

Durham PreK Governance Committee Meeting NOTES

Jim and Carolyn Hunt Early Childhood Resource Center

January 23, 2020 (9:00am – 1:00pm)

In Attendance:

Voting Members: Peggy Ball, Leigh Bordley, Deric Boston (for Terry David), Cathy Collie-Robinson, Drew Cummings (for Wendell Davis), Andrea Daye (for Karen McLeod), Anna Gassman-Pines, Wykeshia Glass, Nakia Hardy, Iheoma Iruka, Michelle Lyn, Beth Messersmith, Ben Rose, Darnella Warthen

Resource Members: Marsha Basloe, Linda Chappel, Alex Livas-Dlott, Danielle Johnson

Guest-- Elizabeth Jones

Support—Maggie Chotas, facilitator; Melinda Rodriguez

Absent: Herbert Davis, Wendell Davis, Tammy Jacobs

WHAT	NOTES
Part A: Welcome, Why we're here & meeting kick-off	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance Committee Chair Dr. Iheoma Iruka welcomed participants and shared her excitement about the opportunity to have time together to deepen relationships and reflect on where the group has been and where it is going. She thanked everybody for the time and talents given so far, calling out the CCSA team for its help in implementing the vision for DPK, for the Task Force, the County Commissioners and the Governance Committee. She gave special thanks to all the families and providers who are bringing DPK to life. • A quorum was established and the committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the last meeting on November 13, 2019. • Dr. Iruka reviewed the session goals, which included gaining clarity about the work by reviewing the history and expectations from the past, celebrating accomplishments and building the vision north star for DPK as it moves forward. She called particular attention to questions about direction, benchmarks and tension points the group needs to grapple with. She encouraged the committee to be comfortable with being uncomfortable when working through tension points. She stated her hope to understand unique and collective roles in this work and make sure all children have access to the highest quality early experiences, all the while ensuring that those who provide care to our young children and babies also feel supported through our system.
Action Taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee approved meeting minutes for November 13, 2019.

<p>Part A: Checking in - Facilitator Maggie Chotas – What’s one element you would like to see in Durham PreK in 2021?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants introduced themselves and shared one element they would like to see in Durham PreK in 2021. • Elements included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Expanded access & funding ○ Durham as a recognized model ○ Increased quality & equity ○ Engaged & supported families ○ Collaborative & aligned early childhood education system ○ Community buy-in ○ Strengthened collaborations & partnerships
<p>Part A – Setting Working Agreements – How will we work together today?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants identified the following agreements for their work together during the retreat: • Respectfully... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Listen to each other ○ Achieve something – get things done ○ Ask questions ○ Encourage ourselves to be creative and open-minded ○ Maintain a high level of engagement throughout the session ○ Celebrate what has been accomplished ○ Acknowledge what Durham has done is really special ○ Dive deeper ○ Be ready to be uncomfortable ○ Apply racial equity lens ○ Take advantage of the time together
<p>Part B – Facilitated section of the Governance Meeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Linda Chappel presented, “What is the history of Durham PreK? What has been accomplished to date?” • Questions, Answers & Discussion about context • Living the Work: What’s before us • <i>Review the Governance Committee Visioning Meeting Notes from meeting facilitator, Maggie Chotas, for the full notes from this section of the meeting’s agenda.</i>

Part C – Business Discussion Regarding the Sliding Scale*

- Reviewed current enrollment by Federal Poverty Level (FPL)
 - Of the 438 seats currently funded with Durham County funds (as of January 3, 2020)
 - 43.4% of families fall below the Federal Poverty Level
 - 29.0% of families fall between 100% to 199% Federal Poverty Level
 - 20.3% of families fall between 200% to 299% the Federal Poverty Level
 - 4.1% of families fall between 300% and 349% the Federal Poverty Level
 - 3.2% of families fall at or above 350% the Federal Poverty Level
 - Governance members requested data on how these percentages compare to Durham County data at next meeting.
 - A little under 50% of children under 5 live below 200% FPL in Durham
- Initial Seat Decline/Acceptance Data (July 2019 initial seat offers)
 - Up to 200% FPL—17 seats were offered and parents declined 17 seats.
 - Between 200% and 300% FPL—86 seats offered, 33 seats declined and 53 seats accepted.
 - Between 300% and 350% FPL—23 seats offered, 15 declined and 8 accepted.
 - Above 350% FPL—65 seats offered, 53 declined and 12 accepted.
 - The average parent fee was \$237.13 for families assessed a 4% of monthly income fee. The average parent fee was \$705.48 for families assessed a 7% of monthly income fee. These monthly fees are for ¾-time care (6.5 hour school day).
- Declined Seats Survey
 - Surveyed families with 4% and 7% parent fees that declined seats for school year 2019-2020; survey was completed either online or by phone. 61% response rate.
 - Asked what factors impacted decision to decline Durham PreK?
 - Parent fee was too high
 - Location assigned was too far away
 - Not satisfied with the quality of the site I was offered
 - Lack of transportation
 - Needed full day of care
 - Didn't have enough time to consider the offer
 - The most common responses from the survey was the parent fee was too high, followed closely by the need for a full day of care and location.

