



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

## Meeting Minutes

August 11, 2021 – 9:00 am-2:30 pm  
Virtual Meeting

### Welcome & Introductions

- DCYF Deputy Director of Community Engagement Deanna Stewart welcomed attendees and initiated introductions.
- Members reviewed the [June 1 Joint ELAC and Provider Supports Subcommittee Meeting Minutes](#).
- [Feedback Loop](#)

### Stabilization Grants Update

DCYF Eligibility and Provider Supports Director Nicole Rose provided update on stabilization grants, the technical assistance Request for Proposal (RFP), and will highlight the Fair Start for Kids Act website and timeline that is now live.

- [Stabilization Grant Presentation](#)
- [Grant FAQ](#)
- [Collective Bargaining RCW](#)
- [Timeline PDF](#)

<b>Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would you have a link to the regions/areas/zip codes that are considered "childcare deserts?" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ These can be found on the Grant FAQ document.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• How often are Child Deserts updated? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We're working on about how often we are going to update that. We will get back to you on that when we have a timeline.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Washington Child Care Association (WCCA) gave feedback that the base was too high. I've been hearing that the Union was able to bargain for every family home to get \$2000 per month for a year, starting next summer. Which would be \$24,000 for every family home if they just have a subsidy child. It seems the base is too high. That would mean that a family home is actually going to receive more than a center licensed for 50. And it's important that we don't favor one part of the industry over another. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ I think it's really important to understand that licensed family home providers are unionized and they have collective bargaining rights related to economics and other things under the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) . That is a piece of how our system operates and works in Washington State. The Agency is always really trying to look at the whole. We did have a reopener related to rates, so there is a tentative agreement with the Union, and that is completely different than what is happening with stabilization grants. Those two things are very separate conversations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• I also believe the base is too high, knowing that you could be somebody licensed for 6 kids or 10 kids. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What should the base be from your perspective? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I've always said that it should be based strictly upon capacity. It feels more equitable. Maybe there's an opposing thought that I haven't considered and I'd love to hear other people chime in.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• If it's a certain amount of money per slot that's the most equitable, I agree. If you have only one student and you receive \$10,000 that's technically not very equitable or would it</li> </ul>
-------------------	---



be in somebody's best interest to open a slot for one spot and call it good? I agree that it is difficult to find a base rate and a base number out there that's the challenge. If we base it on capacity, there's no subjective or objective decision making in that position, it's just that's the number that you have.

- I'd like to interject in terms of the base. Maybe it's the per student amount after the base that would make it more equitable.. I feel it needs to be based on the number of slots you have, and not just a flat amount.
  - The base amount is meant to be a starting point. Let me share a little bit of information. When you look at cost of care, based on national trends for licensed family homes it's really looking at about \$1200 per month, so, even if that was 6 kids that's about \$40,000 if you're looking across five to six months. I hear what everybody's saying, and we're really trying to tie things back to that cost of care as much as possible. Some of the things that we've really grappled with is how do we take into consideration economies of scale and some of this conversation. This is why some of that cost of care work that the Collaborative Task Force started to do is really looking at in the Fair Start for Kids Act and to get us to a place where we all have sort of the same.
- Given providers are liable for behavior of all staff, it is vital Directors are informed of background check status of staff. This should be turned ON.
- If you're going to use a base amount then maybe it should be the base amount and then \$100 in addition.
  - We are trying to finalize those numbers, so that amount could go up or down just a tiny bit, but I don't think it will come down. The goal is thinking about uncovering operating costs for a certain period of time.
- Are foster parents able to get this grant or is it only day care centers?
  - The grants that we are talking about right now are really for licensed centers, licensed family homes and license exempt family, friend and neighbor (FFN) providers. These are not focused on foster parents at this time.
- I also want to be sensitive to those who provide care for smaller populations. I appreciate what they provide, however, the cost of care for larger organizations is significantly higher.
  - Most providers will get at least one verifiable add on, but we can put that in our follow up.
- Have they been able to include the base grant amount in bargaining?
  - As always, I'm transparent with you about the fact that we have to have conversations with the Union. Just like we met with the Center Association and we're having this conversation here, we've had these conversations with the Union as well.
  - One of the things that we've been working on here is the timing.. We have to have the technical assistance RFP in place before we can release the grants. We have to ensure we have the support available to support providers accessing the grant. I appreciate everybody's patience as we work through all of this and make sure we are meeting the intent of the budget proviso..
- Are you going forward with your plan to provide some early learning staff temporary bonus funds through The Managed Education and Registry Information Tool (MERIT)?
  - Our plan at this point is to move forward.
  - To see what this looks like, you can view the [timeline](#) on our website.
- As you know, our feedback was that it should be for everyone. Maybe a shorter timeline or a smaller amount so that it's available for everyone.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We did take that into consideration. We're trying to think about a meaningful amount. If we were to do this for everyone, the amount would likely be minimal. Which is the thought behind the higher amount across providers.</li> <li>● So first come, first serve like whoever gets it first gets it or how would that be determined? Who would be eligible if it's only for some staff?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It would be through an application process in MERIT and would really be about retention. We would likely look at folks that have been employed for a certain number of months, but we will provide some more details.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● When will the grant officially open and when can providers expect it to be distributed?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We don't anticipate having the application open until the fall, with funds rolling out late fall/early winter, depending on how long the application is open.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	---

**Fair Start for Kids Act (FSKA) Temporary Licensed Subcommittee**

DCYF Child Care Licensing Continuous Quality Improvement Manager Aliza Yair presented on the FSKA Temporary Licensing Subcommittee, provided initial planning information, and requested member input on the scope of work.

