Provider Supports Subcommittee
Meeting Minutes
October 12, 2022- 9:00am-3:00pm
Virtual Meeting

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

DCYF's Community Engagement Administrator Erin Kerrigan welcomed members, reviewed virtual meeting protocols, and completed introductions. The group reviewed the Feedback Loop and approved the August meeting minutes.

Discussion	• Can you expand on a child's participation in Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP) and Headstart as an approved activity for Working Connections Child Care (WCCC)?
	o Once a child is eligible for ECEAP and Headstart, they are eligible until Kindergarten. Sometimes a family is also eligible for Working Connections at the same time but when they go in for their twelve-month reauthorization, if they've lost their job, then that family would no longer be eligible for Working Connections. And a provider was using both funding streams to make a full day. This decision package would now count the child's participation in ECEAP and Headstart as an approved activity for Working Connections when a family comes in for reauthorization or even at application. This ensures continuity for families and also providers.
	▪ Would this occur at the original application or at renewal only?
	• It would occur at both.
	• Provider Supports Executive Committee: We are currently accepting nominations for co-chairs!
	o If you are interested in being a co-chair for the Provider Supports Subcommittee, please email us at dcyf.communityengagement@dcyf.wa.gov.

Leadership Panel

Members had an opportunity to discuss better collaboration and other issues with DCYF Secretary Ross Hunter.

Discussion	• From your perspective, what are the functions of the Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC), Provider Supports Subcommittee, and the Parent Advisory Group (PAG)? How does the department process the feedback these committees provide?
	o Any decision that we make affects lots of people (children, families, providers, the economy). Our job as an agency, within the legal structure as created by the legislature, is to balance perspectives. DCYF needs to hear from multiple perspectives and has to balance the law, the governor's office, and how decisions affect parents and providers.
	o ELAC is our umbrella, Provider Supports is focused mostly on centers, and the Parent Advisory Group is about parents and caregivers.
	o We use advisory groups overall to get feedback on what needs to happen, how we can make things happen, and how we can make things work better.
	o Sometimes feedback comes to us from an advisory group's agenda. Other times, DCYF is looking for input on actions the agency plans to take so that it can balance interests and adapt plans.
	o We are listening and trying to balance feedback and make things work better.
	• Is the feedback from the various groups weighted given that child care providers are the only group that have to live by the rules that are imposed upon us and our work?

- o No, there is no formal weighting system. We're trying to find a set of decisions that balances input.
- If the focus here is centers, then where does the voice of the providers who are not union members fit in? I am union and State association. The union only covers half of licensed providers. Again, where is the voice of the whole of Licensed Family Child Care Home (LFCCH)?
  - o We know that licensed family homes are a part of this group and we're working collaboratively on how to grow that membership. This meeting is for all providers, although it's true that most participants are from centers.
- Providers have voiced concerns over the lack of opportunity to work collaboratively with Licensing and to provide feedback when policy decisions are being made. Can you share your thoughts on how this can be resolved?
  - o We do want to hear your concerns. If you bring licensing broad topics ahead of time, DCYF can bring in a team to address these issues.
  - o If you want to change a specific regulation, there is a path.
    - ▪ What is that path? How do we access that path?
      - It depends on what you are disputing. There are formal avenues a provider can go through. There is an avenue to get it to a review board but that is difficult. We are in the process of fixing it. If you have an issue, escalate the issue locally. You can also escalate it to the area administrator.
        - o And are you out of compliance while you are disputing the rule?
          - ▪ Generally, yes. However, licensing can work with the provider to set up a plan to not use that equipment.
      - There is the petition process. We are constantly taking feedback about rules and trying to make adjustments.
- What's been hard is our licensors have been changing consistently. Providers receive an email and another new licensor.
  - o Even if you do elevate, there is the fear of retribution.
  - o The biggest issue is licensors do not seem like they are properly trained. I always get a different answer.
- How do I submit a petition?
  - o Petitions for adoption, repeal, or amendment of a rule are managed by the Rules Coordinator of the agency responsible for the administration of the rule (WAC 82-05-030). It is recommended that petitions are submitted using the DCYF Petition Form here, but petitions sent to the Rules Coordinator via email or in mailed paper form are also accepted. A list of agencies and their rules coordinators can be found here. You can reach DCYF's Rules Coordinator Brenda Villarreal at: Brenda.villarreal@dcyf.wa.gov
  - o More info can be found in the June feedback loop.
- How do we get information out to the entire provider community about escalating concerns and that retaliation is not tolerated?
  - o I'd like to work jointly with the advisory committees on agendas. We can get out written materials to providers.
- If you want to contest a compliance issue or a complaint, the forms you receive from the licensor say that to appeal you need to go through WA Compass. However, if it is your first "offense" the appeal/dispute forms do not exist in WA Compass and the forms are also not available on DCYF's website. It adds a lot of extra stress when you have limited time to file an appeal/dispute.

