



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

RETREAT MINUTES

July 15, 2009
8:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Eaton Canyon Nature Center
1750 North Altadena Drive
Pasadena, California

1. **COFFEE AND NETWORKING**
2. **CALL TO ORDER**

- a. **Welcome**

Mr. Duane Dennis, Chair of the Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable), opened the meeting at 9:25 a.m. Members and guests were welcomed and invited to introduce themselves.

Mr. Dennis made the following opening comments:

- On behalf of the Roundtable, Mr. Dennis expressed gratitude to Mr. Matt Rezvani and BP for sponsoring the lunch.
- Ms. Jan Isenberg, representing the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) on the Roundtable, has stepped down due to her changed responsibilities. She will be replaced by Ms. Sarah Younglove of LACOE, bringing with her a long history of focus on Head Start.

Ms. Younglove thanked Mr. Dennis for his welcome and provided a bit of background. She began her career as a public school teacher, and then joined Head Start in 1978. She has worked in many capacities with Head Start and Early Head Start, including at the Washington, D.C. Headquarters and with the American Indian Branch. Her expertise has been enhanced by her work with deficient agencies that has since evolved to working towards greater levels of quality and excellence.

Mr. Dennis again welcomed Ms. Younglove and expressed his pleasure that Head Start will be at the table.

- b. **Review of Minutes**

- June 10, 2009

Ms. Maria Calix made a motion to approve the minutes as written; Ms. Esther Torrez seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

c. Nominating Committee Report

- Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2009-10

Ms. Connie Russell announced the 2009-10 candidates for Chair and Vice Chair; Ms. Terri Chew Nishimura is the nominee for Chair and Ms. Ruth Yoon as Vice Chair. There were no nominations made from the floor. Ms. Nishimura as Chair and Ms. Yoon as Vice Chair were approved by acclamation. Mr. Dennis welcomed Ms. Nishimura and Ms. Yoon as the officers to begin in September.

- Comments from the New Officers

Ms. Nishimura, saying that she is honored to take on position of Chair, acknowledged those before her and how they inspired her, including Ms. Esther Torres who was chair when she joined the Roundtable, Mr. Rezvani for inspiring the launch of the Steps to Excellence Project (STEP), and Mr. Dennis for his commitment to the policy framework and serving as her mentor. Ms. Nishimura introduced the concept of play as her theme for the coming year and as such distributed tokens of gratitude to staff members who contribute to the work of the Roundtable. She recognized Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu as one of the most unsung heroes, Ms. Helen Chavez as the driving force for implementing STEP, and Ms. Michele Sartell for keeping members informed on legislative issues. She also welcomed Ms. Yoon as the Vice Chair.

3. PLAN FOR THE DAY: FOCUS ON THREE TOPICS

Mr. Dennis provided an overview of the agenda for the retreat and his anticipation of focused and thoughtful discussions on each of the topics.

- a. Steps to Excellence Project (STEP)**
- b. Los Angeles Centralized Eligibility List (LACEL)**
- c. Policy Framework**

4. STEPS TO EXCELLENCE PROJECT (STEP)

Ms. Chavez introduced Ms. Sandy Hong and Ms. Emily Harding-Morick of the University of California Los Angeles Center for Improving Child Care Quality (UCLA/CICCCQ) to provide an overview on the tools selected to reliably measure quality.

a. Overview of STEP Rating System Reliability

Introducing the PowerPoint presentation on measurement and scoring, Ms. Hong provided a brief overview of STEP as a quality rating system that provides an opportunity to increase the quality of services for children, provide information to parents about quality, and offer professional development activities. For context, she explained how STEP fits into the big picture in relationship to other quality reviews, including accreditation by the National Association of the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and the National Association of Family Child Care (NAFCC), and classroom certification, such as Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP). Ms. Hong next gave an overview of the six matrix domains, mentioning that it is important to step back and look at how the domains work together to arrive at an overall score.

