

Early Learning Council
Business Materials

October 26, 2017

Consent Agenda

- *Best Beginnings Committee Report – No Meeting*
- Child Care & Education Committee Report
- *Equity Implementation Committee Report – No Meeting*
- Measuring Success Committee Report
- Spark Ad Hoc Committee Report

Early Learning Council CCEC Committee Report

Committee Charge: The Child Care and Education Committee (CCEC) is chartered to advise the Early Learning Council (ELC) on the issues, challenges, successes and priorities related to affordable, quality child care and early education programs in Oregon, to provide outreach and act as a liaison between citizens and the ELC through community forums and surveys to engage parents, early care and education providers and union representatives and to prioritize outcome based policies for child care and early education issues related to quality, affordability and system coordination.

Report:

The CCEC serves as the Early Learning Council's rule advisory committee for all rules related to early learning and development programs in Oregon under its authority.

CCEC committee met October 12, 2017.

Key Issues Discussed & Uncovered:

Central Background Registry Rules Discussion

- The Committee reviewed the revised rule set and agreed on rule language to forward to the Council for approval. Rule revisions will be presented to the Early Learning Council in November for final adoption pending public comment.
- Specifically, rule revisions will:
 - Update definitions relating to child abuse and neglect, adult protective services and foster care checks; require adult protective services and foster care checks prior to enrollment in the CBR.
 - Update definition of "subject individual" to allow enrollment in the CBR of employees or providers of child care services of one of the nine federally recognized tribes in Oregon or administrators of the Tribal Child Care and Development Fund.
 - Establish disqualifying conditions for enrollment in the CBR.
 - Modifies enrollment period in the CBR to five years; and removes conditional enrollment for the CBR.
 - Creates process for applicant to self-disclose their status as a foster parent and any negative foster care or adult protective services history.
 -

Child Care Contribution Tax Credit Program Rules

- The Committee was briefed on upcoming rulemaking activities for the Child Care Contribution Tax Credit program.



Spark Rule Development

- The Committee received an update on the proposed timeline for rule development and an update on standards development.

Administrative Rules for Relief Nursery Programs

- The Committee was presented with a summary of actions taken over the past year on rulemaking, governance and oversight discussions and legislative revisions to enabling statute and was provided preliminary draft rule language.
- The Oregon Association of Relief Nurseries submitted and presented comments and proposed revisions to the draft language.

Upcoming Key Decisions:

CCEC is scheduled to take final action on Relief Nursery rules in November 9, 2017. ELC will receive a briefing and update at its November meeting.

ELC will receive a briefing on rule revisions to the Child Care Contribution Tax Credit program in November

ELC will begin consideration of rule changes in Registered Family Child Care, Certified Family Child Care, and Certified Child Care Center, and Regulated Subsidy rules in January 2018.

Staffed by:

Lisa Pinheiro, Policy Analyst and Cassandra Ferder, Executive Assistant



Early Learning Council Measuring Success Committee Report

Committee Charge:

Advise the Early Learning Council on the issues, challenges, successes and priorities related to measuring the success of the early learning system and ensuring equitable outcomes for all children, including but not limited to the Early Learning Hubs

Committee Membership:

Present: Kristi May, Colleen Reuland, Bobbie Weber, Holly Mar-Comte, Debbie Jones, Dorothy Spence

Report:

The Measuring Success Committee met on Wednesday, October 4, 2017 from 1:00 – 3:00pm. Members received an update on the recent ELC retreat and discussed the implications for the Committee’s work plan for the upcoming year. It was emphasized that efforts should be made toward finding goals, data, and measures that are shared with our sector partners. The more that partners have shared goals and a unified vision, the more resources can be leveraged to support our collective efforts.

In reviewing a diagram of our partner agencies and organizations, it was noted that a number of our health partners (or potential partners) were not included, such as private care practices, behavioral health, and others. Committee members will send additional suggestions for other partners to the Chair. Philanthropic organizations were also mentioned as potentially strong partners, especially when leveraging resources around shared efforts. Philanthropies can be especially useful in jumpstarting collaborative initiatives, though long-term sustainability is always a concern. One goal for the Committee is to create opportunities where we can bring these different sectors together to talk about our shared goals and common performance measures.

