



**Policy Roundtable for Child Care**  
**Wednesday, May 11, 2011**  
**10:00 a.m. – Noon**  
**Conference Room 743**  
**Hahn Hall of Administration**  
**500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles**



**Proposed Meeting Agenda**

- |       |    |   |  |
|-------|----|---|--|
| 10:00 | 1. | Welcome and Introductions   | Terri Chew Nishimura<br>Chair              |
|       | a. | Comments from the Chair   |  |
|       | b. | Review of Minutes   | <b>Action Item</b>                         |
|       |    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• April 13, 2011</li></ul>  |  |
| 10:10 | 2. | Child Care Policy Framework   | Jacquelyn McCroskey                        |
|       |    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ordinance Change</li></ul>                                      |  |
| 10:20 | 3. | Aligning Our Work for the Well-being of Children and Families   |  |
|       |    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Child Care Planning Committee</li></ul>                         | Bobbie Edwards<br>Chair                    |
|       |    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Commission for Children and Families</li></ul>                  | Trisha Curry, Chair<br>Ann Franzen, Member |
|       |    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Education Coordinating Council (ECC)</li></ul>                  | Trish Ploehn<br>Executive Director         |
|       |    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect (ICAN)</li></ul> | Deanne Tilton Durfee<br>Executive Director |
| 11:20 | 4. | First 5 LA Process for Reallocating Resources   | Duane Dennis                               |
| 11:35 | 5. | Budget and Legislative Updates  | Adam Sonenshein<br>Michele Sartell         |
|       | a. | State   |  |
|       | b. | Federal   |  |
| 11:55 | 7. | Announcements and Public Comment  | Members & Guests                           |
| 12:00 | 8. | Call to Adjourn   | Terri Chew Nishimura                       |

---

**Mission Statement**

The mission of the Policy Roundtable for Child Care is to serve as the official County body on all matters relating to child care, working in collaboration with the Child Care Planning Committee and the Children's Planning Council, to build and strengthen the child care system and infrastructure in the County by providing policy recommendations to the Board.

This page intentionally blank



## Policy Roundtable for Child Care

222 South Hill Street, Fifth Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Phone: (213) 974-4103 • Fax: (213) 217-5106 • [www.childcare.lacounty.gov](http://www.childcare.lacounty.gov)

### **MEETING MINUTES**

April 13, 2011

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Conference Room 743

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration

500 West Temple Street

Los Angeles, California

---

#### 1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

##### a. Comments from the Chair

Ms. Terri Chew Nishimura, Chair of the Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable), opened the meeting at 10:10 a.m. Members and guests introduced themselves.

Ms. Nishimura made the following comments:

- The Roundtable's annual retreat is scheduled for Wednesday, July 13, 2011 at Eaton Canyon Nature Center located in Pasadena. Members were asked to reserve the day.
- A Nominating Committee of three to four persons is needed to identify a Chair and Vice-chair to serve from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2013. The slate ideally is presented to the Roundtable in June, and then voted on at the July retreat. The Nominating Committee members historically have been able to complete their work by conference call and e-mail. Ms. Connie Russell, Ms. Ann Franzen and Mr. Duane Dennis volunteered to serve on the Committee.
- The Los Angeles County Quality and Productivity Commission is hosting their leadership conference on May 12, 2011 from 8:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. at the Music Center's Dorothy Chandler Pavilion. This year's theme is "Time for Solutions" and all County commissions are invited to attend. Speakers include a number of County department heads. Ms. Nishimura asked members to let Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu know of their interest to attend.

##### b. Review of Meeting Minutes

- **March 9, 2011**

*Ms. Bobbie Edwards moved to accept the minutes as written; Mr. Adam Sonenshein seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

## 2. ADOPTION OF THE CHILD CARE POLICY FRAMEWORK

Ms. Nishimura began by thanking the members who contacted their respective Board offices to brief them on the Framework. Likewise, Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey acknowledged the importance of Ms. Nishimura's encouragement to make the visits happen.

- **Tasks and Timeline**

Dr. McCroskey reported that the Child Care Policy Framework (the Framework) was presented to and approved by the Board of Supervisors on Tuesday, March 29, 2011. Supervisor Don Knabe had the item held to note his impressions of the Framework and provide his support.

Dr. McCroskey noted the challenges of implementation. As such, she referred to the work of the Education Coordinating Council (ECC) in partnership with various agencies, including County departments, at documenting their activities that were consistent with the goals of the ECC blueprint. As a result, reports to the Board reflected how the ECC was able to maximize relationships and resources to achieve the goals. Dr. McCroskey suggested using the same approach for implementing the Framework and creating a steering committee to focus on implementation. The Steering Committee would initially establish the parameters of its work, including schedule of meetings (quarterly or every six months), focus of agenda and who should be invited to attend depending on the items. She suggested that a portion of the retreat focus on implementation challenges and opportunities and shaping of the Steering Committee.

Dr. McCroskey next walked members through the Framework tracking document. She noted that related to Goal 2, First 5 LA has funded a data initiative that she believes would be useful at illustrating the cumulative impact of state and federal budget cuts to children and families. The plan is to begin by looking at child development services and maternal and child health. Her concern is that people know about their own programs and service areas, but lack awareness of the cumulative effects of multiple measures. The Data Partnership is interested in seeking ideas on how to capture the budget cuts and map the anticipated impacts.

