



**PROGRAM COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**December 14, 2011 at 8:30 a.m.**  
**15506 County Line Road, Suite 102**  
**Spring Hill, FL 34610**

**Committee Members Present:** Jayne Goldstein, Chair; Ann-Gayl Ellis, Dawn Harvey, Angela Porterfield, Jean Rags

**Committee Members Attending Via Phone:** None

**Committee Members Excused:** None

**Staff Present:** Kim Borrego, Jim Farrelly, Jak Jakubauskas, Betsy Kier, Katie Nelson

**Guests Present:** None

**I. Welcome and Call to Order - Ms. Jayne Goldstein, Chair**

Ms. Borrego called the Program Committee to order at 8:37 a.m. on Ms. Goldstein's behalf. Mr. Farrelly introduced new member, Ms. Jean Rags to the Committee.

Ms. Borrego requested a motion to adopt the draft minutes from the November 9, 2011 meeting as presented. Ms. Ellis so moved and Ms. Harvey seconded the motion. All were in favor with no abstentions and the motion carried.

**II. Discussion, Centers Below and Above Monitoring Standards**

Ms. Borrego briefly described the CAP report for the benefit of Ms. Rags and some of the procedures that take place during the 30-day CAP period. The following centers were reviewed:

TH: Follow up was conducted and minimum requirements were met.

FPH: Follow up was conducted and minimum requirements were met.

LCA: Ms. Borrego briefly explained this center had issued a complaint and was reassessed; their new score was 92%. Mr. Farrelly explained the complaint had been issued against the Provider Specialist and that this center's owner lives out of the country. A peer consultation was initiated with the director.

AFCCH: Follow up was conducted and minimum requirements were met.

EDCC: Follow up is scheduled for this week.

KKCP: Follow up is scheduled for this week.

LR: Did not meet the minimum requirements; CAP was received and approved with follow up scheduled after December 14, 2011.

RP: Did not meet the minimum requirements; CAP was received and approved with follow up scheduled in January.

LS: Did not meet the minimum requirements; CAP was received and approved with follow up scheduled in January.

MPC: Did not meet the minimum requirements and was not utilizing a Coalition approved curriculum. CAP was received and approved with follow up scheduled for the end of December.

FPNPR: Did not meet the minimum requirements; CAP is due on December 17, 2011.

Ms. Borrego informed the Committee that another sixteen (16) providers were assessed and scored 87% or above. Mr. Farrelly explained that fewer and fewer providers are falling below the required percentage and the standards are increasing. The state will begin to impose more difficult standards which may take Coalition staff up to two (2) days to perform an assessment with the new standards. The Quality Committee has committed \$10,000.00 from their budget to field test the new assessment tools.

### **III. Recommendations, VPK Outreach & Awareness**

Ms. Borrego distributed the attached summary of advertising rates for VPK inserts placed in the *St. Petersburg Times*, the direct mail piece and billboard advertising. Each Committee member also reviewed a sample copy of the new VPK direct mail postcard created by Ms. Nelson. Ms. Rags inquired if the prices for the mailing quote reflect the postage increases set to go into effect as of January 1<sup>st</sup>.

Ms. Goldstein suggested adding a line to the postcard that prompted the parent to call a local pre-school or child care center for more information as well as adding that registration is open and children can be enrolled now. A new postcard mock-up will be brought to January's Program meeting.

Ms. Kier informed the Committee that the inserts are typically distributed in January after Super Bowl weekend and the direct mailing piece generally is sent in March. Ms. Nelson explained the preempt agreement for the billboards and informed the Committee that all the billboards were in prime locations.

### **IV. Discussion, "Vision Report" Recommendation**

Mr. Farrelly explained he had requested Ms. Borrego visit other ELC's and providers this past summer to learn what they were doing compared to this Coalition and to create a vision based on her findings for higher quality in our centers. Eight (8) vision recommendations were presented to the Board in September and approved for further consideration.

Ms. Borrego distributed the attached PowerPoint slides on Contract Terms which had been updated with the Board's recommendations. Three (3) different options are being presented: a 2-year Contract Term; a Staggered Contract Year; and an Open Enrollment Period for New In-County Providers.

