



Provider Supports Subcommittee

Meeting Minutes

August 9, 2023 - 9:00 a.m. - 2:30 p.m.
Virtual Meeting

Welcome, Introductions, Virtual Meeting Protocols, and Meeting Material Review

Provider Supports Executive Committee member Julie Schroath welcomed members and completed introductions. The group reviewed the June meeting minutes, Feedback Loop, and Agency Updates.

- [June 14, 2023, Meeting Minutes](#)
- [Feedback Loop](#)
- [Agency Updates](#)

Discussion	<p><i>June Meeting Minutes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can anybody beyond the coach see the Early Achievers videos? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The only people who can view the videos are the coach, the director, the teacher that submitted the video and the quality recognition staff that are looking at the videos. If you would like to get connected with a community liaison, please reach out to DeEtta Simmons (deetta@uw.edu).
-------------------	--

Temporary Licensing Subcommittee (TLS) Recommendation Tracker Update

DCYF Child Care Deputy Senior Administrator Debbie Groff presented the updated TLS tracker for members to review.

- [August 2023 TLS Recommendation Tracker](#)

Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will statewide leadership be attending the regional meetings to ensure consistency? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Debbie Groff is statewide and will be attending. Travis Hanson and Ruben Reeves will be attending as available. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can we as a Subcommittee attend the meetings as well? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are more than happy to include anyone who is interested. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For notices of regional meetings or online webinars, could the notices also come to all members of Provider Supports? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, we can. • When I read the tracker I see requests for more engagement of licensing resources with all providers, yet the replies seem to limit licensor roles to just inspections and outreach access just to committees. • For item 27, it states that Early Achievers is a requirement based on Revised Code of Washington (RCW). That can be amended. What would the position of DCYF be if there is advocacy to have this changed so all providers, regardless of Early Achievers participation, can accept subsidized children to help with early learning deserts? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will follow up on this. • Early Achievers coaches have large caseloads. It's important for all our educators to have Early Achievers support, however we need to make a change where Early Achievers coaches are Early Achievers coaches. At times, there are several projects going on, large caseloads, and it takes a long time to hire someone. It's important to give an opportunity for people to get a waiver. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It's important for all providers to get support from Early Achievers. But the key is if they want it. It was voluntary to begin with and then they decided it's no longer voluntary. A lot of centers who were accepting subsidy completely dropped subsidy.
-------------------	--



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are opportunities to still participate if they want. Coaches are not aware that there are steps for educators to be a part of Early Achievers but not fully. It would be important to share that and be transparent. That way coaches would not be pressured to make sure educators are participating fully. • Regarding the transparency and trust section, there is concern for families with special healthcare needs. Homecare providers are doing the best they can but sometimes requesting the special need rate is very low. Children with medical needs require a lot of support and you can't hire extra staff. Can we include how can we improve the rate for kids with special needs so they can have the best quality support? Also, making sure in-home childcare have forms and don't need to wait would be helpful. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are you suggesting adjusting the rate for children with a documented need for additional support? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increasing the rate for kids with special healthcare need or disability and having the document upfront. • Are some DCYF staff from the special needs team? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will follow up on this. • On Item 29 on the TLS Tracker, why a recommendation in 25 instead of 24? Waiting for a biennium budget? Since this is a budget ask, on a similar vein, will the department consider asking for the extra capital gains funds (\$30+ million) be used to distribute grant funds to simply help centers stay afloat? Can that be part, or considered, as part of the decision package ask for 2024? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How far in advance are decision packages submitted to the governor's office/legislature? Based on the needs of the field, and the extra funding that is now available, why can't it be amended to allow for grant usage for the upcoming session? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The state budget works on a biennium budget which means every two years they enact a two-year budget. However, the state recognizes things happen so in the off years they do a supplemental budget which edits the budget. They don't make changes to the state budget except during the legislative session (January-March in supplemental years and January-April in budget year). We submit proposals in September.
<p>Next Steps/Follow Up</p>	<p>Please reach out to Aliza Yair (Aliza.yair@dcyf.wa.gov) with any questions.</p>

Community Review Panel

DCYF Area Administrator Karen Christensen in response to TLS Recommendation #36, provided an update and feedback on the Community Review Panel (formerly named Internal Review Panel).

- [Community Review Panel Presentation](#)

<p>Discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When you say it's for compliance issues that are not related to Health & Safety - Providers have heard that all Washington Administrative Codes (WACs) relate to Health & Safety in one way or another. Is there a list of WACs that would be excluded from the Community Review Panel? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is a way that we have tracked the risk levels for each WAC. I don't see an issue with providing that information. We will follow up on this. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It should be added to all violations directly on the Review form it is "challengeable" or not. Like (No Challenge, Level 1-2 Challenge available, Level 1-3 Challenge Available) • It is vitally important that the committee review process participants are well-trained in undoing racist practices and unconscious bias to prevent bias from informing decisions.
--------------------------	---



