

September 22, 2020 Family Child Care Task Force

Meeting Transcript

[Judy] pre-meeting announcements. The first is that you'll see that the chat feature is not active tonight. There was no way to have a chat feature. Oh, I'm showing up twice on this, interesting. Anyway, two of my faces, you're so lucky. Anyway, the chat feature, we could not get it on. It's either on for everybody or off for everybody. So it's off tonight. So, you know, Jake, will try and monitor if you wave a hand or give a sign that you need to give input. The other is that Ellen will be muting and unmuting us to manage any of that stray background noise. So if you see yourself being muted, don't take it personally. We're just trying to make sure we don't have too many different echoes doing in different ways. And the very last thing I wanna say is I know some of you will be watching my screen and if I'm constantly going like this, it's because I have some annoying popup thing that I cannot disable. And so it keeps telling me that a speaker won't work. I know that. So if I make a face while I'm poking at my computer screen, understand that's what that's about. I think we are close to all here. I'll follow up on that, the getting attention thing. If you do have something to say Webex does have, if you click on that participant list, next to your name, there's a little hand raise feature. So I'll be monitoring that if that does (mumbles), feel free to hold up like a posted note or something like this and I'll just know when Judy's pausing or the presenter is pausing for questions, feedback. I'll make sure that, you know. that we're good to go, right? We're not waiting on anybody else. - I don't believe so. We may have a straggler or two, but this is pretty close to the full group. Just getting the agenda up here. All right, so we'll call the meeting to order at, let's see 6:03 p.m. tonight. And first thing on our agenda this evening. Thanks everyone for being here tonight at our task force meeting. The first thing on our agenda is the approval of the August meeting minutes. So folks wanna take a minute to look over those. Let us know if you see anything that needs to be changed or updated or... I have audio, but no video. It says that I might be logged in twice. Kyle can be on time but he's not on this call. So hopefully he's working on that right now. and I'm just about to reply to (mumbles). - I'll make a motion to approve the minutes as presented. me, how are we doing this? Are we doing a voice vote on this? Is that how we decided to do this? - Yeah. Judy, you're on mute. What we said was for the minutes, if there was no dissension, it could be a voice vote. But if there were any issues at all, then we can go back to do a roll call. - So I didn't hear. - Got it. I didn't hear anybody bring anything up. So we'll do a voice vote. We did have a motion to approve the minutes. I don't remember who that came from. There's a lot of faces on here. Somebody else seconded it. - This is Ann McCully I'll second. - Thanks Ann. So I didn't hear any dissension. So if we wanna unmute folks or unmute yourselves and we'll just do a voice vote, all those in favor of approval of the meeting minutes, in August 9th meeting say aye. -

[Some Members] Aye. - All right. We didn't have anyone oppose so we'll call to be approved from the last meeting. All right. Next up on our agenda today is an introduction of our new(mumbles) year this evening. - I'm sorry. Point of order. (mumbles) information. I was just curious everyone who isn't talking could just mute their lines so that we don't get the feedback, please, thank you. - I'm not sure if she's on the phone, but if Mary, if you wanna introduce yourself, Mary is one of our new appointees, taking a place of a member who had to leave. Mary, can you? -

[Mary] Do you hear me? Hi, Mary can you just introduce yourself, let us know who you are and what your role is.

-

[Mary] Okay. My name is Mary Albert and I'm a family childcare provider. -

[Mary] Okay. I'm located on the East side of St.Paul 1463 off the (mumbles) street. -

[Mary] I've been doing childcare for 15 years. and being a member of the taskforce. Welcome to our group. And we're happy to have you here this evening and for our taskforce meetings. -

[Mary] You're welcome. - Okay. Let's see next up. Oh, the next thing that I think this is also in your, packet of materials that came via email today, we wanted to update the member reimbursement policy. Since we've been having the work group meetings, we wanted to make sure that folks, if there were any sort of expenses that people needed to have reimbursed as part of the work group meetings that we were gonna cover that. So, (clears throat) so folks wanna take a look and let me see what that's called. So that's called update FCCTF, re updated reimbursement policy. If folks wanna take a look at that, it's pretty, it's a pretty simple change. It's just essentially adding language to make sure that we cover any of the subgroup meetings that folks participate in as well. if that would be helpful. - Yeah, that'd be great. I would hope that with, out of respect for taxpayers, that none of us should need childcare while we're attending these remote meetings at this. I mean, I would just ask for that. So as long as these are being remote, I would like to know that no one is submitting requests for childcare to be reimbursed right now because your kids could be right next to you. you can mute yourselves and stuff. So we just request that. I'll respond to that. I think possibly this came out of her request to the conversation I had, which it is a provider supervising children. And if that's what's considered in this, I can't supervise a childcare effectively under legislative requirements at all times. And so I did raise an hand just ask the question. If I have to like, excuse me, I hired someone to watch my childcare so I can do a afternoon meeting. My question was, is that an option? I'm assuming maybe this came out of that question. - I believe in our first meeting, they had said that reimbursements for substitutes for childcare providers were not covered as part of the statute. 'Cause we had requested that before, correct me if I'm wrong. - I don't remember if that was part of what the conversation we had at the beginning around this chat too. So I don't know if anyone else can chime in on that. - This is Regina on behalf of DHS, since we've tried to help navigate the taskforce reimbursements. I guess what I would say is if we can get you an answer this evening, we will certainly try to do that. I don't know, off the top of my head. I certainly think that if it's covered as a normal part of per diem, then if it's being triggered as part of a work group, even though things are remote succinct, I think the question I'm hearing is, is it within the allowable per diem? And then is it allowed under the potential changes that are being looked at this evening? So if we can get you an answer about, was that allowed just in the normal course, we'll try to do that. Just having my staff check into it, thanks. the reasonable childcare expenses. What is that including? I mean, does that cover a staff to cover for a meeting or during an afternoon? Or is that just for my child? I'm sorry, Cyndi. We may not be able to clarify that this evening, but I think what I think there's gonna be a difference on is is this a childcare expense for somebody's own children, is it a business expense, like, you know, I need to leave my restaurant for a few hours and somebody needs to cover. So I think that's gonna be the difference I think is if it's the taskforce member's own personal childcare expense versus something that might seem to fall under business. So we'll try to get some clarification, but I think I'll look for our co-chairs to help clarify, but I feel like that's maybe a distinction that we need to be clear on is that it's a childcare expense of the individual, their own children. So we'll look into that, but that's how I'm seeing that. - Yeah. And that's what I remember from our conversation too. And just reading it in my mind, when I think of what that means, that would mean childcare expenses for a child of a task force member. That's my understanding of what that means.

- Yes, Hollee here, I specifically asked that question in our first meeting, because when we were doing in person meetings and providers were having to travel far for them, then, you know, for childcare providers, they would need to close for the day or get a sub. And that was reasonable. And we were told then that covering a substitute was not something that was in statute. However, now that those meetings are remote, there's only been one meeting as far as I know, maybe that was from one to 3:00 p.m. and that's during a typical nap time for childcare for the children in our care. And, but the work groups are not mandatory as part of our membership on the task force. can to get some clarification around reasonable childcare expenses. And whether it's for the individual's own children incurring a childcare expense versus something that appears to be related to a business. I think that seems to be the distinction here. So if people are okay, then that's what we'll look into, then that's how we can try to provide some technical assistance on this issue, unless the (mumbles). I guess you have the meeting tonight. There's something different. - I think that's fine. I think we can table this for now and come back to it later in the meeting or in a future meeting, we can do that. This isn't a huge sort of thing that we need to necessarily rush to do. So I think we can table it for now and come back to it later before we get that info or we can just wait till the next meeting. we are up next then to begin launching our discussions. So Ellen, if you could take this document down. Great. Thank you. So just a few things before we start, part of your packet was a revised timeline. Remember that we had a number of reports each month marching on through the fall because we are revisiting work group eight. There are the lucky folks who got to go first and test our systems and we're going to revisit their presentation and recommendations tonight. So we will only do one other new presentation today. The other four work groups will all present in October. And remember we have meetings two weeks in a row. Okay. So we had the original meeting and we had the fall back meeting. And of course we need the fallback meeting. So we'll do both. And all of the work groups will be sending their material to Jake in time that it can be emailed out to you before the first of those meetings. So Jake, I don't have the deadline in front of me, but if the first meeting is like the 20th, think backwards five to seven days and he'll get you the specific dates. Okay. Just so you understand that. A reminder that the chat feature is disabled. So you can use by, going to the participants list. You can indicate that you want something and Jake will highlight that and bring it to our attention. And also that Ellen is muting us off and on to make sure that the background noise doesn't get too crazy. So if you are like me and always forget that you're on mute, don't be surprised if someone tells you to unmute yourself and please help me because that's what I do all the time. I'm looking at your document, the timeline updated timeline, and it has four, it has the four groups that are left going until the 27th, the meeting on the 27th. So I'm wondering if we can clarify which ones are, and maybe that's in a different document, which ones are going on the 20th and which are going on the 27th. - But I think it's safe to assume that those two work groups duty group seven and duty group two, they had a month lead time from their initial conversation before the task force. So let's plan on those going on the 20th. So folks know the timeline since we're getting to that, those dates. - Certainly for October 20th. We are looking at duty group seven and two and for a week later on the 27th, we are looking at duty groups, five and six, okay? All right. And then the last thing is to talk about our voting protocol. So we did have the discussion about when we're doing roll call votes and for any accepting formal recommendations, we will be doing roll call votes. For each of these work group reports, you're getting a list of recommendations. And the process we'll use is resourceful here. The presentation from the groups and some time for Q&A back and forth. And then we'll start to look at the list of recommendations that each group has put forth. And I will be testing for agreement. It's not a formal vote, but if we have a list of a dozen items and 10 of them are things you're not contesting, there's no issue with them. We will bundle them into one motion. So we can do a one roll call vote that will knock a whole bunch of things off the list and then pay attention to the rest. Okay. So I just want you to be clear when I start testing for agreement, it's not the formal vote. It's not a substitute for the formal vote, but we're trying to figure out what will be in that bucket.

And then I'll hand it back to the co chair for the formal process. Okay? Just so you're aware. So I think we are ready and this is gonna be a test of our memory skills to say, what do we remember from last month? Here we go, with second round or repeat command performance. So Hollee, you are up. questions for this, right? We're all ready to go. (laughs) Okay. Well, this is our duty eight work group recommendations and Ellen you're going right. So you can click to the next slide. Our members, ooh, I'm hearing an echo. Is it echoing? Is my voice echoing for everyone else? Okay. We will just deal with that. So members, JoAnn Smith, Julie Seydel, representative Demuth, Cyndi Cunningham, Barb Wagner, and myself are on this committee. You can go to the next one, Ellen, and our recommendations from last month, we've sorted them now into a different format, there we go. Our duty just to reiterate is to consider the methods to improve access to and understanding of the rules and statutes governing family childcare providers. You can go ahead Ellen. And on the next slide, I had a link to the rules and statutes regarding family childcare. I'm not gonna review those. You can go ahead, Ellen. So these are our recommendations for legislative action. Go ahead. I wanna click. (laughs) So for legislative action, I think the one that seems maybe contentious or there were more questions was about the ombudsperson bill. I'm re-introducing that next session. We, again, reiterated the position should be independent and not be a part of DHS or appointed by DHS. And we didn't want it to take away from providers current relationship and progress with DHS. We wanted that to continue. We'd like it to be separate from that. Another thing we suggest is that the Ask-DHS form that's on the DHS website needs to be anonymous and should not require providers to list their licenser. Or that was something when this first came out and this was something that we really wanted, so that a provider, you know, the whole reason that you're going to the Ask-DHS form is because you disagree with something or have a concern about something your licenser told you. And you wanna get advice from someone you think is more, you know, the expert, but some providers might be worried that that would get back to their licenser. And it's not like going above your licenser's head. You know, the providers are worried about that perception. Codifying rule into statute or statute into rule one way or the other so that everything is in one place. And that could be up for discussion. And then the printed book of family childcare rules and statutes should be updated in a timely matter and only updated copies should be sold, right now it's not updated until October. And a lot of times those old copies are sold. And so providers are getting outdated information and we believe this would be a legislative thing. I would say that, right now I don't believe there's a PDF of this where you could, before I've had to put together a PDF of all the different statutes and rules into one PDF, which is quite cumbersome, but it'd be great to have all of them in one place, kind of like the book. So you could download the book, it would save providers money, taxpayers money, and then they wouldn't have to pay the \$20 or so for it. But for many people, you know, they still prefer having that printed copy. And there's no reason to be selling an outdated copy. So those are legislative or things that would require legislative action. You can go to the next slide. Should I take questions as we go along or just go to the end and then take questions? Representative Wazlawik, do you have a preference? - I don't have a preference. I don't know if other folks do. I think because it's been a while since we've got over these, if you want to run through all of them and then we can maybe come back to each separate section and talk about each separate section separately. can go to the next one. Thank you. And these are our recommendations for DHS and we categorize these. So we have three suggestions for DHS. Communication, provider involvement and roles and statutes. So under communication, communication about the rules, statutes, and state and federal regulations and any updates or changes to them, should at least come from DHS, this does not mean that counties should not also be sharing that information, but it's very important for providers, to get them directly from DHS as well. We think it's very important to continue the implementation plans. The 2020 implementation plan was just released today. So thank you. Offering both paper and electronic options to ensure that everyone receives the info and impossibly allowing providers to either like opt into a paperless delivery system, to save paper, to save money, to save time, and