Next, Ms. Hong reviewed the history of measure validation. The conversation started over 10 years ago. In 2005, the domains were selected by a subcommittee of the Roundtable and UCLA CICCQ, relying on a number of studies relating to childhood outcomes. The results of the studies showed consistent reliability and provided the strong foundation for the STEP reviews. Further, the measures are valid. In summary, each of the domains is measured as follows:

Domain 1: Regulatory Compliance – Focuses on health and safety of the program and draws from the Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division for information stating that the program is in compliance with the infrastructure of state licensing.

Domain 2: Teacher/Child Relationships – Observations of adult/child interactions using the Adult Involvement Scale (AIS) are recorded at regular intervals. The numbers are averaged across the morning and reflect the intensity of interactions between adults and children.

Domain 3: Learning Environments – Observations of the programs are conducted by using the appropriate Environment Rating Scale (ERS) (Infants/Toddlers and/or Early Childhood, or Family Child Care). The ERS was selected because it is available for ranges of ages and program types and for its comprehensiveness. In addition, it is used by other programs.

Domain 4: Identification and Inclusion of Children with Special Needs – Programs submit paperwork documenting their use of developmental screening tools, lesson plans, and more to show how the program is meeting this standard. This area is not included in all quality rating and improvement systems.

Domain 5: Qualifications and Working Conditions – Programs need to show evidence that their teaching staff hold child development permits, and have earned child development units and degrees.

Domain 6: Family and Community Connections – The data collectors review the program's records showing that they are connecting families with community resources. This area is not widely validated.

Scoring was decided by Research Committee consensus. Some elements were weighted because as their impact on quality was considered more important.

Ms. Hong summarized emerging aspects based on the results thus far. Domain 4 requires some modifications to include efforts of programs to address children who do not have Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs), or Individual Education Programs (IEPs) as documented by developmental screenings. Mr. Hayslip is helping with this area. Domain 5 with respect to staff qualifications and the child development permit requirements is another area for review, particularly as STEP looks at how to improve the child development system. The data collected for first year will be carefully reviewed and could influence implementation in year 2.

Questions/comments:

- There are five data collectors. A data collector spends four hours in silent observation using the ERS and AIS. A recording is made using the AIS every 5 minutes. An additional hour is dedicated to reviewing the portfolio. Appointments with the programs were scheduled ahead of time; there are no surprise visits.

- STEP operates in 10 pilot communities. The pilot communities were approved by the Board of Supervisors to achieve broad representation across three criteria: socio-economic status, child care supply, and the presence of an infrastructure. Some of the pilot communities have a tight infrastructure (i.e. Long Beach); others are barely present (i.e. Palmdale). Some communities also have resources to help match, such as Santa Monica, which is using municipal funds allowing for tiered reimbursement.
- One hundred sites have been evaluated out of the 220 programs enrolled with results ready for 88. The programs have been recruited through a variety of outreach efforts, including mailings and working with the Child Care Resource and Referral (R&R) Agencies. The goal was 50% of participating programs would be centers and 25% family child care homes. Distinct numbers were established for each community. Participation in STEP is voluntary. All participants are eventually rated.
- Parent evaluations were drawn from studies that had parent survey components. Ms. Jan Brown, now retired from UCLA CICCQ helped programs develop parent surveys. Different surveys helped inform the development of Domain 6, which contains four strategies with multiple sub-strategies. Programs are required to meet 10 of each strategy. This section is least validated by research. Programs use a check off sheet that is included in the portfolio. Some of the items are hard to quantify; others can be pulled into the observation piece. Programs can also add to their portfolios copies of flyers, their handbook, etc. Mr. Hayslip expressed from a program perspective that it is not easy to prepare the portfolio and some of his sites thought they overdid it. He suggested that as STEP moves forward, more clarity on what is expected be provided. Family child care had more difficulty proving what they are doing as they tend to be more informal and sometimes language is an issue.
- Ms. Malaske-Samu stated that the development of STEP has been an evolution and efforts were made to build support into the system. Support is limited, however, with only two and a half staff members assigned to the project. On the other hand, STEP can report an impact. Programs receiving mini-grants are to implement the program improvements before being observed. The areas for identification and inclusion and family and community connections are opportunities for learning. STEP is contributing to the discussion.
- How are programs looking at the results of the developmental screening tools? What evidence exists that they are making accommodations? STEP wants to see that the program is addressing children's strengths and challenges, that they are using a tool and show some evidence of responsivity that children needing it are receiving additional support. Mr. Hayslip added that the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute has not yet figured out how to measure this area.
- The Research Committee is active and includes Dr. McCroskey, Dr. Marlene Zepeda, Dr. Diane Philibosian, Dr. Gail Zellman, and Ms. Patricia Negron of First 5 LA. The Rating Committee, Mr. Hayslip and Ms. Arlene Rhine, conferred on the first batch of ratings and provided input on weighting priorities and scoring.
- Mr. Dennis reiterated that STEP is a pilot. He asked, "When do we test the validity of a tool to assure the path we are going down is correct?" Ms. Hong answered that true validation requires comparison with an outside measure. They did the work initially by looking at other studies. This summer they will look for patterns of scores on individual measures.