The question was raised whether other state agency leaders were having the same conversations about shared goals and measures. It is important that agency leaders are committed to the same efforts and vision in order to have collective impact. It was mentioned that the Children’s Council, a group of agency leaders, met over several months with the thought of developing shared, population-based measures for an Oregon dashboard, but no consensus emerged by the end of the summer and the Council’s efforts ended. So there has been a lot of talk, and general buy-in, from agencies, but no decisions on specific measures.

One Committee member mentioned that the shared measures approach was very different from a dashboard created within her agency. Miriam’s vision starts to bring us back to our goals, and how we leverage that work with our partners. The value of the EL Hubs is that they focus the integration on a developmental stage rather than by agency. This can allow us to start at the beginning, and get upstream of the broader challenges all these different agencies are trying to address.



Getting back to what our real goal is instead of being data-driven – a dashboard is an outcome of our work together, not the starting point.

The Committee revisited some of the challenges of this work: population measures are generally fairly stable and difficult to affect, expected outcomes (e.g., 3rd grade reading) take many years to achieve, political will and support is impatient.

The Committee discussed the goals for a system-level dashboard. One goal is to see population-level changes across the state. These, however, may only change slightly every few years. At a community or agency level, local measures that assess activities or short-term outcomes may be more appropriate. These types of measures are potentially suitable for monitoring purposes. One important role previously discussed was how a dashboard can orient agencies to similar efforts and serve as “north stars.” And measures can also address processes as well as outcomes and serve a role in identifying barriers or pinch points where services get stalled or sidetracked.

A few other approaches to creating a dashboard were mentioned. One was that there is no absolute rule that one dashboard element requires one data source. For example, a number of agencies could each report on their number of referrals that result in services, with the aggregate data serving as a dashboard measure. Related is an approach where each agency or organization collects different data on an important step in a process, and how that process is collectively functioning serves as a dashboard measure. And another approach is to have a bundle of measures from one or more sources that assesses individuals’ or groups’ risk factors or complexities.

There was a brief discussion on the agencies and computer systems that house interagency data such as the education system’s forthcoming Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) and Integrated Client Services within the Office of Forecasting, Research, and Analysis. Geo-spatial analytics within the same office may also be useful.

The Committee next turned to a discussion of conducting program reviews during upcoming meetings throughout the year. The purposes are to get a better understanding of the programs, to look for core set of work running through them, and to assess the gaps in data and understanding in preparation for a business case for a computer system during the 2019 legislative session. How do programs know they are being successful? What data support that conclusion? What data are needed to fully support that conclusion?

ELD program staff are having parallel meetings internally. It was questioned whether program reviews at Committee meetings is the best use of time. Committee staff reporting back about those meetings may be a better approach. Staff will report back to the Committee about ELD’s internal meetings in January and a decision about program reviews will be made then.



Key Issues Discussed & Uncovered:

- Committee staff and the Chair will revise the work plan
- Internal ELD program meetings will continue
- Efforts will be made to connect with the Office of Forecasting, Research, and Analysis regarding interagency data

Upcoming Key Decisions:

- Format for program reviews
- Dashboard development

Staffed by: Ben Tate, Tom George, Sue Parrish



Early Learning Council Spark Ad Hoc Committee Report 10-20-2017

Committee Charge: Advise the Early Learning Council on the issues, challenges, successes and priorities related to revising the Spark/QRIS standards, processes and supports.

Committee Membership: Chair Donalda Dodson, Autumn David, Sabrina Ersland, Pam Greenough Corrie, Lisa Grotting, Robin Hill-Dunbar, Kristin Klotter, Eva Manderson, Marina Merrill, Chelsea Reinhart, Mina Smith, Betty Steel, Renea Wood, Susan Zundel, and Kali Thorne Ladd

Report:

The Spark Revision Ad Hoc committee met on October 20, 2017.

