urban Institute, parents in Wisconsin only have to report changes in income when their monthly income increases \$250 or more, or decreases \$100 or more. Indiana only requires parents to report changes in between recertifications that result in a "loss of service" (eg, they are no longer eligible for the subsidy because of job loss or the child no longer needs care).
- Report changes in the hours of care needed only if they change significantly (eg, from full time to part time needs, or by a factor such as 50 percent).
- Continue eligibility in case of job loss for a particular period of time without interim reporting (usually 30 to 60 days).
- Continue eligibility for short-term fluctuations in hours worked, income, or child care needed (eg, reporting is not required if the change is due to overtime or temporary reductions in work hours).
- Require reports of changes in status, but the subsidy is not adjusted until the regular redetermination period (Connecticut, Ohio, and West Virginia do this in some form).
- Allow flexibility in interim reporting, with opportunities to provide needed paperwork in person, by phone, fax or electronically, and limit what paperwork families have to submit to changes to income or other eligibility factors

without requiring resubmitting the original paperwork determining eligibility.

- Allow families a significant period of time to report changes in status. State policies range from five days, which may put enormous burdens on families, to 30 days or more after the effective date of the report changes.
- Put mechanisms in place to capture information from other data sources and from parents about interim changes in circumstances by linking computer systems for public assistance, food programs, and health care.

better align and coordinate child care programs with other early childhood programs, including Head Start, Early Head Start, and state pre-kindergarten programs. Decades of research show that children benefit from access to high-quality child care and early education experiences, improving the odds in particular for low-income children and helping to build solid foundations for future learning and success in life. Thoughtful subsidy redetermination policies can facilitate continued access to these settings for vulnerable children.

States also have policies in place to address families' failure to report interim changes. North Carolina regulations state: "If the failure to report results in a significant overpayment (e.g., the recipient is ineligible or the fee increases substantially) and it appears that there was intent to commit fraud, the child care social worker may refer the family's case to the agency's Program Integrity Unit... **Services may only be terminated if the recipient is determined ineligible.**"<sup>26</sup> [Emphasis in original]."

In addition to simplifying reporting requirements, states have taken steps to simplify the recertification process. For example by linking benefit systems (such as TANF, SNAP and Medicaid) and synchronizing recertification dates, simplifying paperwork, minimizing or eliminating in-person visits, granting grace periods to families, and sending reminders to child care providers to ensure the completion of recertification,<sup>27</sup> states have been able to help families maintain their child care subsidies without significant burdens during reporting periods.

## Conclusion

Adopting annual redetermination policies, with limited interim reporting requirements, can be a positive, cost-neutral policy change for states. The change may reduce administrative burdens on families and state administrators, help parents maintain child care subsidies that keep them employed, and improve continuity of care for children. Importantly, by changing redetermination periods and interim reporting requirements, states can

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup>U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Child Care Bureau, *Child Care and Development Fund Preliminary Estimates: Reasons for Receiving Care, Average Monthly Percentage of Families (FFY 2008)*

[http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ccb/data/ccdf\\_data/08acf800\\_preliminary/table10.htm](http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ccb/data/ccdf_data/08acf800_preliminary/table10.htm).

<sup>2</sup>Marcia K. Meyers, et al, *The Dynamics of Child Care Subsidy Use: A Collaborative Study of Five States*, 2002, [http://nccp.org/publications/pdf/text\\_484.pdf](http://nccp.org/publications/pdf/text_484.pdf); Roberta Weber, *Measurement of Child Care Arrangement Stability: A Review and Case Study Using Oregon Child Care Subsidy Data*, Oregon State University, 2005.

<sup>3</sup>National Child Care Information and Technical Assistance Center, *CCDF Eligibility Policies*,

[http://nccic.acf.hhs.gov/poptopics/eligibility\\_policies.pdf](http://nccic.acf.hhs.gov/poptopics/eligibility_policies.pdf).

<sup>4</sup>Ross A. Thompson, "Early Attachment and Later Development," in *Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical Applications*, ed. Jude Cassidy and Phillip R. Shaver, 1999.

<sup>5</sup>For a discussion of the causes of child care instability see Gina Adams, Monica Rohacek, and Anna Danziger, *Child Care Instability: Definitions, Context and Policy Implications*, Urban Institute, forthcoming.

<sup>6</sup>U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, *Eligibility Determination for Head Start Collaboration*, <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ccb/law/guidance/current/pq9902/pq9902.htm>.

<sup>7</sup>The Race to the Top application included an invitational priority on early learning that encouraged states to submit applications that include practices, strategies, or programs to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children by enhancing the quality of preschool programs.

<sup>8</sup>U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *HHS Accelerates Head Start Quality Improvements and Submits Impact Study on 2002-2003 Head Start Programs*, 2010, <http://www.hhs.gov/news/press/2010pres/01/20100113a.html>.

<sup>9</sup>W. Steven Barnett, *Long-Term Effects of Early Childhood Programs on Cognitive and School Outcomes*, 1995; S. Helburn and M. L. Culkin, *Cost, quality, and child outcomes in child care centers: Executive summary*, 1995; D. Phillips, K. McCartney, and S. Scarr, "Child-care quality and children's social development," *Developmental Psychology* (1987) 23:537-43.