- Dr. McCroskey suggested working with LAUP to learn how they are measuring community involvement. First 5 LA is also studying early childhood settings. Partners such as these may exist for cross validation. Ms. Hong mentioned that Dr. Carollee Howes is part of a consortium of researchers across the country looking at and sharing measures. Dr. Howes is bringing these national perspectives to UCLA CICCQ's work with STEP. Mr. Hayslip commented that the measures may be reliable and valid and then asked is it getting to what we want.

b. What the Preliminary Data Tells Us about Child Development Program Quality

Ms. Chavez directed members to her PowerPoint presentation, which expands upon her presentation to the Roundtable in June 2009.

- Rating Results

Thus far, STEP has completed ratings on 88 programs, of which 56 are centers and 32 are family child care homes. Sixty percent of the participating family child care homes are large, licensed to serve up to 14 children. Of the centers, 66% hold contracts with the California Department of Education/Child Development Division (CDE/CDD).

In summary, the majority of centers have scored at a level "3" and a majority of the family child care homes have scored at a level "2". None of the programs rated to date have received an overall score of "5". Ms. Chavez noted that the STEP participants are a self-selected group and many of the programs represent the Long Beach area, with the family child care home providers tending to be the leaders of their community. Ms. Chavez cautioned the Roundtable members and guests to evaluate the results carefully as the sample size is small and therefore may not be indicative of the field as a whole.

Focusing on family child care, Ms. Chavez suggested that to determine why most family child care homes are scoring a rating of "2", it is important to examine how they scored in each of the domains. On average as a group, family child care home scores are lowest for staff qualifications and working conditions, which when weighted with the scores from the remaining five domains is resulting in lower overall scores. Keep in mind that decisions were made early on to start with high expectations, contrasted against some state systems that began with lower standards, and then raised the standards as the systems matured. For those states that altered their standards, dissatisfaction among participants has been high.

A couple of questions and comments were raised. What research exists to show a correlation between education and outcomes for children? Some workforce studies have shown a relationship between education and child outcomes; however it is important to look at whether, for example, the outcomes measured are related to academic performance or child development. On another note, it was mentioned that family child care homes are motivated to make programs affordable to parents.

Continuing with family child care, the next lowest scores are in Area 4: Early Identification and Inclusion. Ms. Chavez relayed that the biggest barrier in this area was the use of developmental screening tools; the STEP standard places emphasis on conducting developmental screenings of all children. Nevertheless, family child care providers are very interested in the developmental screening tools as a tangible means for discussing a child's development with the parents and by lending authority for addressing sensitive issues with the

parent regarding a child showing signs of, for example, developmental delays or behavioral concerns.

