Family Child Care Task Force Meeting 11

Tuesday, October 20, 2020

6:00pm to 9:00pm (CST)

Virtual meeting (WebEx)


Task Force Members Absent: Samantha Chukuske, Dan Dorman, Erin Johnson-Balstad, and Marit Woods.

Presenters: Scott Marquardt, Task Force member; Representative Ami Wazlawik, Task Force Co-Chair; and Stephanie Hogenson, Task Force member

Task Force Consultants Present: Judy Plante, Lanterna Consulting; Charlie Sellew, Management Analysis and Development (MAD)

Each Task Force member received the following:

- FCCTF October 20 meeting agenda
- Draft September Task Force meeting minutes (pending Task Force approval)
- Motion for revising FCCTF member reimbursement policy and the revised policy text (will be voted on by members)
- Duty #4 Work Group recommendations
- Duty #4 Work Group presentation
- Duty #7 Work Group recommendations
- Duty #7 Work Group presentation
- Duty #5 Work Group recommendations
- Duty #5 Work Group presentation
- Duty #5 work group-Existing MN and Other State Examples of Child Care Models

Call to order and opening remarks

Co-chair Senator Kiffmeyer called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.
Task force business announcements

Senator Kiffmeyer led the Task Force through the following business items:

- The September meeting minutes were approved via voice vote with no opposition.
- Reconsider motion and vote on updated member reimbursement policy
  - The Task Force considered the proposed motion: “The Family Child Care Task Force adopt the Revised Standards for Qualifying for Per Diem Payments as printed in this attachment [and as amended by the Task Force, if applicable] and that the Revised Standards be effective retroactively to August 1, 2020.”
  - The policy language would be updated to (updated highlighted in red text): “Family Child Care Task Force Revised Standards for Qualifying for Per Diem Payments and for Child Care Reimbursement for the purposes of Minnesota Statutes, section 15.059, subdivision 3: a) a day on which a Task Force member attends a Task Force meeting or a sub-group meeting constitutes a day spent on Task Force activities, for purposes of making daily ‘per diem’ payments to members of the Task Force. b) the Task Force authorizes the reimbursement of reasonable child care expenses that Task Force members incur as a result of time spent attending Task Force meetings or sub-group meetings, that the members would not have otherwise incurred. In this case, ‘time spent attending Task Force meetings’ includes time spent traveling to and from the meeting location.”

The motion passed unanimously with 20 “yes” votes:

- Mary Albert: Yes
- Ariane Bromberg: Yes
- Samantha Chukuske: Not present
- Cyndi Cunningham: Yes
- Representative Lisa Demuth: Yes
- Dan Dorman: Not present
- Erin Echternach: Yes
- Heidi Hagel Braid: Yes
- Elizabeth Harris: Yes
- Stephanie Hogenson: Yes
- Erin Johnson-Balstad: Not present
- Senator Mary Kiffmeyer: Yes
- Kim Leipold: Yes
- Scott Marquardt: Yes
- Kelly Martini: Not present for this vote
- Ann McCully: Yes
- Lanay Miller: Yes
- Hollee Saville: Yes
- Lauryn Schothorst: Yes
- Julie Seydel: Yes
- JoAnn Smith: Yes
- Representative Ami Wazlawik: Yes
- Senator Melissa Wiklund: Yes
- Marit Woods: Not present
Judy Plante (Task Force facilitator) described the voting protocol that would be used for considering the work groups' recommendations.

- The process: Hear from a work group, discuss proposed recommendations among all members, test for general agreement (not a formal vote) on individual recommendations, and bundle recommendations with general agreement into one formal motion to put the recommendations into the draft Task Force report, and conduct a roll call vote. Any recommendations that do not have general agreement will be brought back to discuss at later time.

**Discussion #1: Duty #4 Work Group**

Scott Marquardt (Task Force member) presented Duty #4 work group’s proposed recommendations on business development and technical assistance. The group proposed 9 recommendations, as outlined in Appendix A. Task Force members asked questions and provided comments after reviewing the recommendations.

Judy tested for general agreement on the proposed recommendations from the Duty #4 work group. All 9 proposed recommendations received general agreement and were grouped together. The proposed recommendations from the work group are in Appendix A on page 7. Co-Chair Senator Kiffmeyer moved to approve the recommendations for inclusion in the draft Task Force report.