Dr. McCroskey identified other activities underway as follows:

- Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) is planning to convene a meeting around transition kindergarten. (Goal 4)
- The Board of Supervisors supports the Strengthening Families Approach and is interested in how it might be used throughout the County.
- County Counsel has developed the ordinance to add additional County department representatives to the Roundtable. The ordinance will be presented to the Board of Supervisors soon.

Member and Guest Comments:

- Ms. Terry Ogawa pointed to the value of the ECC model for maximizing resources and capturing implementation activities. It means that accomplishment of the work is spread across multiple partners and the onus is not on one entity. She added that the ECC asked Departments for updates to include in report. The Framework is a lot of work and puts the Roundtable in a unique role with the County departments to effect change.

- The Steering Committee will help guide implementation. The augmentation of the Roundtable with representation by three additional County departments will provide additional structure for implementation. Ms. Nishimura added that the Framework will provide members with direction on how to contribute more to the work of the Roundtable.
- Building on the concept of integration with other County departments and commissions, Ms. Malaske-Samu reported that she has invited Ms. Trish Ploehn of the ECC, Ms. Deanne Tilton of the Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect, Ms. Bobbie Edwards, Chair of the Child Care Planning Committee, and a representative of the Commission for Children and Families to the May meeting to talk about their work and suggest how they could collaborate to achieve the County goals.
- Ms. Ogawa added that there is a direct relationship to the County's Youth Self-sufficiency Plan, which includes items charged to the Office of Child Care directly drawn from the Framework.

### **3. PLANNING FOR PROMISE NEIGHBORHOODS**

Ms. Nishimura noted that in September of 2010, the United States Department of Education funded 21 planning grants for Promise Neighborhoods throughout the country. Two agencies in Los Angeles county received Promise Neighborhood planning grants - Proyecto Pastoral at Dolores Mission and the Youth Policy Institute. The goal of Promise Neighborhoods is to address the challenges faced by students living in communities of concentrated poverty. Promise Neighborhoods grantees and their partner organizations will plan to provide services from early learning to college and career, including programs to improve the health, safety, and stability of neighborhoods, and boost family engagement in student learning.

Ms. Nishimura thanked Mr. Ray Ramirez, Program Director of Early Childhood Education Centers at Proyecto Pastoral for joining the Roundtable as a presenter and congratulated Proyecto Pastoral on bringing something positive energy to the community.

Mr. Ramirez distributed a map of the service area, a fact page on Promise Neighborhoods in Boyle Heights, and a PowerPoint presentation. The service area encompasses the Pico Aliso area of Boyle Heights and aligns with the parish boundaries of Dolores Mission. The area is noted for its high rate of poverty and is 80 percent Latino. The project includes partnerships with two schools, Mendez Learning Center and Hollenbeck Middle School as well as the feeder schools and the child development centers. He added that there are a number of active gangs in the area, so showing stability within the chaos of gang environments will be important.

Promise Neighborhoods in Boyle Heights is defined by a network of local organizations and schools that have come together to make decisions on how to ensure children receive the quality education they need to thrive all the way from the cradle through college. Mr. Ramirez said that one of the goals is to break down the silos of the various agencies that serve children and families. Throughout this process, they are seeking recommendations for moving to scale, and are seeking information on research-based programs that have been proven effective. Ultimately, work will result in a grant application that is due in mid-June 2011.

Mr. Ramirez reviewed the expectations of the grantees, which have included conducting a needs assessment of the community and families, developing strategies of what will be done differently and what data systems will be established, and addressing capacities for financial sustainability and holding partners accountable. Mr. Ramirez spent some time talking about their efforts to identify specific indicators of school readiness and success and showing change.

The data will be specific to Boyle Heights and programs that have an impact on families in Boyle Heights. Some of the challenges including holding partners accountable, for example with parent engagement and what that might actually look like.

Member and Guest Discussion and Comments:

- For Proyecto Pastoral and the early childhood programs, 100% of the families are primarily Spanish-speaking. By kindergarten, the children are bilingual. Proyecto Pastoral is working with other neighborhood preschools and learning center sites on addressing dual language learners.
- What is planned for children zero to three years old? Proyecto Pastoral advocates for quality programs and what parents need to know to prepare for school, beginning with the youngest years. Mr. Ramirez stated their motto, “college is not a dream, it is a plan”. In addition to focusing on parenting, they are teaching parents to be advocates for their children.
- There is a contradiction between what is developmentally appropriate and school readiness in preparing children for kindergarten entry. The Proyecto Pastoral Promise Neighborhood project is also addressing the idea of social change. Given that, what are you trying to change – how children are ready for school or a system that may not be ready for children? Mr. Ramirez replied that the project will try to do both. He stated that if the system is not ready, parents need to know. They are working with parents on all of the domains of child development. They are less concerned about academics, while more concerned about helping children develop an attitude of learning when they go to school and providing families with ongoing resources. Currently, they follow children into school. Promising Neighborhoods will build upon their existing model and share with eight additional early childhood sites, creating opportunities for programs to work together or at least have a common understanding of child development.
- The Steps to Excellence Project (STEP) was offered as a unifying strategy. Also suggested was talking with the early childhood education leadership at Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD).
- Basic indicators have been identified by the federal government. Mr. Ramirez invited suggestions for other indicators to track. Dr. McCroskey mentioned that the Health Department conducts a survey for First 5 LA, which includes questions specific to parents that serve as predictors of overall readiness for school. She added that there is an alliance with the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) that conducts research, asking the same questions and is willing to conduct focus groups in their geographic areas.
- Ms. Malaske-Samu summarized the areas in which Mr. Ramirez had invited suggestions: what it means to be ready for kindergarten; identifying research-based curriculum; and strategies for working with gangs. In addition, the suggestion was made to connect with LAUSD to talk about the work they are doing with Dr. Linda Espinoza around dual language learners. And, STEP might be a consideration as it expands to additional communities.