While the matrix does not require the program to implement use of a specific tool, it does offer guidance on what is required of the tool. Ms. Chavez explained that STEP wants to know whether programs are systematically screening children and, if the screen is positive, demonstrating that they are working in collaboration with the parents and referring for further assessment as needed. Additionally, STEP looks for formal connections between the child care and development program and community resources. Furthermore, STEP is evaluating program accommodations for each child as needed. All of this area is evaluated through documentation and observation. Ms. Chavez pointed out that STEP support materials contain resources with some suggested developmental screening tools.

Members and guests engaged in discussions relating to this area:

- While this area shows low scores, family child care homes are scoring higher in Area 6: Family and Community Connections.
- There is a 50-50 split among those programs interested in making program improvements and subjecting to a second rating. Staff are exploring offering a second round of mini-grants that programs would use to improve in areas where they scored low. However, the larger issue is the burdensome process of preparing the portfolio for the rating. More efforts need to focus on helping programs keep track of and organize their supporting documents, maybe through the use of technology. A suggestion was made to approach First 5 LA to devote resources to the collection of data that would also support the review, for example through the use of technology. For STEP, it is also an issue of timing for conducting the second rating.
- Trainings have also been key. Last year STEP piloted funding for substitutes to allow release time for staff to participate in trainings. Unfortunately, funds for this support were depleted. Currently, staff are looking at how to leverage other trainings opportunities.
- UCLA CICCQ has five data collectors; all but one are bilingual in Spanish.
- With respect to whether to post the scores, it was originally suggested that the scores not be posted until more was known regarding what the data presents. Mr. Rezvani reminded members and guests why STEP was initiated - to give consumers a tool to help them make decisions about enrolling their children in quality child care and development programs. So, as a consumer, what does the data represent and how will it help the parent select a program? He added the question: How do we put the data into the hands of the consumers without scaring folks?

Ms. Chavez, resuming her presentation, stated that the highest scoring domain was in learning environments. Some of this may be due to the proliferation of use of the Environment Rating Scales. She added that the reliability of the scores depends on whether the person conducting the observation has been trained. Self observations tend to result in inflated scores.

Focusing on centers, scores are again low on staff qualifications and working conditions, averaging a score of 2. The lack of qualifications among assistants and aides in program tended to bring scores down. In order to receive a 3, **all** other teaching staff must qualify for a child development permit. This issue led to a brief discussion around alignment with Title 5 and staff qualifications. Mr. Whit Hayslip reported that Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), for example, even though they have staff lacking child development units, they are meeting their Title 5 requirements. This raised the question regarding programs that may exceed the staff to

child ratios with assistants and aides missing the required child development units, yet considered in the program rating.

A number of suggestions were embedded in the discussion causing a closer look at this area. While the standard itself is not an issue, caution should be taken when discussing alignment with other systems, e.g. Title 5 and NAEYC accreditation. Staff will undertake further review of the matrix and its alignment with these other systems. In the meantime, UCLA CICCQ will continue to go with what the matrix says.

Of the 88 programs rated, 22 have LAUP classrooms. LAUP rates single classrooms, whereas STEP rates the entire program. The overall program ratings are lower than LAUP classroom ratings, however a few were equitable. STEP gives priority for observations to non-LAUP classrooms, some of which are infant and toddler rooms. A suggestion was offered to develop talking points to explain the differences in the ratings.

The Adult Involvement Scale (AIS) is used to score Area 2: Teacher/Child Relationships, which also looks at group size and ratios. The AIS is weighted in this area as it measures teacher responsiveness to children, thereby approaching the heart of quality. The data collectors record the interactions in increments of five minutes, tallying the level of interaction they observe. Optimally, the AIS is looking for 70% higher level interactions and 30% at the lower level interactions. Family child care homes and centers on average are at 58% and 54% respectively for higher levels of interactions. Family child care providers may have higher scores due to smaller groups of children. Only the lead teacher was monitored.

