

## 2015 CCPRC Annual Meeting

### 1. Descriptive Information

<p><b>Workshop A-3 (Independence F&amp; G)</b></p> <p><i>Monitoring in the Context of CCDBG Reauthorization: A Discussion to Build a Research Agenda</i></p> <p><b>Description</b></p> <p>This workshop will provide an overview of the proposed changes in monitoring that are part of CCDF reauthorization and will offer an opportunity for researchers and policymakers to discuss questions of interest regarding the effectiveness and impact of proposed monitoring changes. The workshop is designed to foster dialog among participants that can help inform a research agenda regarding ECE monitoring.</p>	<p><b>Facilitator</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Kelly Maxwell, Child Trends</li></ul> <p><b>Presenters</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Katherine Beckmann, Senior Policy Advisor: ACF</li><li>• Nina Johnson, National Center on Early Childhood Quality Assurance</li><li>• Kristie Lewis, Assistant Commissioner for Child Care; Bright from the Start: Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning</li><li>• Leigh Bolick, Director of Early Care and Education: South Carolina Department of Social Services</li></ul> <p><b>Scribe</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ashley Hirilall, Child Trends</li></ul>
---	---

### 2. Documents in Session Folder:

- CCPRC Monitoring Presentation-NJ-edited
- KLexemptprogrammonitoring12-2-15
- SC Presentation – CCPRC – December 2015 amended

### 3. Brief Summary of Presentations

#### • Summary of Presentation #1: Comments from Katherine Beckmann

- Beckmann started by reminding the audience that the ultimate goal of the CCDF reauthorization is to keep children safe. She informed the audience more about the CCDF reauthorization:
  - It was signed into law in November 2014.
  - The CCDBG Act is a 5.3 billion dollar block grant with the goal of promoting each state's economic self-sufficiency and enhancing the school readiness of children.
  - The purpose of the Act is to maximize the state's ability to form their child care facilities the way they want.
  - Two goals of the act are to increase access to high quality care and education and to promote child development.
  - In addition, Beckmann spoke about having more qualified inspectors available in more settings. She spoke about the importance of having a sufficient ratio of inspectors to providers, and making sure that all data is available to the public
  - Each state must draft a plan by March 2016 and fully implement plan by November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2016.
  - For more information, please visit: <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/occ/ccdf-reauthorization>
- Beckmann then discussed the importance of researchers/state administrators identifying what aspects of monitoring truly keep kids safe.

#### • Summary of Presentation #2: New Monitoring Requirements CCDGB Act of 2014 by Nina Johnson

- Nina Johnson discussed the new requirements of the CCDBG Act, first describing a few of the new purposes of the law:

- Promote involvement by parents and family members in the development of their children in child care settings
  - Assist states in delivering high-quality, coordinated early childhood care and education services to maximize parents' options
  - Assist states in improving the overall quality of child care services and programs
  - Improve child care and development of participating children
  - Increase the number and percentage of low-income children in high quality child care settings
- Johnson described the increased expectations in monitoring license and license-exempt programs:
  - States must conduct one pre-licensure inspection for health, safety, and first standards and also annual, unannounced inspections.
  - For License-Exempt CCDF Providers (except those serving relatives) – State must conduct annual inspections for compliance with health, safety, and fire standards. The law does not require that these monitoring visits be unannounced, but ACF recommends that States consider unannounced visits for license-exempt providers since experience shows they are effective in promoting compliance.
  - Implementation Deadline: November 19, 2016
  - States and Territories must have health and safety requirements in place for child care providers that serve children receiving CCDF assistance that cover the following topics:
    - Prevention and control of infectious diseases (including immunization);
    - SIDS and use of safe sleep practices;
    - Administration of medication;
    - Prevention of and response to food allergies;
    - Building and physical premises safety;
    - Prevention of shaken baby syndrome and abusive head trauma;
    - Emergency preparedness and response planning;
    - Storage of hazardous materials and bio contaminants;
    - Precautions in transporting children (if applicable);
    - First-aid and CPR; and
    - Nutrition and physical activity (optional).
  - In addition to the new requirements to conduct monitoring visits, States and Territories are now required to have policies in place to ensure that:
    - Licensing inspectors are qualified and have received training in related health and safety requirements; and
    - Ratio of inspectors to providers must be sufficient to ensure visits occur in a timely manner.
- Lastly, Johnson noted that states/territories will need to consider the following questions:
  - How do we increase monitoring and maintain reasonable caseloads?
    - Considering increased violations, providers in rural areas, ...
  - How do we bring exempt providers into a system that was designed for licensed providers?
  - How do we use all of our resources most effectively, including CCR&R, CACFP, child welfare, subsidy, and licensing?
  - How do we support our staff?
  - How do we support our providers?
  - What is the right balance between support and enforcement?
- **Summary of Presentation #3: Georgia's Approach for Monitoring Exempt Programs by Kristie Lewis**
  - Lewis discussed GA's efforts to strengthen exemption requirements. She identified rules that were effective:
    - Required all exempt programs in Georgia to reapply under new rules and at anytime program had changes
    - Required a valid and current email address for program
    - Required program to obtain and keep records on children
    - Required program to maintain daily attendance records
    - Required parents to sign a notice that they were aware the program was exempt from licensure
    - Required program to post exemption notice and exemption approval letter from DECAL

