



## Family Child Care Task Force Transcription

December 16, 2019

6:00 pm to 9:00 pm

Ridgedale Library, 12601 Ridgedale Drive, Minnetonka, MN 55305

Robert H. Rohlf Room

- Rep. Ami Wazlawik: All right. Good evening, everyone. Thank you for being here at the meeting and thanks to those on the phone for joining us. I am Representative Ami Wazlawik and I'm a co-chair of the Family Child Care Task Force. We're going to go around the table and do some brief introductions, if you can say your name and who you're representing. And then we'll get the folks on the phone after we go around the table. So let's start with Senator Kiffmeyer next and we'll go around the table.
- Sen. Mary Kiffmeyer: Okay. Senator Mary Kiffmeyer.
- Kim Leipold: I'm Kim Leipold. I am on the Association of Minnesota Family Child Care Licensors, and I represent the metro area.
- Rep. Wazlawik: And if you can all be sure to speak into the mic so we can record and hear everybody.
- Liz Harris: I am Liz Harris, family child care provider, and I'm in Cottage Grove.
- Cyndi Cunningham: Cyndi Cunningham, family child care provider representing MCCPIN. And I don't really—I live in St. Paul and I'm just really glad I don't commute.
- Lauryn Schothorst: Lauryn Schothorst from the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce, and just did the St. Paul to here commute.
- Reggie Wagner: Reggie Wagner, the commissioner's designee on the licensing topics. I oversee licensing.
- Heidi Hagel Braid: Heidi Hagel Braid from First Children's Finance.
- Julie Seydel: Julie Seydel from MACCP.
- Rep. Lisa Demuth: State Representative Lisa Demuth, and I also just did the commute from my office.
- Tiffany Grant: Tiffany Grant, and I'm a family child care provider representing providers in the metro area in Brooklyn Park.

Kelly Martini: Kelly Martini, a daycare provider and representing SBCCA, Stearns Benton Child Care Association.

Sen. Melissa Wiklund: I apologize. I'm Melissa Wiklund, I'm in the state senate and I represent Bloomington and Richfield.

Rep. Wazlawik: We have another one. Ann, we're just doing introductions.

Ann McCully: Ann McCully, Child Care Aware of Minnesota.

Rep. Wazlawik: And folks on the phone if you want to introduce yourselves, your name and who you represent.

Erin Echternach: This is Erin Echternach from Bemidji. I'm representing economic development in greater Bemidji, and I'm also a parent representative for this task force.

JoAnn Smith: I'm JoAnn Smith, I'm from International Falls, Minnesota, and I'm representing Koochiching Economic Development Authority and I'm also a parent.

Scott Marquardt: Scott Marquardt from Montevideo, I'm representing the Minnesota Initiative Foundation.

Ariane Bromberg: I'm Ariane Bromberg, I'm representing Family Child Care Incorporated, and I'm from Rochester, Minnesota, and I'm a provider.

Samantha Chukuske: I'm Samantha Chukuske, and I'm representing Greater Minnesota.

Stella Zimmerman: And Hollee, are you on the phone yet? Okay. All right.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: When she does come online, will you know?

Participant: Yes.

Stella: Yes, we should know that.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: Yeah. And just [inaudible 00:03:33] with this.

Stella: And my name is Stella SiWan Zimmerman, and I'm the facilitator from ACET. And we also have with the team here, Jolene Roehlkepartain and then Brad Krueger as well in the back. And a few housekeeping items just for today. If everyone can please state their name and get close to the microphone. The microphone is directional as Ami had mentioned, so please state your name before speaking so that we can capture this as best as possible on the recording device. And then secondly, we also have some ground rules that we established for this meetings and they're both posted. The five ground rules are posted on paper, in the back.

Please note, thank you again for the public for coming today to observe this meeting. We will not be taking any public testimony. If you have any questions

or comments, please email them to the FCCTF@acetinc.com's e-mail. With that, I would like to turn this over to Jolene who's going to get to the get to know members activities before Representative Ami Wazlawik who's going to be the lead for today's meeting take us away on the agenda.

Julie: Can I make a comment? First, this is Julie Seydel, and I mean no disrespect whatsoever, but we have a really tight timeline here and very little time to accomplish this. And not that I don't want to get to know everybody, but we don't have time to become buddy, buddy, we really need—even 15 minutes is a big deal to get work done. And that 15 minutes turns into 20 minutes, 30 minutes, and I really feel the get to know part is a waste of time that we need to get down to the root of what's going on. We're down another 400 providers this year, almost 500. We don't have time to play games. We really need to get moving.

Jolene: May speak to this issue?

Stella: Yes, please do.

Jolene: I'm Jolene. I work at ACET. These get to know you activities are not fun and games even though they look like that, and actually, they are kind of fun. But the reason for them is that this task force has been asked to do extremely difficult work, and the more you get into these types of issues, the harder it gets. So the more you can build relationships and get to know people rather than what you're making assumptions about what other people are like at the table, the better and that the more effective we'll be a group. So we'll keep them very short, but it is important that it helps to go buy in to the meeting—

Sen. Kiffmeyer: Let me just—Jolene, I'm just going to weigh in here. I ran into it last time when we were very, very short on time, and so I just want to weigh in as well. While I appreciate the intentions of it all, I am just not convinced that maybe we put it to the end of the agenda and then it has to wait until the end for us to be able to have time for that instead of making other things go to the end of the agenda and hope we get to them. That's just my concern as well.

Rep. Wazlawik: This is Ami. Jolene, can you let us know, how long do you think this will take? I know we have about five minutes of time right now.

Jolene: Five to seven minutes. We'll make it go fast.

Rep. Wazlawik: Okay, let's do it then.

Stella: Thank you, Ami.

Rep. Wazlawik: All right. This is Ami, and we're going to move on the agenda to the next item, which is approving the meeting notes. So if everyone can, if you haven't had a chance to look at the meeting notes, they're in your packet. If you can take a minute to look those over and then we will vote on them.

JoAnn: This is JoAnn Smith. I'd like to move the meeting minutes from last meeting.

Rep. Wazlawik: Yeah. We're going to vote on those in just a second. I wanted to give folks your time. I still see people looking through the minutes, so we'll go ahead and vote on that motion. I don't think—do we need a second? Do we have a second?

Participant: Second.

Rep. Wazlawik: Okay. We'll second that and then we will all vote. I'll go on the list, alphabetical by first name, so wait for your name. Ann McCully.

Ann: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Ariane Bromberg.

Ariane: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Cyndi Cunningham.

Cyndi: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Dan Dorman. Reggie Wagner.

Reggie: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Erin Echternach.

Erin: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Erin Johnson-Balstad. Heidi Hagel Braid.

Heidi: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Hollee Seville.

Participant: She just moved out a second ago.

Rep. Wazlawik: Okay. JoAnn Smith.

JoAnn: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Julie Seydel.

Julie: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Kelly Martini.

Kelly: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Kim Leipold.

Kim: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Lanay Miller.

Participant: Not here.

Rep. Wazlawik: Lauryn.

Lauryn: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Liz Harris.

Liz: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Marit Woods.

Participant: I think she's gone as well.

Rep. Wazlawik: Me, aye. Representative Lisa Demuth.

Rep. Demuth: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Samantha Chukuske.

Samantha: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Scott Marquardt.

Scott: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Senator Kiffmeyer.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Senator Wiklund.

Sen. Wiklund: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Stephanie Hogenson is also absent, I believe. Tiffany Grant.

Tiffany: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Hollee, we are voting on the minutes. If you approve of the minutes—

Hollie: Aye.

Rep. Wazlawik: Okay. Thank you. All right. So those minutes are now officially minutes. And I will hand it over to Senator Kiffmeyer to go over the feedback from last meeting.

Sen. Kiffmeyer:

So from the last meeting, first there were questions, to what extent do you agree with the following statements. Meeting met my expectations, 97 percent agree or strongly agree. I was given opportunities to ask questions, 94 percent—oh, it's 94 percent on the first one, 94 percent agree or strongly agree. Agenda topics were addressed at the meeting, 94 percent agree or strongly agree. I felt my voice was heard, 94 percent agree or strongly agree. And I learned something new at this meeting, 94 percent agree or strongly agree. I am satisfied with the level of progress made at today's meeting, 65 percent agree or strongly agree. That's a big departure for us.

And in regards to I have a clear picture of what my follow up steps will be, 75 percent said agree or strongly agree. And the number of respondents were 16 or 17. If you disagreed or strongly disagreed with any statements above, please share why. So on number one, 6:00 to 9:00 PM is clearly not enough time to discuss proper agenda items. Two, I really would like to understand the interim steps for our decision to not send a survey, for example, not repeating the discussion again in December. Number three, please send all materials as soon as possible so we have time to read and study them. Four, not sure where to spend my time between now and next meeting, please send materials as early as possible.

Five, it's always confusing who is going to do what between meetings. Six, it's unfortunate that we can't have subcommittee meetings where larger group meetings that could gather information report back to the large group. It feels like we are spinning in circles and not moving forward. Question four, what was the most important thing you took away from this meeting? The responses, need more discussion time. It's a serious issue, we're getting cut short. Learning about different ways to make things easier for providers, knowing that we can make a difference in the process even if it's small changes. Dr. Fiene presentation was great. Dr. Fiene recommendations I'm gathering was a positive thing.

Seems like we are going down the right path by working together. Dr. Fiene was very informative and he could be instrumental in a new model for Minnesota. Understanding of variances and alternate forms, reporting compliance, Dr. Fiene's presentation, Dr. Fiene presentation. So those were the comments, the most important thing you took away from the meeting, which I would summarize Dr. Fiene did great and we need more time.

Question five, what if anything was missed? One was, I wish we could get the data from the surveys that just went out. It may not be exactly what we were looking for, but it would. Two, not enough time to complete the work assigned to this meeting, not adequate time for discussion and decision making. Number three, discussion of variances cut short. Next one, what additional information or resources would you like to receive at our next meeting? One, can DHS come up with correction orders that are out there? What is the top? What do providers need to work on? What can we do to help providers be more in compliance? Two, I would like to see a presentation from a provider. There

needs to be a clear understanding as to what our job entails on a day to day basis.