Ms. Chavez reviewed the last slide of her presentation, showing the aggregated ratings by the quality elements of each of the domains. The slide highlights those elements scored under a “3” as potential targets for technical assistance and support.

c. Addressing Training and Quality Improvement Needs

Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu reported that the Office of Child Care is convening a group of potential partners on Thursday, July 16, 2009 in the afternoon to discuss training that addresses improving the quality of child care and development programs and opportunities for leveraging resources. She commented that trainings per se provide one level of support, whereas completing academic units is another. Ms. Younglove added that training is more useful if there is follow-up to reinforce the material presented and to guide implementation. LAUP has a coaching model, which is currently under review to determine its impact. Ms. Hong added that training needs to be intentional and follow a logical sequence of events. Another training medium to explore is videotaping. The University of Colorado has embarked on a project, Results Matters that uses videos with families and teachers.

Additional thoughts offered include:

- What is the relationship between the Environment Rating Scales measure of quality and dual language learners. Dr. Marlene Zepeda of California State University Los Angeles and Dr. Linda Espinosa of the University of Missouri-Columbia are studying approaches to dual language learners in child care and development programs. In addition, the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute has developed professional development modules for working with culturally and linguistically diverse children and families.

- BP funded A Place of Our Own, which is aired in English and Spanish and has a phenomenal Web site with video clips. Is it possible to give it some academic value? It is complicated, however teachers with child development permits need continuing education units. Could the program be applied to these units? Colleges could use the clips in their classrooms and direct providers to the site.
- Head Start and NAEYC have funded satellite courses for credit. Students are able to download the courses. Also of importance is working with cohorts using a combination of video and gifted professors where they use technology and come together.
- More stipend applicants are taking on-line courses. Ms. Malaske-Samu stated that this is raising some questions on what parameters need to be established.
- Additional models were presented that rely on various combinations of cohorts, such as participating in national satellite trainings that allow for submitting questions to facilitators in real time, using video with stopping points that allow for discussion, and more.
- Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey reintroduced Michael Gray of the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) and suggested that information regarding the availability of the videos be passed on to relative care providers.

In thinking about the meeting scheduled for Thursday, Ms. Younglove suggested learning about what training is currently being offered, where is void, and what should be the goals. She reflected on the unique role of the Roundtable in providing a neutral place where everyone can benefit, yet recognized that this role is tricky.

Dr. McCroskey added that there is a way to align the professional development and the quality systems. She added, children are on a development trajectory, and so are adults. Each comes with their experiences. We want to take early educators on a logical sequence through reflective teaching and as a whole practitioner. The emphasis should be on the foundational information needed to succeed and build upon it. The trick is that there are many different learning styles, and levels of learning to be had. Ms. Malaske-Samu added that evaluations on the trainings to date have ranged from nothing new to very exciting. Kentucky made everyone take foundational courses and there was uproar. The point is being intentional and developing a trajectory to help teachers learn and grow. The role of the Roundtable cannot be underestimated. It has a role as convener of different groups to figure out how to leverage resources and funding, not just a database, but a system for maximizing existing resources. This would be a major infrastructure project. First 5 LA has a workforce development project that is beginning this work and the Roundtable can contribute to that work.

Ms. Malaske-Samu reiterated the purpose of the meeting to include identifying the needs in the field, what currently exists, and how do we meet the actual needs. Ms. Terry Ogawa suggested also looking at trainings offered by and to other groups that touch children, such as DCFS and the Department of Mental Health, which is working with child care and development programs.

5. LUNCH AND RECOGNITION OF ROUNDTABLE MEMBERS

Mr. Dennis reconvened the meeting after a brief break for lunch and further networking. Ms. Malaske-Samu recognized the outgoing Chair and Vice Chair, Mr. Dennis and Ms. Russell, with token gifts. She reviewed the quiz that asked members and guests to match members' names

with information about them. Dr. Ayala and Ms. Nishimura were awarded small prizes for their insights.

6. POLICY FRAMEWORK – FOCUS THROUGH DECEMBER 2009

a. The Charge:

- **Establish baseline data on child care utilization by Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) clients by June 30, 2010**

Dr. McCroskey talked about the importance of the Policy Framework in making the connection between high quality child care and development and its potential benefits to children and their families who come into contact with DCFS. The Policy Framework brings together the Roundtable, the Child Care Planning Committee, the Office of Child Care, County Departments and others around what we know about early brain development and the contributions of high quality early care and education. The challenge now is implementing the document.