#### **4. FIRST 5 LA PROCESS FOR REALLOCATING RESOURCES**

Ms. Nishimura asked Mr. Dennis to talk about how the First 5 LA Commission is addressing the pending loss of \$424 million.

Mr. Dennis reported that the Commission is engaged in a planning process that will reduce their current budget by \$424 million. He warned members that the plan will have an impact on programs that many of members and guests cherish. By the end of the May meeting, there will be reductions that will have significant implications for all First 5 LA funded programs, potentially including their investments in Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP), the School Readiness Initiative (SRI), Partnerships for Families (PFF), and in the newly developed county-wide strategies including the place-based initiatives. SRI is due to sunset in June 2011 and PFF is due to sunset in December 2011, however grantees are advocating the continuation of funding for these initiatives. The Commission Chair, Mayor Antonovich, is welcoming comments on some of the plans. The Roundtable has a vested interest in the workforce consortium, which is also at risk.

First 5 LA appears to be giving up a disproportionate amount of funds because AB 99 states that 50 percent of the fund balance as of June 2010 is to be returned to the State. At that time, First 5 LA had a balance of \$848 million in its reserve account. The proportion of the take away is also greater in that First 5 LA receives 30 to 40 percent of the total statewide allocation.

Mr. Dennis mentioned that other jurisdictions are suing the state based on the fact that the take away of funds could be deemed illegal considering the original purpose of the Proposition 10 legislation. First 5 LA may consider a lawsuit in its closed session scheduled for tomorrow, April 14, 2011. Ms. Kate Sachnoff added that the cuts need to be made and the funding put in reserve even if the Commission decides to move forward with a lawsuit. Child development also has taken large hits; cuts to First 5 LA may compound the challenges resulting from cuts. No one wants to lose funding.

Ms. Malaske-Samu distributed a draft letter for Duane to take to the Commission meeting. The draft letter addresses the consortium. Discussion ensued around what should be the focus of the letter. It was suggested that the letter take a more principled stand, addressing the cumulative cuts to child development services from federal, state and local levels that could be used to inform First 5 LA's decisions. The Data Partnership is interested in using data to show disproportionate cuts in child development and maternal and child health. While First 5 LA does not control government cuts, it should take these cuts and their cumulative effect into consideration as it makes decisions. Dr. McCroskey suggested that the Roundtable convene a study group to help paint a more vivid picture.

With respect to the letter, the suggestion was to start with a broader perspective, speaking to the multiple cuts imposed on child development services from the different tiers of government. In the meantime, work with the Data Partnership to prepare an impact study that can be presented to the First 5 LA Commission in May to help inform their decisions. Dr. McCroskey will convene a small group of Roundtable representatives and friends to begin the work. Others who may contribute include two researchers from First 5 LA and Healthy City to translate the numbers into layered geographic maps as visuals that illustrate the cumulative impacts.

Ms. Ogawa asked if First 5 LA has developed a chart of encumbered, unencumbered, etc. funds. Ms. Malaske-Samu distributed copies of the First 5 LA special workshop meeting on April 5<sup>th</sup>, which contain budget tables. Mr. Dennis noted that of current funding allocations, \$145 million is for the programs earmarked to sunset this year. The deficit for achieving the \$424 million due to the state will grow larger as constituents rally for preserving funds in their communities and for their projects of interest.

Dr. McCroskey also shared her thinking that strategically it would be important to meet with Ms. Helen Berberian as Deputy to the current Chair. Connect the budget cuts to implementation of the Policy Framework and allude to the Roundtable and the Office of Child Care as the entity that protects child development community, therefore in a position to inform countywide decision-making for early childhood education.

*\*\* On April 14, 2011, the First 5 LA Commission announced that it will be pursuing legal action in an effort to retain their funds.*

## **5. EDUCARE UPDATE**

Ms. Nishimura thanked Ms. Ogawa for keeping the Roundtable in the Educare loop and for bringing good news.

Ms. Ogawa, Educare Consultant, relayed that the Educare proposal will be submitted to the Bounce Network at the end of May 2011. Susan Bonis has been hired as the consultant to conduct focus groups in English and Spanish through May.