Three, specific models of other forms of child care licensing, FCC centers, groups, specializations, et cetera. Four, handouts ahead of time if at all possible. Five, encourage those who use acronyms to explain what those are. For those who live in the world of acronyms, that is always a challenge. So that is the feedback summary.

Stella: Thank you, Mary. Now, we're going to move to duty number one. And the duty number one, just to restate this, is to identify difficulties that providers face regarding licensing and inspection, including specific licensing requirements that have led to the closure of family child care programs by reviewing previous survey results and conducting follow up surveys if necessary. So Ami is going to be talking about the proposal that's also in your packet next.

Rep. Wazlawik: This is Ami. You all have a proposal to task force document in your packet. If you had a chance to look at it before, great, if not, take a minute or two to do that. I'm just going to talk through a couple of key points from the proposal. So we discussed as a group doing a survey, and feel like there's the need to get more specific information about licensing requirements that have led providers to close their licenses. And so we had talked about doing a larger scale survey and given the cost and the amount of time that it would take, we decided to scale back. And so the proposal that you have is a proposal for a scaled back version of the survey. That would be reaching out to family license providers who have closed their licenses since January 1, 2017.

And the survey would be going out to via e-mail to providers between—from providers between January 1, 2017 and the end of this year, folks who have closed their licenses during that time period. And so the proposal lays out some of the things we hope to do with this, and we're going to be discussing whether to move forward with the survey at today's meeting and then discussing the proposed survey itself and the e-mail that would go out to former providers. So you can look at the second page of the proposal lays out some of the statistics that we have about these providers in terms of e-mail addresses and where they're from, and some remaining questions that we have as we move forward.

I don't know if DHS has any updates on those outstanding questions or anything about the Institutional Review Board if they have anything that they want to add at this point. DHS.

Beth Fraser: So this is Beth Fraser, the policy manager for the licensing area. And the two outstanding questions, the first one was related to whether the dataset would be public or private. And after doing some more research, it looks like the data will generally be considered public as long as people—as long as it isn't identifiable. So especially in areas where there's a text box that somebody could fill in. If somebody said, "Hi, this is Tiffany and I think blah, blah, blah," well then that one answer would need to be redacted because it would be clear who had

said it. Not all of her answers, but that piece of it. But as long as there was not something that made it identifiable, the dataset itself would be public data.

And we're still looking at whether the wording at the beginning of the survey or the e-mail would need to be tweaked, but given that it is public data, I'm not sure it would need additional verbiage because typically, the law says you need to provide a privacy warning if the data will be classified as private data. And in this case, it generally would not so we probably wouldn't need that much.

Rep. Wazlawik: This is—go ahead, Beth.

Beth: We do have—we asked our data analyst to come tonight. He is our survey guru in house, and so he is here to answer more specific questions if you all have questions about the survey or how the tool works or whatever.

Rep. Wazlawik: Okay. This is Ami. Thank you for the update, Beth. So what we're going to do now is we're going to, since we've done a little bit of an overview, we're going to talk—are we going to break into groups to discuss or vote first? Okay. So we're going to open for discussion on the topic of doing the survey itself, not the survey, not the survey content, but on doing the survey as is laid out in the proposal itself. So folks have comments or feedback, please state your name and then give your feedback. Cyndi.

Cyndi: Cyndi. My question is, on the charge that was in legislation, does it require that we do former or just collect data on what's conflicting or problematic? Sorry, it's been a long day. Is the charge former providers, or is the charge that we get that of what's a problem for providers?

Rep. Wazlawik: This is Ami. The charge is specific licensing requirements that have led to the closure of family child care programs. So it doesn't specify former providers, but likely the former providers who have closed their licenses are probably going to be the best source of information on why they closed their licenses, but certainly open to feedback on that. I think one of the things we're trying also to do is to not get outside of what our duties are and then make this into a thing where we're getting all this different information from different sources. And it would also require—we would have to likely tweak whatever survey we send out if we decide to include current providers.

Cyndi: Cyndi again, I woke up this morning. My struggle is this, what was discussed before is that trying to get people, and I've done some discussion with providers, closed current providers, our board for MCCPIN, Minnesota Child Care Provider Information Network, for those who wanted acronyms, that I think the return even on the investment in just time to go to former, I think there's a lot of anecdotal and known information on why people have closed, and I think it's really difficult to apply it to those that are necessarily in the field right now. And the chomp at the bit question I want answered is what would keep providers in business right now?

Because I think one, that's a message to current providers that they're important and that we need to know this and this is what we're trying to solve, and that we really would get to the point of what the problems are that are having people contemplate getting out of the business. And then those are things we could solve that would actually continue to message a positive to current providers and to bring them in. So I think there are things like the REETAIN grants, yes, ma'am, like other things. There's a lot of known stuff we have that we really could work on and fix. So mine is, I really would like to challenge that we need to do former. We need to reach out to current and give them the message that it's important that they're here and [inaudible 00:22:45].

Sen. Kiffmeyer: I have for you, in regards to that, Cyndi is, do you think the same questions in this survey as they're currently written could be answered by a current provider or would they have to be rewritten?

Cyndi: I got a little annoyed at the first part of the part of the current versus former. So when I went through these for the most part, I would say that most of the questions would be maybe tweaked a little bit in their wording, but I think it's all—and I think the questions themselves or the intent of the question still reaches to the same point.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: It's a yes or no. You think it would be. I know you got to talk it through, but—

Cyndi: I don't think they would take much tweak I think it would be. If we're talking about—are you asking me would this have to be redone? Not completely. I haven't read through it from that lens because that's wasn't how it was presented me.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: Just the concern I have is that we've spent a lot of time on surveys. And what I don't want to see us do is spend all this time on surveys that we don't get to the work, and then we lose time on others. Maybe when we get, since this is written for former people, when we get the results from it, I don't think it'd be too terribly difficult to send it out again to current members, but to try and figure out both of those right now when we're this far down the road on former, I would be concerned about all the time we're spending just doing that. We barely even touched the content yet.

Cyndi: Cyndi here. I guess because we haven't touched the content, to me, it's like the content could be reworked and I think the reasoning for getting those who have closed and the potential for getting response from those that have closed, I think is really low in my opinion. And in thinking that people who have been out of the business aren't going to look at the DHS e-mail and answer it and go through this amount of time and effort to answer survey I think is questionable that you're going to do it.

Kim: This is Kim. And also, do you really think this? I also agree with Cyndi. And I think that if you're looking at the top thing on here, there is only 61 percent of e-mail addresses of the former providers. So those are people who have quit. So if you

think of 61 percent of them, how many of that number is going to answer, are going to answer the survey? So it's kind of the reward return type thing.

Stella: Anyone else?

Hollee: This is Hollee. [inaudible 00:25:48] I do.

Stella: Hollee, can you repeat that? We didn't hear you very clearly on our side.

Hollee: Oh, sorry. I was thinking of if no one else had something to say, I did.

Stella: Yeah, go ahead.

Hollee: Okay. Just a couple of things regarding the survey itself. I think as long as we're doing this survey, it would only require a couple of wording changes to include current providers to get a true gauge of what is happening in this field instead of what things were a factor you'd say is or were. It wouldn't require much time. I mean, one thing that is really big is that someone else, some other group of people, I don't know, needs to conduct a survey. The survey cannot, in any way, be conducted by DHS. I'm sorry, but they're not impartial. And most of the reasons providers list for closing are going to be related to licensing or DHS regulations and that kind of thing.

And we know this because we conducted a survey a few years ago, 6,700 family child care providers and 33 percent of them completed that survey within a week. Maybe an option would be having some volunteers from the subcommittee, administer the survey through SurveyMonkey or something. That can be free and even to get some of the other—I mean, it wouldn't cost much to get a few other features available. And then it's so nice because it populates the data nicely for you. And then we could see something else that was important was being able to see the individual answers from providers or former providers because what if someone's just having a bad day? I mean, it happens with some surveys where you have to throw out your high and low and they're left with what's left.

Because what if someone doesn't seem to be taking it seriously and all their answers seem like a joke. Well, if you have them all compiled together, it's not going to give you a true reflection of anything. It won't be very reliable. And that way, we can tell if there's a trend in one area or another. So you could have the aggregate data, but also say, "See, okay, these are participant one's answers, these are participant two's answers." And so that was it regarding the actual survey itself.

I think we should do it, but I don't think there has to be a big cost, but I think we just need to make sure that everything is—it's reliable, that if we're going to take the time to do this, that we get many responses and that we not only learn from the people who've left the field but also prevent more providers from leaving the field. And like I said, I just think we need to make sure that that data isn't going to be, I don't know, that it's fairly interpreted.

Stella: Thank you, Hollee. And I wrote down what you provided as well for that comment about that. Ann, you also had a comment, is that right, too?

Ann: I just wanted to clarify—this is Ann. It seem to me that in the bullet points here at the proposal, it talks about the e-mail coming from the task force, so I wonder if that will help mitigate some of what you were saying, Hollee and others, about coming from DHS. I mean, we talked—the original discussion about this task force being very reflective of a lot of voices and if it can show that in the e-mail that might be helpful in getting responses. And I would just say I still think it's worth doing. I mean, I think we all reacted last time to the cost being so much, but if we can do this in a way that's less costly, I'm still very interested in the idea of asking some of these more detailed questions that could underneath the question of paperwork or regulations. Let's get at the meat of what those mean, even if it's a small response.

Julie: This is Julie. Is there—couldn't we have basically, like Hollee said, a small subcommittee from here, two or three people that can do the SurveyMonkey? SurveyMonkey is not hard to do, it's extremely inexpensive. And again, I know that they're saying that this e-mail will come saying it's from somewhere else, but this is the task force, this is not DHS's task force, we need to take care of it here. And then it says here that the final survey information would go to the DHS Institutional Review Board. Why does it need to go there? SurveyMonkey will collect all of that information and that needs to come back to the task force.