Dr. McCroskey iterated the question of how to establish baseline data as efforts move forward to provide child care and development services to families engaged with the Department of Public Social Services and DCFS. She commented that there are significant numbers of families in both systems, they are all over the county, and turnover is prevalent. Dr. McCroskey referred members and guests to their packets for a copy of the document published by the Education Coordinating Council (ECC), *Investing in the Future of L.A.'s Most At-Risk Children: Data on Needs and Resources for Preschool Children Involved with Child Welfare and Probation* that provides point in time data. With DCFS, children who come to the attention of the system should be flagged for child care and development, not just those who are in the system. She added that there are no good data systems and the existing systems do not necessarily communicate with each other. The Roundtable has a unique vantage point to think about and raise meaty policy issues to the Board of Supervisors and Department Heads. While important, quality child care and development is not an issue that rises to the surface naturally given day to day concerns of other Departments.

Dr. McCroskey continued by suggesting the Roundtable think of the long term by strategically moving all partners to the same agenda, beginning with establishing baseline data. Referring to the ECC document, the numbers of children in DCFS are predominantly infants due to overarching concerns about their safety. Ms. Terry Ogawa passed out maps showing the distribution of age groups and racial composition of children in placement through DCFS across the county. The maps also show where child care and development services are located. Dr. McCroskey pointed out that a large number of children are in relative placement, followed by Foster Family Agencies (FFAs). Thought needs to be given to informing relative caretakers of their choices and the resources available. For children served through a FFA, the agency often has resources.

Dr. McCroskey next referred members and guests to a handout showing the in-home and out-of-home services caseload for children birth through 13 and number of children served by the Alternative Payment (AP) Program prepared by DCFS. Clarification is needed on the numbers presented. DCFS administers an AP Program that serves natural parents and relative caregivers. Children are referred by the Children's Services Worker (CSW) for parents needing care because they are working or going to school. The AP does not serve licensed foster parents. Relative caregivers may receive a maximum of 18 months of child care, recertified every six months. The same is true for natural parents, but typically their cases are only open

for six months, then they are placed on the Los Angeles Centralized Eligibility List (LACEL). Families referred through Emergency Response receive six months of services. Relative caregivers must have a qualifying need; parents may be in counseling. Kin Gap families are eligible while the family is in system and has a qualifying need. The CSW can determine that a child is at risk. A child is no longer considered at risk if in a foster home or legal guardianship. This is an area of great concern if it is accepted that high quality child care and development services promote healthy growth and development, particularly critical for children who have experienced a trauma that led them to DCFS.

Dr. Richard Cohen stated that the major responsibility of DCFS is safety of the child. Logically it makes sense that if a child is with foster parents or a relative at home, the child is no longer at risk for abuse, neglect or exploitation. However, the outcomes for these children are not good. There is a need for a larger sense of at risk for what. Quality is the issue and the benefits accrue when a child is in a quality program. Dr. Cohen echoed the need to facilitate enrollment of DCFS children and their families.

Mr. Dennis added that attention needs to be paid to the number of grandparents caring for children as a result of the involvement of child protective services and mental health. Key over the next 15 years is how support is offered to grandparents.

The following comments were made:

- The numbers for Asian children are low – what impact does culture have? Dr. McCroskey answered that historically the African American population has been over-represented due to the systematic disposition to judge cases that leads to certain results. It is more complicated to make conclusions about the Asian population as it is a composite of various Asian populations. Certain sub-groups have degrees of disproportionate representation than other groups, which is hard to see from the data. American Indian children are skewed in that when they come to the attention of DCFS, they are disproportionately taken into the system. Hispanic children are also disparately represented in system, however they are more likely to remain in their home. On another note, Asian children are less likely to come to the attention of DCFS due to their lower use of public services. The more likely a family with a child comes into contact with public offices, the more likely a report is filed, which speaks to poverty as a determining factor.
- There is a preponderance of children in Stage 1 Child Care in license exempt care. As the family moves to the other Stages, they most likely access license care. Special populations are the hardest to help access any type of child care and development services. Is there a way to look at how many DCFS families are also involved with DPSS? It requires coordination between both systems. A work group has been formed to look at the reasons special populations of DPSS clients do not access child care. Efforts should also focus on connecting families to other programs, including Head Start and LAUP.