## **6. BUDGET AND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES**

*Identify opportunities for Los Angeles County to promote collaboration among service providers and advocates on behalf of needed legislative or regulatory changes.*

### **a. California Budget and Legislation**

- **AB 419 (Mitchell) – Community Care Licensing**

Mr. Sonenshein directed members to their meeting packets for a copy of the bill analysis on AB 419 introduced by Assembly Member Holly Mitchell on February 14, 2011. This bill would increase the frequency of unannounced inspections by Community Care licensed facilities to annual inspections of child care and development centers and family child care homes every two years. In addition, the bill would increase the initial application and renewal fees by 10 percent and replace the \$200 correction fee with a re-inspection fee of \$100 to ensure that a violation has been corrected.

Mr. Sonenshein noted that the bill is much broader to also apply to other nonmedical residential care, day treatment, adult day care, or foster family agency services for children.

Mr. Sonenshein reported that the Joint Committee for Legislation suggests that the Roundtable recommend the Board of Supervisors take a position of “support” on AB 419, adding that the issue of a robust licensing system critical to ensuring the basic health and safety of children served in child care and development programs has been a priority of the Roundtable for some time.

*Mr. Sonenshein moved to recommend that the Board of Supervisors take a position of “support” on AB 419; Dr. McCroskey seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

Mr. Dennis recommended exploring ways to support licensing fees to child care providers, such as identifying potential funding streams. His concern is with increased requirements and periods of low enrollment creating an extra burden for providers.

- **SB 486 (Dutton) – First 5 LA**

Mr. Sonenshein next referred members to their meeting packets for a copy of a letter sent to Senator Ed Hernandez, Chair of the Senate Committee on Health documenting the Board's "oppose" position on SB 486 introduced by Senator Dutton on February 17, 2011. SB 486 proposes to eliminate the First 5 Commissions and divert the tax revenues to the General Fund for the Healthy Families and Medi-Cal Programs.

Ms. Sachnoff reported that the author has pulled the bill. It may now become a two-year bill.

- **2011-12 Budget Bills**
  - SB 70 Budget Trailer Bill – Signed by the Governor
  - Status of SB 69 – Main Budget Bill

Mr. Adam Sonenshein referred members to their meeting packets for a copy of the memo containing the proposed pursuit of position recommendations to the Chief Executive Office's Intergovernmental Relations and External Affairs (IGEA). The memo outlines the child care and development items that have been proposed for reductions or elimination in the main budget bill, Senate Bill (SB) 69 and budget trailer bills, SB 70 and Assembly Bill (AB) 99.

In summary, SB 70 approved by the Governor on March 24, 2011 contains most of the major changes to child care and development services, including: reduces all contracts for child care and development programs by 15 percent; limits eligibility for subsidized child care and development services to children up to 10 years old, children with exceptional needs, children up to 13 years old under the supervision of child protective services or deemed at risk of abuse, neglect or exploitation, children up to 13 years old who are homeless, and children up to 13 years old during non-traditional hours; reduces the income eligibility cap to 70 percent of the State Median Income (SMI); reduces reimbursement to license-exempt providers to 60 percent of the family child care rate; and increases family fees by 10 percent.

The main budget bill, SB 69, has been approved by the Legislature, however has not yet been sent to the Governor due to unresolved legislation dealing with revenues and the elimination of the redevelopment agencies. SB 69 contains the proposal to reduce the Standard Reimbursement Rate (SRR) by 10 percent. The Legislature may hold a bill indefinitely; once the Governor receives it, he has 12 days to take action unless at the end of the legislative session, when he has 30 days to act. In the meantime, advocates are taking advantage of the time to rally constituents to urge their legislators to oppose the reduction. The Assembly Budget Subcommittee #2 has scheduled a hearing for May 11, 2011 at 4 p.m. to discuss the SRR reduction and other child care and development issues.

#### **b. Federal Budget and Legislative Update**

Members were again referred to their meeting packets for a copy of the memo from the Roundtable to IGEA outlining the recommended pursuits of position on proposed Federal budgets for the remainder of fiscal year 2011 and fiscal year 2012. In summary, the Roundtable recommends opposing the Republicans' proposals to significantly reduce funding for child care and development services, including Early Head Start/Head Start and the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG). Rather, the Roundtable is recommending the Board support the President's early learning agenda, which would increase funding for the programs to maintain their existing levels resulting from the augmentations made under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), establish the Early Learning Challenge Fund, and more.

Mr. Sonenshein reported that by late Friday night, negotiations between the legislative leadership of both parties and the President resulted in significant budget cuts (\$38.5 billion) for the remainder of 2011 to prevent a shutdown of the Federal government. A one-week Continuing Resolution was passed to allow the Legislature to work out the details. Even as child care and development services were spared, other programs serving low-income children and families received deep cuts.

Larger battles between preserving funding for government programs against proposing revenue streams to reduce the federal deficit are imminent.

In closing, Mr. Dennis relayed that Assembly Member Mitchell hears very little from the child care and development community, except in times of crisis. On the other hand, she receives lots of information from seniors regularly. Mr. Dennis called for encouraging get parents and providers to contact their legislators regularly. Dr. McCroskey asked if a fact sheet had been developed on the potential impact of the reduction to the SRR. Ms. Laura Escobedo volunteered to create a fact sheet.

## **7. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. John Berndt announced that Ms. Sarah Younglove is retiring from LACOE. Her last day is May 30, 2011. LACOE is continuing its search for a Superintendent; it also has two Assistant Superintendent positions to fill as well.