And I apologize if I'm insulting anybody, but the task force needs to be in charge of this not DHS, and this is a lot of DHS here, and it will turn off providers from answering if they get the whiff that DHS is behind this. Even some of the questions in the survey put me off reading them as a provider because of the way that they were presented, and we need to be really careful on how we're asking providers that. And one of them was, did you feel the paperwork was too difficult? No, but your continuing re-interpretation and changing and the paperwork is.

Some of those questions need to change because we don't want to insult somebody and make them feel like you were inadequate and you couldn't handle the job. That's not what's going on here. And we get a little bit too technical when we use state agencies to do certain things.

Stella: And the question that you had raised, Julie, can someone from the DHS answer the question about the DHS institutional report question please? This is Stella.

Beth: Yeah. This is Beth. And because the—so we have been asking about whether or not it would have to go to the Institutional Review Board. And so an institutional review board is, for anyone who doesn't know, and I don't know what people know and what they don't know, basically, a lot of organizations like universities and in this case the state agency, have an institutional review board that review surveys before they go out to be sure that any research is being done ethically and appropriately.

And so it's not that the data that is answered will go to the review board, they will have nothing to do with the data that is returned, it's just they review a survey before it's sent out to be sure that it's being done ethically and appropriately. And they have said that because DHS is part of it, they feel like they wouldn't need to see it. So that's what that is about. And we are very clear, it's been very clear and we are fine with it not coming from DHS. We have been taking teams to figure out how to get the survey done in a way where it does not appear to be from DHS. And Peder can speak more to how the e-mail would look, how it would be sent out if you all want that information.

Julie: Being that this isn't a DHS survey though, why does it have to go to the DHS Institutional Review Board I guess is my question. This is not supposed to be a DHS survey, why does it have to take that extra step? As it is right now, we will be lucky to get this information in time to do our report to the Senate. And if we have to wait for DHS to review all of these things and get that back, it's not going to happen. And again, by doing that, it appears that DHS is way more involved in the survey than they should be. And that's where I'm having a problem with this, this is supposed to be the task force, it's not supposed to be DHS.

Reggie: Hi, this is Reggie. And I really appreciate all the comments this evening starting with Cyndi's around the scope and role of DHS. And I just want to remind everybody, we actually had proposed going very, very external contracting, we took great pains to acknowledge that that was a legitimate concern. So now, we're all in that place of trying to address cost, timing, what people think is beneficial, and so that's one reason why it was being looked back at what can DHS do to help facilitate move this along, but also tee it up in a way that the task force begins to step in. So I just want to make sure, we're not trying to take this over and do this survey, we actually—we're really trying to hear everybody initially and we're looking at getting a contract.

So somehow between an expensive contract that people thought would take way too long versus something that looks like it's morphing back to the department playing a role, I think we're all just trying to find that balance. I think we have a couple of suggestions. I mean, I do think a practical piece, Beth, you might want to address is that—and we know that e-mails are only as good as whatever somebody wrote and however long they keep it active, but the e-mails that we would be using are not—they're not public data, so we can't just generate a list of e-mails and give them to anybody on the street.

So that's a piece of what we're balancing with here if it's done. If somebody just wants to send a postcard with a simple link, that's something different. Addresses even for former providers are classified as public data. So what we're also balancing by DHS potentially playing a role in facilitating it is to look at what's an appropriate use of the e-mails that are in our bailiwick. So there's a little bit of juggling going on about how to facilitate and where DHS might be able to play a role knowing that the greater value will be if it really is coming from the task force for sure.

Julie: This is Julie. I have a question. Did you say the e-mail addresses are not public information or they are? I got a little—they are public information?

Beth: No. So this is Beth. And the e-mail addresses that are included on—to the extent e-mail addresses are included on a providers application that is then provided to DHS and is in licensing's database, that is private data. Because all licensing data is private unless the statute specifically says it's public, so there are public, there are e-mail addresses for some providers that are public that are owned by another part of the department. As I understand it, that's what you all use to send out the MACCP survey. But these e-mails for the license providers, which I believe is a broader dataset is our private data.

Julie: Then how does Child Care Aware and Think Small get that list of e-mail addresses to send out all of those e-mails?

Participant: Business e-mails, I believe.

Beth: This is Beth. And my understanding is they get them from another part of the department, they're not licensing data.

Reggie: Right. This is Reggie. Again, we can certainly dive as deep as we want in it. What I think we're talking about is how the department uses things that affect its license holders and uses an e-mail is very, very different from us generating a list on a spreadsheet and sending them out to anybody that says, "Hey, I want a whole list of providers e-mails." So the e-mails don't get distributed for somebody else to take and use for whatever their marketing is. But how the department uses things that affect the license holder, the use of it is very different from generating a list and making it available saying, "Here, you guys go ahead and do a Google survey and use this spreadsheet and here's a whole bunch of lists." We can't do that. We can only give what's public data for media, anybody to use. So I think that's what we're trying to say.

If people just want to send out a survey that has a short little link that somebody could go and type in a tiny URL and do it, then that's totally fine, and addresses our public information. So what we're balancing here is if the department is working with and on behalf of the task force to facilitate the use of that, that's different than giving somebody the actual list of e-mails.

Kim: This is Kim. As a part of the task force, we're not just anyone on the street, right? So that list that DHS has, as Julie was saying, if there is a subcommittee or a few people who decide to do it a different way and it comes from the task force e-mail, we're not just someone on the street, we're people who have been legislatively appointed to be here to have this list, so us being here, whoever it is that might do it, I guess legally we would have to look at. And then again, we're still going weeks out and things like that, but I don't think that we're asking to give it to anybody, I think figuring out—yeah, I don't think it's a—I don't think we're making it a public list, we're making it a task force appointed duty list.

Reggie: And this is Reggie. And Kim, I guess I would agree. I guess I was just trying to maybe more generally talk about what we mean. So if anybody would find it helpful at this point, we don't want to cut the conversation off. We do have our person who's worked on the surveys that could talk about a way in which we've thought through how to we think accommodate people's concerns that it not be "A DHS survey" and come from the task force. We think that there may be a way to do that.

Kim: This is Kim. Then I guess I have a question maybe for him, yes. I'm actually less concerned about it coming from DHS, I'm more concerned with it going back to DHS. So when that happens, does that come—can it come to the task force e-mail address, or who's doing all that? I don't know because I don't get it. That's why you're here.

Stella: This is Stella. Before we open this up for DHS for you to join us, I do want to just ask if there are any members here that want the protocol to proceed with the protocol as is, if there is a reason why to proceed with the protocol as is, I would like to hear from you why. So I just want to make sure that there's different opinions about this, I want to hear that, too. If there's a member that would like to proceed as is.

Scott: Stella?

Stella: Yes.

Scott: This is Scott Marquardt. And before I get to my actual question, I just want to reiterate what I think I heard Cyndi and Hollee and Ann and probably others say that I've looked at this entirely with the lens that this has to be grounded as a business retention survey, retaining these enterprises that we need for our state's economy. And it's the same grounding that the Minnesota Chamber uses, greater MSP, DEED, local EDOs, anybody that's doing this. If we don't have a business retention lens in all of the questions including whether or not we approach existing providers, then I think we've missed the mark.

My question for the department is, let's say at this very moment at 6:52 PM, the survey was approved as is, no questions, full speed ahead, looking at your survey, it says it's going to be e-mailed out in January or February and then two weeks to complete it. What is best case scenario timing? If everything was blessed this minute, what's best case scenario for when our task force would have a compilation back to look at? Are we looking at April?

Reggie: This is Reggie. In a minute, we'll have Peder introduce himself and talk about it. I certainly want to acknowledge with Scott's immediate comment about let's just say 6:52, everything said go. The task force has the ability to say when you want it sent out. What I think the conversation and the proposal reflects is perhaps the realities of some timing about the holidays and where will people—do you really want to send it before the first week of January. So I mean, I think there's a little bit of that. I think we—do we know if the IRB is a factor in there or no,

they shouldn't be a factor at this point or is that one of the—okay. So do you—yeah. Okay.

Peder: So hello, my name is Peder [inaudible 00:42:31], I'm a data analyst at DHS. So try to remind me if I miss any of these questions that are going around. In terms of the timing, maybe starting back to the—from the last question back to the first. So if we left two weeks to take the survey, then everything that was generated in those two weeks would be available pretty much right after that. It's the speed at which it would take me to download all the data as an Excel file or however people would want it to then get that data out to people, so that would be all the responses. The thing that might take a little bit more time is depending on the kinds of changes that would be proposed or needed in the actual survey itself, take a little bit of time to make sure we're putting that in there, proofing it, making sure everybody has buy-in.

And then this Institutional Review Board, really the point is to make sure we are protecting what could potentially be private data or data that could identify people. So that's—it's really that whole structure is in place to protect the data of the people responding to the survey, so that's a step that we're really tied to to make sure that they are approving that what we are doing is protecting any responses that people would give back to us and not putting them in danger in any way, but getting private data out there that people could have access to.

Going back to—so I guess I answered, too, about where the data would come to and in terms of how long it would take to get it, but how it works with the tool that we have at DHS, it's called Snap Survey. So basically, we can change the from line in the e-mails that would get sent out to whatever we would want it to be. So the proposal would be some form of family child care task force or whatever you would decide, that would be what you would receive the e-mail from. And then, all of that data would come back to the—it's called the web host, but it's basically what this tool uses to collect all of the responses that people have sent through a link in their e-mail. So I don't know currently of a way that that could be automatically to somebody else's e-mail, but that could be sent as soon as we have it.

So basically, in my mind, it would be, if we've said this closes on this date, then give one or two days to make sure we've brought it all together and then just send that raw data on and then that would give people really anybody in this area or any other area, the opportunity to then analyze that in different ways that they would want to. And then the analysis of that is a whole different question about how people would want to proceed with that. I want to make sure I didn't miss anything in that, any of those questions, so feel free to throw anything else back to me that I may have missed. Thank you.

Participant: Can the survey come from Peder?

Peder: I have a very long last name so it might be difficult.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: This is Mary. The two questions that we're just dealing with right now was where it comes from, the logo of Family Child Care Taskforce, that's not an issue, correct, Peder?