Donalda provided a summary of the Spark revision presentation she provided to the ELC, including the ELC's positive response to the revisions to date. The Spark committee was also updated regarding the recruitment of additional members to the committee given several resignations. The committee will be assessing applications for the three open membership positions and may extend the application deadline past October 27 if necessary.

Tom Udell, TRI, shared information regarding the Equity Implementation Committee's input on the proposed Spark prioritization of resources (supports, incentives, and technical assistance). The EIC was supportive of working with providers to collect family self-reported race and ethnicity information to inform the prioritization of supports and incentives within the Spark. The Ad Hoc committee supported the revision teams moving forward with this direction.

The Spark Revision Ad Hoc committee also reviewed the final draft of the Spark standards and recommended these move forward in the development of the Spark system. The Committee Chair and staff will present additional information on the development of these standards at the November Early Learning Council meeting.

Finally, the committee reviewed and provided input for an expanded work plan of topics to provide policy input on through the next 10 months.

Key Issues Discussed & Uncovered:

Key issues include: Need to add adult child-interaction, consumer engagement, standards crosswalks with accredited and Head Start programs, and more details about monitoring into the work plan.



Additional discussions were around expulsion and suspensions. The committee discussed how this issue might be reflected in the overall Spark framework, such as in continuous quality improvement content and professional development.

The committee emphasized the importance of ongoing and frequent communication to the field regarding where the revision and transition process for Spark is.

Upcoming Key Decisions:

Upcoming decisions include continuing to adapt the work plan, providing guidance and input on a communication and community engagement plan, and policy guidance on transition planning.

Staffed by: Shawna Rodrigues, Early Learning Division
Meredith Russell, Program Development Lead, Early Learning Division
Dawn Woods, Child Care Director, Early Learning Division



Board Action Summary

AGENDA ITEM: Administrative Rule Briefing, Child Care Contribution Tax Credit Program

Summary of Recommended Board Action

ACTION: No Action –Council Briefing and informational item

ISSUE: Administrative Rules for Child Care Contribution Tax Credit Program

The Early Learning Council is being briefed on the Child Care and Education Committee’s upcoming consideration of administrative rules for the Child Care Contribution Tax Credit Program.

BACKGROUND: In 2003, the state legislature enacted the Oregon Child Care Contribution Tax Credit to improve the quality of child care programs through education awards and quality improvement grants. The Early Learning Division is authorized to issue tax credit certificates up to \$500,000 in total certificates per year. By making a contribution to the program, taxpayers receive an Oregon state tax credit of 50 cents for each dollar contributed. The credit claimed cannot exceed the lesser of 50 percent of the amount contributed in the tax year or the tax liability of the taxpayer for the tax period in which the credit is claimed. The Child Care Contribution Tax Credit has a sunset date of January 1, 2022.

Past and present contributions have been disbursed to individuals through education awards and to licensed providers engaged in Spark. Supported activities include quality improvement dollars for center and family-based care facilities. Less than three percent of tax credit dollars have been spent on administration of the program.

Legislation passed in 2015 limited the amount that can be claimed against a taxpayer’s liability to 50 percent. Prior to passage of HB 2171 in 2015, the amount was set by the Early Learning Council by rule.

During the 2017 legislative session, the Oregon Legislature amended the Child Care Contribution Tax Credit. HB 3066 provided technical fixes to the statutes governing administration of the tax credit. The bill removed erroneous statutory language and added language to support strategies identified following enactment of the tax credit program.

Rule revisions to be considered will align existing rule with these statutory changes. The enabling statute includes authority for the Council to adopt rules to establish criteria to be met by providers to receive funds.

ACTION PRECEEDING RECOMMENDED BOARD ADOPTION:

The CCEC was briefed on the need for rulemaking at its October 12, 2017 meeting.

BOARD MEMBER PRESENTING REPORT FOR ADOPTION: Bobbie Weber

CONTACT: Dawn Woods, Child Care Director, Sandy Gorsage, Program Development Specialist, Office of Child Care, Lisa Pinheiro, Early Learning Policy Analyst, ELD