## **8. CALL TO ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

### **Commissioners Present:**

Mr. Duane Dennis  
Ms. Bobbie Edwards  
Ms. Ann Franzen  
Mr. Michael Gray  
Ms. Dora Jacildo  
Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu  
Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey  
Ms. Terri Chew Nishimura  
Ms. Connie Russell  
Mr. Adam Sonenshein

### **Guests:**

Mr. John Berndt, Los Angeles County Office of Education  
Ms. Mary Hammer, South Bay Center for Counseling  
Ms. Patti Oblath, Connections for Children  
Ms. Terry Ogawa, Educare Consultant  
Mr. Rafael Ramirez, Proyecto Pastoral  
Ms. Kate Sachnoff, First 5 LA  
Ms. Angie Stokes, The John Tracy Clinic

### **Staff:**

Ms. Laura Escobedo  
Ms. Michele Sartell



## A Brief Guide to County-Related Bodies Addressing Children's Issues in Los Angeles County

The County of Los Angeles encompasses over 4,000 square miles and is home to over 10 million people. There are 88 incorporated cities, 80 K-12 school districts, and 13 community college districts within the County. Los Angeles County Office of Education reports that 90 different languages are spoken by students in the County. In addition, Los Angeles County is home to some of the wealthiest and some of the poorest families in the country.

The size, density and diversity of the County tend to complicate how services are developed and accessed by families. As a result, a number of County-related committees and commissions have evolved to address both service specific and service integration issues. The following information offers the reader a very brief description of groups that are currently working on children's issues.

### Child Care Planning Committee

**Enabling Authority:** State legislation AB 2141, adopted in 1991, and AB 1542, adopted in 1997.

**Established:** June 1991

**Membership:** Per the California Education Code Section 8499.3, the 50 Child Care Planning Committee members are appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the County Superintendent of Schools, and represent five categories; child care consumers, child care providers, community representatives, public agency representatives, and discretionary. Each category is to account for 20 percent of the membership.

**Focus:** The Planning Committee implements the mandates described in the California Education Code Sections 8499-8499.7, and works closely with the California Department of Education (CDE) on issues related to child care funded by CDE. Mandates include:

- Conduct a countywide child care needs assessment every five years, addressing child development services for children birth through 12 years of age;
- Develop a countywide plan to meet identified needs; and
- Identify high-need areas for subsidized child care services.

**Contact:** Laura Escobedo, Planning Coordinator  
Office of Child Care

**Phone:** 213.974.4103

**Web Site** [www.childcare.lacounty.gov](http://www.childcare.lacounty.gov)



### Commission for Children and Families

**Enabling Authority:** County Ordinance

**Established:** May 1984

**Membership:** Each member of the Board of Supervisors nominates three Commissioners, for a total of 15.

**Focus:** The Commission for Children and Families reviews all programs administered by County departments that provide services to children at risk, receives input from persons and community groups related to County administered services, and makes recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and County departments.

**Contact:** Martha Arana

**Phone:** 213.974.1431

**Web Site:** [www.lachildrenscommission.org](http://www.lachildrenscommission.org)

### Education Coordinating Council (ECC)

**Enabling Authority:** Action of the Board of Supervisors

**Established:** November 2004

**Membership:** 24 members drawn from school districts, county departments, juvenile court, city and county commissions, advocacy groups, community agencies, youth, and their caregivers.

**Focus:** To raise the educational achievement of foster and probation youth throughout Los Angeles County to equal that of other youth.

**Contact:** Trish Ploehn, Executive Director

**Phone:** 213.974.4532

**Web Site:** [www.educationcoordinatingcouncil.org](http://www.educationcoordinatingcouncil.org)

## First 5 LA Commission

**Enabling Authority:** Proposition 10 - approved by California voters in November 1998.

**Established:** December 1998

**Membership:** Nine members are appointed by the Board of Supervisors, including the Directors of the Departments of Public Health and Mental Health, an expert on early childhood education, and five members, each nominated by a member of the Board of Supervisors. Ex officio members include representatives of the Commission for Children and Family Services, the Inter-Agency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect, and the Policy Roundtable for Child Care. The Chair of the Board of Supervisors serves as the Commission Chair.

**Focus:** The First 5 LA Commission administers the County of Los Angeles portion of the tobacco taxes levied by Proposition 10, and directs these funds to services that will increase the number of children from prenatal stage through age 5 who are physically and emotionally healthy, safe and ready to learn.

**Contact:** Evelyn Martinez, Executive Director

**Phone:** 213.482.5902

**Web Site:** [www.first5la.org](http://www.first5la.org)

## Inter-Agency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect (ICAN)

**Enabling Authority:** County Ordinance

**Established:** 1977

**Membership:** ICAN membership includes 27 County, City, State and Federal agency heads; five private members appointed by the Board of Supervisors, and a representative from UCLA.

**Focus:** ICAN is dedicated to improving the lives of abused, neglected and at-risk children through multi-disciplinary efforts that support the identification, prevention and treatment of child abuse and neglect. ICAN provides advocacy at the County, State and Federal levels.