<sup>10</sup>State of Colorado, *Report of the State Auditor, Colorado Child Care Assistance Program Performance Audit*, 2008, [http://www.leg.state.co.us/OSA/coauditor1.nsf/All/8B87ED8F4A51F63687257516007C98D8/\\$FILE/1909%20CCAP%20Perf%20Nov%202008.pdf](http://www.leg.state.co.us/OSA/coauditor1.nsf/All/8B87ED8F4A51F63687257516007C98D8/$FILE/1909%20CCAP%20Perf%20Nov%202008.pdf).

<sup>11</sup>Kathleen Snyder, Patti Banghart, and Gina Adams, *Strategies to Support Child Care Subsidy Access and Retention: Ideas from Seven Midwestern States*, Urban Institute, 2006, <http://www.urban.org/publications/311388.html>.

<sup>12</sup>Gina Adams, Kathleen Snyder, and Jodi R. Sandfort, *Navigating the Child Care Subsidy System: Policies and Practices that Affect Access and Retention*, Urban Institute, 2002, <http://www.urban.org/uploadedPDF/310450.pdf>; Gina Adams, Kathleen Snyder, and Patti Banghart, *Designing Subsidy Systems to Meet the Needs of Families*, Urban Institute, 2008,

[http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411611\\_subsidy\\_system.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411611_subsidy_system.pdf); Gina Adams, Kathleen Snyder, and Jodi R. Sandfort,

*Getting and Getting and Retaining Child Care Assistance: How Policy and Practice Influence Parents' Experiences*, Urban Institute, 2002,

<http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310451.pdf>.

<sup>13</sup>Adams et al., *Designing Subsidy Systems to Meet the Needs of Families*.

<sup>14</sup>See Deana Grobe, Roberta B. Weber, Elizabeth E. Davis, *Why Do They Leave? Child Care Subsidy Use in Oregon*, Oregon State University Family Policy Program and Oregon Child Care Research Partnership, 2006, [http://www.hhs.oregonstate.edu/familypolicy/occrp/publications/2006-C&S\\_Study\\_Final\\_Report\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.hhs.oregonstate.edu/familypolicy/occrp/publications/2006-C&S_Study_Final_Report_FINAL.pdf); Adams et al., *Getting and Retaining Child Care Assistance*.

<sup>15</sup>Adams et al., *Getting and Retaining Child Care Assistance*.

<sup>16</sup>Snyder et al., *Strategies to Support Child Care Subsidy Access and Retention*.

<sup>17</sup>See Deana Grobe et al., *Why Do They Leave?*

<sup>18</sup>See discussion of dynamic nature of employment of low-income women in Adams et al., *Designing Subsidy Systems to Meet the Needs of Families*.

<sup>19</sup>Marcia K. Meyers, et al, *The Dynamics of Child Care Subsidy Use: A Collaborative Study of Five States*, 2002, [http://nccp.org/publications/pdf/text\\_484.pdf](http://nccp.org/publications/pdf/text_484.pdf).

<sup>20</sup>U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, *Program Instruction CCDF-ACF-PI-2010-06—Program Integrity, Financial Accountability, Access to Child Care*, 2010, <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ccb/law/guidance/current/pi2010-06/pi2010-06.htm>.

<sup>21</sup> Kathleen Snyder et al., *Strategies to Support Child Care Subsidy Access and Retention*.

<sup>22</sup> U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *Eligibility Determination for Head Start Collaboration*.

<sup>23</sup> Adams et al., *Designing Subsidy Systems to Meet the Needs of Families*.

<sup>24</sup> Delaware Department of Health and Social Services, Division of Social Services, 16 Del.C., Ch. 5, §512, 1004.11.

<sup>25</sup> U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *Eligibility Determination for Head Start Collaboration*.

<sup>26</sup> North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services, *Child Care Subsidy Services Policy Manual*, Chapter 11: Responding to Eligibility Changes and Redetermination, <http://zeus.dhhs.state.nc.us/olm/manuals/dcd/ccs/man/CCSc11-02.htm#TopOfPage>.

<sup>27</sup> Snyder et al., *Strategies to Support Child Care Subsidy Access and Retention*.



# AGENCY-WIDE FAMILY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

FALL 2010

Prepared by  
the Research Department



**Child Care  
Resource Center™**

Quality · Support · Development · Education

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank staff in the Research Department and management and staff in the CalWORKs Program, Family Support Services, School Readiness Program, Head Start, Family Child Care Home Education Network, and Resource and Referral without whom gathering and compiling these data would not have been possible.

For more information regarding this and other projects, please contact:

Olivia Pillado, M.A., Research Coordinator

818.717.1000 ext. 8101

[opillado@ccrcla.org](mailto:opillado@ccrcla.org)

or

Susan Savage, Ph.D., Research Director

818.717.1040

[ssavage@ccrcla.org](mailto:ssavage@ccrcla.org)

Child Care Resource Center

20001 Prairie Street, Chatsworth, CA 91311

[www.ccrcla.org](http://www.ccrcla.org)

### Description of Project

In 2008, Child Care Resource Center launched an agency-wide effort to collect family needs assessment data from families served in programs across the agency to gain a better understanding of the families' needs to be able to better support them in their economic success and in their children's social and emotional development. Data were collected from families participating in the following programs: California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs), Family Support Services (FSS, Stage 2, Stage 3, and AP), School Readiness Initiative (SRI), Head Start (HS), Family Child Care Home Education Network (FCCHEN), and families requesting child care referrals through the Resource and Referral (R&R) department. Family needs assessments were also collected from parents on the Centralized Eligibility List (CEL) in 2009 and data these are presented as a comparison group of families who were not receiving subsidized child care services through CCRC when they completed an assessment. Where data is available by service area or for multiple years, comparisons are presented.