Dr. McCroskey recommended that the Roundtable convene a meeting to include Department Heads to clarify language, share information on the issues, and conduct cross mapping. Linkages should also participate, although it is one source of specific information. Ms. Charlotte Lee said the first step should be sharing information across the Departments. She added that DPSS is looking at child care to support families meeting welfare to work requirements, whereas the Roundtable has much broader goals. Ms. Malaske-Samu mentioned that LACOE has been working on an American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Early Head Start proposal that includes bringing services to families in their home. Ms. Lee offered that DPSS can slice and

dice data to determine how to outreach to certain populations. While they have no money to pay for outreach, DPSS has the mechanism to identify population. She added that it would be beneficial to bring programs to families' homes.

Dr. McCroskey suggested that the work be conducted in a policy oriented way. Likely, Department Heads will assign members of their staff to serve as their liaison and be actively engaged. She noted that the Board of Supervisors has elevated issues of child care and development, which should help bring high level staff members to the table. She added that the data is so discombobulated that work is required to combine the data and address the differences in definitions. One contribution of the Roundtable can be a more effective use of county resources. She added that work is underway to kick start a data consortium. In response, Ms. Laura Escobedo, staff with the Office of Child Care, announced an upcoming planning meeting hosted by LAUP.

- **Establish a baseline and increase CalWORKs participants use of licensed child care use by 5% by June 30, 2010**

Ms. Lee referred members and guests to their meeting packets for a copy of the DPSS Child Care Data Report for June 2009. She cautioned that the document represents a point in time and changes are anticipated as a result of State Budget negotiations. DPSS contracts with and makes referrals to the Alternative Payment Programs. Dr. McCroskey referred members and guests to the utilization study passed out at previous meetings. Work is underway to think through how services are being used to increase the chances that child care is approved, noting that it is an issue of access rather than the type of care.

b. Social Marketing Approach by Parent Engagement

Dr. McCroskey introduced Dr. Rafael Angula of the University of Southern California (USC) School of Social Work. Dr. Angula studies the impact of social media on behavior change and how it can be used as an impetus for social change. In addition, he is an accomplished documentarian and a teacher of documentary film-making. His presentation is designed to help the Roundtable think about how to inform parents within the STEP communities, DPSS and DCFS on child care and its benefits. See the PowerPoint presentation, *A Social Marketing Approach to Parent Engagement*.

In summary, the presentation addressed commercial marketing technologies, the power of communication, developing a social marketing plan, the entertainment/education process and its contribution to social change, and provided examples of social marketing successes.

Dr. Angula's presentation provoked the following questions and comments:

- How do we engage parents who have not thought about quality, but just need child care? Ms. Younglove offered that Head Start conducts outreach out to families who have not even considered the benefits of participating in the program.
- Social work interns have not yet taken on a project focused on child care and development. Dr. Angula proposed Master of Social Work students to work on preproduction and research and the School of Cinematic Arts to help with the production end. He envisioned the creation of a 12 minute DVD that could be mass produced. Funding would be required for mass production at a cost of \$.50 per DVD. It would take approximately seven to eight months from pre- to post-production. The video could also be posted at You Tube. He

noted that it is important to consider legal clearances for things such as music. DVDs are likely to reach a larger audience given that some populations do not have Internet access.

7. LOS ANGELES CENTRALIZED ELIBILITY LIST (LACEL)

Ms. Escobedo referred members and guests to her PowerPoint presentation and three handouts. She also introduced members of the LACEL team in attendance, Ms. Sarah Moton, Data Manager, and Mariela Balam, Outreach Coordinator.