Peder: No, that would not be an issue. Yeah. You could have any logo that you would want in the survey itself, in the e-mail itself, and then the from line, when you get that e-mail and you see it's from Peder, it's from whoever, you could change that to what you want.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: And so when the data comes back, when we've closed the window for taking up that data, other than making sure that any personally identified information is removed, all the rest of the raw data would be available in the format that the task force would like.

Peder: Yeah. So there's a lot of different ways of reporting that out. Sometimes the Excel spreadsheet is a little harder to work with, but you can also get them back as like a PDF of every single survey with each response checked out. It really depends. We could talk about that.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: And Peder, does it also have—are there preset reports that are already designed in the survey tool that you have, predesigned reports that can be generated?

Peder: That's a good question there. There are some. I have not really used the tool in that way, I must say, so there are some ways of doing it and it depends on how you've set up the survey. As a data analyst, I usually like the spreadsheet and then I play with it, so my knowledge of exactly how those—like how that tool, Snap Survey would generate specific reports that do any kind of statistical analysis. I'm not exactly sure, but I know that it does do things like for every single response, here's the count of people who responded in that way in a very standardized way. So that could come from that tool itself. There could be other ways to take that Excel spreadsheet and format it in a way that may or may not be more helpful than that as well.

Ann: May I just—this is Ann, I just want to clarify and to your question, Julie, I just quickly checked with Angie. I thought I remembered this, I passed my data privacy test. What it is for Child Care Aware, there's a public e-mail address that we have, that's what we can give. The providers also can designate a private e-mail address, which is what—maybe you must be talking about this in the system is my guess, and that's only for internal communication and you. So the only thing we can never give out to anybody that requests is the public e-mail address, their business e-mail address. That helped.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: I just have a quick question, Ann. So this is Mary. Where would you get the original e-mail dataset from?

Ann: We are connected with DHS Licensing to run the Child Care Aware system. So if we're doing the market rate survey or doing communications to providers, but that isn't—the e-mail addresses that are private don't go out.

Lauryn: This is Lauryn. Just a question then. So if it goes through this mechanism and a child care provider asks the question, "Oh, this isn't going to DHS, is it?" That would be incorrect. They wouldn't be able to say that. There would be some element of this that does go through, even if you're just passing the data along. And that would be your concern is that if people think there's any connection to it.

Julie: And a lot of what we're talking about with the analytics and stuff can be set up through SurveyMonkey, and it just automatically generates it. And this is nothing against you personally. I just have a problem with all this information going back to DHS because it may not be you, it could be anybody there can manipulate those responses where if it comes back through SurveyMonkey, it's all right there, it spits it out, everything is in black and white, it's already done for us. And there isn't that huge timeframe of waiting for you to do your job. Survey closes, boom, the information's there. It's that fast.

Stella: This is Stella. Just for transparency of it, does the Snap Survey tool allow for the ability for members to be able to have a link to see real time responses? So for example, as a response come into the system, it gives that aggregate report so you can see it, it's live. This is Stella.

Peder: I am not sure. I don't think so off the top of my head. I mean, I personally log in to the tool to access all the functionality of it, so to make that available with the passwords and all that kind of stuff, I don't know if there's even a way to do that. I don't think so though.

Liz: This is Liz Harris. Julie, is your organization capable of sending out a survey?

Julie: We've done it before, yes.

Liz: So I guess my question would be then if the providers at the table or if other people are nervous about it going to DHS, then could your organization send out maybe the same survey, maybe even Peder sends out the same survey?

Julie: I mean, we definitely can do that, but I think it really needs to come from the task force. I don't want it to come from MACCP or Child Care Aware or MCCPIN, it needs to come from the task force. But I know that Hollee is really good at surveys. And if we could get a couple of people, like a subcommittee put together that we could put this in SurveyMonkey and have it go out from the task force and come back to the task force.

Liz: How can you provide those e-mail addresses to the task force collectively of your organizations?

Julie: Child Care Aware would be able to. Child Care Aware have been in this situation.

Hollee: [inaudible 00:51:09]. Hollee here, sorry. Child Care Aware provided us with e-mail addresses many times. The problem is, Child Care Aware wouldn't

necessarily have providers who have closed their businesses or they would have to coordinate with DHS anyways. Isn't that correct, Ann?

Ann: Yes. This is Ann. And again, I don't know if it's—we'd need to find out what the rules are around the private e-mail addresses. I am looking at Reggie. I don't know.

Julie: This is Julie again. We're talking about private versus business e-mail addresses. Are there any child care providers here that have a private and have a business e-mail address? I think it's kind of a mute point because your business e-mail address is your e-mail address, and we don't keep them private because we want people to be able to e-mail us. So I think this private versus business is kind of a mute point. If there's not an e-mail address, there's not an e-mail address. There are thousands. We had 6,700 e-mail addresses for our last survey, that's a lot of e-mail addresses.

Participant: And we can't just use those e-mail addresses for the task force and change the language so close to current or previous providers. I'm sure there's e-mail—I can never get rid of an e-mail address in the database that I ran when I was in Dallas.

Julie: Well, it's from 2017 so I would like to see an updated list of the e-mail addresses from Child Care Aware because I'm sure there are some that are gone and some that have been added. So yes, if they could get us an updated list, we could just send right from that.

Stella: With the questions from Lauryn and I believe Kelly, did you have a comment as well?

Kelly: Yeah, I have two things. First of all, is the same cost that we've always been talking about, is this going to change anything? And then, can the survey be sent to the whole task force, not just DHS, can we get all the information so that we can mismatch or whatever when we bring it to the table. And then actually, another question is, how many private e-mail versus regular e-mail can you find out? Is there only 10 private e-mail addresses versus—is there any way DHS can let us know? Is there only 10 e-mails that are private that they can't share or I don't know.

Stella: Is there an estimated number? This is Stella.

Beth: This is Beth. And I think that we could compare the number of e-mails that we have in the licensing database with the e-mails the other part of the department has and find out how many, I don't know how many there are.

Peder: And this is Peder. Also depending on if you are looking at those people who have closed in the last three years. I don't know off hand if that number is going to be different for closed providers, but that's just another thing to consider.

Ann: And this is Ann, I don't know if we keep closed ones. That's what I'm just checking on.

Stella: And this is Stella.

Scott: This is Scott.

Stella: Go ahead, Scott. Sorry.

Scott: No, sorry if I cut somebody off. I'm hearing a concept brewing about the idea of a group of volunteers, a subcommittee within the task force revising the survey and leading and coordinating the process of disseminating it and getting the results back in. So what's done truly from within with the smaller group, I guess I'd have a question for the committee chairs or for the department because we're a charter task force by the legislature. Are there any procedural or legal barriers to doing that? Because I think if that was possible, it would alleviate a lot of the concerns here. Can a small group of volunteers run with this, for lack of a better phrase, use data that we can get from Child Care Aware or any of the other organizations there so we don't have to deal with managing what's private, what's not and just kind of roll with this?

It would not have a government intervention, it would not have a professional consulting intervention, it would be truly grassroots from the committee is what procedural barriers do we have to doing something like that?

Rep. Wazlawik: So this is Ami. I think the biggest barrier we have is in procedural, but if we do a subcommittee, this is going to take even longer. We have a draft survey here that we can discuss. We have a proposal. If we don't like it, we don't have to move forward with it, and that might be when we have a discussion. But I think the longer—this is just going to drag on and on. I think we're having a good discussion. We can talk about where the survey is coming from. I think if we're trying to get former child care providers, I think it's going to be really hard to use a business e-mail address unless it is a personal e-mail address as well because these folks may not have those e-mail addresses set up.

So I don't know if anyone else has thoughts on breaking up, but I think we have a survey. If we can talk about the survey and decide what we want to do, we can change the e-mail address that comes from, we can change—I don't know if we can change and do something with SurveyMonkey instead of the survey tool that DHS has so we can have those graphs and those reports, or if we could change the e-mail address where the data goes. If people have concerns about it going to DHS, if we do it through SurveyMonkey, could it go to ACET or someone else? I think those are some questions that we have. That if we could get those questions answered, maybe we can move forward with the proposal that we're going to it. Because what we want to vote on is that we're actually doing the survey.

We can make tweaks to who it goes to, but I think getting started with former providers and seeing what our response rate is and knowing that we can make

some tweaks to the language and we can even decide what those tweaks are tonight. If we have time to go to current providers, I think we could do both. But I think it's really important that we try to reach out to former providers first and then get something started based on what we have and then move on from there with whatever we want to do as a next step. I don't know if DHS can chime in on any of those e-mail addresses, data going somewhere else, different tool, if that would be an option for us or not. I know there are some costs associated with SurveyMonkey when you reach a certain limit, but I don't know if you can chime in.

Reggie:

So this is Reggie, and I think if what people are looking at is can a different non-DHS tool, SurveyMonkey for instance, be used? I think if ACET is the facilitator, works to secure whatever that kind of tool is or—and is sending it out on behalf of the task force. I mean, not—I know people recognize ACET, but they'll recognize just like, I'm assuming, it'll come from the task force, right? But if ACET is managing that as the facilitator of this and what we can do is to without us being named all over it, but because we're the contracted facilitator, the department holds that, we can work with them to at least make the e-mails available.

Again, we were looking at Snap Survey because we were trying to bring some value added with no cost to help create a no-cost survey and not have people have to go to SurveyMonkey. So if people say we can take the guts of a survey, finalize it, created in SurveyMonkey or whatever other commercial products are, I think we can work with ACET to get that out on behalf of the task force and that they would then be the ones that are holder of that account on behalf of the task force. So I think that's what we would do. And then we're not even involved in terms of it being our Snap Survey account, that's just the department's version in house of a SurveyMonkey. So I think that's what I think we could probably do to facilitate the outreach and to keep ACET on behalf of the task force.

Sen. Kiffmeyer:

This is Mary. If ACET can do that and we have that, I still think that a small subcommittee of three people or so could work with ACET and could be helpful I think in that regard. But the other thing I think, I don't know if I want to deal with two separate surveys considering the amount of time this has consumed already here. Let's tweak some of those questions is or were a provider. I don't know if it's going to be that big a thing. Originally, I talked about maybe doing that just to expedite things, but if expediting means we do both of them at one time with just a little adaptation of the survey, then let's get on with it so we can talk about the content.