### General Findings

Table 1 below illustrates the highest areas of need for families served by CCRC. The red cells indicate the greatest area of need for each program, orange cells indicate the second highest area of need, and yellow cells represent the third highest area of need for each program. Across the agency, the greatest proportion of parents expressed a need in Housing Programs; 4 out of 6 programs had the largest group of parents indicating a need in this area. Furthermore, while this area of need was not the highest for families in HS, 34.0% indicated that they had a need in this area. The second highest area of need was in Utility Bill Assistance with 4 out of the 6 programs having this as their second highest area of need. Additional areas in which the highest proportion of parents indicated need were: Recreational and Educational Programs for Children, ESL Classes, Parenting Classes, and Job Training. See Table 2 for data on each program's need by domain. See Tables 3 through 6 for multiple year and/or multi-site comparisons (when available) by program.

**Table 1. Areas of Highest Need by Program**

	CEL	CalWORKs	FSS	SRI	HS	FCCHEN	RR
Housing Programs	50.9%	59.0%	21.0%	11.0%	34.0%	52.9%	44.7%
Utility Bill Assistance	52.3%	57.0%	20.2%	11.0%	N/A	52.9%	52.9%
Recreational Programs for Child	42.4%	22.3%	9.7%	22.1%	N/A	43.1%	41.7%
Educational Programs for Child	43.4%	25.1%	7.5%	29.9%	N/A	36.5%	39.8%
ESL Classes	22.5%	6.4%	3.6%	26.0%	39.5%	28.4%	10.7%
Parenting Classes	35.2%	20.7%	7.9%	22.1%	45.4%	41.2%	33.0%
Job Training	29.1%	23.1%	9.3%	15.6%	41.1%	38.2%	10.7%

Red= Highest Area of Need; Orange= 2nd Highest Area of Need; Yellow= 3rd Highest Area of Need

#### Family Child Care Home Education Network- General Findings (in Table 2)

Over 50% of families indicated a need in Housing Programs and Utility Bill Assistance. Over 40% of parents expressed a need in Parenting classes and Recreational Programs for a Child, over 30% expressed a need for Educational Programs for a Child, and over 20% of parents expressed a need in Food Stamps / WIC, Public Transportation Services, Finding a Job, ESL Classes, College, and Nutrition Education.

#### CalWORKs- General Findings and Multiple Year Comparison (Table 3)

The needs of our CalWORKs families have not changed much in the last two years. This year, greater than 50% of our clients report needs in the areas of Housing Programs and Utility Bill

Assistance. Greater than 20% of our clients report needs in the areas of Dental Insurance for Children, Parenting Classes, Job Training, Finding a Job, College Programs, Educational and Recreational Programs for Their Children, and Public Transportation Services. This year there was an increase in need for Child Dental Insurance (from 12.2% in 2008 to 21.9% in 2010).

#### Family Support Services- General Findings and Site Comparison (Table 4)

Greater than 20% of families reported needs in the areas of Housing Programs and Utility Bill Assistance. In general, needs for families in HQ slightly greater than needs for families in AV. Notably, families in HQ reported greater needs in the areas of Parenting Classes (10.2% vs. 3.9%), double the need for GED / High School Diploma (8.7% vs. 4.1%), ESL Classes (4.5 % vs. 2.0%) and College (10.7% vs. 5.3%) than families in AV.

#### Head Start- General Findings and Multiple Year Comparison (Table 5)

The needs for families were almost identical during both assessments (Fall 2008 and Fall 2009) with over 20% of families reporting needs in the areas of Housing Programs, Parenting Classes, Job Training, GED / High School Diploma, and ESL Classes.

#### Resource and Referral- General Findings and Survey Modality Comparison (Table 6)

More than 20% of families reported needs in the areas of Food Stamps / WIC, Housing Programs, Utility Bill Assistance, Public Transportation Services, Parenting Classes, Job Training, Finding a Job, College, Child Care Services, and Educational and Recreational Programs for Children. In general, families who completed a family assessment by mail reported higher needs than families who completed an on-line family assessment, particularly in the areas of Basic Needs such as Housing Programs (51.0% vs. 38.5%), Food (25.5% vs. 11.5%), and Clothing (29.4% vs. 7.7%) and Skill Enhancement areas such as Job Training (41.2% vs. 23.1%), Classes for Reading and Writing (11.8% vs. 5.8%), Finding a Job (37.3% vs. 23.1%), GED/HSD (21.6% vs. 15.4%), ESL Classes (13.7% vs. 7.7%), and College (27.5% vs. 21.2%). As indicated in the March 2010 R&R report, families requesting referrals via telephone (and thus completing surveys via mail) are more likely to be Latino, to have lower income (make less than \$12,000/year), to not have a High School Diploma, and to be separated than families requesting referrals via the on-line referral system. The differences in needs between both groups of families lends further support to the idea that families who access referrals via telephone and families who access referrals on-line are different from each other.