then, but also, or to opt into a printed delivery system because not everyone uses email. And then it's important to offer those, the common forms at least and info in multiple, at least the most common languages. And that can be quite cumbersome. And I know right now DHS said that, counties do have interpreters and this might require a lot more time and effort, but those forms might be kind of confusing to someone whose first language is not English. And so offering it in some of the most common languages would be helpful. DHS has worked hard to maintain or to update an accurate list of every family childcare provider with an email address. And I think Barb Wagner stated that they are at at least 91% accuracy right now, a lot of that is on, either information gets to counties and maybe counties don't update DHS with the new email addresses in a timely manner. Some of it might be due to providers, not updating it. 91% is pretty good. It's important to be able to reach those other 9% of providers. And so maintaining an accurate list is very important for providers who do have an email address. And then sending a postcard mailing from DHS to existing providers with maybe the top most critical information they need the most commonly requested info and, maybe do it just a onetime mailing. And then new providers would get that at orientation or with their license. But when something really important comes up, it would be helpful to do a postcard mailing. And again, if providers opted into a paperless delivery system, then they wouldn't have to. Like, for me, I'm happy to just get it electronically. I like having that record and I don't like wasting paper for other people they might prefer the postcard. Go ahead to the next slide. Thank you.

The next one is about provider involvement. We think it's very important to add family childcare providers to the implementation plan group. We do not believe that it has to be a large group of providers even just a few, but just so that providers can give input, their unique perspective of how they might read this, how it could be interpreted. We think it's important for the stakeholders to be involved. So again, it does not mean that you have to have 10 or 20 providers, but it's just a couple of providers to be able to give input. Offering meetings with stakeholders about any proposed legislation before the legislative session begins. And we think it's important not to have last minute bill introductions, and that all providers should be informed about these meetings. So DHS did offer stakeholder meetings a week and two weeks ago, there were two different meetings, same content, two different times. So we're glad that DHS offered that. Right now there's not details about the legislation, just what is being proposed, but it's very important for us to hear this information before the session begins. So we want to ensure that will happen. And then updating the guide to becoming a licensed family childcare provider. And that link was in the PDF. It was a last meeting too. It was in there. But important it's to reflect legislative changes that have occurred over the last few years. It doesn't appear to have been updated since 2017 and include a few licensed family childcare providers, licensors, and DHS in an annual review of that guide. And again, it does not mean it has to be a 25 member task force kind of thing, but just giving even if it was sending an email to a couple of people and saying, hey, could you please give your feedback? I know DHS has done that on some documents a few years ago. I remember they asked for input on things. I believe in fact, they asked for input on this guide, Regina, you correct me if I'm wrong, I believe in this guy first came out, you shared it with some of us and asked for input about it, but that would be helpful even just sending an email. It doesn't mean you have to have many meetings or anything like that, but again, getting providers involved in things that affect them. Next slide, please.

The next one is about rules and statutes. Again, I mentioned this before, but we wanted to put it under legislative and DHS because some aspects might be DHS responsibility making that form anonymous, but also adding... We suggested adding a search function to the form. Like Amazon, for example. I'm not saying I order from them a lot, but when you have a question about an item, you can start doing a query and it will pop up with other questions, similar questions and answers that people have already answered. And so something like that for common topics or a help file, like customer support websites have a... Is your topic about this and then you click it. And then it has a list of previous questions. And I think that would save DHS staff a lot of time too, and possibly licensors and definitely providers and then summarizing each section of rule and

statute in one place possibly using that guide to becoming a family childcare provider as a starting point, because that has a lot of helpful information for both new and seasoned providers. And so having that in one place would be helpful. So you could use that as a base, get rid of some of the information that doesn't relate to existing providers and go from there. The information should be in plain language, making it clear, understandable, and as brief as possible. And we wanna empower providers to go through the steps. Next slide, please. The recommendations for counties, next slide. Thank you. Okay. The county recommendations. Again forwarding communications from DHS and sharing county specific info with providers. I mean, I know my county does this. I think most counties are really good about this, but with 87 different counties, there's a wide gamut of the amount of information that is shared. So it's important to reiterate that. County websites should really have any forms that for DHS that are on their website should be linked to the DHS page to ensure that they're always up to date and then it saves them time. So they're not constantly having to upload a new document. They would just be links to the DHS website, that specific form. Again, maintaining an accurate list of every family childcare provider in the county with an email address, and then submitting that information to DHS in a timely manner. And then we had suggested before about possibly adding a pop-up on the county childcare website, any time there were big changes to rules or statutes or forms. It could be a small little pop-up that says, "Providers, did you know that X, Y, Z or the 2020 implementation plan was just released today, click here for more info." Or something like that. Next slide, please. And then recommendations for providers again, next slide. We just said that providers need to be involved in family childcare meetings, plans, and hearing. So anything that affects them, they should have a say, sit at the table, so to speak. And then the next slide is about our recommendations, top recommendations. And honestly, we believe that the family childcare task force, or we're asking the family childcare task force to support all of our recommendations. Sorry, next slide, Ellen. And almost all of these recommendations are very minor. They don't require huge changes in practice. They might be involving a couple people. For myself, I'd be happy to help with anything I can, whether it's getting something set up and then the charge of this, I know we were asked to limit it to three overall recommendations, but the intent of this task force was to be a comprehensive group to make positive changes to family childcare providers and licensing so that, to help with the crisis, to make improvements. And if we say that we're only limiting each group to three, you know, that seems not in the spirit of the taskforce. And so we're just asking that, all of these recommendations be adopted. We understand there's gonna be more questions and maybe disagreement about maybe one of them, but these should not have huge costs associated, if any, with them. The only exception would be the ombudsperson bill. So I guess we'll field any questions you have. Damn I'm getting an echo. (laughs) So Ellen, if you could move to the recommendation sheet instead. So we can take a look at that. And yes. As representative Wagner suggested let's go back and see if there are any questions or discussion. We will just take them by section. So let's look at the recommendations for legislative language. If you could scroll that up just a little bit so we can see all four of those. Great. Thank you. Any questions or discussion on these? -

[Kim] Yeah, this is Kim. -

[Kim] Hi. I have a few questions. What is the implementation plan group? Who's on that? -

[Kim] Oh, okay. And so is it only DHS or is it providers or is it community or parents? - Yeah, it's just DHS right now from what Barb Wagner said. -

[Kim] Okay. And then who are identified and maybe, I don't know if this is the right, whatever, who are identified as stakeholders in like the spirit of all of this, is it providers and parents and DHS? and DHS in most cases, of course, some things parents could be involved in, but normally at the level we're talking about for these things, parents aren't necessarily stakeholders. These are not health and safety, they don't really affect

health and safety. They don't have to do with the day to day operation or anything that directly affects their children. And a lot of this, to be honest, is parents aren't gonna be putting in the time or they are not gonna understand the rules and statutes that relate to these things. If you make a group too big, you're not gonna get as much done. And again, we're not trying to add a bunch more people to any of these groups. Just having a little bit more input from providers. the point of end users understanding. So how things get written if an end user or in this case, a provider reads it and just kind of scrolls it. It's more likely to be understood by the general population of providers. -

[Kim] Okay. And the other thing that I wanna say, I think my other questions, I do wanna say that I don't, as a licensing worker, I don't really care either way, but I understand, why the Ask-DHS thing goes to a licenser. And that is to get the feedback from the worker who maybe the provider has a problem with. And I get that that's might be not great, but I don't hear about, I guess, I don't know the providers who are on this, I would love to hear from all, like, I don't hear a lot of complaints about licensing workers. If somebody doesn't like what I've said, we usually talk it out or they I just give them the legal channels to go through. And so I get why that's on there. I don't know about that one. I'll be honest. And then the other one I would like to add that, and this you providers can all be mad at me. It's also the provider's responsibility to know the rules and statutes and not just be involved with changing. And I think those go hand in hand. I think, I always say, it's like me driving on a certain road. It's up to me to know what the speed limit is, to know where the stop signs are. If it's a one way or whatever, because I am licensed to drive that car. I really understand that rules and statutes are really hard to understand I've been doing this 14 years and there are days, even for me, don't think that maybe I don't have a problem with, obviously with providers being involved with everything. But I think also there has to be some onus on providers being responsible for themselves to know the laws and the rules and the statutes. We, in fact, one of the recommendations, we talked about providers that they have to walk through the steps. We didn't want to hold their hand the whole time that they need to take the time to read these things. But I think, you know, as well as anyone that there's a lot of room for interpretation, or there have been a lot of different interpretations about things that some people would never expect to have differences of interpretations. And so it's yes, many providers don't take the time to read the rules and statutes and that's unfortunate and they really should. And we're business owners and that's definitely a different issue as far as the Ask-DHS page. I'll let someone else answer that. I think you're obviously it seems like, I haven't heard complaints about you. So I mean, if I'm being honest, I don't have any complaints about my county, but I've heard so many from other counties, unfortunately. But other providers might be able to share more openly. You know, our livelihoods, in an instance, have been affected by licensing. -

[Mary] This is Mary. I'm just gonna comment on the couple issues here. I think the answers should be the same, no matter who's asking, no matter who's the licenser. When you ask a question, you should ask question DHS and get an answer. And it really shouldn't matter. So I think having it be anonymous and just simply answering the question as it is asked, and I don't think the rest of it is material to the answer at all. Secondly, under the recommendations for providers, I think Julie you could add some more details there. I think it is important for providers to have to do due diligence and that providers should have to read the manual, know the rules, invest in it, run their business in a ethical way, run with public health and safety in mind. I think some of those things are somewhat assumed in some ways here, but I still think that you could flush out those recommendations for providers was even some of the things that you just said, Julie. -