Ms. Escobedo provided an overview of LACEL, beginning with the scope of LACEL users, the California Department of Education (CDE) requirements, and the numbers of children and families registered. Overall, more than 145 CDE-contracted child care and development programs with an aggregate total of nearly 2000 sites and serving approximately 96,000 children in Los Angeles County use the LACEL. As a result, there are more than 900 users entering and/or retrieving data from LACEL. Currently, there are 28,481 families with 40,321 children registered. Of the children registered, 37% are infants, 40% are preschool age, and 23% are school age.

Referring to the handout, *Tracking Application by Rank*, Ms. Escobedo remarked that Rank 1 families do not wait less time than other families, rather enrollment patterns are evenly distributed across ranks. Among the issues for enrolling families from the LACEL is that sometimes families move and cannot be reached, particularly higher ranked families with the greatest need. It was suggested that advocacy efforts focus on helping families overcome some of the barriers to actual enrollment, such as lack of documentation and a focus on how to achieve universality so families receive services. Another suggestion was to create touch points to facilitate enrollment, such as allowing for a case manager from for example a social service agency to be the point of contact for the family,

Ms. Escobedo next reviewed the handout, *CPS Flagged Records by Rank*. She noted the small number of child protective services families registered on the LACEL and even smaller numbers enrolled. When the DCFS staff enter families on the LACEL, they are receiving child care and development services through the DCFS AP Program and are likely to still be receiving the AP services when they are called by another CDE-contracted program with funding or space available, so are likely to turn down the offer for enrollment. The families do not seem to fully understand the time limits associated with the DCFS AP Program, thus delaying transfer of families to more permanent child care and development arrangements. Mr. Michael Gray stated that DCFS is a referral-based program. He will discuss with the Child Care Unit staff using placement reports to generate a proactive approach to transitioning families into more secure child care and development programs. He added that DCFS is entering income information and exploring ways to support continuity of care.

A question was raised regarding how census data might help determine where families are. Ms. Escobedo answered that the census data will help with the development of the next needs assessment, work which will start in 2010 and be used to establish recommend priorities for state funding allocations.

Mr. Dennis suggested, in closing, that the discussion on LACEL continue given its major impact on connecting families with subsidized child care and development. He further predicts it to becoming a bigger issue in the current budget climate with potential cuts in other health and social services. He also re-iterated the need to explore taking a multidisciplinary approach to helping families.

8. WRAP UP AND HAND OFF

Mr. Dennis adjourned the meeting by welcoming and passing the lead to the new chair and vice chair, Ms. Nishimura and Ms. Yoon, beginning at the September meeting.

9. CALL TO ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Commissioners Present:

Dr. Celia Ayala
Ms. Maria Calix
Mr. Duane Dennis
Ms. Ann Franzen
Mr. Whit Hayslip
Ms. Kathy House
Ms. Charlotte Lee
Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey
Ms. Terri Chew Nishimura
Ms. Holly Reynolds
Mr. Matt Rezvani
Ms. Connie Russell
Ms. Esther Torrez
Ms. Mika Yamamoto
Ms. Ruth Yoon

Guests:

Mr. John Berndt, LACOE Head Start
Mr. Richard Cohen, Los Angeles County Education Foundation
Mr. Michael Gray, Department of Children and Family Services
Ms. Emily Harding-Morick, UCLA CICCQ
Ms. Sandra Hong, UCLA Center for Improving Child Care Quality
Ms. Ozuana Merchan, Department of Children and Family Services
Ms. Terry Ogawa
Mr. Steve Sturm, Department of Children and Family Services
Ms. Sarah Younglove, Los Angeles County Office of Education

Staff:

Ms. Mariela Balam
Ms. Helen Chavez
Ms. Laura Escobedo
Ms. Kathleen Malaske-Samu
Ms. Sarah Moton
Ms. Michele Sartell