- [Fair Start for Kids Act Temporary Licensed Subcommittee Presentation](#)
- [FSKA Discussion Questions](#)

<b>Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Is the committee limited to those mentioned in legislation? It would be a lot of work, might-be better to have more people.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The committee is not limited to those mentioned in legislation. I agree, it's better to have more people. We definitely can't make these recommendations without at least providers and parents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● We need to ensure that we include Early Childhood Education Assistance Program (ECEAP) licensed providers and parents voice.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes, it is very important to leverage the existing infrastructure.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Will this group be able to look at licensing rules to recommend changes? That might impact someone's decision whether to become a provider.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The processes to change Washington Administrative Codes (WAC) is a little different than a legislative report on recommendations for the licensing process. If the result of the recommendations is that there are particular WAC's that are restrictive to folks getting a license, then the recommendation would be to engage in the rulemaking process.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Is it possible to ensure a variety of different models of education? We know one size does not fit for all children.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes, when we think about diverse model policies there's not just culturally diverse but also pedagogically diverse.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Will this be an application process or will this work come to this Provider Supports Subcommittee?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ I don't have an application process now. Are you recommending that this be an application process?                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No, but we should include the existing advisory group subcommittees. All of the committee members could live under the same umbrella, ELAC because they have all the advisory committees there.                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Absolutely, I will be interacting with you all quite a bit, As I mentioned before, the working group/subcommittees must also include parent voice so we do have to bring this work to other spaces.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
-------------------	---



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will you be coming back to this group for people interested in being in the subcommittee, if so, when?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes, in the fall.                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We meet again in October. It will be a combined meeting with ELAC and the Parent Advisory Group (PAG). That would be a great time to ask who wants to be on the subcommittee.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• You said that there's going to be this work that generates a report, where does the report go? Who approves the report and the contents of the report?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The bill says provide recommendations. I am the primary staff person. My hope moving forward is to help facilitate conversations between the Subcommittee and people at DCYF who can provide more information about these work streams. The report is due to the legislature by December 1, 2022.                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Who finalizes and approves this report before it's submitted?                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I believe it will be the subcommittee. I will have to double check this, but I think the Government Affairs team helps. I'll have to get back to you on that.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	---

**Integrated Pre-K (IPK)**

DCYF Integrated Pre-K Administrator Alicia Brender and DCYF Director of Early Learning Programs Kelli Bohanon provided answers to the previous meeting's unanswered questions and shared updates.

- [Integrated Pre-K Presentation](#)
- [IPK Report Recommendations](#)
- [IPK Key Barriers](#)
- [IPK Discussion Questions](#)

<b>Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the directive specifically say that K-12 should house PreK?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The directive is part of the report. We can also link to the directive so you can see that that full directive and what it says about the emergence of Transitional Kindergarten (TK) and how agencies should work together to ensure that we're meeting the needs of children with disabilities and infusing those quality pieces that we believe.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Where are these housed?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This is not all about K-12, but it was already there. We've got to address the issues that aren't working because there's some big ones, especially for kids who need us most, children with disabilities, etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Will this mean that licensed providers will no longer be needed in communities for preschool?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Absolutely not. We are trying to completely avoid that at all costs by doing this. We are trying to stabilize the system by addressing the barriers. We need all of you, we need all of us to do this work. We can't serve children and families if we're not all doing it, so that is not our focus.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Are PreK preschools in K-12 exempt from licensing?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Integrated Pre-K is *not* a program. This is not about a new funding source or program. This is a report with recommendations. Our vision is that providers of all types will be able to more easily use multiple sources of funding to offer Pre-K, and to ensure all Pre-K is tied to quality.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• On the previous slide, an identified barrier is licensing rules. I thought TK isn't regulated by licensing and could go down to age 3.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ These are complex issues. How we support the child care community in the Pre-K landscape is critical to serving children and families in Pre-K settings. Part of these recommendations address these inequities. DCYF and Office of Superintendent of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
-------------------	---



Public Instruction (OSPI), along with all community partners, will address the pieces that are within our jurisdiction to address.