[Kim] I need to say again, this is Kim . That every single house and every single provider is different. So if a provider gets an answer from a worker and they don't like the answer, but it's about the steps on their house or the layout of a room or an outdoor space. DHS wouldn't know that without talking to a licensing worker. Again, I

can see it both ways. I think there should be something for a non anonymity, but there's also places where there can't be. I mean, if DHS doesn't even know exactly what the provider is speaking of, then they can't answer the question. - Couldn't you have both, this is Julie. question about that if a provider and provide their(mumbles) I just looked at the form, but obviously I've never used it personally, but how would DHS get back to the provider to get their answer if they don't submit their contact information? What are the types of things that go on that forum? I'm that much more ignorant, even. to yeah, answer this, but the form would not be anonymous. It would be like, you don't have to put your name, but they could still contact DHS. But the fact that it goes back to your licensor does not make it anonymous. The providers could still choose, put their name. And I guess what I would say about this, there is a link on our webpage about contact us. And when you open it up and it says, contact us by email, it's specific on the family childcare page. And it asks for some minimal things, the license number, the provider name, the county, the email address, the general area of the rules and statutes that your question pertains to. It gives some brief explanation that we will be reaching out to the county licensor. You can submit more than one question. Don't use any information about individuals, very, very small, very small it's a text box that they fill in and they send it on. And so when this was set up, as you know, Kim has mentioned as I think some others, perhaps we all want across licensing to be able to answer the question, the exact same way. That's what we strive for across all my service areas. We also know that we are dependent upon the information that we are given. And if the information that we are given is not the entire information, perhaps because a provider just might not think something is relevant, but a licensor that's been out there that knows the location or the number of kids in care or where in the house they're using the program, knows exactly like five other things, more relevant, simply because they've been there. That question is going to mean something very, very different to the licensor who knows the program. I think Kim explained that very, very well. And so if people are expecting us to answer a question at DHS, with no knowledge of what the program even looks like, and then they take some action on it and it turns out that, well, we relied on what they told us, and then they acted upon what we told them. But the licensor knows that well, no, they didn't explain to you that really, what they did is they took some rope and they this, or they, you know, we've had several issues of that. You know, I'm not saying it's like Kim said, it's there's fact dependent. So we actually felt they're trying to provide the clarification was the most helpful by actually saying, reach out to the licensor because it could be the licensor said, I know I've tried to explain that. It could be, we correct the licensor and say you, I would just say that to them that, I just said say no, no, no, that's not helpful. So we see great value in keeping this for the same information and trying to resolve it. So I think if this becomes completely anonymous or, you know, there's some prohibition to not talk to county licensors, we cannot be responsible for us, not fully understanding everything that is occurring at the licensed program. And I'm sure that there are definitely questions we ask that are very basic. What are the statutes, what are the (mumbles) It's easy, we do that all the time. We try to make sure people know exactly where in the rule that says X, Y, or Z. It's when you apply the rule of the standard to a particular set of facts, that can be challenging. And just so you know, in any of my other licensed areas, whether it's centers, CD treatment programs, there are certain information questions, almost anybody can answer. And then there are other questions where we will always say, you know what? I need to talk to the licensor. They were out there, you said last week. Yep. I'm gonna go and talk to them and see. So for us, this is a very standard way to ensure that people get the correct information. something very very different. When I think about bath DHS, I think that the very basic informational kind of thing, whereas you're describing red gene even now, but what I hear Kim and others talk about, that's more of an appeal. You're appealing and that actually would fit more with them. If you have a situation like that. I think what the providers are trying to say is that if DHS and the licensors both together make a decision, the provider feels like they're getting dumped on to the one and they have no chance to have them. So I think ask the adjuster, I'm thinking about that is kind of a different thing than appeal to DHS.

And I understand this set of circumstances, but that's a very different thing than what I was thinking of a definition of Ask-DHS. So what's your explaining, Regina, I think my thoughts about Ask-DHS forms is different. - Right, and I think we don't control what the providers type in because it's a text field. And so, you know, senator, I think that there are definitely questions where it would be very much, you know, informational explanatory. How do I find this form? What do I, this absolutely. That is part of what happens. But the range of questions that we get are oftentimes specific. So if we can answer the question very quickly, we will. So I'm just trying to explain, I think that people use that for a whole on the continuum of the range of questions that we get. And some are harder to answer without feeling that we may not have all the facts. -

[Kim] This is Kim, again, can I ask to see what the, can we hear from the providers on what they would use it for? Because the other thing about appeals is that there are very specific ways of going about appeals. If you don't like a correction order, you can request reconsideration. If you don't like something that we say in a meeting, you now can appeal that. So that's, it's very different. So I would like to hear from the providers to see what they have or have heard others use this for. -

[Liz] This is Liz. I second that with Kim, as far as, and maybe even Regina can answer this. Is how often is it used? Is it a highly utilized form that we're talking about? Because I've never used it. And I guess just having some background on that would help too, as to how often it's used. - Yes, this is Regina. I don't have that information handy. If my staff were able to get it as they're monitoring this, I can let you know. I don't have that off the top of my head. a little bit concerning whenever I see anonymous, I really don't believe anything can ever be kept anonymous when we're talking about children. And especially if something falls under abuse and neglect for a child. And so I guess that's why I'm trying to wrap my head around exactly what the Ask-DHS form looks like. I mean, that looks like I've seen it, but like what types of questions come to as DHS? And then the other thing is, that, I mean, providers, the relationship is with the county. I understand we may not want to talk to the county, but it's still gonna get back to the county in some way, shape or form, even if it's anonymous. If that makes sense, because for the answer that DHS would have to provide them, maybe some of these questions, they have to get that from the county. If that makes sense. Our recommendation is that they anonymous thing is that they are not requiring that providers not be required to list their licenser. Now the form could very easily have a caveat that says, please note that if this is a, you know, a specific issue about your program or your home, that we may not be able to answer it without knowing, you know, more specifics or your county. I can say that there's been a few times where this has been used. Some counties claiming that providers were, I'm not gonna call up the two specific counties, at least saying that providers needed to follow licensing rules and regulations 24/7. So that providers were being forced to hold their own children's birthday parties on the weekends offsite, because they would have far more children and family members in their home than they would be allowed. Providers being told by some licensers that dog water bowls were considered quote, bodies of water and were hazardous. And these are not made up, that's from 2016 and those were interpretations. So without, you know, pushback about that, you know, we pushed back and then DHS came back and acknowledged to those counties. And, you know, I did email them a lot. And I remember we, when the family childcare early childhood task, I can't remember what it was called, the committee where we made recommendations in 2016. That was one of the things I presented. I know Senator Kiffmeyer, you were on that. And might remember that I had shared a picture of a dog honorable with Pelli girl and no lifeguard on duty signs and stuff, just as an illustration. And other one was about animal excrement in the yards. You know, at what point, if your dog goes out, how do you know if they did their business or not? You know, did they have to walk with something behind them at all times to prevent anything? I mean, things like that, where, okay, I know what the rule in statutes say, this seems to contradict with that. My license are saying this, this is, these are people who didn't get necessarily receive

correction orders and they were questioning it. So a licenser said you can't do that. They didn't necessarily get a correction order. And the providers were questioning that if the licenser is, you know, holding firm on that, where do they go? They would go to DHS and asks. So that's what this is before. -

[Kim] This is Kim again. So then in those cases, why wouldn't you want DHS to know about who is saying those things? If, it were me and I was telling someone that they could have, couldn't have their children's birthday party at home, you know, and nobody knows I'm doing that. I would think that you would want to then know the county or the worker so that it could stop. Like, how are you gonna fix the problem if you can't address it with that county or with that worker? to the provider to do that. That would be their choice. This is the whole point is to give providers the choice, whether or not they wanna list their licenser. It doesn't mean they do not. They can't just means that they would have the choice of doing it. make a comment, please? Hello, part of this came out like Kali says two 15 to 16. We've come a long way in communication and respect and responsibility. And some of the processes that we have available to us now that weren't, haven't always been available with some of these examples. I think where this one, I don't believe the form says, let us your licenser. I think DHS knows that by our license. I think the challenge has been is that in 87 counties, not all licensers are amazing and wonderful, and providers don't know who to go to to get clarification. So they go to Facebook or they go to other places that aren't looked upon as reputable or as credible, or we should be going into the officials. But if the official, who is the county licenser, which DHS has no authority over and how they perform some of their job, job tasks, if the provider is the position that really, how does that work? And where is that at to be educated? The round process is that first, it's not a level playing field where the provider is on an even footing, or can just get information. DHS goes to the licenser first and providers end up feeling like we don't have a, that level playing field, or don't have that ability to be heard first. Do I think, I think it's just like, if there was a phone and I know we always go into these conversations and say, oh my gosh, that's more time. If there could be some kind of communication to both the provider and the licenser through an email or something like that, that would be one thing. But if a provider is like, seriously, what is the rule? They have the choice at this point in time to Ask-DHS, it goes to their license or their outage. They don't really have the ability to get the answer they're looking for. They just get the co or the shield or the whatever through the licenser. If they don't do that, which most providers don't seem to want to do, then they have to go to Facebook or another social media or another provider. And that's not really where I would prefer everybody to get their information. So setting up an Ask-DHS isn't to take a correction order and Ask-DHS it's, we've heard something we've said something, someone, something has been said is this real? Is this not real where that kind of generalized interpretation. And if DHS goes to the licenser first, the provider ultimately really never gets their answer and often ends up in a conflict with their licenser. So being how, where do we get that information? An ombudsperson works for what work we don't have that reading the rules might work. Facebook, everybody says, don't go to Facebook, but I'm sorry. It's one of the only places we can have some other discussion than some other piece. So the anonymous isn't about setting people up. It's about leveling the playing field. As long as DHS goes to the licenser first, that's not a level playing field. At some point, we will not be able to answer some of the more nuanced and facts, specific things that come in. So if people, if there is a change, however that's made, can we make it anonymous? We can make it anonymous. And when they ask us where a form is, when they ask us this, they ask us something that is easy to do. That, that's an easy part, but people will, once again be felt that we are not answering their questions. We're not responsive. We're not something. So I just, you know, there's no easy answer to this. There are certainly questions that are easy, directing them to the form, the website, emailing them something. We do that all the time. So I just want folks to understand that if there ends up being some sort of a change, however, that may come about, we will also be more limited in the type of question that we try to respond to. So I just think we should be realistic about how to make something manageable if we're only doing some amounts and. think

Regina D at justice, putting a very, very difficult spot and those kinds of questions. I don't think the Ask-DHS was either meant for resolving disputes and some of those things, it was much more the other kind of straightforward questions. But I think since we already have a recommendation here legislation before, I think it went quite well, that I think if we supported the nonprofits person, I think that would help a great deal and keep people off of the mixture of the Facebook and some of those kinds of things. I think it'd be better for DHS to have some of these kinds of things, directed to a numbers person who would actually have the skills and the knowledge and the authority to be that interface. I think that would be very helpful to DHS as well. - As long as we're on that. I'm just curious if there was discussion of where the person would sit, if they're not going to be at DHS, just didn't know what the lines of authority or responsibility or any of that would look like. And I don't know how other ombudspeople's structures work. So just curious if that's something you discussed. - Representative Damon's could probably speak to this because this was her bill last session. Didn't mean to put you on the spot. - You're fine. And I apologize. I've been on and off. My wireless router is going out at home and I've had to reboot twice. So I, I'm not sure how to answer your question. The bill definitely will be reintroduced. And knowing that the feeling of the committee at this point is that it would not sit with it DHS. That's something they need to take a look at. And then I wouldn't refer up to Senator Kiffmeyer with other expertise, as far as where other persons responsibilities and oversight have landed. - There's actually a bill that we had in the Senate. That kind of discussion of there's an ombudsperson, kind of a group, because this is not just for this. This is too for nursing homes and many other situations that you had that kind of independence. So that's what we were taking look at when we actually got legislation will define that more specifically to find that place that was a good trust for everybody. This is Judy and where I just want to do a time check. We've got another eight minutes on our time for discussing these recommendations, we will of course take what we need, but we wanna give a fair reading to the other topics tonight. So we've talked a bit about the ombudsperson bill, if there's any other conversation about that, or of the other recommendations under legislative action. So this would be a three codifying rule into statute or vice versa. Everything should be in one place or for updating the book of family healthcare rules and statutes in a timely manner and only selling updated copies. My question for legislators, the last one does not seem to be a legislative action. So that would be my question for you. I'm wondering if there's any other conversation on these items in section A and then we'll move on. that if it would be in our legislative action, (mumbles) because it involves legislation or rules and statutes. they have any information about when did this happen, how it happened, et cetera. With number three codified rule under statute or vice versa, I'm pretty happy with him on that recommendation. I think that's more as someone who used to be on the outside of the state government and trying to influence policy and rule. I think rule is oftentimes there's a process that it can be influenced, but different than the legislative process. And I kind of have a very careful what you wish for caveat to this recommendation. I think the purpose of everything being in one place and providing ease of understanding, I completely understand that intent, but I do think there's a reason that there's statutes and there's rule and there's prophecies to engage stakeholders and each of those. And I think both of those properties are beneficial in my opinion. So family childcare, providers, and stakeholders. absolutely agree with you. That would make me very, very nervous. I mean, just having lived through the need to try to update our statutes, to meet federal requirements and the fact that we were probably the last state to come into compliance because so much was already in statute and the specificity of it. And I think each have their place. I agree with you. And I think depending on how political winds flow, you probably want options on both sides of that equation. So again, yeah, I get the ease of wanting it in one place. And I do understand, like we've all talked about that rule needs to be updated. That's part of the problem right now. I think the department has admitted that as well, it's woefully overdue for updating, but to have it all particularly in statute would personally as an old lobbyist to make me very nervous. I just, I kind of think that