- Regarding the Workforce Retention Grant, providers appreciate this grant but feel that it would have been better to allow flexibility for award amounts. Directors could have prioritized greater amounts for long-term, full-time staff members, rather than the approach that requires part-time and new staff be given the same amount. This is an example of a time that feedback was given but not incorporated. What can be done to fix the "not feeling heard" sentiment among providers by the department?
  - o For this particular grant, we did solicit feedback and received a large response but every group wanted to be prioritized. We had to comply with federal and state rules when making our decision. Our goal was to get the money out the door quickly and that kept our turnover rate in providers to be reasonably close to what it was prior to the pandemic.
  - o Information on all child care grants can be found online [here](#).
- Can specifics about how child care center providers were involved in decision-making for the stabilization and CARES grants be provided?
  - o This was a balancing decision that DCYF made.
  - o We're happy to send out a list of people that were part of this decision-making process. We are looking at different ways of engaging groups.
  - o There is a disconnect between what we are saying in advisory group meetings and what is getting to DCYF decision-makers. How do providers get their voices heard and see the value of their input?
    - The more complicated we make a particular grant, the more opportunities DCYF has to get it wrong. DCYF has to hire more staff to administer grants which take more time. This is not a black-or-white decision. I don't disagree with what you're saying but I don't know how to do it. DCYF would have to build a huge infrastructure to track full-time versus part-time employees.
  - o I am happy with the new grant format that distributes per staff while allowing 15% held back to help with tax burdens.
- Regarding grants, we need more communication to providers on what they will be receiving and when.
- Is DCYF looking into how to put any boundaries on Transitional Kindergarten (TK)? We are aware that early learning programs have existed within the K-12 system (like developmental preschool), but this is expanding the number of 4-year-olds that are being placed in the K12 system without early learning regulations.
  - o Basic education is a protected constitution in the state of WA and transitional kindergarten was added into the language for the full-day kindergarten. DCYF has zero regulatory control and does not have authority over TK. We are producing a report with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) that speaks of providers' concerns but does not solve this issue. If a change is going to occur it needs to occur through the legislature.
    - Do you know if there's been any talk about legislators creating any boundaries on TK?
      - I know there has been talk but I do not know the specifics. I would recommend bringing legislators to this group.
    - OSPI is also interested in engaging in some rule-making in regards to TK.
      - I would go talk to OSPI to find out what that looks like. They should hear from you as their regulations affect your business and children's experiences throughout the state.
        - o Who at OSPI would you suggest this committee engage with?

	▪ Michaela Miller, OSPI Deputy Superintendent (michaela.miller@k12.wa.us or 564-200-2161) - Developmental Preschool kids are in morning programs and then move to another center in the afternoon. Why don't the federal dollars follow the child to the child care center? - DCYF is working with OSPI to move towards "push-in services" and identifying where the child is already receiving services instead of the traditional "pull-out model" where they go to a special education classroom. We would like to hear from providers about what's working well and what's not working well. In an ideal world, money would follow the child.
Next Steps/Follow Up	Secretary Hunter will attend Provider Supports meetings twice a year with Licensing present.