#### Conclusion

Housing Programs and Utility Bill Assistance are two areas of need which have been and continue to be a high priority for families served by CCRC. In the most current assessment, over 50% of families in CalWORKs and FCCHEN, over 40% of families accessing child care referrals through R&R, and over 20% of families served by FSS and HS indicated a need for information on Housing Programs. Furthermore, multiple year data for families in HS and CalWORKs indicate that this is an area of need that has been relatively high for the last two years. Therefore, it is important to continue to research information to support families in this domain, including information about LA Housing Programs which can be found at <http://www.lafh.org/services/permanent.html>.

Multiple year data for CalWORKs and HS families indicate that the areas of highest needs have remained relatively the same during the last two years, with one exemption—the percentage of CalWORKs families reporting a need for Child Dental Insurance increased from 12.2% in 2008 to 21.9% in 2010. The increase in percentage of families indicating this as an area of need may be reflective of budget cuts in the state of California which temporarily halted enrollment in the

Healthy Families Program during 2009.<sup>1</sup> Hence, it is important to remain cognizant of families' changing needs and continue to connect families to resources in this area given that untreated dental disease in children can potentially lead to children's absences in school, an inability to eat well, sleep well and function well at home and school and can have potential costly long-term effects.<sup>2</sup>

The multi-site and service modality comparisons also reflect the importance of recognizing that even within a given program, families may have different needs. Slightly greater proportions of families served in HQ through FSS reported needs in the domains assessed than families served in the Antelope Valley. There were also differences between families who accessed child care referrals via telephone and families who accessed child care referrals through our on-line referral system. Greater percentages of families who accessed referrals via telephone expressed a need in basic needs areas such as Housing Programs, Food, and Clothing and Skill Enhancement areas such as Job Training, Classes for Reading and Writing, Finding a Job, GED / HSD, ESL Classes, and College than families who accessed child care referrals on-line.

Information provided in this document can be used by management and staff to better gauge and understand the needs of the families we serve in order to guide and focus efforts to support families in their economic success and in their children's development.

---

<sup>1</sup> Children Now Oral Health Access Council (2009). *Oral Health Policy Brief*. Retrieved on 9/17/10 from [http://www.childrennow.org/uploads/documents/oral\\_health\\_brief\\_092009.pdf](http://www.childrennow.org/uploads/documents/oral_health_brief_092009.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> The California Society of Pediatric Dentistry. *The Consequences of Untreated Dental Disease in Children: Looking Closer at California's Children*. Retrieved on 9/17/10 from [http://www.cspd.org/advocacy/pdf/untreated\\_disease.pdf](http://www.cspd.org/advocacy/pdf/untreated_disease.pdf).

**Table 2. Agency-wide Family Needs Assessment**

	Central Eligibility List (CEL)	CalWORKs (CWSS)	Family Support Services (FSS)	School Readiness Initiative (SRI)	Head Start (HS)	Family Child Care Home Education Network (FCCHEN)	Resource & Referral (R&R) (Combined)
	N = 707	N=251	N = 4269	N = 154	N=1084	N=102	N=103
	Summer 2009	Summer 2010	Oct09-Jun10	Fall 2009	Fall 2009	Summer 2009	August 2009
<b>NEED</b>							
Health insurance for child(ren)	8.9% (63)	<b>10.0% (25)</b>	4.8% (206)	1.9% (3)	2.3% (25)	8.8% (9)	6.8% (9)
Medical Home	16.3% (115)	13.1% (33)	6.7% (284)	2.6% (4)	10.2% (111)	<b>17.6% (18)</b>	15.5% (16)
Dental insurance for child(ren)	16.4% (116)	<b>21.9% (55)</b>	5.6% (240)	3.9% (6)	2.9% (32)	16.7% (17)	10.7% (11)
Food in general	24.5% (173)	<b>13.1% (33)</b>	4.5% (192)	7.8% (12)	8.4% (91)	12.7% (13)	18.4% (19)
Food for this week	7.9% (56)	<b>17.1% (43)</b>	3.6% (153)	3.9% (6)	4.0% (43)	1.0% (1)	16.5% (17)
Food Stamps / WIC	26.7% (189)	13.5% (34)	5.7% (243)	12.3% (19)	13.0% (141)	<b>29.4% (30)</b>	21.4% (22)
Clothing	18.4% (130)	18.3% (46)	4.9% (211)	5.8% (9)	8.3% (90)	11.8% (12)	<b>18.4% (19)</b>
A place to live	12.6% (89)	12.4% (31)	3.8% (160)	1.9% (3)	3.4% (37)	13.7% (14)	<b>16.5% (17)</b>
Housing programs	50.9% (360)	<b>59.0% (148)</b>	21.5% (918)	11.0% (17)	34.0% (369)	52.9% (54)	44.7% (46)
Utility bill assistance	52.3% (370)	<b>57.0% (143)</b>	20.2% (863)	11.0% (17)	NA	52.9% (54)	44.7% (46)
Public transportation services	21.8% (154)	29.9% (75)	6.6% (282)	6.5% (10)	NA	27.5% (28)	27.2% (28)
<b>MENTAL WELL-BEING</b>							
Parenting classes	35.2% (249)	20.7% (52)	7.9% (336)	22.1% (34)	<b>45.4% (492)</b>	41.2% (42)	33.0% (34)
<b>COUNSELING PROGRAMS</b>							
Mental health	NA	NA	NA	NA	9.0% (98)	NA	NA
Parenting	28.4% (201)	NA	3.3% (139)	7.1% (11)	NA	<b>23.5% (24)</b>	26.2% (27)
Marital issues	8.6% (61)	2.8% (7)	1.3% (57)	3.9% (6)	NA	<b>8.8% (9)</b>	8.7% (9)