The motion passed with 20 “yes” votes and 1 “no” vote:

- Mary Albert: No
- Ariane Bromberg: Yes
- Samantha Chukuske: Not present
- Cyndi Cunningham: Yes
- Representative Lisa Demuth: Yes
- Dan Dorman: Not present
- Erin Echternach: Yes
- Heidi Hagel Braid: Yes
- Elizabeth Harris: Yes
- Stephanie Hogenson: Yes
- Erin Johnson-Balstad: Not present
- Senator Mary Kiffmeyer: Yes
- Kim Leipold: Yes
- Scott Marquardt: Yes
- Kelly Martini: Yes
- Ann McCully: Yes
- Lanay Miller: Yes
- Hollee Saville: Yes
- Lauryn Schothorst: Yes
- Julie Seydel: Yes
- JoAnn Smith: Yes
- Representative Ami Wazlawik: Yes
Discussion #2: Duty #7 Work Group

Representative Ami Wazlawik (Task Force Co-Chair) presented Duty #7 work group’s proposed recommendations on training. The work group proposed 4 recommendations for legislative action and a single recommendation for DHS, as detailed in Appendix B on page 10. Task Force members asked questions and provided comments after reviewing the recommendations.

Judy tested for general agreement on the proposed recommendations from the Duty #7 work group. All 5 proposed recommendations received general agreement and were grouped together. Co-Chair Senator Kiffmeyer moved to approve the recommendations for inclusion in the draft Task Force report.

The motion passed unanimously with 21 “yes” votes:

- Mary Albert: Yes
- Ariane Bromberg: Yes
- Samantha Chukuske: Not present
- Cyndi Cunningham: Yes
- Representative Lisa Demuth: Yes
- Dan Dorman: Not present
- Erin Echternach: Yes
- Heidi Hagel Braid: Yes
- Elizabeth Harris: Yes
- Stephanie Hogenson: Yes
- Erin Johnson-Balstad: Not present
- Senator Mary Kiffmeyer: Yes
- Kim Leipold: Yes
- Scott Marquardt: Yes
- Kelly Martini: Yes
- Ann McCully: Yes
- Lanay Miller: Yes
- Hollee Saville: Yes
- Lauryn Schothorst: Yes
- Julie Seydel: Yes
- JoAnn Smith: Yes
- Representative Ami Wazlawik: Yes
- Senator Melissa Wiklund: Yes
- Marit Woods: Not present
- (DHS) Cindi Yang: Yes
Discussion #3: Duty #5 Work Group

Stephanie Hogenson (Task Force member) presented Duty #5 work group’s proposed recommendations on alternative child care delivery models. The presentation covered recommendations for alternative child care delivery systems in between current licensed family and center-based child care models. The presentation discussed existing child care delivery models in Minnesota (traditional model, special family child care, co-located family child care) as well as models in neighboring states, and the work group made 4 recommendations. Task Force members asked questions and provided comments after reviewing the recommendations.

Judy tested for general agreement on the proposed recommendations from the Duty #5 work group. All 4 proposed recommendations received general agreement and were grouped together. The proposed recommendations from the work group are in Appendix C on page 11. Co-Chair Senator Kiffmeyer moved to approve the recommendations for inclusion in the draft Task Force report.

The motion passed with 19 “yes” votes, one “no” vote, and one “pass” vote:

- Mary Albert: Yes
- Ariane Bromberg: Yes
- Samantha Chukuske: Not present
- Cyndi Cunningham: Yes
- Representative Lisa Demuth: Yes
- Dan Dorman: Not present
- Erin Echternach: Yes
- Heidi Hagel Braid: Yes
- Elizabeth Harris: Yes
- Stephanie Hogenson: Yes
- Erin Johnson-Balstad: Not present
- Senator Mary Kiffmeyer: Pass
- Kim Leipold: Yes
- Scott Marquardt: Yes
- Kelly Martini: Yes
- Ann McCully: Yes
- Lanay Miller: Yes
- Hollee Saville: No
- Lauryn Schothorst: Yes
- Julie Seydel: Yes
- JoAnn Smith: Yes
- DHS (Reggie Wagner): Yes
- Representative Ami Wazlawik: Yes
- Senator Melissa Wiklund: Yes
- Marit Woods: Not present
Closing announcements and adjourn