And so basically, we have ACET coordinating and sending it out, get three people or so from our task force representative of providers or an organization—boy, that sounds horrible. Sorry to do that to you. Can accomplish that that helps keep the task force itself involved in the follow through with the survey, I think it'll do a lot for confidence. And then I think we do one, tweak those little things. We can do that right here tonight if we get to that, but I think

the more important thing is actually the survey questions and the structure themselves and we haven't even touched that yet. So we can kind of conclude this, ACET does it, have three people from the task force maybe work together to get that done, do both current and former so we do this just once, and get those questions as such.

I don't know if it matters to me so much whether they were current or former, I'm more interested in the content of their response. That if we do that, if we can get those three things taken care of, then we can move on to the content of the survey.

Stella: And Melissa, Senator Melissa Wiklund.

Sen. Wiklund: Thank you. This is Melissa. I just had a question though about can you clarify what would happen if ACET does that, facilitates that and is sending out the e-mail, receiving the responses, the information will sit on some server that is at ACET, what kind of email addresses can they be provided? Are they considered within the privacy bubble then if it's given to them or are they outside of it? My concern is that if you're giving another entity a set of e-mail addresses, does that somehow make that list become publicly requestable, and so that would make it harder for us to know that we're sending to former providers, current providers, whatever. Does that make sense?

I'm just wondering, you were saying that the addresses you're getting are considered private. If you take those e-mail addresses and you give that list to ACET to facilitate the survey, is that an acceptable use of those e-mail addresses?

Reggie: This is Reggie and Senator, again, I'll give an answer that's about as informed as it can be knowing that the way it works at the department in any other places, anytime somebody makes a data request, you then have to actually drill it. I'm saying that I believe the use of the survey, the use of the e-mails that are in Licensing's database is generally a one time for the purpose of sending out this survey. We're not giving them all of these e-mail addresses that they can then do what they want with. I don't think we've ever had anybody that I'm aware of in my six years at Licensing make any request around the e-mails and then we send it to our privacy office in the end.

I mean, so we're doing the best we can with our understanding of how data practices does. We're very sensitive to what is and isn't called out in statute as public data, but we do see the role of DHS and this task force as others have said. I mean, it's not just anybody, but the idea is not that we're giving them these e-mail addresses that they can then keep receiving and resurvey.

Sen. Wiklund: Okay. I'm just concerned. I just want to make sure that the people who—

Reggie: Beth's done a little deeper dive on this, so she may correct me now.

Beth: So this is Beth—so I think that because there's a contract between DHS and ACET, that ACET would be acting on behalf of the commissioner and therefore there's a contractual understanding in a way that there isn't with other entities at this point.

Sen. Wiklund: And then, I guess neither question would ACET then be tasked with going through the responses to I don't know, redact or if there was private responses given, or would everybody in the task force see all of that if there was like a private response like you were saying that somebody said who they were, I'm so and so, and I'm providing free form comments. Would those have to be removed before the information goes to task force members?

Lauryn: This is Lauryn. And a question to build on that then since we all signed an oath of office and we're members of a statutorily designated task force, would we be bound already just by virtue of that for privacy reasons that would maybe satisfy the terms that you're concerned about?

Beth: This is Beth. And what I can say is that a standard part of state contracts when we the state contracts with a vendor is there's often language about data privacy. And if you get access to private data as part of this contract, you will protect it, blah, blah, blah. So that's pretty standard. I have no idea about as designated members of a legislative task force, whether that same thing applies. I mean, there hasn't been anything like that that you've signed or anything, so I don't know. And I can't speak to who would redact any data that might otherwise be considered private. This isn't an avenue that we've totally explored.

Julie: This is Julie. I think the private information is almost kind of a mute point because the questions that we're going to be asking, we're not asking for personal information. There are a couple of questions that I think need to be pulled like your age and things like that, but the questions don't lead into somebody giving us personal information about themselves, about children that they care for, so I'm not real concerned about somebody saying Sally Mae Johnson was a kid in my care. There's no reason for somebody to say something like that. But we could, if we did the small subcommittee of three people, I guess we could have them look through it real quick before it goes out to everybody to make sure somebody didn't do that, because somebody said they're having a bad day. But I don't think any of these questions really lead us into personal information that we would have to be concerned with.

Liz: This is Liz. Okay. So I'm just trying to wrap my head around all the survey talk here. DHS, I believe last year came out and did a public meeting with providers. Did they go to every county?

Reggie: This is Reggie. I think you may be talking about some of the trainings and outreach, provider outreach meetings. No, we did not go.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: We really got to stay on topic.

Liz: No, this is part of it. What I'm wondering is if you did a survey but then if you did a follow up with the providers because I know they came with Senator Bigham and Senator Housley and they talked about these issues. And so if we're talking about not being able to get a return e-mail from either former providers or current providers, then why—I guess what I would suggest is, especially when we're talking about privacy and all the privacy versus public is that, is that something that you could also do to get even more of that information is to reach out to the providers, not just through an e-mail.

Participant: There's a lot of that information already out there. We've had the previous task force on access and affordability. We have all of their comments and recommendations from 2016, I believe it was. We've done this several times, so we have a lot of that information. We're never going to get through any of this. If we do a survey, then we wait for DHS to go out and talk to people and we wait to compile for more information. We've got a lot of information that's already out there. If we're going to do the survey, we need to do it quickly. We need to get it out, we need to get it back quickly and then compile that with the current information that we have. We don't have time for DHS then to go out from county to county or lawmakers to bring in more information that we've already talked about over and over again for the last many years.

Liz: So where is that though? I'm sorry. This is Liz. So where is the report? Is there a report from 2000 from—

Participant: I'm not sure if I have it with me, but, yeah, there is—

Liz: —MACCP that you could share with the task force? That's what I'm wondering because I haven't even seen—

Participant: Here is a summary of the recommendations from 2016 that I have right here.

Rep. Wazlawik: So I want to keep us moving forward on this. I don't think—from my understanding, we don't have the information we need to tackle this duty from the data that we've gathered that's why we were talking about doing the survey at all. A couple of questions that I want to ask, can ACET actually do this, and who's going to pay for SurveyMonkey because it's not free if you send out a certain number of e-mail addresses. So I think that's something we also need to talk about. If we're going to move in that direction, we have to consider that as well.

Participant: I do have some information on what it will cost. There is an unlimited everything plan which is \$75 per month billed annually, so it's under \$1,000, or there is a decent plan that has fewer options for \$444. So we're looking at maximum \$1,000 to do this survey. And that's unlimited so we can send out to 10,000 people if we want to.

Stella: This is Stella. So I think ultimately, I think we got about five more minutes for this particular topic, but I wanted to just kind of summarize what I think I'm hearing unless someone has a different opinion about this, but I'm hearing that

there's a desire to move forward with a survey, of a version of the survey that's already in this packet, but that it's not done, necessarily administered by DHS. Whether that external group is with a subcommittee or with ACET, but the desire was not to move forward with it being internal to DHS, and the idea of doing this as a subcommittee or a subgroup of three or four people, being able to drive this forward whether we use SurveyMonkey or any other platforms. I wanted to just look at the co-chairs in terms of what your thoughts are on that particular pathway.

Rep. Wazlawik: I don't like it. I think that we have to have everybody in the task force involved in developing the survey, and everybody on the task force should have equal access to the information without it having to go through a group to screen it. I think if we get the personal data out of there, if that's ACET or someone else. But it makes me uncomfortable to have a small group of people who are not representative of the folks on the task force taking that on without everyone else's input.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: Well, I think we want to be really careful in regards to—I know the clarity has been there in regards to what you said, Stella, that it wasn't a matter of the subcommittee. There were discussions that we have here, but—and after that came ACET that that was an option. And I think then the discussion was maybe representatives from the task force work with ACET rather than DHS work with ACET. That's all. I just wanted to make sure we clarify that. But I think ACET can do it. I am looking for an answer from you, Stella, in regards to can you do the SurveyMonkey. Can ACET do it? I mean, if you can't, well, then it's a whole different—then we're having a discussion that's worthless.

Stella: This is Stella. So ACET provides services and survey, design survey analysis. So one of the things I think I have to just have a little bit more conversation with DHS regarding our original role in our contract as a facilitator. And what this means if we are doing the survey analysis, it puts us in a spot where some of the duties here, ACET is now playing a role in implementation of that. So I think to answer that question, just point which is yes, ACET does have the capacity and does have the software with SurveyMonkey along with other packages, not just SurveyMonkey to do this.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: Another question that I have for you is in regards to, I don't know if anybody here is looking for analysis so much, but just to get the raw data and that SurveyMonkey will have often the kind of reports or other kinds of things that you can do, not necessarily that we would expect you to summarize them, ACET to summarize them and then give it to us. I think everybody here really wants to be able to see the data for themselves. The issue of the personal private possibility on the comment section maybe or somewhere like that is when you have the radio buttons, you can't make those personal comments, right? That's what I think Julie was referring to. But sometimes if you have a comment box, that's where they might do that.

We don't have to have a comment box either, so then that takes away that potential privacy area anyway because if you have the radio buttons, you just really can't do it.

Participant: It's where you get the best feedback though.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: Pardon?

Participant: It's where you get the best feedback though.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: On the comments.

Participant: Not necessarily.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: Okay. So then the other question is, who is the person—the issue in the privacy of data is that it may need to be somebody, I'm not quite sure who, can just read through those things to be sure. And your personally identified information is redacted before the raw data goes out for everybody to do their own analysis. Does that make any difference, Stella?

Stella: So yes. So SurveyMonkey does have the capacity to give out the summary of the data. They come in for real time so you can see the results real time in the aggregate format or in a singular format, which is survey by survey. Just like when you fill out a survey form, you can see the results survey by survey. We can also remove the open ended comments for it to be public view. But again, it's using a—we're now talking about the logistics of the survey going into a different platform than what we are originally discussing within this agenda. But I wanted to pause for a second and I see Cyndi having her hand up as well, so Cyndi.