	CEL	CWSS	FSS	SRI	HS	FCCHEN	R&R (Combined)
	N = 707	N=251	N = 4269	N = 154	N=1084	N=102	N=103
<b>COUNSELING PROGRAMS</b>							
Terminal illness	1.4% (10)	0% (0)	0.3% (11)	0% (0)	NA	<b>1.0% (1)</b>	1.9% (2)
Domestic violence	3.5% (25)	<b>4.0% (10)</b>	1.1% (47)	1.3% (2)	NA	2.9% (3)	3.9% (4)
Stress management	23.5% (166)	16.3% (41)	6.8% (290)	9.7% (15)	NA	<b>18.6% (19)</b>	18.4% (19)
Quitting smoking	2.5% (18)	<b>3.6% (9)</b>	1.1% (47)	1.3% (2)	NA	1.0% (1)	3.9% (4)
Child abuse	1.7% (12)	0.8% (2)	0.5% (22)	<b>1.3% (2)</b>	NA	1.0% (1)	2.9% (3)
Suicide	1.1% (8)	0.4% (1)	0.3% (11)	0% (0)	NA	<b>1.0% (1)</b>	1.0% (1)
Death	1.3% (9)	0.4% (1)	0.5% (21)	0.6% (1)	NA	<b>1.0% (1)</b>	1.9% (2)
Depression	12.9% (91)	10.8% (27)	3.6% (152)	5.2% (8)	NA	<b>11.8% (12)</b>	14.6% (15)
Substance abuse	0.8% (6)	0% (0)	0.2% (8)	<b>0.6% (1)</b>	NA	0% (0)	1.0% (1)
<b>SKILL ENHANCEMENT- NFORMATION WANTED</b>							
Job training	32.0% (226)	23.1% (58)	9.3% (396)	15.6% (24)	<b>41.1% (446)</b>	38.2% (39)	32.0% (33)
Classes for reading and writing	7.9% (56)	4.0% (10)	3.9% (167)	3.2% (5)	7.0% (76)	<b>11.8% (12)</b>	8.7% (9)
Finding a job	32.0% (226)	21.9% (55)	8.9% (378)	15.6% (24)	NA	<b>27.5% (28)</b>	30.1% (31)
GED / HSD	18.7% (132)	10.0% (25)	7.0% (298)	9.1% (14)	<b>24.2% (262)</b>	16.7% (17)	18.4% (19)
ESL classes	22.5% (159)	6.4% (16)	3.6% (153)	<b>26.0% (40)</b>	<b>39.5% (428)</b>	28.4% (29)	10.7% (11)
College	29.1% (206)	20.3% (51)	8.7% (371)	3.9% (6)	15.3% (166)	22.5% (23)	<b>24.3% (25)</b>
<b>OTHER INFORMATION WANTED</b>							
Family planning	6.6% (47)	3.6% (9)	2.0% (85)	4.5% (7)	NA	2.9% (3)	<b>10.7% (11)</b>
Child care services	<b>49.9% (353)</b>	9.2% (23)	2.1% (88)	11.0% (17)	19.2% (208)	3.9% (4)	<b>30.1% (31)</b>

	CEL	CWSS	FSS	SRI	HS	FCCHEN	R&R (Combined)
	N = 707	N=251	N = 4269	N = 154	N=1084	N=102	N=103
Child safety	4.2% (30)	4.4% (11)	1.1% (45)	<b>4.5% (7)</b>	NA	3.9% (4)	2.9% (3)
Nutrition education	17.8% (126)	12.0% (30)	4.5% (194)	13.0% (20)	NA	<b>25.5% (26)</b>	11.7% (12)
Educational programs for your child	43.4% (307)	<b>25.1% (63)</b>	7.5% (322)	<b>29.9% (46)</b>	NA	36.3% (37)	<b>39.8% (41)</b>
Car seat distribution	16.1% (114)	7.2% (18)	2.4% (104)	7.8% (12)	NA	10.8% (11)	<b>14.6% (15)</b>
CalWORKs	8.8% (62)	5.6% (14)	1.48% (63)	1.3% (2)	7.0% (76)	<b>10.8% (11)</b>	9.7% (10)
Recreational programs for your child	42.4% (300)	22.3% (56)	<b>9.7% (412)</b>	<b>22.1% (34)</b>	NA	<b>43.1% (44)</b>	<b>41.7% (43)</b>
<b>INFANT CARE</b>							
Child take bottle to bed?	16.4% (116)	18.3% (46)	3.7% (159)	13.6% (21)	NA	<b>27.5% (28)</b>	
If Yes, bottle has liquid other than water*	66.4% (77)	60.8% (28)	67.3% (107)	81.0% (17)	NA	60.7% (17)	
Need prenatal care	1.1% (8)	2.0% (5)	0.7% (28)	0.6% (1)	<b>4.4% (48)</b>	0% (0)	2.9% (3)
Information on breastfeeding	2.4% (17)	<b>3.2% (8)</b>	0.5% (22)	5.2% (8)	NA	0% (0)	3.9% (4)
<b>LEGAL ASSISTANCE</b>							
Divorce	5.0% (35)	<b>5.6% (14)</b>	3.3% (139)	0.6% (1)	1.4% (15)	3.9% (4)	3.9% (4)
Restraining order	2.1% (15)	<b>2.0% (5)</b>	1.1% (47)	1.3% (2)	0.3% (3)	<b>2.0% (2)</b>	1.9% (2)
Immigration	8.1% (57)	3.6% (9)	1.2% (52)	3.2% (5)	7.7% (84)	<b>8.8% (9)</b>	5.8% (6)
Custody	7.2% (51)	<b>9.2% (23)</b>	3.0% (127)	0% (0)	2.1% (23)	3.9% (4)	7.8% (8)
Landlord / tenant	3.5% (25)	2.8% (7)	1.2% (52)	1.9% (3)	0.9% (10)	1.0% (1)	<b>5.8% (6)</b>