Senator Kiffmeyer closed the meeting at 8:30pm and thanked members for their participation. The next meeting will be on October 27.
### Appendix A: Duty 4 Work Group Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation and priority</th>
<th>Legislative</th>
<th>DHS</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Providers</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>FCCTF Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) One-Stop-Shop:</strong> Develop a one-stop-shop with navigators/technical assistance specialists to help child care providers start up and navigate the system and to provide referrals to child care and business specialists at the organizations that provide supports, with an exploration of how this can be deployed at a regional level to maximize connections to more localized resources. Although this would likely have a website/electronic component, the key element for success is access to “human capital” and the ability to talk with a person. Additionally, at the state-level, this effort would aim to improve alignment of state agencies that have regulatory oversight of child care providers and support providers in navigating these requirements, including the state Departments of Human Services, Labor and Industry, Employment and Economic Development, Health, and Public Safety (Fire Marshall).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Philanthropy, Children’s Cabinet, DEED, DLI, MDH, DPS</td>
<td>Approved for inclusion in draft report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **2) Consistent orientation training:** Develop a recommended/suggested orientation training curriculum for incoming family child care providers, developed in partnership with family child care providers, counties, and DHS, to ensure all new family child care providers have the same critical baseline information. | X | X | X | Approved for inclusion in draft report. |

| **3) Infrastructure needed to support family child care mentors, coaches and consultants:** An infrastructure is needed to allow family child care providers to | X | X | X | Approved for inclusion in draft report. |
Recommendation and priority | Legislative | DHS | Counties | Providers | Other | FCCTF Status
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
access support from mentors, coaches and consultants and receive credit toward their career lattice, credentials, and training hours for Licensing and Parent Aware. A mechanism is needed to recognize individuals in these roles, and allow them to document their hours in a system. Supports are needed to help associations offer these services to members, and to support all mentors, coaches and consultants to provide quality services, and to facilitate payment or documented volunteer hours, as appropriate.

4) **Business training and consultation**: Increase investments in business training, consultation and related services to help providers build and strengthen their businesses and acquire key business skills, such as tax planning, money management, and other aspects of running a business.

| X | X | Philanthropy and Economic Development Organizations | Approved for inclusion in draft report.

5) **Loans and grants**: Provide funding for forgivable loans, microloans, grants, and guarantees for family child care providers, including the potential for more expensive investments, such as home remodeling; in addition to evaluating existing public finance programs for potential policy/eligibility modifications which can better support family child care entrepreneurs.

| X | X | DEED, MN Housing, Philanthropy, Econ Dev Orgs | Approved for inclusion in draft report.

6) **TEACH and REETAIN**: Provide better marketing and communication and more funding for TEACH scholarships and REETAIN bonuses.

| X | X |  | Approved for inclusion in draft report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation and priority</th>
<th>Legislative</th>
<th>DHS</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Providers</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>FCCTF Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7) Training and education pathways:</strong> Provide high school and higher education pathways to train and credential future family child care providers, and encourage qualified existing providers to stay in the field.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>MN Colleges and Universities, Philanthropy</td>
<td>Approved for inclusion in draft report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8) Shared services pilot:</strong> Build on existing pilot efforts to help family child care providers pilot shared services collaborations to test ways to create economies of scale through different combinations of shared services. This may include innovation grants and also helping existing shared services pilot initiatives reach the next level.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>Approved for inclusion in draft report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9) Training for family child care service providers:</strong> Provide training for tax preparers, business advisors, financial advisors, commercial lenders, insurers, and others who serve child care providers, to better understand and serve the industry and to build the ecosystem of support.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philanthropy and Economic Development Organizations</td>
<td>Approved for inclusion in draft report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: Duty 7 Work Group Recommendations