**Contact:** Deanne Tilton Durfee  
Executive Director

**Phone:** 626.455.4585

**Web Site:** <http://ican4kids.org>



## Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP)

**Enabling Authority:** Action by the First 5 LA Commission

**Established:** September 2004

**LAUP Board of Directors:** Five members are appointed by the County Board of Supervisors; the Superintendent of County Schools and two representatives of First 5 LA serve as ex officio members; and eight additional members are elected by the Board of Directors.

**Focus:** Within ten years, LAUP intends to:

- Implement preschool services to 100,000 four-year olds in Los Angeles County;
- Develop 32,000 new preschool spaces; and
- Create 10,000 new "Teacher" and "Teacher Assistant" positions.

**Contact:** Celia Ayala, Chief Executive Officer

**Phone:** 213.416.1200

**Web Site:** [www.laup.net](http://www.laup.net)

## Policy Roundtable for Child Care

**Enabling Authority:** County Ordinance

**Established:** March 2000

**Membership:** The 22 members are appointed by the Board of Supervisors and include a variety of backgrounds such as business, education, research, and economics.

**Focus:** The Policy Roundtable for Child Care is charged with reviewing and developing policies that affect the supply, affordability and quality of local child development services for the purpose of advising the Board of Supervisors.

**Contact:** Kathleen Malaske-Samu, Director  
Office of Child Care

**Phone:** 213.974.4103

**Web Site:** [www.childcare.lacounty.gov](http://www.childcare.lacounty.gov)



California State Budget: Child Care and Development Services  
Comparing the Budget Act of 2010 to the Proposed 2011-12 Budget

Table 1. Comparison between Budget Act of 2010 and 2011-12 Budget										
Program	Budget Act of 2010				2011-2012 Budget (Enacted: SB 70; and Proposed: SB 69) <sup>1</sup>					
	State/CCDF <sup>2</sup>	ARRA <sup>3</sup>	Other Adjustments	Total	State/CCDF <sup>4</sup>	ARRA	Other Adjustments <sup>5</sup>	Total	Change	Percent Change
<b>Child Development Division</b>										
State Preschool <sup>6</sup>	\$379,518,000 <sup>7</sup>			\$379,518,000	\$322,685,000			\$322,685,000	(\$56,833,000)	(15%)
General Child Development <sup>8</sup>	\$758,374,000	\$17,347,000		\$775,721,000	\$587,463,000			\$587,463,000	(\$188,258,000)	(24%)
Migrant Child Care	\$30,579,000			\$30,579,000	\$25,112,000			\$25,112,000	(\$5,467,000)	(18%)
Alternative Payment (AP) Program	\$251,770,000	\$18,830,000		\$270,600,000	\$200,918,000			\$200,918,000	(\$69,682,000)	(26%)
CalWORKs Stage 2 (AP)	\$193,650,000	\$36,272,000	\$201,020,000 <sup>9</sup>	\$430,942,000	\$315,993,000		\$52,191,000	\$368,184,000	(\$62,758,000)	(15%)
CalWORKs Stage 3 (AP)	\$365,918,000	\$18,905,000	(\$256,000,000) <sup>10</sup>	\$128,823,000	\$264,297,000			\$264,297,000	\$135,474,000	105%
Resource and Referral Programs	\$18,688,000			\$18,688,000	\$18,688,000			\$18,688,000		
Extended Day/Latchkey										
Handicap Allowance	\$1,940,000			\$1,940,000	\$1,400,000			\$1,400,000	(\$540,000)	(28%)
CA Child Care Initiative	\$250,000			\$250,000	\$225,000			\$225,000	(\$25,000)	(10%)
Quality Improvement	\$47,115,000	\$18,783,000		\$65,898,000	\$49,654,000			\$49,654,000	(\$16,244,000)	(25%)
Centralized Eligibility List	\$7,900,000			\$7,900,000					(\$7,900,000)	(100%)
Local Planning Councils	\$3,319,000			\$3,319,000	\$3,319,000			\$3,319,000		
Accounts Payable	\$4,000,000			\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000			\$4,000,000		
<b>Child Development Division Totals</b>	<b>\$2,063,021,000</b>	<b>\$110,137,000</b>	<b>-\$54,980,000</b>	<b>\$2,118,178,000</b>	<b>\$1,793,754,000</b>		<b>\$52,191,000</b>	<b>\$1,845,945,000</b>	<b>(\$272,233,000)</b>	
Child Care Facilities Revolving Fund	\$5,000,000			\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000			\$5,000,000		
Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA)	0			0	0			0		
Growth	0			0	0			0		
<b>Learning Supports</b>										
After School and Education Safety Program	\$547,081,000			\$547,081,000	\$547,003,000			\$547,003,000	(\$78,000)	(<.01%)
21 <sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers	\$174,034,000			\$174,034,000	\$150,926,000			\$150,926,000	(\$23,108,000)	(13%)
Cal-SAFE Child Care	\$24,778,000			\$24,778,000	\$24,778,000			\$24,778,000		
Pregnant Minor Program	\$13,327,000			\$13,327,000	\$13,327,000			\$13,327,000		
<b>Learning Supports Totals</b>	<b>\$759,220,000</b>			<b>\$759,220,000</b>	<b>\$736,034,000</b>			<b>\$736,034,000</b>	<b>(\$23,186,000)</b>	

ARRA Funding expires with 2010-11 Budget

<sup>1</sup> Proposed budget reflects budget reductions specified in SB 70 (Chapter 712, Approved March 24, 2011), including elimination of services for 11 and 12 year olds, reduction to the income eligibility cap from 75 to 70 percent of the State Median Income, 15 percent across-the-board cut and 10 percent reduction to the Standard Reimbursement Rate (SRR). Line items for State Preschool, General Child Development, Migrant Care, AP, and Handicap Allowance also reflect a .21 percent decline in the birth to four year old population.