like, and like what you just said that I think everyone's acknowledged that rule two needs to be worked on, but moving that around, I think it could do more damage than good. That's what my two senses on that. clarification for folks on number four, about that book of family childcare rules and statutes. I believe that people are referring to books that are published by the, basically the website is mnbookstore.com through the department of administration. It really has nothing to do with us at DHS and we pay for our copies like anybody else. So I just want to be clear. I believe that the book that's been referenced before is a book that is put out by department of administration Minnesota's bookstore. I also wanted to point out if you look at item B three rules and statutes and the final bullet there is considered summarizing each section of rules and statutes in one place, which as I read that accomplishes the communication of where things are so that providers would know. And so it addresses, I think what the intent was on a three, that's the least informed person in the room speaking there. So unless there's anything else on section A, let's look at B, which is communications, provider involvement and rules and statutes. I don't know if anybody else just went to the Minnesota bookstore website, but they said they're gonna be eliminating the print publications. I don't know if that means that thing that people were referring to in that bullet. I don't, I have no idea what that means. I just Googled it and I was like, oh, so I don't know if that has an impact on that recommendation if they're not even doing it anymore. They're not gonna be doing any publishing books anymore. 'cause I was like, oh, I've never heard of this bookstore. And there's a big thing that says starting August 31st, the store will eliminate print publications, but we'll continue to provide mailing list services. I don't know anything about this. So maybe it's a different, maybe this to come through the website, but that's what the website. So yeah, that would take care of that whole piece. And once upon a time in a past life, I worked in the department that involved Minnesota's bookstore and they really did handle a lot of print material that was 25 years ago in the world has changed. And they've been in financially challenging times with that business so that the trend towards the day will just do mailing lists, is not surprising. So that probably does address that particular book. All right, so let's move on to the items B communication. - I'm sorry, Julie said that she's in trying to talk, but she can't be heard. She said she was, she can't get unmuted I guess. - Yeah, you go, Julie, can you hear me now. There you go, hello? Sorry. I've been trying to chime in here. I do have my phone muted on my end. So if you could not meet me on your end. So when I need to say something I can chime in, that would be great. Sorry. I know it's kind of a pain, but I want to go back to the whole rule and statute thing and just the reason that was brought up and the reason we asked to do that is, and not that has been done, but technically by DHS, yes, they do have to notify providers. There's some steps to go through, but it can be changed a lot easier than statute can be changed. Statute has to go through the legislative process where we're able to speak in front of legislators to let them know what the reasons we have for standing for or against something. And that's why were wanting to move rule into statute. It would put everything in one place and then things would have to go through the legislative process to make those changes. That is not my understanding of the official rule making process, at least to add new rule, maybe to take rule from statutes and pass. Somebody needs to help me on official rule making process. My understanding is that's cumbersome in terms of time and it does involve a lot of input. So maybe I'm on the wrong page here or the wrong industry. and it does not involve input, or it happens with lawmakers. - And just as a point of information, I have multiple multiple rules that we oversee throughout all of our regulated providers, including our treatment programs. And I don't know when the last time is, I've been at licensing since 2014 or so. I don't know when the last time is that we went in proactively to do anything in a rule. So I understand that the process that about you could go in and potentially amend a rule, and there are certain ways to do that for an existing rule. And I just am saying that that is in theory, it exists and in practice the licensing division. And before my time when Jerry Kerber was the division director, I don't know when the last time is that we ever went into a rule, opened it up in part to make changes. It's just, we don't have the bandwidth to do that in licensing. We haven't, I think that's part of the

problem with the rule. So I appreciate speaking to what's possible, but I wanna also make very clear to those that aren't as familiar with our work. That that is not anything that licensing has ever really historically done is to go in and open up a rule. been the themes to the school age definition, changing it to when they turned five. I believe that was the last time. And then the States late 2013 safe sleep recommendations too. So I'd have to double check. There's a lot in statute around safe sleep for sure. - Anyway, that's fine. - I think there's a number of providers who want everything in legislation. I personally, and I think many providers want code or the rule, excuse me, updated. So it's understandable. It's changed some of the processes that have been stood out would have worked. And I don't wanna have to go down to the legislation every year for every point for every whatever. So I think the combination of the two options is important. I'm gonna ask you now to move on to section B, which is communications provider involvement and rules and statutes. And this is the recommendations for DHS. So do you see anything in the bullet points under item one, communication that is problematic or questionable? And if I could just kind of going back to some of those questions that you asked folks to all of us to be looking at for recommendations particularly about what have any changes been made that address that. I do wanna make sure that everybody understands that in there was legislation put in by I'm sure, obviously legislators, I don't think it was anything in a department bill is what I mean. It's 2458.1434. It was first put in statute in 2017 and it specifically requires information be sent to childcare license holders. I mean, I feel like if people looked at 2458.1434, they would see most of what's already in there. And so not only have we changed our practice to communicate more, the implementation plan is out, we've got kudos for it. You know, trying to be very clear and explain in plain language what the statutory changes are, but all of this, it allows us to do it electronically. That was very, very clear. So I want everybody to really be aware in these recommendations of what's currently in statute, because this is what we've been doing. The C cap area is doing that or subsidy program. We are moving into that. So in general, for number one, I mean, we're sort of statutorily required to notify people and we can do it electronically. So when it starts talking about sending postcards, it seems to under go counter to what's already now in statute as the preferred way. And so I just, and I'm not really clear from a DHS standpoint, what the second bullet really gets at about paper and electronic options. I mean, remember the primary kind of point of contact is the county licenser. Those forms are generally all submitted at the county level. So I don't know if that's the type of paperless that people are talking about. Certainly for some appeals, we do tons of things electronically already, but so I'm not really sure what they mean. And depending on the paper, you know, sometimes we have to send things by certified mail or mail based on statute. Those are more formal licensing actions that may not be what people mean here. So I just want to offer a few things on, you know, on that, if you just want to stay with B1, but I'm feeling that a lot of what's called out is in statute. So I guess I would ask, you know, to be aware of that. - This is Hollee there, that was a 2017 law. And I testified that was a bill proposed and drafted by MACCP. Senator Kiffmeyer carried that in the Senate and it was had bipartisan support and yes, it agree that DHS is communicating electronically and that's great. And this was so that everything would be clear, however, this isn't happening everywhere, not every providers. And again, that's why that maintaining an accurate list of every family childcare provider with an email address is important. We want to ensure that that continues, but that, you know, step that was important in there. It's not saying to take away from that, the part about the paper and electronic options, it is not about appeals or anything like that. It's just about those communications that if providers, you know, if some providers are sometimes DHS might send something in paper and so providers should have the option of checking. I only want electronic delivery. I mean, that should be welcomed, you know, but then there are some providers who don't maybe have internet access or don't have the aren't tech savvy enough to do that. I mean, you know, I can't understand that, but, you know, so I want to be fair to them. So for them, they might need some paper copies, not everything, but sometimes communications might need to come and pay per spent. are generally very attentive and aware of where their

providers are at. And we always make sure that county licensors can make anything available in paper and others on this can speak to them. So anyway, I'm just reminding us all, there's a statute that seems to cover a great deal that then move us in the electronic way. And I will say with the yeoman's work, all the work done by county licensors, since this COVID started, we have, I think 98% of family healthcare providers with an email. And I think that is something we haven't had. And we are excited about that and gonna work really hard with our county licensors to keep that up to date. I just wanted to say, I think the way the second bullet point and the last bullet point are written, but those would require legislation to implement so at a cost. So if that's felt that that recommendation should go forward that's one thing, but you know, doing a mailing or, you know, a common, commonly doing a postcard mailing and offering paper from DHS, it seems like it will require a statute change. It'll require some legislation. And it'll also require us to figure out a fiscal mode for that. send a postcard mailing. And at the end of 2012, about safe sleep saying that children are dying or babies are dying. You need to follow safe sleep practices. That was the first time DHS had done a mailing like that in all my years, being licensed. And I was licensed in 2005, but they don't have to contradict. And I mean, if it were up to me, I just say, can you give providers an option to just check off? I only want paperless delivery and then it would save money and time and everything. But I don't know. I mean, I would ask the committee members, I, this is not where I would draw my line in the sand, the postcard mailing. I'm fine without it, but I would defer to the committee for their recommendations on it. That's not something that is gonna make the biggest difference for providers for looking for the things that are gonna make the biggest impact for providers. Those two bullet points are not the things that are gonna prevent providers from leaving the field. I mean, I don't even know if I would even get a postcard in the sense where I don't get my mail. My husband does and he'd probably throw it away. So, but I do think that, you know, the costs, we always have to be very mindful of anything that costs money. And again, this is my \$0.02 is that I just prefer that anything that is paperless, that communication be sent that way, because that is the way of the world. And I do believe that the county licensors, like what Regina had said, that they know how to get ahold of them when important changes are happening and occurring, that's it. So I'm going to ask Ellen, is it possible if you are able to edit the document, could you replace the bullets under each of these numbers, one communication and you have five bullets. If you could put A, B, C, D E instead, so that we can track those and do that for all of those. For our discussion, there there any comments on provider involvement. This was ad family childcare providers to the implementation plan group, offering the meetings with stakeholders about proposed legislation and updating the guide to becoming a licensed family childcare provider. Any comments or questions on that? Can you guys hear me? I had headphones in for a second. - You're good. all of it in the process. Anyways. I just wanted to point out too. I think to Senator Watson's point about the, some of the things costing money that likely the piece around as important as it is to have multiple languages that that would likely cost as well, because we would have to be there gonna be some translation done there for folks to make sure that that's actually translating sort of that sort of language that we use in terms of forms and that sort of thing that needs to be done by an actual person, because to make it understandable. And then that was, so that was the point I wanted to offer before I moved onto the provider piece. So I will just throw that out there. Okay. Provider involvement, questions or concerns? because it's involved DHS, I just wanted to kind of give a little quick, hopefully context about this thing. And I think Kim mentioned it early on about what is an implementation plan group. There is no group, this is what DHS does. We do it all across the areas in our department. We do, you know, I've worked in not, you know, advocacy groups that do this, you know, at the end of session, you try to make sure that your co members, your audience knows what passed. And so we don't have an external group. We don't engage the county licensors in it. We are trying in good faith to say, this is what passed in statute. Here's what it means for providers. Here's what it means for licensors to kind of look for. We've gotten really good feedback and thank you, and please keep it up and folks