Cyndi: It's almost mid-30 for the break. I'm going to go back to what I started with and I'm going to add a caveat, which is I understand the frustration that we're not getting anywhere to this final decision and I respect that Senator Kiffmeyer because it is frustrating. However, I think that doing it well and doing it one time is worth maybe not having it done by a report date because the reality is, as Julie said, and as I've experienced, we've been at these tables many times. There's a lot of points that have been brought up over the years of what the problems are that we could start addressing now. And I do think it's critically important to message current providers and give them the message that it's important and that we do it right, right?

I think the process is critically important that we don't rush it through to an answer. I think for me, the real question is who are we trying to target? Why are we trying to get the information and really, what do we want with it? And I guess for me, what are we going to do with it? We've done this so many times. What's going to happen with it? Use what we've got, move forward with that, do the survey well, take the time to dig through all these things and do the survey well.

Stella: And one more. I know it's 7:30, so I'm going to take one more comment, and I believe Kim, you had started with that. And then I wanted to make sure that we're staying on task. We're going to go on break after Kim, your comment.

Kim: Representative, I didn't understand what part you don't like. I just want a clarification about a subcommittee doing it, about ACET doing it, or which part you said you just didn't like.

Rep. Wazlawik: I'm fine with ACET doing it as long as they have the capacity and that's something that DHS and them can work out. I don't like the idea of a subgroup. I think we have so many different voices on this committee, in this task force. I think it's really important that they're all part of the discussion, especially when it comes to the questions that we're asking. I think we all have viewpoints that are really valuable to making sure we ask those questions.

Julie: This is Julie. I think you're misunderstanding. We're going to do the questions here. The subcommittee wouldn't be doing the questions, they would simply be setting it up on SurveyMonkey for us to get the results back. Everything would be done here with all of us, and the subcommittee, their only job would be to make sure that it gets onto SurveyMonkey, it's set up and then the information comes back to us. They're not going to be tasked with actually writing the survey, changing anything. Everything would be said and done by us and they would just be there to make sure that it got onto SurveyMonkey and we get that information back.

Rep. Wazlawik: From my understanding, that's what ACET's role would be. So I don't know how that's different than what we've talked about them doing.

Julie: Because they're working with DHS, and we'd rather have it worked with the task force than with DHS.

Rep. Wazlawik: Okay. Well, we're going to take a break and we'll come back after the break. I think—Senator Kiffmeyer and I were talking about what we want to do for the rest of the meeting, and we think that we really want to come back to duty one tonight and wrap it up. So if people are okay with that, we'd like to continue the discussion after the break and come back to that after the break as well. Back at about 7:42. Add some feedback from—some people already, but we're going to go through and talk about the survey questions. We will come back to the discussion about the method because we have some things that we need to kind of figure out amongst ourselves about how that's going to work. So we'll come back to that after we discuss the questions.

So the Child Care Task Force survey questions are this little packet, if you want to take a look at them. And I think Senator Kiffmeyer had some feedback and I know we've heard from a couple of other people about their ideas, so folks have—I think we'll just start out with the first couple of demographic questions. I think that's one through six. So we'll break it down that way. If people have feedback or questions or comments on questions one through six in the survey, if folks want to share that and we'll get started.

Stella: Kim? I'm sorry, what did you say, Kim?

Kim: [inaudible 01:20:24] get in here, my feedback?

Stella: There were more feedback than this. So this just came across my desk just now.

Kim: Is this your desk right now?

Stella: Yeah. Right now. So I did take the ones that you did—folks that e-mailed me. I'm sorry, if you e-mail me past a certain time today, I was on my road to this meeting. So if I was on the road to this meeting, I didn't get them yet. But the ones that did send me an e-mail prior to me being on the road, they were shared with the leadership group.

Heidi: This is Heidi. What is the source of this information that got passed around? Who is this from?

Rep. Wazlawik: Senator Kiffmeyer, these are your suggested changes or are these from someone else?

Sen. Kiffmeyer: No, these are just comments that I received, and I just have them printed out because it's so much easier to work with somebody's written, right? That's all, they're just comments.

Rep. Wazlawik: I didn't know we were giving comments. From task force members?

Sen. Kiffmeyer: To the survey, yes, task force members. I haven't even read through them all. I sent my comments, but because I was traveling, they got lost somewhere.

Stella: One of the things I want to do is when we met as a leadership group—this is Stella again. We talked about being able to give folks as much time as possible in reviewing items on the agenda. So one of the things that I wanted to do is just for today's discussion, in addition to this information here, if there's any comments on the survey itself, let's go ahead and open up that discussion that way. And I know some of you have sent e-mails or some of them that Senator has collected and others.

Kim: This is Kim. I did send comments, but it doesn't appear that they're on here. Some of them are really basic. The main one that I want, because I think someone else will bring up the other ones, the main one that I would like to talk about is question number 14 regarding protecting children's health and safety. And I know that Lanay feels this way. She's ill so she's not here, but we did discuss it. I don't think this should be a question. If someone is having an issue with a following infant safe sleep requirements, I don't want them licensed. I want children to be safe. I think our job as DHS licensing workers and providers is to keep children safe. So all of—this whole entire question is really, really concerning to me. I guess capacity ratio, age distribution, things like that might be okay.

But infant safe sleep, we've had a major reduction in infant deaths since we have required certain things of providers regarding safe sleep. Water, food, and nutrition I'm assuming that—I mean, I got a complaint today from parents that the provider wasn't feeding the children properly. Background study requirements, I'm assuming that all parents that are bringing their children somewhere want background studies done on the people who are caring for their children, activities and equipment. My point is, I just think if these things aren't being done, then maybe childcare is not the right place for you to be. The rest of them, I can defer to other people because I'm sure it was the same comments.

Stella: Okay. This is Stella. Thank you, Kim. So what I want to do is before we move forward on the next set of comments, I want people to react to the comment and recommendation by Kim to delete item four which has the cluster—

Participant: Fourteen.

Stella: Fourteen, sorry. Question number 14 which has a cluster of questions that she just went over.

Participant: Delete 14?

Julie: This is Julie. And I agree with you Kim that the infant safe sleep requirements really threw me off because like she said, if you can't follow safe infant sleep practice then you should have never been licensed in the first place. Also, the whole maintenance requirement, wear and tear to my home, that really doesn't have to do with health and safety. I mean, you're talking about painting and different things like that, that's really not health and safety. The water, food, and nutrition requirements, a lot of those are based by the food program, not by childcare licensing. Yes, they can call licensors and complain, but a lot of that comes down from the food program, not from licensing those requirements.

And back on study requirement, I guess you could say it was health and safety, but that's really not where the problem falls. It's not that we don't want to do a background study because it's health and safety, we have a problem with background studies because we can only get them done Monday through Thursday from 10:00 AM to 3:00 PM in the afternoon. So that doesn't have anything to do with health and safety, that has to do with us not being able to get these done without closing our doors and interrupting daycare for a day to go and have our family background study. So these questions under health and safety I think are—

Sen. Kiffmeyer: So are you supporting deleting the 14?

Julie: Yes. A couple of the questions on there could be brought somewhere else, but the way it's laid out, 14 just doesn't make any sense.

Stella: Thank you, Julie. Anyone else that is in support of because I want to hear if there's someone else that thinks there are—question number 14 should stay or certain items from question number 14 should say.

Rep. Wazlawik: Can I just ask a question? This is Ami. Julie, you had said maybe those can go other places. Did you have ideas for which ones would be—I think that your point about the background study requirements is important, so is there a different spot that you think would stay if it's not staying there? Because I think some of these—the capacity ratio that you mentioned, Kim, I think is another issue that isn't the health and safety necessarily but could fit somewhere and would be helpful for us to know as a task force.

Julie: I think just under basic, what were the reasons, some of the reasons that caused you to quit child care or you're thinking of quitting child care. Because I know background studies was a big one at one time when they were going to—background study that are minor children. So maybe these should be moved to an area—were these any of the factors that caused you to quit? Not that they're necessarily health and safety.

Participant: Move question 14, background study requirements [inaudible 01:27:01] under question 14.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: In capacity ratio I guess, too.

Lisa: This is Lisa. We can move a couple of those questions potentially question eight. So the background study, the capacity ratio out of fourteen.

Stella: I'm sorry, what did you say? Move to number what?

Lisa: Number eight.

Stella: Number eight.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: And how about the capacity ratio on age distribution, could we put that under eight also, because that's more of an administrative type of thing.

Participant: Cyndi.

Stella: Cyndi?

Cyndi: I agree with the perspective that Kim and Julie have done. However, it seems like maybe the first—the question itself is what's wrong is that if we're looking that duty one is licensing inspection difficulties, what I don't see being addressed in this and what could be addressed here is understanding and implementing the licensing rules, not necessarily being able to do them, but the—I don't really see anything in here that gets to the point that what I hear is trying to understand, trying to keep up with it, trying to get the counties to understand, and being able to then do what I'm supposed to do is really where I'm continued to find providers being frustrated.

So safe sleep, Wednesday, we're having—I mean, we have a DHS group working on safe sleep because of sleepwear is and the clothing wear is incredibly confusing and problematic and interpreted differently. So in that perspective of safe sleep is a problem, I believe for providers to be able to know and understand what they're supposed to do because of some of the nuances that are around safe sleep or getting correct information from their county and from DHS for that—not necessarily just the ability to put a child down in that safe environment.

There are some nuances and understanding that are not clear that—and as far as the infancy of sleep, a big piece that changed with that is there's a multitude of reasons why the deaths went down, but one of them is when we get socked with fines in the fear if a child dies and then what happens with that and how we're treated through that regulatory process is a huge fear factor for providers. So many providers just quit taking care of infants. So one reason there's not as many dying is because they're not in family child care. So I agree with if you can't follow safe sleep, if you can't do the rules, no, I don't think you should also.

However, the ability to know and understand what the rules are, having them consistently interpreted and implemented, that is a problem. So I don't know if there's a way to rephrase that one.