Trauma-Informed Care

DCYF's Early Learning, Trauma-Informed Professional Development Coordinator Jess Mayrer, presented members with updates and gathered input on DCYF financial awards for early childhood professionals who acquire training on trauma-informed care, and on DCYF efforts to create trauma-informed professional competencies.

- Trauma-Informed Care Presentation
- Trauma-Informed Care Feedback

| Discussion | Do you have a preferred assessment? We are growing some developmental screening, but are still working on it. Please let me know if you're thinking of any particular assessment. How is the Pilot made available? We're rolling out the pyramid pilot in Educational Service District (ESD) 112 and will be expanding that as the months and years go on hopefully with continued support for this work. Please reach out to Jess ((jess.mayrer@dcyf.wa.gov) or Childcare Aware for additional information. Is this on top of the State Training and Registry System (STARS), Enhancing Quality of Early Learning (EQEL), etc. or is this embedded in those trainings? The financial awards are on top of EQEL etc. The foundational training will be wrapped into childcare basics but we won't be expanding the hours of childcare basics. We think that everyone should have a foundational understanding of trauma-informed care. Beyond that people will be eligible. Are there links to any of those trainings? Please reach out to Jess (jess.mayrer@dcyf.wa.gov) for that information. Is DCYF going to provide financial awards for folks that take Trauma Informed Care (TIC) trainings? Paid through Managed Education and Registry Information Tool (MERIT) directly to staff? The financial awards will be going out through the training contractors. They will be reaching out to people who have already taken the trainings through the MERIT mechanisms. Is it a reimbursement for paying for the TIC training? Beyond the foundational training is where there is an incentive. You will not have to pay for the training and receive reimbursement, rather you will receive financial awards for taking the trainings. This is great training to have but it needs to be done in a way that "kills two birds with one stone" approach, not on top of ongoing PD requirements (STARS). If things are done via the DCYF portal, they do not "count" toward STARS |

	• There are a lot of things that have been offered to providers as voluntary training but then becomes mandatory. TIC is valuable but I'm concerned about it becoming another requirement.
	  o The foundational training will be required but incorporated into our foundational requirements. Beyond that, I don't anticipate, and there have been no discussions about requiring a pyramid model for example, or conscious disclosure, or any others.
	• If this is going to be mandatory and retroactive, it would be nice if the format was simple. We don't want to add another thing for providers to have to do that might put some people over the edge.
	  o I definitely understand that. We want to make sure we're not re-traumatizing families, kids, and providers.
	• With our business coalition in Seattle, we were talking about the University of Washington (UW) services that are extremely expensive but comprehensive. Have you looked at any populations of training that you could make available to providers through other resources? If we wanted to have a provider group training in Seattle and get DCYF's support to pay for that.
	  o The foundational training is in partnership with [Cultivate Learning](#) at UW. We want to make sure the trainings are available to everyone. We are doing a train-the-trainer format so that people can disseminate the material in their own communities.
	• DCYF has the Complex Needs Grant and there's a lot of work happening at the UW [Haring Center](#) with regard to trauma-informed care so why are they separated? We're in a hiring crisis right now. The onboarding requirements are the same for full and part-time staff which is ridiculous. DCYF seems out of touch with the sector.
	  o Child care basics will stay at 30 hours. We will not be adding hours.
	    ▪ We should look at reducing the hours, 30 is a lot
	• Unless there is a grandfathering, it becomes a requirement for anyone who has already done childcare basics. It layers more and more requirements.
	  o Are you going to require it for those who already have done Child Care Basics (CCB)? Will it count as STARS training for staff that has already taken CCB?
	    ▪ I hear what you're saying. I will take your feedback and that will help shape the decision-making.
	• There are groups besides UW that are culturally appropriate for different communities. Are you looking at utilizing those? Is there going to be a Request for Proposal (RFP)? How do we make sure that we have culturally appropriate organizations also working with us?
	  o In terms of an RFP, I'm not sure but I did have a good conversation with the Tribal Policy Advisory Council about having to train the trainer so that they could provide it to their communities and make it their own.
	  o We are working to make sure that we have developmentally appropriate trainings in general. We are also working to make sure that we have the right people delivering the training and making it culturally acceptable and appropriate for as many different people as possible.