Note: \*This percentage is out of children who take bottle to bed. Bold numbers indicate program which had the highest need in a particular domain across the agency. A highlighted cell indicates that area of need was one of the highest three for this program.

**Table 3. CalWORKs: Multiple Year Comparison**

	CWSS	CWSS
	N = 411	N=251
	Summer 2008	Summer 2010
<b>NEED</b>		
Health insurance for child(ren)	10.2% (42)	10.0% (25)
Medical Home	16.8% (69)	13.1% (33)
Dental insurance for child(ren)	12.2% (50)	21.9% (55)
Food in general	21.7% (89)	13.1% (33)
Food for this week	14.4% (59)	17.1% (43)
Food Stamps / WIC	12.2% (50)	13.5% (34)
Clothing	25.3% (104)	18.3% (46)
A place to live	15.6% (64)	12.4% (31)
Housing programs	59.9% (246)	59.0% (148)
Utility bill assistance	56.4% (232)	57.0% (143)
Public transportation services	27.0% (111)	29.9% (75)
<b>MENTAL WELL-BEING</b>		
Parenting classes	26.5% (109)	20.7% (52)
<b>COUNSELING PROGRAMS</b>		
Mental health	NA	NA
Parenting	20.7% (85)	NA
Marital issues	2.4% (10)	2.8% (7)
Terminal illness	0.5% (2)	0% (0)
Domestic violence	3.9% (16)	4.0% (10)
Stress management	15.6% (64)	16.3% (41)
Quitting smoking	4.1% (17)	3.6% (9)
Child abuse	1.9% (8)	0.8% (2)
Suicide	0.5% (2)	0.4% (1)
Death	1.2% (5)	0.4% (1)
Depression	9.7% (40)	10.8% (27)
Substance abuse	0.7% (3)	0% (0)

	CWSS	CWSS
	N = 411	N=251
	Summer 2008	Summer 2010
<b>SKILL ENHANCEMENT- INFORMATION WANTED</b>		
Job training	22.9% (94)	23.1% (58)
Classes for reading and writing	6.1% (25)	4.0% (10)
Finding a job	22.1% (91)	21.9% (55)
GED / HSD	18.2% (75)	10.0% (25)
ESL classes	5.1% (21)	6.4% (16)
College	20.4% (84)	20.3% (51)
<b>OTHER INFORMATION WANTED</b>		
Family planning	4.4% (18)	3.6% (9)
Child care services	6.8% (28)	9.2% (23)
Child safety	4.1% (17)	4.4% (11)
Nutrition education	14.6% (60)	12.0% (30)
Educational programs for your child	24.1% (99)	25.1% (63)
Car seat distribution	11.4% (47)	7.2% (18)
CalWORKs	3.2% (13)	5.6% (14)
Recreational programs for your child	31.6% (130)	22.3% (56)
<b>INFANT CARE</b>		
Child take bottle to bed?	16.3% (67)	18.3% (46)
If Yes, bottle has other than water*	68.7% (46)	60.8% (28)
Need prenatal care	0.7% (3)	2.0% (5)
Information on breastfeeding	1.0% (4)	3.2% (8)
<b>LEGAL ASSISTANCE</b>		
Divorce	6.3% (26)	5.6% (14)
Restraining order	2.9% (12)	2.0% (5)
Immigration	3.4% (14)	3.6% (9)
Custody	8.5% (35)	9.2% (23)
Landlord / tenant	2.9% (12)	2.8% (7)

Note: “NA” indicates that this information was not collected for this program. A highlighted cell indicates that area of need was one of the highest three for this program.