<sup>2</sup> SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010; Item 6110-196-0001.

<sup>3</sup> SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010; Item 6110-198-0890.

<sup>4</sup> SB 69 (Leno): 2011-12 Budget. Enrolled: March 17, 2011; Item 6110-196-0001.

<sup>5</sup> SB 69 (Leno): 2011-12 Budget. Enrolled: March 17, 2011; Items 6110-485 and 6110-494.

<sup>6</sup> Of this amount, \$50 million is available for the Prekindergarten and Family Literacy (PKFL) Program, of which \$5 million is for wrap around care to children enrolled in State Preschool.

<sup>7</sup> The totals for State Preschool reflect the part-day programs only; full-day is incorporated into the General Child Care budget line item.

<sup>8</sup> Of note, the General Child Development line item encompasses the budget for full-day State Preschool.

<sup>9</sup> SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010; Item 6110-494.

<sup>10</sup> SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010; Governor's line item veto eliminating CalWORKs Stage 3.

- Quality Improvements

Table 2. Quality Improvement Detail						
Program	Budget Act of 2010 <sup>11</sup>	ARRA	Total	2011-12 Budget <sup>12</sup>	Change	Percent Change
Schoolage Care and Resource and Referral	\$2,002,671		\$2,002,671	\$2,002,671		
Infant and Toddler Earmark	\$11,342,626	\$5,273,000	\$16,615,626	\$11,342,626	(\$5,273,000)	(32%)
Quality expenditures to be defined <sup>13</sup>	\$664,000		\$664,000	\$3,178,000	\$2,514,000	379%
CalWORKs Careers in Child Development	\$3,591,000		\$3,591,000		(\$3,591,000)	(100%)
Training for license-exempt providers	\$1,250,000		\$1,250,000		(\$1,250,000)	(100%)
DSS contract for licensing inspections <sup>14</sup>	\$12,300,000		\$12,300,000	\$8,000,000	(\$4,300,000)	(35%)
Trustline Registration Workload	\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000	\$960,000	(\$40,000)	(4%)
Health and Safety Training	\$500,000		\$500,000	\$455,000	(\$45,000)	(9%)
Health Hotline*	\$75,000		\$75,000		(\$75,000)	(100%)
Health Line – Infants and Toddlers*	\$81,000		\$81,000		\$81,000	(100%)
Technical Assistance – Access to Capacity Funds*	\$75,000		\$75,000		(\$75,000)	(100%)
Preschool Education Projects*	\$114,000		\$114,000		(\$114,000)	(100%)
Child Dev Permit Prof Growth Advisors*	\$63,000		\$63,000		(\$63,000)	(100%)
Child Care Recruitment and Retention Programs	\$11,825,000		\$11,825,000	\$10,750,000	(\$1,075,000)	(9%)
Child Development Training Consortium	\$320,000		\$320,000	\$291,000	(\$29,000)	(9%)
Birth to Five		\$1,758,000	\$1,758,000		(\$1,758,000)	(100%)

\*Item 6110-196-001, Provision 3(d) of Budget Act of 2010 allocated funding until October 1, 2010.

For questions or comments on the budget tables, contact Michele Sartell, staff with the Los Angeles County Office of Child Care, by e-mail at [msartell@ceo.lacounty.gov](mailto:msartell@ceo.lacounty.gov) or by telephone at (213) 974-5187.

<sup>11</sup> SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010; Item 6110-196-0001, Provisions 3 and 4.

<sup>12</sup> SB 69 (Leno): 2011-12 Budget. Enrolled: March 17, 2011; Item 6110-196-0001, Provisions 4 and 5.

<sup>13</sup> One-time federal funding available for budget year. Remaining funds are to be used for child care and development quality expenditures as identified by the California Department of Education, with approval of the Department of Finance. (Item 6110-196-0001; see Provision 3(c) in 2010-11 budget and Provision 4(c) in SB 69).

<sup>14</sup> The budget relies entirely on federal funding for this item. (Provision 3(d) in 2010-11 budget and Provision 4(d) in SB 69).

## FACT SHEET

### Impact of 2011-12 State Budget Bills for Child Care and Development Services: Education Trailer Bill SB 70 (Chapter 7) and SB 69 (Pending Approval)

#### Introduction

Governor Brown, faced with a projected budget gap of \$25.4 billion on June 30, 2012 (\$8.2 billion current year and \$17.2 billion budget year), proposed \$12 billion in spending reductions to programs and \$12 billion in revenues. In addition, the Governor declared a fiscal emergency, which imposed an expedited process for the Legislature to consider the Governor's proposals and arrive at agreements on bill language to send to the Governor for his approval. To date, the Governor has signed 13 budget trailer bills, including Senate Bill (SB) 70 (Chapter 7, approved March 24, 2011), which implements most of the proposed reductions to child care and development services.