looking for it as you all were. And so I just don't understand how we would ever engage externals in something that is very much just a, we're doing this across all our business areas. Our whole department is doing this. I mean, this is our responsibility to try and inform people of changes to statute that have happened in other groups, talk about the exact same changes. So I think that's just a standard thing that happens. I wanna clarify this guide to becoming a licensed family childcare provider. I think that, I think every once in a while in the task force, there's confusion about two different documents or things that got put out the guide to becoming a licensed family childcare provider. It was a requirement for DHS to do. We released it in February of 2020, it's on our website. And the one from a few years ago, I think people may be referring to a legislative appropriation that went to deed department of economic development to create a kind of a manual, a startup, if you will. That we really had very little involvement at DHS in that document that is a few years old. That may need to be updated, but I still, I think there's kind of confusion perhaps, or, you know, a few different documents that do possibly similar things, but are different. So the one on our website, if you go ever and look at it, it was just put out and made public in February of 2020. And obviously we will continue to see if any changes come up that impact kind of that getting into it. So I just wanted to offer that as a, for C, thank you. Can you hear me? Okay, yep. Regina we are actually talking about the one that was just published when going through it. And there are some references for some changes that were done in 2020 in September that are not updated in that February one. So unfortunately I think that's gonna have to be updated every time. Well, basically every legislative session, because in there it talks about the subs that 30 hours, 30 days instead of 500. So that's what we were talking about with that. - That's fine. We just got our legends, our implementation plan out there. We're still gonna have to go in and make sure all the other things on our website get updated. So, but it says from a few years ago, because we were trying to see if there was confusion. So thank you for clarifying it. provider involvement A, B and C? Let's move on. - I have, this to Julie, I have one more comment. And what we're discussing about the implementation plan when it goes out, not necessarily providers and licensors, and everybody's sitting on this committee and deciding how it's written, but there are things, if you could even just show it to a couple of providers and say, does this look okay? Will it be understood? Not until page 24, does it let providers know that that substitute training takes effect September 30th of this year, but you have a year of technical assistance. So immediately as they start reading through the first, you know, five, six pages, they're not seeing that any, in there anywhere. And the panic started where in the beginning, it could have been noted and just simple little things that stop a lot of confusion. And a lot of people answering questions that really don't know the answer. And basically the provider community kind of freaking out a little bit. one. This is Hollee here. What if you sent it to both state associations and their employment, or some family childcare associations, and then you would have their input. I know when I need documents. So when I create documents, I want multiple eyes on them and having a unique perspective, especially when you're sending it to these family childcare providers, people who work in licensing, you know, Barb Wagner has that, but she, I mean she has that experience. But, you know, she said that she hasn't been a provider for many, many years. And so, you know, having people who are in the field now can offer a unique perspective and would not require a cost, does not have to be cumbersome or time consuming. Simply sending an email out and asking for feedback would be my suggestion. more comment being made. Did I miss something here? - Just pointing out it's just a legislative update so. -

[Kim] But there, this is Kim. There's also like suggestions and things like that, sometimes in it, like what this could kind of mean. And I can tell you that licensing workers also don't have any, don't have an opportunity to provide feedback for that document either. We can update. -

[Kim] It would be nice if we didn't because we have to answer most of the questions. that needs to happen. It's very challenging to try and provide information. We are constantly being urged to get information out, and then we are having a process placed on it. So if this ends up being a recommendation, we can continue to get out our legislative summary. That's the core work of what we do. And if this has morphed into a different action item that people need to see look different, there needs to be a delineation between what my staff do on getting out the information on legislative updates. We then urge to get them out timely. We've done it in two stages. So I'm just trying to be clear on what our process is. - Okay. Let's move on to three rules and statutes, which we have there. Ellen, can you scroll up? Okay. You have the, here's where the ass VHF button comes up again. We have worked with providers and licensors to develop plain language training on how to access, read, and understand the rules and statutes and consider summarizing each section of rule and statute in one place, possibly use the guide as a starting point for existing providers. So those were the three, any additional comments that we've not covered so far? Going once? offer this is Regina from DHS. The only comment I would offer when I see C and I don't know if this is exactly what people mean, but summarizing each section of rule and statute in one place, I just, unless I'm missing it, I am familiar with other States that have created much more documents that I think look like this. They are extremely long. It will make the minibookstore.com book look trivial. It is its own process that I think would have a fiscal attached to. It would take very long time would be almost like a rulemaking update kind of process. It's very, very labor intensive. And so I might be misunderstanding what people mean, but when I think about what's being talked about in C, it is almost like sort of a, an interpretive guideline. And, you know, it's like every craze, every clause gets broken down. You can have examples. And literally for family childcare, I think I have seen things that are well into the couple of 100 documents, 100 pages. It's, I just want to be sure that, you know, if this were to ever go forward, that there is clarity that I think it's an extremely cumbersome and could produce a very lengthy document when the feedback that I have gotten very consistently is things are too long. They're too complicated. We can't find it. So maybe there's benefit to having it all in one place. So I'm just saying, I might not know the example, but what I've seen suggests a very detailed and formal process because in essence, it, maybe it's not interpretive guidelines that put, it makes it sound like to me. And I think that's got its own challenges. -

[Kim] And this is Kim. I was also, my other question is who would be doing this? What was the suggestion on who would be doing the summarizing of each section? and this is falling under the recommendations for DHS buckets. So the implication is this would be a DHS task. I'm looking at the back to becoming a licensed family childcare provider. I know it's not 100% up-to-date with the changes from this legislative session, but I guess I'm wondering, this seems like a pretty, like a shorter version of what folks are referring to with this. And so I'm wondering if there's someone could provide some clarity around what more they're looking for in terms of, you know, it says as brief as possible and bullet points. And so I'm wondering sort of what more beyond the guide that folks are looking for that they're helpful. I don't know if anyone can speak to that at all. The guide right now is to becoming a licensed family childcare provider. The intent of this would be for existing providers to find things. And yes, it can take time to do this. Every Monday morning, I posted an update on our page, our Facebook page covering every single section of rule and statute related to family childcare providers. We talked about it not being interpreted that they would be plain language and brief, but the guide to becoming a licensed family childcare provider, like we said, you could use that as a starting point, but make it for existing providers. Once someone becomes licensed a lot of that information and that guide they won't need anymore. So just putting it, you know, a summary of rules and statutes. Then let's move onto the next session, Ellen. Now we're looking at counties for communications from DHS, since your county specific info, place links to DHS forms and info to ensure it's up-to-date and to save time, maintain an accurate list of every family childcare provider in the county, and possibly add a pop-up on the county childcare provider page. If there are any updates to rules,

statutes, and forms, any questions or comments about that? Hearing none, then recommendations for providers that providers need to be involved in family childcare, meetings, plans, hearings, et cetera. Questions, concerns? lot, correct me if I'm wrong, maybe someone else can speak to this. But I do think that providers now are being involved in a lot of family childcare meetings. And I know there's lots of providers that go up to the Capital and they testify. So, I mean, I would like to make sure that they are involved, but I guess I'm not sure what other outlets where they need to be involved in. So someone can speak to that. And I would like to speak as far as being out of the Metro area. I know it takes me a good hour and a half to get down to the Capitol. I'm so sorry to say this out loud, but this COVID thing kind of is a godsend that we have the Zoom meetings and the WebEx meetings. This is awesome. I don't have to leave my house. I don't have to drive two hours to come to those meetings. So if the Zoom meetings and the WebEx meetings don't stop, we can be more involved. So that's a blessing. trying to be there that there's, you know, we were asking for recommendations for everyone and to be fair, that we wanted providers to take ownership too that they need to take the time to, you know, attend things whenever possible, or ask someone or listen to recordings and you know, participate, pay attention to the rules and statutes, read the plans and whatnot. So this was trying to be fair. The fact that everything is not for legislators, VHS and counties, that providers also have responsibilities too, but also we did want providers to be included, but that was kind of under the DHS recommendations we specifically listed including providers. Okay. So Ellen, can you scroll back to the top? We're going to go through these and Mark, perhaps you can highlight them, the items where you are. This is my testing for agreement. Okay? So if we have any items where you think that you all want would be voting in the affirmative. And I think for this, if we can tolerate, if we can tolerate the noise, maybe we can unmute everyone. And hopefully we won't have dogs barking and everything else. What I want to do is just go through, this is not debate time. I just want to see where there's already agreement. Okay? And what I'm gonna say is if you I'll ask affirmative and negative question, all right, so 1A ombudsman person, a bill should be reintroduced positions should be independent and not in DHS. This should not replace provider's current relationship in progress with DHS. How many think they could vote? Who thinks they could vote affirmatively? -

[Some Members] Yes. They have to be un-muted first, sorry. Or they can unmute themselves. - Okay. Everyone's been unmuted. Well, I want to make sure that the fine. - So make sure you're unmuted. Are there, is there anyone who would not be, is there, do we have any strong? - Yes. So this is Regina, just as a point of information because this bill had been introduced previously and it did have a fiscal cost just for people that aren't as familiar. I can't really speak on behalf of the department and commit us to anything that costs money. I have a lot of bosses above me that there's a very formal process to do that. I do want to make sure people know though that when the bill was getting hearings last session, I believe that the department's position on it was that they were neutral on it. So I'm not gonna like weigh in either way, but I just wanna make sure people understand that I can't really offer a whole lot of that. And hopefully there won't be many times that we have to do that, but I feel like I just want to remind everybody it's not easy for me to weigh in when things have costs. - I'm sorry. - I don't remember what it was. It was some level of a full time FTE. I don't have that the top of my head. I just don't remember like maybe 100,000 somewhere in there. I don't know. Don't quote me, but it's like, it wasn't like way, way off of that. And I don't think it was way, way under that. I seem to, sorry stepping on you. I seem to understand though, from my question earlier, this wouldn't be, so it wouldn't be a DHS fiscal note. It would be some other department, which is what I was trying to ask them. - I mean, I assume if it's not with you, why would you pay for it? or is it existing funding repurposed? When we introduced to the 19, there was a fiscal note for the body, the house of \$160,000. That would be new spending. But when we introduce, there's always different ways to look at when it does get reintroduced. - We're just going to be in a crazy different budget situation so. different budget situation. So the purpose of this task force, it's a recommendation is we're not

voting on legislation here right now. We're voting on the recommendation and it should be up to the legislature to deal with some of those kinds of issues. Knowing that the concept and the recommendation to have a numbers person is still valid in my opinion, and the leave it to us as legislators to work through those kinds of issues. should be part of our pockets of things that we move forward? Any hesitations? Okay. All right, next to was the, this version of make the FGHF form autonomous and removed the requirement for providers to list their licensor. Do you, are you in favor of that or not in favor? -

[Some Members] Yes. It's not your formal vote. I'm just trying to test your agreement. - Okay, so just go to, I'm sorry. - We're trying to get those things that we can put in a bucket and do one roll call vote on, and then we can go back and revisit other items. So this is not the end. I'm just trying to test agreement here. A third was codified 83 codified rule and statute or vice versa. Everything should be in one place. How many would be in favor of that? -

[Some Members] Yes. -

[Some Members] No. Okay. I'm hearing enough. It doesn't make this initial bucket. All right. Item four, update the book of family childcare rules and statutes. Sounds like that's a moot point. Can we pass on that one? -

[Some Members] Yes. - Okay. We'll pass on that one. Move on to B1, 1A, communication about rules, statutes, and state federal regulations should come from DHS and continue the implementation plans. Are you in favor? -

[Some Members] Yes. Okay. Offer both paper and electronic versions with an opt in opt out, in favor? -

[Some Members] Yes. - Okay, not? Let's move forward on that. Offer forms and information in multiple most common languages. -