Julie: This is Julie. I agree with Cyndi. There needs to be a question in there about do you feel—basically, do you feel competent on a daily basis knowing that you are in compliance with the reinterpretation and implementation of the rules? Because that's—what happens in there is on a daily basis something will change, a question will come up and then you're like, "Oh, my gosh, am I in compliance?" And not that it's anything that we're purposely doing, we just don't know anymore. Forms change all the time, interpretations change. And that's a big question there.

Ann: This is Ann. I appreciate thinking hard about how we phrase these and even what categories they go under because even around this issue, it's sort of what are we going to do with that information. I certainly hope we're not going to go backwards on safe sleep requirements, but if it's about interpretation and enforcement and communication, then that's something we can do. So I think thinking hard about how we phrase it and which category it goes under implies different things about how the data's going to get used.

Kim: This is Kim. That's exactly what I meant and said when I e-mailed, that the health and safety requirements should not go backwards. That's not talking about the training of the health and safety requirements, that's talking about the actual health and safety requirements themselves. And I think my problem was regulations protect children's health and safety. To what extent was complying with these regulations difficult for you? It's the question. I mean, if these were difficult for you, again, I'm sorry, I'm glad you're not providing care anymore. Sorry.

Hollee: Hollee, here. I agree with what Kim had said about and Julie and Cyndi, that I think that keeping some of this, I think in the interest of keeping this survey as brief as possible while keeping it to give us the data that we need, what if we just—and I think I don't know who suggested it, but taking question 14 and instead of listing each one of these things, we already have about regulations in question eight and make—right now, question eight, that was one of my concerns is that there is no open-ended answer box right now.

So allowing people to give more feedback for question eight, which should be before questions seven by the way, but—and complying with other regulations, all of that can fall on there except background study requirements. I think that is more of an administrative thing and should be separate. It's not necessarily a health and safety regulation per se because provider's concerns with that aren't the fact they have to do a background study. It's normally, my minor was threatened with doing it. I think that was the biggest issue. I don't—providers aren't—and then with the rollout of the fingerprinting, of course there's going to be issues, but I think overall, providers aren't opposed to that. It's the, okay, there are kids needing it and which kids need it and that kind of stuff.

So I mean, listing it—I wouldn't be opposed to getting rid of 14 and moving background study requirements to question eight and leaving an open ended box for people to expand on, please list any, or please give more specifics about anything you checked.

Stella: So this is—I'm sorry, this is Stella again. Hollee, I just want to make sure I capture that. So in terms of question number eight, you're mentioning that you are in support of moving those questions that were in 14 on background study requirements and into question number eight but having it open ended, have an open ended—for question number eight to have folks, right, administrative factors, is that what you're recommending, Hollee, for the group?

Hollee: Yeah. That would be fine because the rest of question 14, I don't think you need to individually list each of those because I agree with Kim, if you can't follow some of basic things, I'm happy to have you shutdown. But I mean—and again, it's going to be too cumbersome of a survey if we just add every—make it an exhaustive list. So I'd be in favor of getting rid of everything else being specified on question 14 and just moving background study requirements to eight or somewhere else.

Participant: As a question for those who provide care, the basic requirements that we're talking about, just from a quantification standpoint, how difficult are they not from A, it is hard, but time-consuming organizationally, costs—just as a estimate, if I'm having to do a pie chart the time that I spent setting up a business, and I want to go into child care, what would I need to devote to basic safety regulations to comply with the state? We're looking for people closing but also barriers for people.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: It varies. It varies by your home, how much of your home you're going to use. On a daily basis, you go around your house and you make sure everything's neat and tidy and everything's tucked away for those health and safety things. There's a very large amount of time spent. A lot of it is it's stent on the administrative part is the paperwork.

Participant: So more of the paperwork, not complaint with all these—I mean, if you're looking at your day too and what you have the capacity to do, I have to spend this amount of time, paperwork, care, you can't do professional development training, you can't do other things because there's a lot of work that goes actually into the business.

Participant: And somebody brings up a question and your back and looking in statute rule, make sure that you actually understand the rule and statute and then you're in compliance. So it's a daily basis, a couple hours every day at least, and that's once—I've been doing this for 18 years.

Participant: Can I just jump in and remind people to please say your name before you speak?

Julie: I'm sorry, this is Julie.

Participant: For a new provider coming in, you're talking to a lot of time.

Participant: So it could potentially be difficult to comply with infant safety requirements even though they're basic to know that you're a statutorily in compliance if you ever ask a question.

Julie: I guess the only part is it's really not that hard to place a baby down on a crib, on their back with nothing but a nook in their mouth. If you're going to get into swaddling and sleep sacks, then you're going to probably have some problems. So I don't swaddle and I don't use sleep sacks, problem solved.

Tiffany: This is Tiffany. I just want to say my center or my program is in a center, so it's different. So some of the issues that some of the providers are facing in their homes, it's different from me. But what I will say as a provider, I have had issues with safe sleep. I don't—I always put my babies like I'm supposed to, but I did have a issue of a parent that constantly put their baby on their stomach. And so when the baby will come to our program, moms in the program outside in the charter school, the baby would cry a lot. And so that was frustrating for us because what do we do? But we still comply with those because we have to, but it was really hard for the family. So I just think that we do need to take that into consideration that some of our providers, it is difficult for them.

Cyndi: I think the ability to—I think that's a really good question. It's like anything, there's a learning curve, right? And so the frontend of the learning curve is steeper. But we're sitting with providers who pretty well are [inaudible 01:38:27]. What is I continue to see for a good chunk of providers is that there is discrepancies by the counties and the licensors of how they talk to providers

and implement and that's getting better. And then there's the piece that if you don't know or understand legislation or where you get to implementation or how you do that, I mean, there's a really steep curve there for providers to do the changes in particular, and then to make sure and continue to spend, am I doing this right, am I doing this right, and to build the confidence.

So I think the confidence to know that you're doing it and to know the rules and the laws is where I think the shaky ground gets, the sleep sacks, the swaddles, working on trying to get that clarified so it's not so confusing. Yeah, the paperwork, I mean, it's like finding a system. Once you have a system, it's not hard, but I think it's very difficult for many providers to figure out how to come up with a system because they don't understand all the impacts of everything.

Participant: But then the paperwork changes. I mean, the registration forms that we have in the last couple months.

Stella: Yes, this is Stella. Scott, did you say something?

Scott: Yeah. I'm sorry if I over spoken somebody, and I'm not trying to take the attention off of question eight, but Hollee's recommended suggestion, which I like has really sparked the bigger question in my mind about what we want from this compilation if there could be a desire or a trend. And somebody made the comment earlier about the importance of qualitative charter to quantify and make Q charts and graphs and trend lines. But it can get really to the guts of the key questions we're asking. As I look at question 10 and 12, are key business retention questions of their laundry list, and they're not followed up with a explain box. What they're followed up with is an open ended box about what's missing from the laundry list.

So I think is it time to have a broader discussion about we want more qualitative data or quantitative data because I would make an argument as we talk about the role of maybe 14, 10 and 12 should be in this mix, too, because as is, we miss the opportunity to have folks explain because we give a defined laundry list and only a chance to just say what's missing. And then also on 17 and 18, 17 and 18 are key business retention questions about what resources could have been out there. I would argue there are several resources missing from that list like all parts of the capital stack, entrepreneurship ecosystem questions, gap financing, things like that. And again, we can't have a 3,000 item list, but there's no option for other there.

So as I look at this conversation here of eight versus 14 and then 10, 12, 17 and 18, I'm somebody who would advocate for more chances to be qualitative and to explain, but it does change the type of stuff that we get back. So I guess I'm curious what the group's opinion would be on that. My vote's for more qualitative and lower the laundry list. One could argue it makes for a longer survey, same time I think for business retention surveys, it can get more robust data and we should probably figure that out before we debate the 8-14 one anymore.

Stella: Thank you, Scott. I also noted that, too, in terms of some of the key questions. I have Cyndi who's also raised her hand, too. I do want to, after Cyndi, break us into groups. We are going to have to break up into groups and discuss certain elements in here. At a glance of this sheet that's here, we've got some feedback as well that pertains to other items in here. So what I want to do is be able to give the group an opportunity because we can cluster into three groups. Have you discussed very specific topics within your group, come back to large group in terms of what you discuss and recommend for the large group to consider. So Cyndi?

Cyndi: Yeah. I guess this is the point I go back to is, yes, we don't want people working if they can't do those things. But the duty is identify difficulties that providers face regarding licensing and inspections. We need to get—if we're going to follow that, we need to figure out what is it about those things that were difficult. They might not be what we want them to overcome, right? Just whatever, I don't like putting children down or whatever, that no, I don't want them providing care. How do we get the point of difficulty regarding licensing is in inspections, that's the lead sentence.

My struggle with the survey and the change in this piece and what we don't want them doing it if they can't do this, that's not really what we're tasked with doing, our task was what's the difficulty to be able to do that, and I don't see that in the survey.

Stella: All right. So with that, I'm going to split us up into groups for very specific topics that you guys were going to be talking about. So we're going to do group A in the back. That would include everyone on the phone. And Mary and Kim, if you two could go in the back with group A and all those folks on the phone. And group B would be in the back. And group B is going to consist of, let's go Reggie, all the way to a Senator Melissa Wiklund. So you guys will be group B. And then group C will be Ami with Kelly to Heidi. So Ami will be group C which will consist with Kelly and I'll be in a second for Ann, Kelly all the way to Heidi. But Ann, you're going to be in the group with Kim, Mary, and you. The three of you will be group A with the phone.

All right. So in terms of what would be next step that you all are going to work on is three very specific tasks. So group A will be coming back to the group to talk specifically about the demographic questions, okay? So I've heard folks wanting certain demographic questions to be removed. I heard things like expanding upon it, different age range and so forth. So group A is going to talk specifically about questions one through six and then making a recommendation on what needs to be changed. When you come back to the group, please make that recommendation.

Now, group B is going to work specifically on question seven through—it's going to be basically all the questions except the one which is number—I'm sorry, where is my note about—okay, group B is going to work at all the questions we find at demographic one, and move specifically on all the questions minus 14

and B because that's part of group C's work. Group C is going to work on questions 14 and 8. Group B will look at the other questions that are not 14 and eight in the demographics.