- Required program to post notice IF the program had no liability insurance
    - Lewis defined exempt programs eligible for subsidy funding
      - \*She noted that 14.5% of total programs are license exempt, stating that most of their certificates (vouchers) are in licensed care.
        - Government owned and operated (largest population of exempt programs receiving subsidies)
        - Nursery Schools, playschool & kindergarten, etc. for ages 2-6 years for no more than 4 hours per day
        - Day camps for ages 5 years & older operated by national membership non-profit organization
    - Georgia previously launched a widespread monitoring initiative of exempt programs during the Summer of 2014:
      - Focus was to conduct on-site reviews of summer day camp throughout the state
      - Goal: Visit the Gov't owned & operated, Day Camp/ 5+ & Non-profit summer exempt programs that had active CAPS certificates
      - Approach:
        - Identified a sub-set of experienced licensing consultants located across the state to conduct on-site monitoring visits
        - Contacted programs before visiting to determine if program was still operating
        - Sent letter to all programs in May and June explaining process and reason for visits
        - Conducted webinar with consultants to outline procedures for monitoring
        - Provided memo for consultants to give to exempt programs during site visit  
NOTE: Memo outlined that exempt summer providers, that are currently receiving funding through the Childcare and Parent Services (CAPS) program, were being visited in order to capture routine health and safety data. They ensured them that the visit in no way would jeopardize their current exempt status or CAPS funding.
      - 67 visits were made and consultants used a one page monitoring tool called "Basic Health & Safety Checklist." The tool's focus was on a sub-set of our core rules as well as CRC's and determining if local approvals had been obtained.
      - Findings:
        - Staff Ratios – 92% met
        - CRC's – 57% met
        - Supervision – 87% met
        - Transportation provided by 60 of 67 sites visited
          - Improper restraints reported at 3 sites (of those able to be observed)
        - Pool on premises at 31 of 67 sites
          - Not adequately fenced or secured at 3 of 31 sites
        - Discipline observed at 40 of 67 sites; inappropriate discipline reported at only 2 sites
        - Local approvals:
          - 13 sites did not have a certificate of occupancy
          - 11 sites did not have fire marshal approval
          - 19 sites did not have zoning approval
      - Other considerations discussed:
        - Determine which exemptions would continue to receive subsidy and other benefits
        - Build on work of previous exemption task force recommendations
        - Determine the impact of exemptions on Georgia economy
        - Include programs in QRIS as an alternative to licensing – major public awareness campaign launching in 2016
        - Engage parents in the process (e.g., focus groups)
- **Summary of Presentation #4: Monitoring in South Carolina's QRIS by Leigh Bolick**
  - Bolick started with an overview of their first Tiered Reimbursement subsidy system, which was introduced in 1992. It was a three tiered system and allowed all legally operating providers to participate. Mandatory standards were developed for each tier- these standards were based on licensing regulations. In addition, annual on-site assessments were implemented for all providers at the top two levels.