[Some Members] Yes. -

[Some Members] Yes. - And not. Okay, we'll put that move forward. Understanding there is likely to be some class to that. Maintain an accurate list of family childcare providers with email addresses, in favor. -

[Some Members] Yes. and sending the postcard. -

[Some Members] Yes. All right. We'll put it forward. Provider involvement. - Yeah. I just don't know how we'll know what's critical information, but if it goes forward, people can implement it I guess I just. to be that too. That is it. Is it easily limited? So I'm already communicating electronically. That's why I really hope people will look at what's already in 1434. It seems very duplicative. So I just don't want cross-purposes it's recommendations go forward. I just, you know, will wanna be able to implement things and have it make sense so. - So if you do the opt in to paperless, if you could give people option to opt into paperless, then they don't need the postcard mailing. Probably as somebody said, would need to be legislative changes. We just need to have it all make sense and be consistent. I know you're voting right now, but I just, I wanna put in a plug for the more notification, the better, especially during this time of chaos, is we're dealing with small business owners in other areas. There's so many things that get missed, you know, renew your assumed name, renew your LLC, sign up for this. And there's so much info flooding Adam, that if there's a postcard and an email, I would rather have them have more. So I think through the lens of people that are, you know, trying to keep it going, these investments make a lot of sense. So thank you. - All right. Let's move on to 2A, add file, family childcare providers to the implementation plan group, which we now understand there really isn't one of, in favor of this recommendation? I do wanna note that Barb Wagner from DHS didn't say that there is an implementation plan groups. This is not something that we made up. - It's internal, it's an internal project. That's what I've tried to

explain. So if you wanna create one, maybe you should say, create an implementation group to develop an implementation plan. I don't, I mean, I'm just saying like there's no group, it's all internal DHS licensing staff. temperature of the group on this one, in favor? -

[Some Members] Yes. -

[Some Members] No. Tons of people are muted right now. So if they're not saying one thing one way or another, it makes it really tough. - Well, there's enough people speaking Hollee. I think that there's clear there's division on some of these and then we can go back and do it as what I can do to be saying, if you go back and do a fire call approach, right. for the one first bucket and then we can come back and revisit whatever you like, but let's move forward with those things that are not controversial. Okay? Second offering meetings with stakeholders about proposed legislation before the legislative session begins, favor? -

[Some Members] Yes. Updating the guide to becoming a licensed family childcare provider to reflect legislative changes. -

[Some Members] Yes. Okay. Put a move forward on that. And then the rules and statutes. This is the Ask-DHS form. Did we address that earlier on page one? - Yes. That's required work from DHS about adding the search function to the form. So we didn't know which part needed to be DHS and which part needed to be legislative. So the anonymous part, we wanted it in statute, the search function under DHS. with the first sentence of A, up above, under legislation, we did not get a resounding yes on that. And can we look at the, adding the search function to the Ask-DHS form for common topics as a separate item? - All right, who's in favor of the search function, yes? -

[Some Members] Yes. Perfect, okay. Put a move forward on that. - Probably there's no doubt from at Ask-DHS. Yep 'cause right now there is no nothing. It's just, we have tons of info on our website. So now somebody wants a third function. That's okay. I'm trying to understand it. Thank you. - Yeah. That's the two part are there, okay. Work with providers and licensors to develop plain language training on how to access, read and provide for understand the rules and statutes, agreed? -

[Some Members] Yes. a clarifying question as we're doing this. So some of these things under DHS are going to require funding. And my understanding is that that would require legislation. I don't know if Regina or someone else can speak to that, but if we have a fiscal note, et cetera, associated with these things, I just wanna make sure they end up in the right spot in terms of what are we recommending that we're actually doing? Some of these things like creating a third functionality on our website is likely gonna have a systems cost of some sort. It does not exist right now. on the search function and just make a note. clock, a physical clock done C. plain language training and understanding that this would also require some funding. Are you in favor of this one? Yes, anyone? -

[Some Members] Yes. Okay. That one can say move forward and requires funding understanding again, that when vote on this, you were voting to make this recommendation and someone else will determine the legislative process, whether it gets funded or not. And then D, consider summarizing affection and rule in one place, probably using the guide as a starting point for existing providers in plain language, clear, understandable, and brief as possible. Agreed for that. -

[Some Members] Yes. -

[Some Members] No. - Okay. There's not agreement on that. So we'll leave that for now, going for the counties. Are there any of these that you do not agree with? -

[Kim] This is Kim. The only thing I would say is again, kind of to all the points of adding popups and things like that. I mean, for me, who comes from Dakota county, that might be fine, but it's kind of weird with smaller counties or things like that. I don't see a problem with it. And I like it. It just might not be as easy for some of the smaller you know, counties, but that's all, I don't have a problem with it. licensed recital county, I don't know that that's gonna fly in smaller counties. I've been looking at some of their websites. A lot of them don't even have anything on their websites for childcare. So adding a popup is not gonna happen. says, possibly add a pop up. We didn't say, add a pop up. We didn't say that it should be required. We didn't, this was a recommendation for counties, whether or not, I mean, to be discussed by the task force, whether or not this is something that goes into the final recommendations, you know, but this is something that could be suggested to counties too. to propose legislation, it would be a state legislature mandating each county to do something or how it actually would in practice go into effect. - That's not what we discussed. of this is Judy, my understanding of these were recommendations for counties not requiring any legislative action, correct? Communication, forward communications from DHS. I mean, I hope there's an understanding that not every communication that we send to counties can get forwarded on. I mean, there are things that are just like, I mean, I just, we didn't really talk about that. It was sort of a recommendation for the counties, but considering we send things on to DHS, I mean, I don't think the expectations, every single communication we sent a DHS should get sent on. I mean, there are just things about like internal things, things we're talking about, I just. to be really clear here 'cause if everybody thinks, share, share, share, I'm just assuming that other communications that I think even, I mean, I haven't heard the county licensors bring it up, but I'm assuming that there are things that we send that, I mean, I don't know. - Nope, this is, I'm sorry. I'm just trying to create an understanding that in my relationship of overseeing the counties and doing business with them and trying to provide technical assistance and training and other things to them, I'm just trying to make sure that we don't all walk out of here with some different understanding that every email I send to a county automatically needs to have a send forward on. Otherwise, why am I sending it to the counties and not providers? We send a lot now to providers then county. So I'm just trying to go where this goes. Maybe there's some clarification that could be helpful at all I'm suggesting. We put more details about this. It's specifically said in the presentation, we were talking about information. You're talking about the indifferent interpretations from 87 different places. And so it was important for counties to forward those communications from DHS, those statewide communications, you know, about implementation plans or pending legislation or stakeholder meetings, those kinds of things. And then counties would direct, you know, counties would directly share pertinent county information with providers as well. So that counties were forwarding information from DHS. They didn't have to interpret the state, you know, emails. We were not talking about forwarding all communications, of course not. But in the presentation we put more details. This recommendations sheet is purposefully grief to make it easier for the taskforce to vote on it. So the wording of this can be obviously worked out in the inter, in the legislative report. - Okay. So let's take them one by one then, as worded. Are you, would you vote yes On forward community, on item one C one. - Okay. So I've heard one voice on each. So that is not presenting answer. Let's try that again. Would you vote yes on this? -

[Some Members] Yes. - As it's worded. I do not support it. - Okay. Let's come back to that one and rework it. - So that's the C1, right? - So (mumbles) that's a problem. what do you mean by communications? So you may come back to that as this tweak the language, please place the link. Yes. Okay. C2, place links to DHS forms and info to ensure it's up to date and to save time, that's a recommendation to counties. Would you say yes? -

[Some Members] Yes. Got it. Let's move that one forward. Maintain an accurate list of every family childcare provider in the county with an email address. -

[Some Members] Yes. Move that forward. Possibly out a pop up on county childcare provider page, would you vote yes? -

[Members] Yes. Any nos, okay. I think I'm leaning towards def, mostly yeses. So let's move that forward. And then recommendations for providers. Providers need to be involved in family childcare, meetings, plans, hearings, et cetera. It's a recommendation. Would you vote yes? -

[Members] Yes. So Jake, have you been keeping track and obviously Ellen's been writing this. What we'd like to do now is vote on the... folks that are having problems getting kicked off and getting back in. And maybe it's been resolved. I'm trying to open my participant list, but my staff got a text. So is like maybe people are back on. I know there's been another issue so... - This is Polly and I've been kicked off and on. - This is Hollee and I've also been getting kicked off and on. I haven't been able to get a text 'cause everything has been timing out on me to get my info, to get the number. But I'm back on. Are we missing anyone else, Ellen, Jake Pile? - Not that I said, Jake, now I can say, I know Erin had to leave. So she's actually out of the meeting. She didn't get kicked out. She said, she'll leave early. So Aaron's not here. - I haven't heard from anyone being kicked off. - I'm seeing the names of everyone who's been here the whole time, except for one here. - Okay, yeah. It's the blessed wonders of technology. So as wonderful as these can be, it can also be frustrating. All right. So what we would like to do is get what, all these things that we said, move forward into a bucket boat, okay so. up just so we could see, because I think there were some that didn't have move forward next to it. But I was curious 'cause not everyone was just feeding either saying yes or no. So I'd just be kind of curious. to see if there's interest in voting on them. So this is simply to take care of the move forward items and then we'll come back to all the others, okay? - I'm getting some feedback that I'm cutting out over you. I'm wondering if we could have everybody muted again. What we're doing is taking all those were are very rough unscientific, voice vote said, move forward. We'd like to have a motion. Co-chair will handle this voting process. Jake will call a roll. You can vote a formal vote. And then we're going to take a well deserved break when we're done with that. And then come back to any of the other specifics that you want to reconsider. Those things that were not included in this first bucket. Make sense? Okay. So Ami, I'm gonna turn it over to you. - Okay. So what we're gonna do, everything that says move forward next to it and read. I think there was one that we had to rework. Julie, do you wanna do that before we do that? Or do you want us to come back to it after this? First of all. - Let's come back to it after this first vote, we'll clear the deck of all the move forward things and look at what's left. - Okay. So what we're gonna do, what we're gonna be voting on is moving forward with everything that has move forward next to it, which we had, what we just went through this sort of rye run here to see sort of support, not support all of these things that said move forward were things that people said yes to. So we're gonna be voting. I'm pointing at my screen, like it's moving, but we're gonna be voting on all of the move forward items at once together in a group, because we've all just sort of given feedback about what we think we should move forward with. So that's gonna be what we're gonna be doing. I don't know if there's a way to get them all in the same spot. We can't see them all at the same time right now and still read them all. - I don't think that there's a way to do that. Sorry to say. - I'm wondering if maybe if we put it in landscape instead of portrait, if we can do that, I don't know if we can do that with a PDF, maybe not. So all of the things that say move forward next to them, we're gonna vote on as a group. So that would be, the motion would be to recommend these things that are marked as move forward as being recommendations from the task force? Anybody have any questions on that before we take a formal vote? Can we just scroll down and just remind ourselves exactly what all falls in that category. Might be easier to say what doesn't. I can say the things that we're known. So it's easier. So I'll just recap real quick. So from section A,

legislative action, the nos, so the ones that would not be considered for a vote were items two, three, and four, item number two, three and four. - Jake you've just cut out. - Jake you've cut out. What did you say to all of us? I don't know if everyone's on a computer. - Okay. Let's do that. Ellen, is it possible for you to send this by email to the task force members? I just need to stop sharing my screen for a few minutes. - Okay. Let's do that. - For the items that require funding, is the recommendation then silent on that level of funding? - Yeah, because we don't know what that gonna cost. - It's simply an acknowledgement that there would be funding necessary. pops up in your email screens, see that, yeah. Sorry about what that issues was. - It's sad that you didn't have enough bandwidth, which could be said of most of us. 'cause we're hearing echoes. Sometimes I call it the livestream being shared. - Okay, so Ellen, is this working, are you able to send it to us? and Jake will to send it on to all of you. - Yep, ma'am (indistinct). Would you prefer to take a short vote right now? Come back and vote and then dive in on the rest of these? Or would you like to wait for the email to pop up? and then vote on these? Do you think we need a break? Yes, we do. Okay. So during your break, look at your email, be ready to come back and vote. I have 8:10. Can we be back at 8:15? Let's do that. Let's do 8:15 and suffice it to say, we're going to get through this one topic tonight and then we'll regroup on our schedule. Okay. Thank you, see you in five. So Scott, while we are waiting for everyone to rejoin us, are you available for this for the October 20th meeting? Is that a date that works for you? Yeah. It's the same time Eve, right? I mean, I don't know when this segment will end, but we can, you know, if you want to start it or introduce it, ours is fairly compacted. But I mean, you know, we were assuming after, you know, talking with Jake that there'd be 20 minutes of presentation and I know that would run it up, but if you wanna at least get part of it into it we, I'm fine with either Judy. - Okay, well, we'll see how this goes with these last three items. And if we can do it expeditiously, then we'll get the preview from you at least. And if we can't do it expeditiously, we'll do it in October. So plan A, plan B always good. critical mass back? Okay, from this. So we are still in need of a vote. And so I do need to know that people are back. - I'm back. - I'm back. - I'm back. Sorry, I'm here, I put my camera off. - All right, Cyndi, both Cyndi's. - Hey, Cyndi DHS I'm here. Kim, JoAnn? -