- Ok, so ECEAP (housed anywhere) has to deal with licensing rules? TK does not, right? Didn't you say last time that they only answer to the school district?
  - That is correct, we are working on this process. To be clear, most of ECEAP has to follow licensing. There are some exceptions in tribes, school districts, etc.
- So, if TK goes into the public-school system, they do not have to follow the high expectations and limiting restrictions that the public system has to meet?
  - TK is in the public-school system already. It's optional and currently, only a handful of the 295 districts are implementing TK. And that is correct, they currently have few rules related to quality to follow. We are trying to change that in this effort.
- TK is free and not based on income? Also, goes down to age 3?
  - TK is offered as free, yes. It can serve 3-5-year-olds. Children that qualify are essentially eligible when they are deemed to be "at-risk" of not being kindergarten ready, which each district can define within their community.
- Members shared additional comments and concerns
  - How will TK support families who need work day supports for wrap around hours beyond traditional K-12 hours?
  - Does this take away from the catchment of existing ECEAP and Head Start providers?
  - California has "mixed delivery" in their free preschool language, but it is not actually mixed delivery. I know that's where my concern comes from - knowing that other states have created issues for existing childcare centers in their states.
  - If we want to ensure a strong high-quality infrastructure overall, we need to avoid creating scenarios that siphon off resources from one part of the infrastructure in favor of another (workforce, tuition vs "free").
  - Will these programs have to follow the same expectations and regulations as the private system? Ration, Educations, WAC?
  - Just so you both know, we are all aware that early learning already exists in K12. We've always known that. Our questions are still valid. We are concerned.
  - Once again, licensed centers will be left behind because every teacher in early childhood will opt out of working in a center to work for the school district with all the state pay, healthcare, retirement benefits, etc. We already see this happening every day.
  - Our budget structure is based on a Nursery through Pre-K. I am unsure how our programs will be able to restructure to meet budget constraints without the balance.
  - It's important the entire early learning infrastructure is held to the same standards and expectations. It's about fairness as well as ensuring consistency in health and safety and child development. TK and unlicensed (less than 4 hours) are areas that should be held to the same expectations.
  - When our local school district moved from a half day kindergarten to a full day kindergarten, it affected everyone in early childhood and hurt us dramatically as small businesses. Every single family opted to go for the school day for free. We were completely blind-sided. I do see this potentially happening with this, as well

### Policy Development and Review

Government Affairs Advisor Genevieve Stokes provided updates from the previous legislative session(s), agency request legislation, current process/next steps, and delve into planning for the upcoming session.

- [Policy Development and Review Presentation](#)



- [Policy Development and Review Discussion Questions](#)

<b>Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the big issues in our field is the lengthy timeline around background checks and the upcoming deadline that would prevent us from starting an employee until they're completely cleared. How could DCYF work with this group to form legislation that would help?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ During operating session, we have flagged some rules and are waiting on guidance for immediate changes.</li> <li>○ The CE team has connected with Nicole Rose and Chris Parvin, for more information on where we are with temporary and broader fixes and plan to have this conversation at the next meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Members shared additional comments regarding background checks             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ I know there's temporary waivers. I think we're all concerned about what happens when that ends.</li> <li>○ The company we have to use is offensive to me. I cannot imagine a person of color having that experience during recent fingerprinting.</li> <li>○ Our experience is that the time slots are extremely limited, there's only one location near us (and we are in King County), and the place itself is not a nice place. Not a great place to be sending young women alone, potentially by public transit.                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Great feedback, this is a problem beyond just childcare. Often when we hear background checks are a problem, those specific problems are helpful. Anytime you can put anecdotal evidence of the problem in writing and send to us, it is helpful.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
-------------------	---

**DCYF Racial Equity and Social Justice**

DCYF Office of Racial Equity and Social Justice Administrators Dae Shogren, LaToya Holmes-Ware and Evette Jasper led a listening session to inform the five-year equity strategic plan being developed by the newly created Washington State Office of Equity

- [DCYF Racial Equity and Social Justice Presentation](#)
- [Racial Equity & Social Justice Framework](#)
- [DCYF Strategic & Racial Equity Plan](#)
- [Racial Equity and Social Justice Discussion Questions](#)

<b>Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What metrics will be used to ensure all employees are practicing these core values?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We have racial equity tools we are working on developing with staff.</li> <li>○ We are working towards gathering information from staff about what's happening and not happening for them.</li> <li>○ We are looking at the core values and how the system shows up for folks, with our staffing, who's getting promoted, how are people getting recruited, what are the requirements for job application, the pay equity, how our supervisors and leadership are also engaged in trainings and how are they then taking that information and folding it into the work that they're doing.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• What coaching is available for those who "don't see color" or those who feel that their practice is "equitable" and are unwilling to change?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Our office has a suite of trainings offered each quarter; Foundational Racial Equity Training, LGBTQIA+ training, Race the Power of Illusion, etc. We've also partnered with our Office of Tribal Relations to provide an Understanding Tribal Sovereignty training.</li> <li>○ We have a black affinity, BIPOC affinity and a white responsibility gathering that are held once a month. These are an opportunity for staff to be supported by leadership and supervisors.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
-------------------	--



Washington State Department of  
**CHILDREN, YOUTH & FAMILIES**

- We're cultivating space for those conversations and providing information that we feel is necessary for folks to rethink their privilege. We are engaging leadership and pressuring for accountability.

**Closing Remarks/Adjourn**

**Next  
Steps/Follow  
Up**

- The next meeting will be a joint one with ELAC and the Parent Advisory Group on October 5, 2021.