- Bolick then described the changing political environment in South Carolina, which she described as not being in favor of regulation
  - Quality staff began monitoring Level C exempt providers, including FCC
  - Licensing was also visiting licensed providers twice a year
  - Licensing took on the responsibility of health and safety monitoring for Level C licensed providers; quality staff no longer visited these providers
  - In 2014, legislation eliminated one licensing visit, only one a year is currently allowed and legislation gave licensing the authority to visit registered family providers
- Currently South Carolina's QRIS is...
  - Phasing in Licensing visits for Registered Family providers
  - Reinstating annual quality monitoring visits for Level C license providers
  - Strengthening monitoring of lowest level providers with new standardized health and safety assessment tool (formed basis for licensing visits to registered families)
  - Analyzing information from a pilot conducted to monitor FFN providers (60)
  - Licensing forms the basis to ABC Quality
  - Quality is the "door" to the subsidy program
  - Working on ABC Quality "credential" for exempt facilities (4% of expenditures)
  - Reviewing and revising ABC Quality standards, starting with birth to 2, piloting now
  - Looking at changed required by CCDBG law
- Where are we going?
  - Background checks for exempt facilities
  - Full background checks for FFNs
  - Implementing FFN monitoring visits, likely in 2016; all CCDF providers will then be monitored by ABC Quality Staff
  - Need to establish reasonable restrictions on eligibility for FFN subsidy providers
    - Relative and non-relative
    - State visit prior to enrollment or within a specific time frame
    - Determine in FFN's should be required to become registered (FFN defined as keeping more than two unrelated children)

#### 4. Brief Summary of Discussion

- Kelly Maxwell posed a couple of questions to the audience:
  - How do we know we are looking at the right standards? What aspects of monitoring are most important?
    - Group's consensus: Wish we had the money for rich research. We should think about how we mine data and how it can be most useful.
  - It might be helpful to know what outcome is most interesting to states?
    - Bolick: Health and safety. We want to be able to go above and beyond that but we have to be practical. We have a lot of physical site issues (broken windows, etc)
    - Beckmann: ACF put out CCBDG and it provides efficiencies and includes evidence-informed standards. I urge you to think about what really makes a difference in informing both policy and program.
- Audience Question: How comfortable are SC programs with licensing standards and how qualified are your licensors?
  - Bolick: Child care providers defined standards in the beginning and must give consent to any added regulations. We had a high amount of subsidy users, but with more regulations that has dropped off. We know that if we pay for it, providers are more likely to complete it. Additionally, in SC, it takes a number of visits to correct physical environment issues so again, it's about monitoring and enforcements. How these two areas work together.
- Kelly Maxwell: What are the research questions we can identify with the upcoming CCBDG act?
  - Comparing across type of providers
  - Difference in subsidy and density
  - Seasonal fluctuations? How do you maintain monitoring year round? Where are children going around the year? How reasonable is this to monitor?
  - Do you want to look at monitoring and compliance? What kind of staff training will it take to make this happen? How can their provided support incentivize their usage?

## 5. Summary of Key issues raised

- *Emerging findings that may be of particular interest to policy-makers and ACF?*
  - GA and SC have been and are currently increasing their monitoring of license-exempt programs. These two examples may be useful for other state administrators who need to increase monitoring because of the CCBDG Act. ACF can look at these examples to make monitoring recommendations to other state policy makers.
- *Follow-up activities suggested to address questions and gaps (e.g., secondary analyses of data, consensus meetings of experts, research synthesis or brief, webinar, etc.)? AND Recommendations about future ACF child care research directions and priorities?*
  - Have a conversation about what standards/indicators matter about monitoring. What aspects impact children?
  - Researchers can continue the conversation Kelly Maxwell began about identifying key research questions that can be useful with the upcoming CCBDG Act.
  - Also, think about how to make recommendations about mining administrative data to support research around the CCBDG Act.