[Kim] Kim is here. Well, I love it. When this thing bounces around and tells me, people are in different spots, Regina, you there? Yes, I am here and my staff have had problems being able to be on the screen. And so I've asked them if they can just join and be listen mode because we had been trying to get you guys some clarification. So I'm not sure what's going on with the screen. - That's good. All right. Well, I am hoping everyone is back and ready. So co-chair, I'm ready to turn it back to you so we can have a vote. So you've seen the email in front of you that has everything with move forward listed, back to you. what we're gonna be doing, we're gonna be voting on all of the things that said move forward next to them, on the document that Jake just sent out to folks. So take a quick look through that, just to have a sense of what we're holding for. So I'm gonna make, I'm pretty sure I can make the motion. So I'll make the motion to move forward. The ones that say move forward to be recommendations in our upcoming report. So that's the motion. Do I have a second for that motion? And now I don't know if Jake's gonna do the roll call. Whoever's doing the roll call. We'll do the roll call again. We're voting on all the things that say move forward. I'll do the roll call vote. So what I'm gonna do is I'm just gonna work down the participant list. So it's, on my list says like first name. And there are two calling users. One's calling 11 and one's called 12. I'm gonna circle back to you at the end. If we 'cause sometimes WebEx will duplicate your name and then your phone number, if you're calling by phone. So it may be resolve it. I'll circle back to those two if we don't have a voicemail from them. And just to be clear for, to Regina, are you the DHS voting member chair is Cyndi. Or does Cyndi Regina vote here? No, okay. I just want to clarify. Okay, then I will work here. - We can't hear you. - You can't hear me again. How about now? Can you hear me now. - I think Regina was talking, but we couldn't hear her. I think Regina would be voting for this duty and I would be voting for four not sure. - I'm sorry, my new button is very sensitive and I've been muted in both with my computer and

my phone. I may be one of the numbers. I apologize. So I'm here. I'm un-muted and I'm voting on these tonight for the DHS rep. Sorry about the confusion. - Okay. Then I just want to clarify, so I will start working on a list and I guess the vote would, yes or no in representing wisely? A comment you wanted to make? We're taking one vote right now to vote on all of the move forward items only be brought in once right now, just to clarify that in case anyone is wondering. - So I'll just read off when I read your name. You can say yay or nay to the vote. So I'm starting now. So the first on my list is representative Wazlawik, Ami, Go down to Cyndi. Heidi. Is Kim there? And it's here on my, as a center. So Melissa Wiklund. And then we have Shannon Stewart. Stephanie Hogenson. user 11, is that your name? Did you name to call out? - No, that's Mary. So Mary Albert. Your vote? So now the test, did I miss any of the taskforce members? Hearing no, hearing none from that, I think we have, we've all yes, it was all yays. So the motion carries. So going back to the list, I see seven items that were not in the move forward category. One of them is item A four about the book that is published by the Minnesota Bookstore that is no longer publishing books. Am I okay to say we're not dealing with that recommendation as a result. - Okay. Then I'd like you to go in sort of reverse order, go to items C one, which was the forward communications from DHS and share county specific info with providers. The question here was, what do you mean by communications? Do you want to revise this in a way that allows you to move forward on it? Or do you want to skip it? Those are your two options. Revise, skip. Anyone interested in making an editorial attempt or should we move on? - I'm sorry. This is Kelly again. I guess I just want a correction or like a verification of our all counties. being able to communicate and to communicate to us like, 'cause our county does communicate with all of us and they should have all our emails. So is every county on the same path. And then if, yeah. - We are on C1, which as written says forward communications from DHS. were like, what communications? They need a little more definition. I wonder if adding the word forward, official communications from DHS. was, this is Hollee, was about communication, about changes to licensing rules and regulations. And we said, providers, follow state rules and statutes. Information should come from DHS to eliminate 87 plus different possible interpretations of each change. So what about communication about changes to the rules and statutes that come directly from DHS and counties can forward that information and counties, and provide county specific information? - I'm not sure what you're meaning there, are you saying 'cause then another place it says DHS should send us out to the providers themselves directly? Or are you saying here that they send an official communication about changes in rules and statutes to the counties, then the counties adds their specific info plus the DHS, so will you clarify then? - Yeah, no, we're talking about DHS and those providers that counties can forward that information if they choose. But some oftentimes counties will come up with their own interpretations and send those to providers and say, DHS, they might even say, DHS has sent this out. This is what it means really, you know, if we have to follow the state rules and statutes. So it would make it very clear that if it's just the DHS information, DHS sends information about the state rules and statutes counties can forward that information and also provide county specific information. That's all it was meant to be. It was not meant to be all the private data or you know, like a foyer or anything like that. And I think the idea of getting it directly from the source without interpretation at the local level sounds wonderful. It's been great to see all the information coming directly from deed out to economic development folks, local elected officials and entrepreneurs themselves. And then yes, the locals can customize it and reinforce it on. But that at the end of the day, the key stuff, whether you're in any part of the state comes directly unfiltered straight from the source. So I think this is great and removes the burden from the locals with allowing them to spend their time just on local stuff, not interpretation. So sounds fabulous to me. communication should come directly from DHS regarding rules and statutes. Is that what we're saying, Hollee? - Yes, but I mean, we're not trying to discourage counties from sharing information. I just want to keep communication from DHS to the providers, which is what Scott is saying as well, which has done in many other agencies just DHS send it out directly, counties can later add what they want to do, but each provider should get

directly from DHS. So they know what DHS actually said. That is just good policy in my mind, just like Scott, Mark said for other agencies. - Right, and that's what we're already required to do by that other statute. I mean, we're sending tons of emails to providers. This has to do with certain things, I guess that we send the counties need to get forwarded on to providers. And I'm trying to make sure that everybody's really clear what that really means because probably a lot of stuff we send to counties. But if what I'm hearing is DHS, you should be communicating directly to providers. I feel like we do that through like a huge amount now. And that's what that statute does. So I guess I'm trying to figure out, do we need this one? I don't know. Let me explain it this way. This is how I see it. Okay. It's not that we're saying DHS, send more stuff out. What we're saying is instead of counties taking the DHS email that was sent out with legislative changes and sending to providers, their interpretation of those legislative changes, they need to forward the email from DHS and then they can make their comments. That's what we say. Right, we have an implementation plan. That's the whole point of the implementation plan is this is what's changed. This is what it means. And we send that out. we're saying is when the county you're not listening, you're not hearing me. What I'm saying is, but when counties send it out, sometimes some counties do not send out your official email with it. What they send out is their interpretation of the DHS implementation plan. We send it directly to providers. Can we just to do anything. We're just asking recommending to counties that they send out the actual email from DHS, with any of their additional information, instead of just sending their information. That's all we're asking. We're not asking DHS to do anything additional. This is not a critique of the DHS process. This is a request of counties to honor the information they're getting from DHS forwarded as is, and then add any county related specifics to that. re-interpreting DHS guidance, they can only be a pass through. keep moving forward so fast sometimes with lovely changes that some of these things end up being a mute point. I think the idea of the county is sending out DHS information originally like over the last few years has come about because not all providers were getting the DHS information. I think with DHS's efforts to get, make sure that everybody has an email or communication or everything there that now we pretty much are all getting direct information from DHS. I don't think that we need the counties to be resending any of that information to us. It should just stand as it is. So I don't think we need this one anymore. Maybe two weeks ago, we did before we knew how many of the email addresses for providers were current. - We're not saying that they have to do it. What we're saying is if they're going to do it, they need to send the actual DHS email forwarded with it. We're not saying you have to do this. Everybody's got to send out an email from the county. We're saying, if you do, please forward the email from DHS, along with your information. - Exactly. I'm gonna give a, this is Hollee here. I'm gonna give a perfect example to clarify the masking mandate by the governor. That was pretty crystal clear to me. I'm not saying I agree with it, but it was sent to providers and then several counties, actually many counties were completely split on what it means for providers no, parents don't need to wear a mask. Yes, they do. Some thought that providers needed to, it was, there was so much confusion when at the end of the day, the children's cabinet and the governor's executive order had been shared by us. And we were told what we had to do. So if counties had just sent that information, instead of interpreting it, you know, it was like on a Thursday or Friday. And by Monday they find, you know, we asked the children's cabinet. I think Stephanie, I contacted you and said, can you guys please clarify, you know, what is and is not required to because there's many different interpretations. So this is to prevent interpretations, misinterpretations of state rules and statutes when the DHS communications should stand alone. how lauryn said it was bad. It's about counties not reinterpreting or sending in a vacuum. They're all interpretation. That's very different than what the sentence reads are. If we said include communications from DHS, in addition to county specific information to providers. I'll repeat it again. Include communications from DHS. In addition to county specific information to providers. If there is something coming from DHS, the counties, and I know that they do, they should not be re-interpreting anything. We send it out in Dakota county.