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why isn't the provider contacted for additional information to their case? It seems like this process heavily favors licensing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There should always be a response. When the provider requests the dispute to begin with, they can provide DCYF with any information they would like to share. We combine this information with the licensor's notes from the case before the supervisor or Internal Review Committee reviews the dispute. • It concerns me that DCYF Leadership holds field level meetings to discuss WAC interpretations. There should be providers invited to those meetings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, at the upcoming community cafes we will be looking for opportunities to meet with our local providers. Licensors will attend with their local unit so that we can work on some consistency across the state. Providers can use the WAC Q&A box to pose those same types of questions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need total transparency about the interpretation meetings, agenda and minutes to Provider Supports. • We are told we only have 10 days to request a review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the first level there is a 10-day dispute timeline after an inspection report is issued. For the second level, if the supervisor upholds the citation and it remains valid, then it is automatically sent to the Review Committee. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If you're past the 10 days, then you have no opportunity? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, that is true. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is that a written rule? I feel like that should be challenged. It's DCYF friendly but not provider friendly. Can that be revisited? • Is the oversight board still accepting applications? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, the application process is still live online. Previously titled the "Internal Review Process Panel", the Community Review Panel Application is for providers interested in being added to the roster. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The application (internal review) doesn't seem to be a fillable form. Is there a fillable version? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not currently, but we will look into updating it. • Is there a timeline for getting the community review panel up and running? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The timeline is as soon as possible. We do have more work to do at the first level because supervisors should be talking to providers. We have protocol written up for the internal review committee. We have a rotating list of staff members from all over the state to participate. • Is there a timeline for the community cafes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are trying to set up something for this fall but have not nailed down dates yet. We will be doing these at the regional level.
<p>Next Steps/Follow Up</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please reach out to Debbie Groff (Debbie.groff@dcyf.wa.gov) and Karen Christensen (karen.christensen@dcyf.wa.gov) with any follow-up questions.

Licensing Q&A

<p>Discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hispanic providers need more support from DCYF. As we talk more about equity and inclusion, we need more bilingual supports. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Education requirements for bilingual staff are challenging. If there are waivers out there, utilize them for licensors. That would open doors for people of color to be working with someone who speaks their native language.
--------------------------	--



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As we focus more on the professionalization of providers, credentials and higher levels of education, we should have better partnerships or more opportunities for them to continue their education in their home language or in a bilingual setting. ● The partnership and support that licensing was hoping to provide in 2019 when new WACs came out has really broken down into more punitive action. It feels even MORE punitive than it did prior to 2019. It feels very nitpicky and punitive instead of a learning experience where we get resources to make changes (as well as a reasonable amount of time). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This is on DCYF’s radar, and we are revisiting this with our staff and trying to rebuild the relationship with providers. I’m hoping you will see improved changes with our staff. Our intent is to build our licensor up as a partner with the provider. ● The experience across the state is a punitive response if you reach out to a licensor’s supervisor. It can be retaliatory, and it turns into harassment. What are you doing to ensure that supervisors are supporting licensors and continuing to be professional? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ One avenue for this issue is the supervisory review process. It goes to an internal group for statewide consistency. Please keep bringing these issues forward. We want to make sure we are offering the technical assistance component. ● Do licensors have a certain time frame on when they need to respond to emails/phone calls made? I don’t know when to escalate situations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If you don’t hear from a licensor in a couple of working days, reach out to a supervisor. If it’s extremely urgent reach out immediately to a supervisor and if you can’t reach them, contact the area administrator. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The website does not seem to be updated and the list is not easy to find. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● We will follow up on this and make sure the information is accurate and easily accessible. ● Is there a formal process to provide feedback on licensor experience? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There needs to be anonymous surveys available for providers to fill out after monitoring visits. ● Do you think a list of licensing supervisors can be shared with the field with the process laid out for providers? Is it possible to share this information in a way where licensors won’t feel like you are “throwing them under the bus”? There is a need to be sensitive to that as well as we want everyone to feel supported.
<p>Next Steps/Follow Up</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Please reach out to Travis Hansen (travis.hansen@dcyf.wa.gov) and Debbie Groff (Debbie.groff@dcyf.wa.gov) with any follow-up questions.

CE Team Leadership and Vision

DCYF Deputy Director of Community Engagement, Emily Grossman provided an overview and update of the CE vision and answered questions from members.

- [Community Engagement Presentation](#)

<p>Next Steps/Follow Up</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Please reach out to Emily Grossman (emily.grossman@dcyf.wa.gov) with any follow-up questions.
------------------------------------	---

Background Check Workgroup Update

DCYF Government Affairs Advisor, Genevieve Stokes and Max Brown from the Office of Financial Management (OFM), provided an update on the Background Check Workgroup.