Next Steps/Follow Up	• Please reach out to Jess with any follow-up questions (jess.mayrer@dcyf.wa.gov).

Child Care Collaboration Task Force Update
Ryan Pricco and Luc Jasmin from the Child Care Task Force provided an update from the Task Force.

Discussion	• Who were the recommendations submitted to and what becomes of them?

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>

- o Commerce and DCYF are finalizing the report. The task force did a lot of work on the recommendations. The next step is the report will be submitted to the governor and Office of Financial Management (OFM) for review. They need to approve it before it becomes public. The report is due at the end of November.
  - ▪ Is there any interest by the legislators to take some or all of the recommendations and create legislation?
    - • I don't think they're looking at this as one piece of legislation because a lot of this is embedded in budgetary work. But absolutely, legislators were involved in the task force, approved the recommendations, and have every intention of taking the work forward.
- • I'm disappointed nothing came out of the compensation technical work group. Is there something we can do, so that this work does not get dropped?
  - o The compensation work group actually got us here. I don't think we'd be here without it. We don't have enough support in the legislature to do this. We need advocacy from the field to put pressure on policymakers to make this a priority for the state's budget.
- • Will there be a public service campaign? Are there written materials which can be shared widely?
  - o Yes, once the report is finalized, we will have materials that can be used to engage different constituencies.
- • How is the current cost of care study feed into this report or future plans?
  - o The study totally informed the recommendations that we put forth. It is central to what we are doing. That study is the cost model.
- • Would new revenue sources need to come from providers?
  - o There are other advocacy organizations and coalitions that work on trying to reform the tax code with the outcome being additional revenue for investments. This industry needs to play a role in developing those revenue sources and supporting them being put into place.
- • Are there other states the Task Force has looked at that have already created a model around compensation?
  - o There are no other states that have created anything close to what we're doing. There are some municipalities that have made good progress on compensation like Washington DC but there are not a lot of examples in this country to pull from.
- • Can you come back to the group and share what was accepted and what was not? It's important for the community to know what was not included so that we know how to advocate.
  - o Yes, we would be happy to do that.

</td>
</tr>
</table>

Preschool Development Grant
DCYF's Preschool Development Grant Birth-5 Administrator Tracie Kenney and Integration Specialist Delta Heiberg provided an introduction to the Early Learning Coordination Plan with a focus on the goals and strategies that promote access to high-quality childcare and early learning opportunities in underserved communities.
- • [Early Learning Coordination Plan Presentation](#)

<table>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>

- • The previous version of this plan did not accomplish supporting the workforce. How does this plan accomplish the outcome area for a strong and supportive early learning workforce?
  - o We took the previous plan and did an evaluation of what didn't happen. Some things in this plan are very similar to the first plan because we have to do better. This plan takes previously unsolved issues and centers on racial equity as well,

</td>
</tr>
</table>

	adding an additional layer of coordination piece. That will give it the bump the first plan didn't have. We have created a coordination structure that will grow to other networks and become more than just goals and strategies.
	• If you would like a physical copy, please fill out this survey.
	• The snapshot of children and families is five years old; is there anything available since the 2020 census?
	○ We are updating the Statewide Needs Assessment and will publish that in mid-2023. That document is where the data comes from for the ELCP. It will also be available on the new website (and the 2020 version is currently on our PDG page on DCYF's website)
Next Steps/Follow Up	• Please reach out to Tracie (tracie.kenney@dcyf.wa.gov) or Delta (delta.heiberg@dcyf.wa.gov) with any follow-up questions or feedback.