We might say, here's a hotspot. There's some things that you might really wanna look at, but we don't send out interpretations. There may be licensing workers who do, I'm not saying there's not, but that I agree with. And it doesn't, that is telling us that we have to forward communications from DHS and share county specific info with providers. That sentence is telling us that's what we have to do. And I don't agree with that sentence. put it out for discussion. And I would say hearing that then it's almost like county should not add their own interpretation would be the recommendation that county should not do that. And that they should honor the DHS instructions, very different. I understand better now. concept in this discussion that you want to move forward in terms of a motion? - I'm just unclear how this is fitting into a legislative package. Is it a versus? and recommendations for counties. - Right. I'm just wondering though, the vehicle at the task force, we'll just put out this report with the. - There's no teeth to it is my question. There's no legislative requirement that counties abide by this rule. It's just part of the task. task force do have weights. We have county licensor representatives here, but I would say just the recommendations on the discussion is valuable. Could it lead to something else? Yes, but I would say more. What I'm hearing from people is that county should not add their interpretation to a direct communication from DHS. is Senator Kiffmeyer. I agree with that, that the county should not send out information to providers. That is the county's interpretation of DHS. It all needs to come straight from DHS. The way that my emails are received, I get my email straight from DHS. And then I get my emails from the county, my county is they will just do a copy and paste verbatim from DHS, just as information, I don't know. don't know how we get that. Regina, maybe that's something that DH centers could inform counties that they shouldn't add interpretations to it. That's what really adds to confusion. - And I think that's just a conversation with DHS and the counties. I don't know why this is on there personally. - For you, Liz, it might not be an issue, but for many providers, like I said, it's not an issue in my county, but this is something that comes up all the time. A lot of these recommendations under each category are just recommendations and they don't necessarily need to be included in legislation, but coming from the task force gives it more weight. And so I would make a motion. All DHS communications or all communications from DHS are sent as is that county and counties do not provide additional interpretation to those DHS communications and rules and statutes. - I don't know if someone has another wording. - On trying to avoid, all I'm trying to avoid is having about 120 licensors individually keep asking, is this the kind of thing I have to send on? Does this need to go to providers? So lurking in here I think is that we, when we send something out to providers directly, which as, you know, we do more and more, we tell county licensors, they get it. Like we know, you know, a couple of hours ahead of time, usually not tons, but a little bit ahead of time. And we usually have a message in there that says, nope, this email is being sent out to county licensed to providers and you know, by the end of the day or whatever the timing is, and generally they already know we're gonna send it out. As we have more emails, maybe counties will not feel a need to send it out. They try to be helpful. licensors are interrelationship with their providers. They wanna be seen as a source of information and technical assistance and support. And so working in here is a lot of ambiguity. I think about how that relationship with the county licensor continues to be a positive and collaborative source without having us between DHS and the counties worry about what kind of communication did I just send to the counties to some county licensor, think this should go out. I mean, the minute some county licensor says, well, I think that should go to the provider. I'm just gonna forward it on not edited. We're back to why are some people sending certain emails from DHS on and not others? It is if you want to hear more about the changes in statute, beyond just whatever is in the implementation plan. We do that. And we do that now. And we have chilled you all providers with emails, including now Stephanie is roped in with the children's cabinet. So the information I believe is flowing and is flowing in a way that it has never been, but I'm very concerned that having counties forward something on without adding extra. It's so challenging for us to helpfully scope out that we will have, you know, just a lot of gray area and the very thing you all want to do, which is to have consistency. I think this is a tough one. So we're

doing way more to communicate from DHS directly to providers. We've heard that message loud and clear. - Point of order. Hollee here, I'm sorry. I made a motion. I provided clarifying language for this about counties. If they want to share DHS information, they can do so, but not to interpret that DHS communications about rules and statutes and legislative changes, and they could still share county specific information to providers, I made that motion to clear it, provide that clarification. I think it's being made more difficult than it needs to be. And I'm just being honest here, but I made a motion. Someone could second it so we could carry on. I was getting a lot of feedback there. I couldn't hear myself, just when you're saying, I'm looking at it, I'm thinking about the language you just said, and you said, counties can do this, but can't interpret it, but they can share county specific information, I guess. What is the county specific information if it's not that's what I'm confused about is if that, if that county specific information is not them interpreting it, what would that be? I guess is my question. trainings that are being offered are tiered information about financial aid offered by counties, fun events, activities, their newsletters, all counties or many counties, at least put out a newsletter with information and activities and whatnot. And that's awesome. And we definitely want to keep doing that. It's just discouraging from providing interpretations of the state rules and statutes, because that leads to more than 87 different possible interpretations. And the misinterpretations thing comes up all the time. And just so I understand the intent of your motion, the problem you're trying to solve and trying to prevent is that my providers here in Chippewa county and Montevideo get the document directly from DHS and across the river in yellow medicine, they get the county's interpretation of it without the state accompaniment. And there's all the risks of interpretation. So what you want is the providers on both sides of the river to get it directly from the state without interpretation. And if there's any customization, it's about, yeah, here's a fun event or a loan program, but that the meat of how to change your tires is told the same. - But I think if you, I mean, you can make that recommendation, but without it being required, then county can say, thank you for the recommendation. It's not, they're not prohibited from, or it's not the state, same one thing. So I guess I just, I'm struggling to understand the point of this without it being an actual legislative or agency directive. - Well, that's the point of this entire task force, every single one of these recommendations, except the ones that fall under legislative are just recommendations. They aren't. And none of even the legislative ones are not legislation yet. So this is a legislative task force. And so everything you could say, the same thing about any one of these. But, so this is Judy and we need to, there's a motion that's been made. I'm gonna hand this back to the co chair for the regular process on emotion. - I can, but I don't have a language written anywhere, so I'm not even sure what language we are holding on right now. 'Cause it's not the language that's in the document, which I don't think it is. I guess I'm unclear what I'm making a motion about. And I want to be clear with that. - And there's also no second. have to know what the, we know there's a motion, but I don't have, we don't have it written everywhere for everybody to see. So unless we have it written somewhere, I can't say we're making a motion on something. If we can't all look at it. That's my concern right now. - Absolutely. So Ellen or Jake, were you able to capture Hollee's recommended motion here? And I was, if Hollee can restate, that'd be great. 'Cause I don't want, I wouldn't want to say it the way I had to mark down 'cause I don't know if it's accurate. - Okay. I'm trying to write it out again. It's easier to understand. Unless someone has another idea about language. I can rescind my motion so that someone else can make a, if they have better wording. - I mean, wouldn't it be, would it be easier to just say if a county sends out information from DHS about changes to statute, blah, blah, blah, they must send the original language and not include their interpretation of it. that does not even include the DHS. Any Info, any communications sent from counties should not you know, include interpretation of the rules and statutes as that, those communications should come from official DHS communications or something to that effect. - This is Cyndi. If we're just working on a reword, can we just pull it off the table? My view of this is the DHS is reaching providers at a rate and a process that's not been done before. We don't have the same problem that we've had

before we're providers weren't getting information and we, DHS already States and providers should know that interpretation isn't supposed to be happening. So this seems like a redundant, ongoing unnecessary process. So my personal motion or whatever is that we just take this off. And we let DHS take care of the communication directly to providers. And we'll let providers deal with the counties. forward with the spirit of this, the intent of this language and fine tune it before it is included in legislative report for approval by the task force? Because if so, I'd like to make that motion in the interest of moving on. it back for reconsideration with new language? I would suggest approving a recommendation with, I mean, I've suggested a few times the language lauryn's language was good, but so that we can move on, but we've received an interim. I mean, we have, we received a draft report anyways, so we can fine tune the language. It'd be nice to ask this duty so that we can you know, move on to the next ones at the next meeting. I would like to not leave anything undone. - I think it's clear that the interpretation issue is significant for providers and needs to be included in some capacity. It's just whether or not it's strong language or less strong language. So it should, we should come back to it. the co-chair we have, there was a motion and a second, but the motion needed to be reworded at this point. What is your process advice? consideration at the end, what other things have been dealt with. So we don't end up having this one come ahead of so many others, but leave it on a list to be dealt with later on, meantime, Hollee can work on the language and do whatever she wants with that. - lauryn, you're a good word. Smith could you email me your suggestions? (laughs) Are you okay with that? - Yeah, I think that's fine. Come into it right now. - We're not coming to it. Yep. Okay. Next, we have the issue in A two and B three A, both of which say make the Ask-DHS form on the DHS website anonymous and do not require providers to list their licenser. Do you want to take a stab at that, sure? Should we simply take a vote on that particular topic? - This is Ann, I need some, because I think I heard either Hollee or Julie clarify that it wasn't that the provider would be anonymous and yet the reading of it still looks like it's both end. It's like you could be anonymous as the provider and not least your licenser. So if we're truly just saying, if the recommendation truly is just saying they don't have to list their license, or I think we need to remove autonomous piece. should be to make it clear. There should probably just see be a slash instead of, and it says anonymous slash do know what, I mean. Because it's, I don't know. That's kind of a basic way of saying it. That's fine. doesn't put their own contact information. have no way of contacting them. It was to prevent the provider's information from being sent the county. just trying to wrap my head around this too. We'll just be like a Craigslist type email situation. Because even if you give DHS your name, they're gonna know who your licenser is, but then how are they gonna contact you? They would not be contacting your licenser. That was the issue that providers should be able to get answers to their questions without their license or being notified that they asked the question. there's seven minutes left. And I think we're gonna go down a road with this one, like we did with the last one, because I think there's different interpretations as Regina and I have talked about, you know, paperwork, things like that, where it's anonymous or you know, where it's easy to lead someone there is fine. But if it has specific licensing questions about their specific homes and situations, they do wanna check in with the county. And I don't know if other people feel that way or if it's just me as a licensing worker or whatever, but I'm not sure that now six minutes is gonna be enough to solve this one either. my gut says the same thing. Are you all right with tabling this one as well? Any objections? All right, then we have two last things. One is codifying rule into statute or vice versa. Everything should be in one place. Do you want to discuss vote on that? to a different one weekend, but I just want to make sure. - Yeah, but let's go to A three, certified rule and statute or vice versa. Everything should be in one place. We heard some reservations about that. Given the rule process, the statute process, the difficulties of all of that. Do you want to act on that? that until another meeting. last item was that three D consider summarizing each section of rule and statute in one place and following plain language. So, and we heard the difficulty in doing that. Sorry, I'm getting an echo too. a question about process. My understanding was that the things that we

didn't agree on we wouldn't be taking a vote on. And so we've had a lot of discussion. And so I guess I'm still confused about we're having more discussion about them. And my understanding was that the ones we didn't agree on we would be coming back for a vote, if we decided that we wanted to reword it. So I guess I, I would like to hear, I don't know if you have thoughts on that other folks, but I know we're running short on time, but that was my understanding of how the process would work. If it's not going to work that way, I think some clarifying clarification would be good. 'Cause we're just gonna keep discussing these until the end of December if we don't ever decide that we need to take a boat on some things. So we could take item a three D about that and do an up-down vote. - That's fine. - I'm sorry, what's three D? I'm having trouble following on my PDF here. section of Roland statute in one place and possibly use the guide as a starting point. - I'll make a motion to recommend that. we make that recommendation. There's been a motion. Do I hear a second on that motion? - I'll second. This is Julie. And then we'll have to do a roll call vote on this. roll call vote on that motion. The same process as last time. I'll read the names and you need to say no or yay to that. (indistinct) I'll go by first name. So Ami Wazlawik Sorry, I thought it was. Ariane Bromberg. - Let's see, Liz Harris. - Okay. So then by my counts, you have seven yeses and then the rest were nos. The rest, no is however many that is. won't be forwarded on as one to be included in the report. So I think we're at nine o'clock here. Judy, I don't know if you have any, anything you wanna add here before we wrap up. You're on mute if you're trying to talk. - Thank you. We'll make a determination on the date for those tabled items and when they'll be considered, but they should be considered based on some revised language and brief conversation. So we will pick up in October with the other work group that was scheduled just to present tonight. We'll go first on October 20th. And I know everybody's about to hang up and I'm just asking for 30 seconds. I would like to give a shout out and a sendoff for Beth Fraser, Beth is moving on from DHS Licensing has taken a position with a small nonprofit back doing business, organizational work. I'm probably not expressing it right, because we're at the end of the night. Anyway, we will miss her. She's done a

[mumble] job for this taskforce and for our legislative and stakeholder work. And she may or may not still be on the call right now. 'Cause I know she was budding up against something else with family, but I do want to make sure that, you know, if you would have ordinarily emailed Beth after October 2nd, why don't we just say to at least initially just reach out to me or Barb Wagner. Okay? And then we will figure out what world that it hits and just want to make sure that you all know that. And we give her a nice little sound off. So thank you for all that. Thank you. - I just I'm Hollee here. I just want to clarify that item B two A, the implementation group thing. It was not gone over viewed before. So that will be something that will be discussed the next time I assume. that anything that didn't get discussed from this? Well, we'll have to find a spot for it on a, in a future meeting. - Thank you, Cyndi here, you will be greatly missed. We've appreciated you as providers. Thank you for your work. declare victory for tonight. It was a lot of work and I am tired. We all need to get them done. So thanks everyone for being here and for your active participation. And we'll see you at the next meeting. (phone beeps)