



# Provider Supports Subcommittee of the Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC)

## Meeting Minutes

April 6, 2022 – 9:00 am - 2:30 pm  
Virtual Meeting

### Welcome, Virtual Meeting Protocols, Meeting Minutes Review & Introductions

- DCYF Community Engagement Manager Erin Kerrigan welcomed attendees, walked through the virtual meeting protocols and initiated introductions.
- Members reviewed the [February 9, 2022 meeting minutes](#).

### Feedback Loop & Agency Updates

- [Feedback Loop](#)
  - [2021 Provider Supports Subcommittee Annual Reflection](#)
  - [2022 Provider Supports Subcommittee Work Plan](#)
- [Agency Updates](#)

<b>Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the feedback loop it lists how many providers attended the Fair Start for Kids Act (FSKA) Temporary Licensing Subcommittee meetings. Do you track for this meeting too? How many centers? How many family homes? How many others?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ For this meeting we track member attendance which does break down into center, family home, etc.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Next Steps/Follow Up</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Community Engagement team will send over more information about the roles of the Executive Committee with the follow-up email.</li> </ul>

### FSKA Grants and Support Update and Opportunity to Engage

DCYF’s Contracts and Relations Manager Mallerie Lopez, Child Care Grants Manager Kelsey Boyce, Trauma Informed Care Coordinator Jess Mayrer and Dual Language Coordinator Athena Jimenez provided updates on topics such as grants, dual language designation and trauma informed care, and gathered feedback from members.

- [FSKA Grants and Support Update and Opportunity to Engage Presentation](#)

<b>Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there criteria developed to meet when applying?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Yes, the criteria are being a licensed or certified center or home serving children receiving state subsidies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• What is the proposed turnaround time for approving grant request for the Complex Needs Fund?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ We expect to have funds out the door at the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 2022.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• What qualifies as “unique needs”?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ It does not need to be related to a specific diagnosis. This grant is for children with behavioral needs, developmental delays or unique needs.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A competitive grant process doesn't feel right when needs are so great across the entire sector.</li> <li>• You can find more information on the Child Care Stabilization Zip Code Factors <a href="#">here</a>.</li> <li>• Please share where the idea came from for this type of grant? When was the last time extreme access deserts data was updated?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ We were directed by the Legislature to create this grant. Last year the Early Childhood Education Assistance Program (ECEAP) distributed a similar grant and so</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
-------------------	--



there is actually two parallel grants going on right now for the complex needs fund. This is from the Fair Start for Kids Act (FSKA).

- Who determines how the subject matter experts are selected? Why is the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) involved in the selection process?
  - Legislation asks us to involve OSPI and that is why we are partnering with them. Subject matter experts are going to specifically be from areas that are affected by children with complex needs. We will have someone from infant and early childhood mental health consultation, bilingual or bilingual language expert access, representation from Early Achievers, child care licensing, child care subsidy special needs rate, ECEAP, as well as OSPI.
- Will this be an ongoing grant or is there a sunset?
  - We have been funded for the biennium, fiscal year 2022 and fiscal year 2023. The legislature will determine if we will be funded for future biennium's.
- Are you saying that there's legislation that instructed how this grant would be implemented?
  - No, the legislative language specifies what the support can be used for.
- This grant comes as a tremendous relief as having access to special needs funding is a tedious task and leaves centers vulnerable due to children's special needs not being supported.
- There are many children in private paying programs that have unique needs as well.
  - I hear you, which is why we will expand eligibility to include private paying programs in the next phase of this grant.
- Is there a reason why it is not open to all now?
  - That's part of this phased approach that we are using and trying out. We want to be able to focus on a smaller pool and look at the needs and what is working and what isn't along with internal capacity of being able to wade through these applications and give them the attention that they deserve.
- So ECEAP will receive a separate pot of money?
  - Yes. They aren't part of the 4.6 million we mentioned.
- The language says staffing but DCYF language goes further to say if staffing extra hours/extra staffing. Why the additional restriction?
  - The grant request would be for staffing to help a child with a complex need as opposed to general payroll that you are already paying.
- There is no doubt that many programs need funds to help pay for the costs associated with inclusive care. However, if programs aren't sustainable and unable to recover, there will be even fewer options for care. It doesn't make sense to not adapt funding to current conditions.
- Doesn't this group, Provider Supports Subcommittee, seem like a place for recruitment for this?
  - The recruitment hasn't happened yet and the recruitment team will be made up of providers who are eligible for the grants and Child Care Aware.
- How can one apply to be on a design team? Will information be shared with providers directly?
  - If you are interested in being on the design team, feel free to email Mallerie Lopez at [mallerie.lopez@dcyf.wa.gov](mailto:mallerie.lopez@dcyf.wa.gov).
- I find it surprising and disappointing that we're hearing there is a need for providers in a design group but not utilizing this group of providers for recruiting.
  - At the last Providers Supports Subcommittee meeting we did say that folks who are on advisory groups like this one can also be a part of design teams.
- Who's on the advisory group? Please provide a list of members.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ On slide 19 of our presentation lists who we are partnering with.</li> <li>● It is like this conversation is happening in a bubble, many of us are having a hard time with staffing and it isn't the reality of where we are at now. Who is coming up with these ideas?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It originated from the FSKA in section 304. The idea here is to strengthen the workforce and not deplete it, so I really appreciate where you are coming from.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Will trauma informed care be extended to school districts? Or services aren't continued to be offered once the child hits kindergarten. Trauma informed care needs to start in the Child Protective Services (CPS) system because many kids never have a counselor assigned to them.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We are working in alignment with OSPI on the Pyramid Model Launch and is very much infused with trauma informed approaches.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● It just feels like yet another group is being developed instead of utilizing advisory groups that already exist.</li> <li>● When was that group created?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This group started in August of 2021 and we met for the first time in December of 2021.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● It's frustrating that Provider Supports always seems to hear about things after they are created, developed, and already underway.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Next Steps/Follow Up</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● You can find more information on the Child Care Stabilization Zip Code Factors <a href="#">here</a>.</li> <li>● If you are interested in being on the design team, feel free to email Mallerie Lopez at <a href="mailto:mallerie.lopez@dcyf.wa.gov">mallerie.lopez@dcyf.wa.gov</a>.</li> <li>● If you have questions about dual language designation, feel free to reach out to Athena Jimenez-Manalo at <a href="mailto:athena.jimenez-manalo@dcyf.wa.gov">athena.jimenez-manalo@dcyf.wa.gov</a>.</li> </ul>