The main budget bill, SB 69 approved by both the Assembly and the Senate, has not been sent to the Governor due to lack of agreement on the Governor's proposals to extend temporary tax rates and eliminate the local redevelopment agencies. SB 69 contains a provision that would reduce the Standard Reimbursement Rate (SRR) paid to California Department of Education/Child Development Division (CDE/CDD)-contracted child development centers and Family Child Care Home Education Networks.

#### Budget Bills Impacting Child Care and Services

##### APPROVED EDUCATION TRAILER BILL - SB 70: CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

On March 24, 2011, Governor Brown approved SB 70 (Chapter 7), which is the trailer bill for education. This bill contains a number of reductions to child care and development services as follows:

- Eliminates subsidized child care and development services for most 11 and 12 year old children.<sup>1</sup>
- Reduces the income eligibility cap for subsidized child care and development services from 75 percent to 70 percent of the State Median Income (SMI), adjusted for family size effective July 1, 2011.<sup>2</sup>
- Reduces reimbursement to license exempt providers from 80 percent to 60 percent of the family child care rate effective July 1, 2011.
- Adjusts the family fee schedule that has been in effect since fiscal year 2007-08 to reflect revised income eligibility limits for fiscal year 2011-12 and increase the fees that families must pay. The revised fee schedule reflects increases that do not exceed ten percent of the family's monthly income.
- Imposes 15 percent across-the-board cut to all CDE/CDD child care and development programs, including State Preschool and CalWORKs Stage 3.

##### PROPOSED BUDGET BILL – SB 69: REDUCING THE SRR

The main budget bill, SB 69 - approved by the Legislature but not yet sent to the Governor - contains an additional yet significant cut to

<sup>1</sup> Exceptions include children up to 21 years old with exceptional needs, 11 and 12 year old children under the supervision of Child Protective Services or at risk for abuse, neglect or exploitation, 11 and 12 year old children needing services during non-traditional hours, and 11 and 12 year old children who are homeless.

<sup>2</sup> Currently, a family of three with a monthly income of up to \$3,769 is eligible for subsidized child development services. As of July 1, 2011, a family of three may earn nor more than \$3,518 to meet the income eligibility criteria.

subsidized child care and development services:

- Ten percent reduction to the Standard Reimbursement Rate (SRR) paid to CDE/CDD-contracted child development centers and Family Child Care Home Education Networks, including State Preschool.

### **Implications of Budget Cuts to Child Care and Development Programs in Los Angeles County**

The approved cuts in SB 70 ultimately will result in fewer low-income families having access to subsidized child care and development services:

- Most working families with 11 and 12 year old children will need to make alternative arrangements for before and after school services; families will receive priority for services in After School Education and Safety (ASES) Programs and 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers as space is available.
- Families with incomes between 70 and 75 percent of SMI will no longer be eligible to participate in CDE/CDD-subsidized programs; families above the new income threshold and with children currently enrolled in a subsidy program are beginning to receive a notice of action stating that their last day of service is June 30, 2011.
- The 15 percent across-the-board cut further limits the availability of child care and development services for low-income families. In Los Angeles County, it is estimated that in the aggregate contracts for child development centers, inclusive of California State Preschool Programs (CSPP), and Family Child Care Home Education Networks, will be reduced by \$63.7 million,<sup>3</sup> resulting in approximately

<sup>3</sup> The estimate is conservative at best as it does not reflect the savings scored from eliminating services to 11 and 12 year old children and reducing the SMI.

9,000<sup>4</sup> fewer children receiving child development services.

...ADD THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF A REDUCTION IN THE SRR!

As proposed in SB 69, the reduction in the SRR creates a more significant layer of cuts to child care and development programs threatening their very survival, particularly those serving infants and toddlers. Over and above the 15 percent across-the-board cut, the SRR paid to center-based programs and Family Child Care Home Education Networks means less financial resources per child while requiring programs to provide services that meet higher standards, including lower teacher/staff to child ratios and smaller group sizes, higher teacher qualifications, and enhanced learning environments.

In Los Angeles County, the cut to the SRR would mean a further reduction estimated at \$36 million to serve approximately 52,200 children from birth to 10 years old.

If SB 69 is approved as currently written, the consequences to CDE/CDD-contracted child care and development programs are likely severe, potentially leading to:

- Significant loss of spaces available to serve infants and toddlers.
- Closures of classrooms, and, in some cases, entire programs.
- Reduced wages and/or staff layoffs.
- Compromise in levels of quality and ability to meet Title 5 (Education Code) standards.

Questions or comments relating to this fact sheet may be referred to Laura Escobedo by e-mail at [lescobedo@ceo.lacounty.gov](mailto:lescobedo@ceo.lacounty.gov) or by telephone at (213) 974-4102 or Michele Sartell by e-mail at [msartell@ceo.lacounty.gov](mailto:msartell@ceo.lacounty.gov) or by telephone at (213) 974-5187.

<sup>4</sup> Currently, approximately 61,500 children are enrolled in child development programs in Los Angeles County. With the across-the-board reduction, an estimated 52,200 spaces would remain.