- Some feedback from parents to the management agency was that they were given 3 days to 1 week to make a decision for placement.
- Of families that declined and were using licensed care, 91% of the families were using at least 7 but less than 10 hours of care and majority were paying between \$751 and \$1,000 per month for full day of care.
- **Wrap Care Fees**
 - In the fall, we surveyed all Durham PreK providers about wrap hours (before and after care) and fees
 - The average wrap care rate was \$418.44 per month, the lowest fee was \$200.00 and highest fee was \$690.64.
 - Calculated average cost for full day of care
 - Families with no parent fee – average cost is \$418.44 per month for full day of care
 - Families with a 4% parent fee – average cost is \$649.68 per month for full day of care
 - Families with a 7% parent fee – average cost is \$1,134.15 per month for full day of care
- **Review of the Governance Committee approved SY2019-2020 sliding fee scale**
 - Scale begins charging a parent fee at 300% Federal Poverty Level (FPL)
 - Charges parent fees on a flat percent of a family's gross monthly income
 - Tiered sliding scale fee
 - 4% at 300% PFL
 - 7% at 350% FPL
- **Sliding Fee Scale Recommendations beginning SY 2020 - 2021**
 - Recommendation A
 - Eliminate the 7% parent fee
 - Charge 4% parent fee at 400% FPL
 - Recommendation B
 - Eliminate the 7% parent fee
 - Charge 4% parent fee at 300% FPL
 - Recommendation C
 - Keep current sliding scale
- **Sliding Fee Scale Discussion Summary**
 - Concerned with data from this current year and the high decline of seats from families with higher incomes and how it affects the economic diversity of the program.
 - In January, monthly revenue from parent fees was \$11,053.37. Cost modeling of revenue from parent fees estimates potentially higher monthly revenue from parent fees if parent fees were below \$700 as more families may be more likely to accept their seat offers.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Durham community expresses discontent about the current economic segregation that exists in many of their systems. This could be an opportunity to avoid that happening in Durham PreK. We can still prioritize lower income children, but also do not want them to be in a segregated system. ○ Case studies of families of four were presented of currently enrolled families at 350% FPL. Case studies showed that families were two-working guardian households and employed as teachers, city, county and state employees. ○ Committee member expressed concerned the committee had not had enough time to consider all the variables to make a decision about the sliding scale. ○ Would like to analyze the decline/acceptance and enrollment data annually and keep revisiting the sliding scale. ○ Must consider our long-term vision for the program and the goal of engaging lower income and higher income families. ○ The 7% parent fee may have other unintended consequences. If we remove the 7% fee, we would be more competitive and perhaps attract providers to the system that historically only serve higher income families. ○ Wrap care costs add a lot of cost to many families, requiring them to pay more than the intended 7% of their gross monthly income. ○ For many families, \$1,000 a month is still more than they can pay. If committed to a universal program, would need to be more accessible. Also creates community buy-in and support and can help build our reputation as a high-quality, golden seal program. ○ Discussion about why recommending the parent fees to start at 400% FPL. Many families at 300% FPL are two-working guardian households that need wrap care. Wrap fees add to cost and families at 300% FPL do not qualify for financial support for wrap care. Families at 300% FPL are working, middle-income families. ● Motion to adopt recommended sliding scale for SY 2020-2021. Make the program free for families up to 400% FPL and have a 4% parent fee for families at or above 400% FPL. Cap parent fees at \$1,250 per month (reimbursement rate). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Motion voted and passed with 11 yays and 3 nays.</i>
Action Taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Committee members approved the following sliding scale for SY 2020-2021: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Make the program free for families below 400% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) ○ For families with household incomes at or above 400% FPL, a parent fee of 4% of gross monthly income will apply ○ Cap parent fees at \$1,250 so no parent pays more than the per child reimbursement rate
Summary and Adjournments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Next Meeting is March 4, 2020 from 9:30 - 11:30 am.

** Agenda items with handouts*