**Cost of Care Study**

DCYF Childcare Administrator Matt Judge and Simon Workman from Prenatal to 5 Fiscal Strategies provided an update on the Cost of Care Study.

- [Cost of Care Study Presentation](#)
- [Washington Cost of Care Study – 2022](#)
- [Cost of Care Model](#)

<p><b>Discussion</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● More information about the study, including links to the survey can be found <a href="#">here</a>.</li> <li>● If you are interested in learning about the report completed by Prenatal to Five Fiscal Strategies on understanding the cost of quality child care in New Mexico, you can visit <a href="#">here</a>.</li> <li>● On a national level, have you seen any true change in compensation anywhere? Also, have you heard if the collaborative task force has decided to pick up the work from the compensation technical workgroup?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Washington D.C. moved to this model and we have seen salaries increased and have gone up about 20% in the last four years. A caveat there have been more money going into the system too. New Mexico moved to this model last year and built into the rate a higher salary that is currently shown and it's a bit too soon to see if there have been significant changes. We will connect with the folks with the collaborative task force and get back to you.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Next Steps/Follow Up</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● More information about the study, including links to the survey can be found <a href="#">here</a>.</li> <li>● If you are interested in learning about the report completed by Prenatal to Five Fiscal Strategies on understanding the cost of quality child care in New Mexico, you can visit <a href="#">here</a>.</li> <li>● Thanks for inviting us. Very happy to come back and keep engaging on this issue. We encourage all providers to take the survey, sign up for an interview, and continue to engage on this important project <a href="#">here</a>.</li> </ul>



**DCYF Diapering Station Privacy**

DCYF Childcare Policy Program Manager Tyler Farmer provided an update on the DCYF Diapering Station Privacy Petition.

- [DCYF Diapering Station Privacy Version 1](#)
- [DCYF Diapering Station Privacy Version 2](#)