- [Background Check Workgroup Presentation](#)



<p>Discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public school teachers are not held to the same background check requirements as childcare providers. If there was consistency for all people who had access to kids, would there be greater attention and the ability to influence expediting background checks? It should be a high priority for the safety of kids. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The main function of the workgroup was to try and figure out the efficiencies that could be had in terms of delivering the process. There is some overlap if we're looking at anybody who is serving children, but we did not go into that level of policy. • Is the state open to holding onto fingerprints if an individual opts into that? • It's really not the background check that takes the most time, it's really getting an appointment to get the background check. • What is the rationale for using the Rap Back system? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is a concern that the state would have a ton of information sitting on servers. If we want to have an efficient system that moves people quickly and real time, the Rap Back allows us to do that. But there are racial equity social justice concerns. There also needs to be a lot of work done with stakeholders to design this in a way to address the racial equity social justice concerns. • In rural parts of the state, we can't even get appointments to get background checks. We need more options for providers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We agree and recognize this problem. In last years' budget proposal, DCYF did request funding for state staff to have fingerprinting and background check capabilities at DCYF offices. We did not receive it in the governor's budget but are still working on this issue.
<p>Next Steps/Follow Up</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please reach out to Max Brown (max.brown@ofm.wa.gov or 360-810-0277), Senior Budget Advisor Cynthia Hollimon (Cynthia.hollimon@ofm.wa.gov), and Budget Advisor Carly Kujath (Carly.kujath@ofm.wa.gov) with any follow-up questions.

2024 Legislative Session & Government Affairs Update

DCYF Government Affairs Advisor, Genevieve Stokes will provide and update and gather feedback on the 2024 legislative session planning.

- [Legislative Session Presentation](#)

<p>Discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does this funding include increasing children with special healthcare needs or disability rate? • Is there also a way parents will be qualified for childcare? The cost of living is so high. Children are not getting adequate care. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are aware of this issue. We're not asking for any major income eligibility increases in this budget for the 2024 session. The Fair Start for Kids Act (FSKA) did plot out increases to income eligibility every two years. In 2025, FSKA says we must increase the eligibility for working connections childcare. We also know that the increase that is happening next year will not be enough for families who can't afford private pay but don't qualify for subsidy. We are still working on this issue. • Is there a plan for a parity ask for centers so that those who accept subsidized children can have access to the \$2100.00 per month family home providers are receiving for simply having ONE state subsidized family enrolled? Centers could also do a lot with an extra \$25,200.00 per year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The reason that this is not in there is that is something that would be considered new. We are really focusing on the asks that we had last year as it related to
--------------------------	--



	infant and toddler rates and the non-standard hour bonus as we work towards that larger cost of care enhancement.
Next Steps/Follow Up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please reach out to the DCYF Government Affairs team (dcyf.govaffairs@dcyf.wa.gov) with any follow-up questions.

Preschool Development Grant, Child Care Access & Living Wage Proviso

DCYF’s Assistant Secretary of Early Learning Nicole Rose, Preschool Development Grant (PDG) Administrator Tracie Kenney, and Federal Initiatives and Collaboration Administrator Matt Judge will provide members with updates from the Early Learning team.

- [Child Care Access & Living Wage Presentation](#)
- [Provider Feedback and Recommendations Memo](#)
- [Early Learning Division Written Updates](#)
- [Childcare Access Discussion](#)

Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the work of the Compensation Technical Workgroup incorporated into this work? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, it will be. • Is there a different process for families that are not trying to qualify based on being low income or how does that get incorporated? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will need to follow up and see if this provides an opportunity to further streamline our process so that we’re not running two different systems. • Are there any thoughts on providing compensation to providers who are volunteering their time to be on these advisory committees? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This is something we are looking at around living wage and compensation. The rate model group is going to look at what providers need in terms of paid leave for training or other situations. ○ I also used Imagine Institute sub hours for today (I’m an in-home provider). It would be awesome to add a few hours for those of us volunteering to be here. • I’ve had families get questioned about the father of their child - how often the child sees the father, how often does the father pick up things like diapers to contribute in ways that are not directly handing over cash. These feel so invasive. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does this happen when they call in for subsidy? That is helpful to know that is happening and we can follow-up with contact center staff on that. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, when they call to get re-authorized for subsidy. • Regarding cost of care, are you talking about the cost of care based on private pay rates or are you talking about the real cost of care? Most of us are not actually charging the real cost of care because our parents can’t afford to pay it. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The childcare collaborative task force’s report and model that they released in December 2022 is about what it actually costs. It also recognizes that what parents are able to pay for in the private market isn’t adequate to sustain providers. We are looking at what does it really cost the provider, how can they have a living wage, and what would the state need to pay for that to happen. • For providers who have less than 75 spots, they don’t qualify for Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP). Is there a way for centers that have a high need for ECEAP to not have the cap be less than 75 spots? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As we think about ECEAP expansion and entitlement, I can take that back to see what is the number of slots that someone who need to have to a contractor versus subcontractor.
Next Steps/Follow Up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please reach out to Nicole Rose (nicole.rose@dcyf.wa.gov) with any follow-up questions.



Closing Remarks/Adjourn

Next Steps/Follow Up	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Can a supplementary meeting be called in September? Would like some shorter focused meetings as needed.• The next meeting is scheduled for October 11, 2023.
-----------------------------	---