**Table 4. Family Support Services: Multiple Site Comparison**

	FSS : AV & HQ	FSS: AV	FSS: HQ
	N = 4269	N=1580	N=2689
	Oct2009-June2010	Oct2009-June2010	Oct2009-June2010
<b>Need</b>			
Health insurance for child(ren)	4.8% (206)	3.9% (62)	5.4% (144)
Medical Home	6.7% (284)	3.5% (55)	8.5% (229)
Dental insurance for child(ren)	5.6% (240)	3.9% (62)	6.6% (178)
Food in general	4.5% (192)	2.7% (43)	5.5% (149)
Food for this week	3.6% (153)	2.5% (39)	4.2% (144)
Food Stamps / WIC	5.7% (243)	3.7% (58)	6.9% (185)
Clothing	4.9% (211)	5.0% (78)	5.0% (133)
A place to live	3.8% (160)	2.6% (41)	4.4% (119)
Housing programs	21.5% (918)	15.3% (242)	25.1% (676)
Utility bill assistance	20.2% (863)	15.1% (239)	23.2% (624)
Public transportation services	6.6% (282)	5.7% (90)	7.1% (192)
<b>MENTAL WELL-BEING</b>			
Parenting classes	7.9% (336)	3.9% (62)	10.2% (274)
<b>COUNSELING PROGRAMS</b>			
Mental health	NA	NA	NA
Parenting	3.3% (139)	8.8% (139)	0% (0)
Marital issues	1.3% (57)	1.1% (17)	1.5% (40)
Terminal illness	0.3% (11)	0.1% (2)	0.3% (9)
Domestic violence	1.1% (47)	1.3% (21)	1.0% (26)
Stress management	6.8% (290)	6.9% (109)	6.7% (181)
Quitting smoking	1.1% (47)	1.2% (19)	1.0% (28)
Child abuse	0.5% (22)	0.1% (2)	0.7% (20)
Suicide	0.3% (11)	0.1% (2)	0.3% (9)
Death	0.5% (21)	0.6% (9)	0.5% (12)
Depression	3.6% (152)	3.4% (54)	3.6% (98)
Substance abuse	0.2% (8)	0.1% (1)	0.3% (7)

	FSS : AV & HQ	FSS: AV	FSS: HQ
	N = 4269	N=1580	N=2689
	Oct2009-June2010	Oct2009-June2010	Oct2009-June2010
<b>SKILL ENHANCEMENT- INFORMATION WANTED</b>			
Job training	9.3% (396)	8.5% (134)	9.7% (262)
Classes for reading and writing	3.9% (167)	3.2% (51)	4.3% (116)
Finding a job	8.9% (378)	7.9% (125)	9.4% (253)
GED / HSD	7.0% (298)	4.1% (64)	8.7% (234)
ESL classes	3.6% (153)	2.0% (32)	4.5% (121)
College	8.7% (371)	5.3% (83)	10.7% (288)
<b>OTHER INFORMATION WANTED</b>			
Family planning	2.0% (85)	0.4% (7)	2.9% (78)
Child care services	2.1% (88)	1.1% (17)	2.6% (71)
Child safety	1.1% (45)	1.0% (15)	1.1% (30)
Nutrition education	4.5% (194)	3.7% (58)	5.1% (136)
Educational programs for your child	7.5% (322)	6.5% (103)	8.1% (219)
Car seat distribution	2.4% (104)	1.5% (24)	3.0% (80)
CalWORKs	1.5% (63)	1.6% (25)	1.4% (38)
Recreational programs for your child	9.7% (412)	7.3% (115)	11.0% (297)
<b>INFANT CARE</b>			
Child take bottle to bed?	3.7% (159)	2.5% (39)	4.5% (120)
If Yes, bottle has other than water*	67.3% (107)	25.6% (10)	80.0% (97)
Need prenatal care	0.7% (28)	0.8% (13)	0.6% (15)
Information on breastfeeding	0.5% (22)	0.1% (2)	0.7% (20)
<b>LEGAL ASSISTANCE</b>			
Divorce	3.3% (139)	2.5% (40)	3.7% (99)
Restraining order	1.1% (47)	0.6% (10)	1.4% (37)
Immigration	1.2% (52)	0.8% (13)	1.6% (44)
Custody	3.0% (127)	2.0% (32)	3.5% (95)
Landlord / tenant	1.2% (52)	0.3% (4)	1.8% (48)

Note: "NA" indicates that this information was not collected for this program. A highlighted cell indicates that area of need was one of the highest three for this program.

**Table 5. Head Start: Multiple Year Comparison**

	HS	HS
	N = 1099	N=1084
	Fall 2008	Fall 2009
<b>NEED</b>		
Health insurance for child(ren)	2.5% (28)	2.3% (25)
Medical Home	8.2% (90)	10.2% (111)
Dental insurance for child(ren)	3.8% (42)	2.9% (32)
Food in general	9.5% (104)	8.4% (91)
Food for this week	4.4% (48)	4.0% (43)
Food Stamps / WIC	13.7% (151)	13.0% (141)
Clothing	8.5% (93)	8.3% (90)
A place to live	5.6% (62)	3.4% (37)
Housing programs	33.7% (370)	34.0% (369)
Utility bill assistance	NA	NA
Public transportation services	NA	NA
<b>MENTAL WELL-BEING</b>		
Parenting classes	46.0% (506)	45.4% (492)
<b>COUNSELING PROGRAMS</b>		
Mental health	8.9% (98)	9.0% (98)
Parenting	NA	NA
Marital issues	NA	NA
Terminal illness	NA	NA
Domestic violence	NA	NA
Stress management	NA	NA
Quitting smoking	NA	NA
Child abuse	NA	NA
Suicide	NA	NA
Death	NA	NA
Depression	NA	NA
Substance abuse	NA	NA