<p><b>Discussion</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tours of potential clients considered "affiliated" with Early Learning programs?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes, if someone is taking a tour of your program with the interest of sending a kid there then they would not need to be screened.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• This just reiterates how helpful we are as a collaborative group! Thank you for asking our opinion and input!</li> <li>• Can we edit to say, "For the purposes of this subsection "members of the public" means anyone not affiliated with or visiting the early learning program. "Or visiting" is an important clarification.</li> <li>• Maybe adding "Individuals invited onto the premises by an early learning provider is considered affiliated with the program."</li> <li>• Who is responsible for making the decisions on complaints or changes requested? We want to better understand the petition process.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We are in the process of developing an approach to petitions and rapidly ramping up resources on communicating the process and how to utilize it.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• How do you determine who is a 'subject matter expert' and where do you find those folks? Are they DCYF staff only? I was thinking as providers being subject matter experts.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There are subject matter experts brought in outside of DCYF staff and is not limited to only DCYF staff.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• How widely known is it that the rules are supposed to go through some review every two years? What is the process?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We will be in touch about that process as we stand it up.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• When a petition is denied, what are the next steps? Does that bring in different subject matter experts?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes, this is for state government wide not just DCYF. If a petition is denied, then the petitioner may appeal to the Governor and then it is in the Governor's purview to uphold or overturn the denial. The Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 34.05.330(3) governs the petition process.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• DCYF is governed by the RCW and we can't deviate from that process. The process that we are talking about isn't about petition process, it is on a WAC review process. That process would be outside of what was being discussed here today.</li> <li>• What part does Ross play in petitions for licensing policy?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ I do not know. I know it is brought to the licensing leadership. If that is also communicated to Ross at that time, I don't know.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Have DCYF staff been childcare providers or do they only have experience on the technical side?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A number of licensors and licensing staff have been providers in their past. For a more global answer on that we would have to get more information from DCYF staff and the field.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Next Steps/Follow Up</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If you have questions about the petition process or DCYF diapering station privacy, feel free to reach out to Tyler Farmer at <a href="mailto:tyler.farmer@dcyf.wa.gov">tyler.farmer@dcyf.wa.gov</a>.</li> </ul>

**2022 Legislative Session Update & 2023 Planning**

DCYF Government Affairs Advisor Genevieve Stokes provided an update on the 2022 Legislative Session and shared a preview of 2023 planning and process.



• [2022 Legislative Session Update & 2023 Planning Presentation](#)

<p><b>Discussion</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mental Health Consultation, is that also strictly for the Early Childhood Education Assistance Program (ECEAP)?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mental Health Consultation is available to Early Achievers providers through their Child Care Aware (CCA) coach.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Could we have more information about the background check workgroup and who is running it?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The workgroup will be run by the Office of Financial Management (OFM). Community Engagement will definitely be looking to connect with that group too.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• This 5-7-day reduction by paying the fees for providers helps but does not address the issues around access to appointment times. Locations are very limited, appointment times are a challenge to get and the turnaround of the process still takes a long time.</li> <li>• Is the “low-income” guidelines based on Family Poverty Level (FPL)? Does the legislation lay that out?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In the Senate Bill (SB) 5793 it is based on 400% below poverty level.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• How was the decision made to pay on enrollment and not on capacity?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The legislature came up with the idea of doing enrollment based payments for three months.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• I keep thinking about mental health services. Sometimes a family needs help finding local resources. Does CCA keep a list of resources for each area?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Each CCA office is staffed with at least one Mental Health Consultant who could also help with potential referrals/ideas for resources. This could be a good topic to have at a future meeting on where DCYF and CCA are at.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Do you ever invite community members/groups to co-sign budget asks or is that against the rules?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It’s not against the rules but it is not really a thing. We try and note which stakeholders are in support of an ask and that is something we list when we submit that information to the Governor’s office.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If anyone has an advocacy group that you feel we may miss, please let us know.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Please consider Washington Child Care Association (WCCA). We are an advocacy group for centers (<a href="mailto:wcca@wachild.com">wcca@wachild.com</a>).</li> <li>○ Greater Seattle Child Care Business Coalition</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Are we going to the 85% percentile in 2022? Will this be something for your future proposals?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No, the legislature did not fund that for 2022. The FSKA does say that the rate increase needs to get to the 85% percentile. The subsidy team will be coming to present more information on this in the future.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Next Steps/Follow Up</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If you have any questions, feel free to reach out to the Government Affairs team at <a href="mailto:dcyf.govaffairs@dcyf.wa.gov">dcyf.govaffairs@dcyf.wa.gov</a>.</li> </ul>

**DCYF/OSPI Joint Agency Integration and Inclusion Work (previously referred to as Integrated Pre-K)**

DCYF ECEAP Assistant Administrator, Nicole Lor and Pre-k ECEAP Administrator Karin Ganz provided updates and gathered feedback on the report to the legislature between OSPI and DCYF on early learning programming for children 3-5 years old.

• [DCYF/OSPI Joint Agency Integration and Inclusion Work \(previously referred to as Integrated Pre-K\) Presentation](#)

<p><b>Discussion</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could you explain the difference between Integrated Pre-K (IPK) and Transitional Kindergarten (TK)?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Year One Report explains part of this on the <a href="#">DCYF website</a>.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Now TK is in direct competition to childcare and ECEAP programs.</li> </ul>
--------------------------	---