In your group, please let us know what items should be expanded upon that are open ended. So if there are questions in here that are not just to address some of the comments that Scott also made, which is, is there an opportunity to make those open ended rather than close ended?

Participant: Stella?

Stella: Yes.

Participant: Does question seven and eight really go together?

Stella: Seven, eight go together? Okay. So it's going to be questions—demographic questions what number again, one to what?

Participant: Six.

Stella: Okay. And [inaudible 01:47:15]. Okay. So if you could please take 15 minutes in your group, we're going to come back together. Please assign a spokesperson for your group for your recommendation. This is Stella. What we're going to do is we're going to be sharing backwards, so C, B, A would be the order. We'll be writing some stuff down, too, the co-facilitator, yeah.

Participant: All right. So we were group C, and we worked on question seven, eight and fourteen. We started with question seven. And our ideas for question seven were to have an explanation box would pop up whenever somebody picked high impact. So basically, if you chose one of these factors as having a high impact on your decision to close your business, please explain. And then also having a box at the end for other factors, so if people have other things that are not included in, unless they can explain those. We talked about striking the food reimbursement response and the isolation from other adults as responses because we didn't feel like those would be very high impacts for people, especially because the food reimbursement one doesn't have a lot to do with state law.

We thought the mentally or physically exhausting, one could move to the personal factor section. And then we wanted to combine one and two into a question that was more about financial viability. And then, if it was high impact for somebody having again, that pop up box would pop up to have them explain why that factor had a high impact. And then for question eight, we talked about moving the home maintenance requirements to a business, the question seven because we thought that was more of a business thing in terms of the money you would have to spend or the improvements you would have to make to your home as opposed to the health and safety.

And then we also thought we would—the background study requirements would be moved to the administrative piece. We wanted to strike the activities and equipment requirements, and then we wanted to reword question 14 to make it more like, I believe, Heidi, was it question 12? To make it more of a general statement, so all licensed providers are required to follow certain regulations, to what extent was complying with these regulations difficult for you?

So it's not saying—it's not implying that people don't care about health and safety, it's just saying there are regulations, which one of these were hard for you to comply with. So that people have those in mind and it doesn't feel like we're jumping out at people and saying you don't care about health and safety. So those were our suggestions.

Stella: Thank you, group C. this is Stella. Group B?

Lauryn: All right. This is Lauryn. One of the things we were going through is a big question was what was missing from the list? What was missing from the list and what is a problem that people are experiencing, and that is the lack of consistency, communication, enforcement and information sharing from the various regulators that people are supposed to be hearing from throughout the process. So I think Reggie said a triangulated relationship is complicated. So adding a question specific to that, which level of government regulating body is the most difficult or problematic to you for you to work with and why? Or really getting to the nature of the fragmented regulatory regime.

The example was, who at the county level is supposed to be telling you about some of this stuff and then who from DHS and why there's been—why somebody has to call somebody who has to go call somebody else and then come back, or why do two people have to schedule two different visits to do two different purposes that aren't coordinating. So having a question specific to that built out.

Rep. Wazlawik: Sorry. Can I just—this is Ami. You said, so adding additional an additional question is what you're saying.

Lauryn: Yes.

Rep. Wazlawik: Okay. Thank you.

Lauryn: But the wordsmithing or the people who do surveys could take the ideas that we just expressed and put it into a nicer phrased question. With regard to question nine, we had a comment about retirement, clarifying that it's about retirement age, not that someone got frustrated and decided to say they are retiring. So clarifying that it was at the end of a career and not a result of something else. And then in looking at the connection of question nine to three and four, having a specific answer to say it was the natural end of their decision or plan to be in business for four years or eight years or whatnot. And then on

questions 17, we thought we should add an option that, "Hey, I didn't know about any of this stuff, would have been nice."

Participant: What is this?

Lauryn: I don't think that needs to be wordsmith, you can just put that in right as I said it, and then adding another option. And then on question 18 with the business support, saying business support including tax information, setting rates, comma, and then adding end services such as health insurance pool, et cetera. Okay. I think that is the nature of our comments for those questions.

Stella: Okay. Great. Thank you, group B. All right, group A.

Rep. Wazlawik: We have the first of the demographic questions. And question one is what year did you close your family child care license. We said to keep the question but maybe if we're looking at changing it to currently licensed providers, change to say, are you currently licensed? If not, when did you close? And then there were—there have been a lot of comments and a lot of concerns about going back five years instead of just three. So that was a five year look back for that.

And then there were—I mean, I know that the beginning of this or I don't know what part it was in about negative actions, I know that that isn't necessarily a provider's choice, but sometimes if they settle on a negative action, then they have settled to not have a negative action on there. So we were just wondering about the negative action question. And then, number two, we—it was—the region of the state that you live in, there was a lot of concerns—do I really need to? Come on, I'm so loud. Question two was a—taking out, why does it say Minneapolis or St. Paul, just say Twin Cities Metro, and then take out suburban metro and just leave it at suburban. There's a lot of discussion about what regions and what sections people live in and how confusing that might be.

Question three. We said, yes, just keep it, we want to know how long people were licensed. And to your point, did you close your family child care license before you intended to? So we want a question in the beginning that maybe says, did you close right when you want it to? Was everything perfect and wonderful? If so, don't answer the rest of the questions because if things were fine, we don't want negative information that we don't need. If they were ready to retire, that's great. If we are losing people—I think we're losing people for a lot of different reasons, but it could be something fine. So I don't know how we can do that. If you've closed when you want to, don't answer the rest of the questions.

Question four—no, question five. We said to remove that. I can't remember writing up there. I have a question—oh, forget it. Yeah. So we said to remove that, it's more important to know how long someone was licensed rather than their age. And then where did you provide family licensed family child care? I don't know that they had strong opinions either way. Leaving it, taking it out, there were opinions about whether or not rural two programs that are being operated out of non-homes should be included in this. But our opinion was that they are Rule 2 programs and if they are closing, than they probably should be still

surveyed. So I don't know if that's something that the whole group feels a way about.

Reggie: So this is Reggie. I would just offer a little data point that number of those special family child care—now, we do have—and my folks will correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that includes even somebody who is just that typical, yes, I am the license family provider, I'm just doing it in the house I rent or own across the street as opposed to in a separate commercial, employer base kind of flexibility. But I think all of those are tagged together, right, as special family child care and we have less than a hundred of those active licenses. So I guess all I'm saying is taking the time to ask that question may be very small.

Kim: Yes, I think we do need it. This is Kim. Because if we were talking outstate, if there is a program that's a C3 that has 14 children in it and it's closed down because of their licenser because of requirements and they have a company out there that now can't stay in business because they've lost 14 spots of child care because they operate out of a church basement, I think it is important. They're a Rule 2 program. And I don't think that—if I'm—they're not special if they're in a home. I do all the special family child cares in Dakota County, and they're not special if they're in a home. It's a home.

Reggie: Yeah. Right. They're in the same section of the statute, that's what I was trying to clarify.

Kim: They're not, no, they're in a home.

Reggie: That's fine. I'm just trying to clarify, so if you know from how you guys classify them, I don't have that in front of me, so it's fine.

Participant: Can I ask a clarification? So you're saying under the law, if I rent a home across the street that's considered a special child care?

Reggie: It's in a section of the statute.

Sen. Kiffmeyer: Can you say which statute that's it because it's a home.

Reggie: Right. It's 245A.14 subdivision 4 I think. It's that whole list of when you don't operate in your own home. The very first one was I'm operating it in a residential home in which I don't live, that was a very first one. And then there began that other, if you're doing it on site. So it's morphed more into the, we had one for a nursing home that wanted to create one. So it's all—so I'm just trying to figure out how we organize our data.

Stella: And Reggie, this is Stella. So if you could get me that information then that way I can just send it to the a whole group for the task force for reference for the future would be good.

Kim: I think it's so important to do all Rule 2 programs, though.

Tiffany: Yes, we need to.

Kim: Because that's—I mean, that's Tiffany.

Ann: I'm sorry, this is Ann. So I don't think we need the question to do that, we just—that has more to do with the distribution list, correct? Who is it you go to? So if we're going to do all Rule 2 programs, that has to do with who it goes to. But we don't necessarily need this question to break it out. Is that what we're saying?

Kim: Correct. Oh, yeah, no, no, we don't need this question.

Reggie: Right. That's fine, Kim. I think I was sort of saying the same thing.

Kim: Sorry.

Reggie: That's okay.

Kim: Sorry for the confusion.

Reggie: I'm glad you brought that up.

Participant: Thank you, Ann.

Stella: This is Stella. Okay. So we've got seven minutes to close out and I just want to be respectful of everyone's time. So it sounds like we've got some really good ideas that was shared with all the groups. And we also had some feedback that was sent by—in this document in front of me as well. So what we're going to do is work on another draft of the survey to then circulate out. I do want to pause for a second and look over at the lead co-chairs, and if you could please do the closing. Next steps.

Rep. Wazlawik: Yes. So next steps are what Stella said, is we're going to get all the stuff that we talked about today in terms of the survey into another draft to circulate for a last round of feedback. And then I think we're still—I don't know if we're 100 percent sure of what our next steps are going to be in terms of who's going to do precisely what for getting the survey out because we still have some questions that need to be answered. So we're going to—I think that's going to be something that we'll probably be hearing more about, too, as we get the survey revamped and put together, is maybe some more information about what can and can't work and what our ideas are for that going forward.

Please fill out your feedback forms, they're really important. They help us—we use those when we have our leadership group meetings to talk about making sure we get materials out early and that sort of thing. So please fill those out before you leave. They do close at 9:00, so please do that as quickly as you can. Can we have—is there a way to get them to you if they want to not race through them?

Stella: Yes, absolutely. You can always scan it in and e-mail it to us or fax it in or mail it. There's multiple ways.

Rep. Wazlawik: So if you want to take more time with your meeting feedback form, you can do that outside of this venue. And with that, we'll adjourn during the meeting.