	HS	HS
	Fall 2008	Fall 2009
	N = 1099	N=1084
<b>SKILL ENHANCEMENT- INFORMATION WANTED</b>		
Job training	38.9% (428)	41.1% (446)
Classes for reading and writing	6.5% (71)	7.0% (76)
Finding a job	NA	NA
GED / HSD	23.8% (262)	24.2% (262)
ESL classes	41.8% (460)	39.5% (428)
College	18.0% (198)	15.3% (166)
<b>OTHER INFORMATION WANTED</b>		
Family planning	NA	NA
Child care services	21.5% (236)	19.2% (208)
Child safety	NA	NA
Nutrition education	NA	NA
Educational programs for your child	NA	NA
Car seat distribution	NA	NA
CalWORKs	7.1% (78)	7.0% (76)
Recreational programs for your child	NA	NA
<b>INFANT CARE</b>		
Child take bottle to bed?	NA	NA
If Yes, bottle has other than water*	NA	NA
Need prenatal care	1.1% (12)	4.4% (48)
Information on breastfeeding	NA	NA
<b>LEGAL ASSISTANCE</b>		
Divorce	0.8% (9)	1.4% (15)
Restraining order	0.5% (5)	0.3% (3)
Immigration	5.5% (60)	7.7% (84)
Custody	1.7% (19)	2.1% (23)
Landlord / tenant	1.0% (11)	0.9% (10)

Note: “NA” indicates that this information was not collected for this program. A highlighted cell indicates that area of need was one of the highest three for this program.

**Table 6. Resource and Referral: Service/Survey Modality Comparison**

	R&R	R&R	R&R
	COMBINED	INTERNET	MAIL
	N=103	N=52	N=51
<b>NEED</b>			
Health insurance for child(ren)	6.8% (9)	3.8% (2)	9.8% (5)
Medical Home	15.5% (16)	17.3% (9)	13.7% (7)
Dental insurance for child(ren)	10.7% (11)	11.5% (6)	9.8% (5)
Food in general	18.4% (19)	11.5% (6)	25.5% (13)
Food for this week	16.5% (17)	9.6% (5)	23.5% (12)
Food Stamps / WIC	21.4% (22)	19.2% (10)	23.5% (12)
Clothing	18.4% (19)	7.7% (4)	29.4% (15)
A place to live	16.5% (17)	15.4% (8)	17.6% (9)
Housing programs	44.7% (46)	38.5% (20)	51.0% (26)
Utility bill assistance	44.7% (46)	42.3% (22)	47.1% (24)
Public transportation services	27.2% (28)	21.2% (11)	33.3% (17)
<b>MENTAL WELL-BEING</b>			
Parenting classes	33.0% (34)	32.7% (17)	33.3% (17)
<b>COUNSELING PROGRAMS</b>			
Mental health	NA	NA	NA
Parenting	26.2% (27)	23.1% (12)	29.4% (15)
Marital issues	8.7% (9)	11.5% (6)	5.9% (3)
Terminal illness	1.9% (2)	0% (0)	3.9% (2)
Domestic violence	3.9% (4)	3.8% (2)	3.9% (2)
Stress management	18.4% (19)	21.2% (11)	15.7% (8)
Quitting smoking	3.9% (4)	1.9% (1)	5.9% (3)
Child abuse	2.9% (3)	1.9% (1)	3.9% (2)
Suicide	1.0% (1)	0% (0)	2.0% (1)
Death	1.9% (2)	0% (0)	3.9% (2)
Depression	14.6% (15)	15.4% (8)	13.7% (7)
Substance abuse	1.0% (1)	0% (0)	2.0% (1)

	R&R	R&R	R&R
	COMBINED	INTERNET	MAIL
	N=103	N=52	N=51
<b>SKILL ENHANCEMENT- INFORMATION WANTED</b>			
Job training	32.0% (33)	23.1% (12)	41.2% (21)
Classes for reading and writing	8.7% (9)	5.8% (3)	11.8% (6)
Finding a job	30.1% (31)	23.1% (12)	37.3% (19)
GED / HSD	18.4% (19)	15.4% (8)	21.6% (11)
ESL classes	10.7% (11)	7.7% (4)	13.7% (7)
College	24.3% (25)	21.2% (11)	27.5% (14)
<b>OTHER INFORMATION WANTED</b>			
Family planning	10.7% (11)	11.5% (6)	9.8% (5)
Child care services	30.1% (31)	28.1% (15)	31.4% (16)
Child safety	2.9% (3)	1.9% (1)	3.9% (2)
Nutrition education	11.7% (12)	13.5% (7)	9.9% (5)
Educational programs for your child	39.8% (41)	40.4% (21)	39.2% (20)
Car seat distribution	14.6% (15)	9.6% (5)	19.6% (10)
CalWORKs	9.7% (10)	5.8% (3)	13.7% (7)
Recreational programs for your child	41.7% (43)	46.2% (24)	37.3% (19)
<b>INFANT CARE</b>			
Child take bottle to bed?	0.1% (8)	1.9% (1)	13.7% (7)
If Yes, bottle has other than water*	NA	NA	NA
Need prenatal care	2.9% (3)	5.8% (3)	0% (0)
Information on breastfeeding	3.9% (4)	7.7% (4)	0% (0)
<b>LEGAL ASSISTANCE</b>			
Divorce	3.9% (4)	5.8% (3)	2.0% (1)
Restraining order	1.9% (2)	3.8% (2)	0% (0)
Immigration	5.8% (6)	3.8% (2)	7.8% (4)
Custody	7.8% (8)	9.6% (5)	5.9% (3)
Landlord / tenant	5.8% (6)	1.9% (1)	2.0% (1)

Note: "NA" indicates that this information was not collected for this program. A highlighted cell indicates that area of need was one of the highest three for this program.