### A. Recommendations for **LEGISLATIVE ACTION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>FCCTF Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Create a Training Advisory Committee: maximum of 15 members; majority are providers; should be a balance of providers from greater Minnesota and the metro area; should include newer and more experienced providers. The Committee should meet a minimum of two times per year, and appointments should use similar language as the FCCTF, including some providers chosen by associations.</td>
<td>Approved for inclusion in draft report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. After 5 years as a provider active supervision training can be completed every third year.</td>
<td>Approved for inclusion in draft report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adult caregiver changes: Change the title and definition of ‘adult caregiver’ to ‘adult helper’ and make it clear in language that this person would be under the direct supervision of the licensed provider at all times and would not have unsupervised access to the children. (See Section 245A.50, subdivision 1a. for language). Remove requirement for physician form and substitute training.</td>
<td>Approved for inclusion in draft report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Providers may count hours that they spend providing training towards their annual required 16 training hours and towards those content-specific training requirements</td>
<td>Approved for inclusion in draft report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Recommendations for **DHS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>FCCTF Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Develop HelpDesk should create short videos designed to help people understand how to do various tasks within Develop. Possible topics include: creating an account, searching for training, applying to become an approved trainer, submitting a training for approval (applies to trainers), updating your Develop record, and printing your training record.</td>
<td>Approved for inclusion in draft report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C: Duty 5 Work Group Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation and priority</th>
<th>Legislative</th>
<th>DHS</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Providers</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>FCCTF Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Recommend legislation that provides DHS authority to develop a process for models of alternative child care delivery models not fully permissible under existing statute and rule that protect child health and safety and provide more financial viability with a focus on smaller communities in Greater Minnesota that have unmet child care capacity needs. There is currently demand for alternative child care delivery models that existing statute and rule doesn’t allow. However, there is a lack of analysis and consensus on what specific changes would address child care business challenges and unmet child care needs while protecting health, safety and development needs of children. This process would allow for idea generation and evaluation of outcomes to better determine recommendations for specific statute and rule changes to create effective alternative child care delivery models that meet the demands of potential providers, communities and families. These could include flexibilities to allow for franchise models of family child care in which there is clear designation of responsibility and liability, staffing structure, education, training and experience requirements, etc. It could also allow for increases in capacity and staffing ratios and structures that are between existing family child care and child care centers. Proposals should be minimally evaluated on the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>Approved for inclusion in draft report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Liability (for the property, the care of the children, compliance, etc.)
- Community support
- Financial viability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation and priority</th>
<th>Legislative</th>
<th>DHS</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Providers</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>FCCTF Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Capital and business support access  
  • Staffing structure and education/experience requirements  
  • Geography (focus on child care shortage areas particularly in Greater Minnesota) | | | | | | |
This process would also require a report from DHS to provide an evaluation of the ideas generated and implemented in order to inform recommendations to create alternative child care delivery models by changing the statutes governing child care licensing and regulations. Authority to approve these ideas could be time limited; however, the programs should continue to remain licensed through an evaluation process that incorporates existing licensing requirements and the evaluation criteria above.

2) Minnesota already has Special Family Child Care options in statute that allow for flexibility that should be further promoted and utilized. We recommend increasing awareness and providing supports and resources for providers and communities to understand these provisions and navigate the existing family child care options in statute, including the “pod models” where multiple family child care providers operate under one roof that is already included in the Special Family Child Care statute.

Recognizing that these options often necessitate additional capital and initial investment, we recommend the legislature, philanthropy and businesses support communities and prospective providers with business support, site assessment and financial modeling to ensure viability of these models as well as funding to support communities and interested providers to start and maintain facilities licensed as Special Family Child Care.

<p>| 2) | X | X | Philanthropy, Child Care Supporting Organizations | Approved for inclusion in draft report. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation and priority</th>
<th>Legislative</th>
<th>DHS</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Providers</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>FCCTF Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) Provide financial supports, tax credits or bonds to support communities and businesses in purchasing, renovating or <strong>constructing</strong> properties for child care facilities, including leveraging underused space in anchor institutions such as nursing homes, hospitals, religious facilities, etc. Prioritize these supports to existing providers seeking to expand or modify their program.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>Approved for inclusion in draft report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Develop a framework in statute for franchise or “corporate” model of family child care ownership. This framework would need to ensure clear designation of the responsible authority and oversight while still allowing for flexibility and innovation to develop programs that meet the demands of potential providers, communities and families. North Dakota statute could be a model to inform this framework.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved for inclusion in draft report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>