She explained the 2-year term could be implemented for all providers or just those who have scored a certain percentage on their assessments. The staggered contract year would be for all center based providers (132 centers) and would follow the Coalition's fiscal year beginning July 1<sup>st</sup>. The school age and family child care homes (100 centers) would follow the calendar year beginning January 1<sup>st</sup>. Both of these options would reduce the workload for staff that now has to contend with all contracts being due by July 1<sup>st</sup>.

Ms. Borrego explained that in-county providers are now able to submit an application to the Coalition at any time to become a School Readiness provider. The Open Enrollment option would allow for a set time frame. Currently staff must postpone other assessments in order to perform one on a new provider. One barrier to this recommendation would be a provider from an impoverished area seeking to become a provider and being required to wait.

The Statement of Impact and the Cost Benefit Analysis were also discussed. Ms. Ellis inquired if other Coalitions are doing something like this and Ms. Borrego replied yes and benefits are being seen. Mr. Farrelly explained that attempting to obtain 350 contracts from providers within a short time span is challenging. He believes the Staggered Contract Year option would work best for the Coalition and staff and recommends this option.

After a brief discussion, the Program Committee agreed to have the options for Staggered Contract Year and Open Enrollment Period for New In-County Providers presented to the Executive Committee for final approval at their January meeting.

## **V. Initial Discussion, Eligibility Redetermination**

Ms. Kier explained that the Coalition's current 3-month redetermination policy was enacted by the Board approximately two (2) years ago. Recent survey results and discussions held at various committee meetings regarding continuity of care have determined the 3-month policy is a very challenging issue with parents. Previously, redeterminations had been done every six (6) months but the state has declared that the paperwork is good for one year.

Ms. Kier informed the Committee that all clients fill out a satisfaction survey and they are very critical of the 3-month redetermination policy. Many parents indicate their employers are not pleased with the amount of time that is being taken away from the workplace. Transportation can also be an issue for clients. Ms. Kier suggested several options that may include having redeterminations done by mail, moving a small percentage of clients to a 6-month program or moving all clients to a 6-month redetermination.

Ms. Goldstein inquired how the redeterminations affect the consistency of care for the children. Ms. Kier stated that if the parent does not re-determine at the 3-month period, the children are removed from care. Mr. Farrelly stated that 7-8% of children are being moved in

and out of care every three (3) months, although the eligibility staff is very flexible with setting appointments with re-determining clients.

Ms. Rags inquired if a survey had been done of when other Coalitions are re-determining. Ms. Kier replied this is the only Coalition doing 3-month redeterminations. Ms. Rags inquired what would be the repercussion if it was determined the parent was no longer eligible at six (6) months. Ms. Kier replied the client could reimburse the Coalition or they would be turned over to the state for fraud and the state would make the final determination. She informed the Committee the Coalition would have to repay those dollars to the state. Ms. Kier explained the Coalition relies on providers to keep eligibility staff aware of any changes in the parents' life and due diligence by the eligibility staff is key during the interview.

Ms. Kier stated she would explore this further and bring additional details and several options to the January meeting. A brief discussion followed on why the redeterminations were changed from six (6) months to three (3) months.

## **VI. Conference Update**

Ms. Borrego informed the Committee that the Conference had 647 attendees that included exhibitors, presenters, staff, volunteers and actual attendees. The income from the Conference was \$22,700 with expenses totaling approximately \$16,700 leaving a net gain of just under \$6,000. She explained that options for other venues are being discussed as well as potential key note speakers. She informed the Committee that the evaluations from the Conference have been overwhelmingly positive.

## **VII. Public Input**

Ms. Ellis informed the Committee that the Health Department performs its re-certifications on their clients annually.

## **VIII. Next Meeting Date – January 18, 2012 at 8:30 a.m.**

The next Program Committee meeting will be held on Wednesday, January 18, 2012 at 8:30 a.m.

## **IX. Adjournment**

The Program Committee was adjourned at 9:40 a.m. without further discussion.

Respectfully submitted by,

Ramute "Jak" Jakubauskas,  
Administrative Assistant