The Child Care Feasibility Calculator
Soleil Boyd and Blair Peterson from WAStem will introduce and provide input on the development of a Child Care Feasibility Calculator from WAStem, which is intended to be an online tool for those interested in starting their own childcare business.

• Child Care Feasibility Calculator Presentation

Discussion	• Could there be a beta test version for us to try over a set period of time?
	○ We might be able to do that sometime in the near future. There are some counties where we don't have enough data.
	• Would there be a minimum amount of information you would need to provide to be able to get reasonable results?
	○ Yes, the main piece of information that you need to have is your location and square footage. You could also skip the square footage and put in the number of students and teachers.
	• Will you have any databases regarding medium wages?
	○ Yes, currently we have wage data from ESD and it is by county.
	• Existing providers can use it to help with their budgets correct?
	○ Yes, it is relatively simple so they could do that.
	• Regarding food budgets, a cost per child based on a few levels of income might help some figure that out.
	○ I would like to do that. I haven't gotten into what are the actual costs of some of these items.
	▪ A simple survey to center directors could help; we'd be happy to share some of our averages.
	○ Because costs are skyrocketing, it would be nice to see a percentage in the model.
	▪ We have been looking at putting this into a web format instead of excel so that we can update it over time.
	• For someone looking to open a business but they haven't identified a building; rent is going to vary depending on where you are. Can you give an idea about rent, if you're in different geographical areas, is there a way to show ranges?
	○ We would really like that data but haven't found it yet. We are continuing to look for center-based model data.
	• What are the core things someone would want to know that we can provide quickly? And what are the things we'd want to call out for people to think about like taxes?
	○ The difference between residential and commercial leases would be helpful.
	• It would be reasonable to provide numbers on some things like an insurance range. But I don't know how you would provide average rent numbers because it varies so much.

	o We are doing research to see if there is someone already collecting this data, like Commerce.
	• Costs also depend on corporate structure (sole proprietor, S-corp, LLC, non-profit, etc.)
	o You could break it up by the size of the program. Start here if you're going to open a center under a church, or licensed for 0-20, 20-50, etc.
	▪ Yes, I think a decision tree type format could be helpful.
	• Do Full-Time Equivalent: average costs inclusive of part-time and full-time. There are differences in tuition, I've seen a premium for part-day versus full-day.
	o The rate that is more holistic for childcare in general, estimate based on that as an overall, instead of by child calculation correct?
	▪ Yes.
	• The calculator's intention is to raise awareness, and show some of the costs and some revenue before we consider additional per-child costs. Should we open another childcare facility or find another way? Does this seem like the right direction or not? But it will continue to meet limitations. Given what we know we cannot address, do you feel it can still be useful? To who? How?
	o Yes, it is a very helpful tool whether you are currently in a center or you are estimating out. Childcare has to rely in tuition; this calculator could help show investors the finances and help people secure financing.
	o There are a lot of things that lawmakers don't understand in terms of small business owners taking on personal risks. There isn't a lot of respect from lawmakers that these are mostly women-owned small businesses.
	▪ I would love some ideas on how we could show that risk in something like this, might be a linked resource/explainer, or if we could build in somewhere in the calculator.
	o I would have found this helpful when I was first starting out and writing out a business plan.
	• Non-profits would save on property tax and may have fundraising income.
Next Steps/Follow Up	• If you have any other feedback, please reach out to Blair (blair@washingtonstem.org) and Soleil (soleil@washingtonstem.org)

2022 Meetings, Closing Remarks, and Adjourn
• Discussion Question Responses and Feedback

Discussion	• The next meeting is scheduled for December 14, 2022.