- Can you please explain how TK is different from ECEAP?
  - OSPI is the agency tied to TK and DCYF administers ECEAP. ECEAP is a comprehensive (education, health, and family support) pre-k program for specific eligible children while TK is education focused and has different eligibility guidelines. You can find more information on Transitional Kindergarten [here](#).
- CCA of Washington is working to keep open communication with and share information with OSPI with regard to the intent of TK. It's potential impact on existing child care, the developmental appropriateness of TK, and ways for child care and TK to co-exist.
- The allowance of TK was approved by Chris Reykdal and allowing school districts to use for their K-12 funding to serve preschool age children in TK. School districts have local control.
- We are already struggling to find qualified staff, only to now have more preschool professionals moving to school districts and away from licensed centers. This is another huge loss for providers.
- I wish DCYF and OSPI would have worked out our collaboration efforts between early learning and OSPI rather than making a whole other program.
- There already is an issue with parts of our industry being subject to extremely stringent and costly regulation while other areas are not. If TK does not have to comply with the same requirements as licensed programs, this will harm private providers.
- Thanks for that Kelli, but this is still another track that will run alongside ECEAP. It will be competition for providers any affected communities.
  - We agree completely and this is not work that'll happen overnight. I do want to suggest that we hold a special work session with this committee so that we can spend more time clarifying and planning with you all around this.
- If regulations are not consistently applied to all providers, it begs the question as to whether they are actually necessary to ensure health and safety of children.
- Where does DCYF stand with IPK and TK?
  - We know that as providers, you have done tremendous work on inequities in regulation and we have established a quality system and we are doing great things to support our provider base. It is difficult with that K-12 piece. We want to align services and some of this does require legislative change and some agencies making change too. One thing that we have started with is this community based recruitment effort on enrollment.
- If school districts bring federal money to create programs instead of growing the quality programs into new neighborhoods, there is a gap of choice for families.
- It absolutely feels like the state doesn't care about the licensed providers. School districts won't pay rent or overhead like providers, they won't have the same issues we have with regard to salaries and benefits, and how will they maintain the same requirements for licensing? There will be an extreme inequity between the school district and licensed providers.
- The risk is that instead of broadening and adding capacity to serve those who currently do not have access we end up replacing capacity of private with public school capacity.
  - Absolutely! This is part of what we will want to speak to in the report.
- A special work session would be good. I agree with quite a bit of the feedback. I understand the politics behind this, but I go back to why in the world would we want to introduce our children, especially Black, Indigenous, People of Color (BIPOC) children, to a K-12 system that continues to fail them?
  - That is a great question. That is part of what we are building in our ECEAP expansion work. We can dig into that when we meet with all of you about ECEAP expansion.





	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thank you for your dedication to a mixed delivery system. I would be very interested in talking more about how ECEAP and other preschool or universal childcare can fit within our community of licensed childcare.</li> </ul>
--	---

**Lead Testing Grant Pilot**

DCYF Health Systems Analyst Jennifer Helseth and Mary Franzen from Department of Health provided an overview of the Lead Testing Pilot for childcare centers.

- [Lead Testing Grant Pilot Presentation](#)

<b>Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there an ongoing requirement for water?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes, every 6 years it is required that water be re-tested.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If lead is detected, are remediation funds available to help providers with the cost of pipe replacement?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes, that is part of the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation (WIIN) Grant, remediation funding.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Does this grant include child care providers?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes, it is designed for child care providers.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• We retest the water and if something comes out, what is the process that the test is positive, what is the process we need to follow? Will your child care have to close while you take care of the problem?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ From examples in the past, if you have one fixture that has a lead problem, then the fix according to the <a href="#">WAC 110-300-0235</a> is to not use that one fixture. As far as the amount of money that needs to be put into it, the WIIN grant has remediation funds to support that. If it is something that is greater, then that is something we would have to review and come up with.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• When a new provider takes water to be tested from their center, but if one licenser is asking for bathroom water and the other is asking for kitchen water? I know you mentioned only drinking water but there is some confusion there.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In childcare centers and home, water from the kitchen and bathroom fixtures should be looked at but probably not the hand washing sink next to the diaper changing station. We don't want providers to be paying double. We are happy to work with a provider or new provider to help with what fixtures to draw from.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Would really like DCYF to have someone who is bilingual who can assist with answering questions and having paperwork and documents available in Spanish.</li> </ul>
<b>Next Steps/Follow Up</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You can find more information on testing for lead and copper in child care facilities <a href="#">here</a>.</li> <li>• If you have any questions about the lead testing grant pilot, feel free to reach out to <a href="mailto:leadfreekids@doh.wa.gov">leadfreekids@doh.wa.gov</a> or Jennifer Helseth at <a href="mailto:jennifer.helseth@dcyf.wa.gov">jennifer.helseth@dcyf.wa.gov</a>.</li> </ul>

**Closing Remarks/Adjourn**

- [Meeting Reflection Questions and Responses](#)

<b>Next Steps/Follow Up</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The next Provider Supports Subcommittee meeting will be on June 1, 2022.</li> </ul>
-----------------------------	--