

Summary of Connecticut's Proposed CCDF Plan: Public Comments

The Connecticut Office of Early Childhood (OEC) sought feedback and input from families, providers and other stakeholders on Connecticut's draft CCDF Plan 2016-2018. The public was able to submit feedback electronically through an online survey tool and at six public forums held in January 2016. Ninety-two individuals participated in the public forums. The OEC received a total of 348 comments. The following table represents the total number of comments for each section of the draft CCDF plan.

Section	Total number of Comments	Percentage
1	19	5%
2	18	3%
3	30	8%
4	60	17%
5	46	13%
6	52	15%
7	43	12%
8	9	2%
General Comments	71	20%

Section 1: Leadership and Coordination with Relevant Systems

- Work with existing partners around the delivery of quality improvement efforts. Partners suggested: ECCP, AFP, FRC, School Readiness Council, Discovery, and RESC. (9)
- Limited Federal Funding for adequate reimbursement (2)

Section 2: Family Engagement through Out Reach and Consumer Education

- Timelines for developmental screening answer were incomplete (1)
- Reference CHDI's website which includes training tools for early care providers and pediatricians. (2)
- Describe in more detail the partnership with Early Childhood Consultation Partnership (ECCP) including the work with the Preschool Development Grant (1)
- Translate of publications in multiple languages (2)

Section 3: Stable Child Care Financial Assistance to Families

- 12 month eligibility will be a relief for families and a guarantee of payments for providers (6)
- Family income fluctuations calculations should be based on 12 months not the number of months working (1)
- Expand the definition of attending education to include all type of educations (3)
- Positive comments regarding increased access for homeless (4)
- Concerns regarding the graduated phase out with more families being supported for longer and money running out (4)

Section 4: Equal Access to High Quality Child Care for Low-Income Children

- Limiting relative care does not allow parental choice (1)
- Restricting eligibility of relatives for infant/toddler is going to put families in a difficult situation to find a regulated setting (1)
- Eligibility for non-standard hours for 3-12 years old, will be difficult for pre-k / head start schedules who do not attend full-day programs when establishing non-standard hours. (2)
- Relative providers use the C4K subsidy as income to pay rent and put food on the table. By changing the relative care options this will endanger the stability of these families. (2)
- Positive comments for conducting the Alternative Methodology Study (AMS) (4)
- The results of the AMS will show that the rates proposed are even further away from supporting high quality (4)
- Establish a wage board to engage stakeholders and include a \$15 minimum wage for child care workers (15)
- Current proposed rates for reimbursement do not cover the cost of providing care and impedes recruiting high quality staff. (10)

Section 5: Standards & Monitoring Processes to Ensure the Health & Safety of Child Care Settings

- Currently some relative providers use the C4K subsidy as income to pay rent and put food on the table. By changing the relative care options this will endanger the stability of these families. (5)
- Deadline of July 1, 2016 for reducing relative care will create a difficulty for families (4)
- Concern over accessibility of training and at low or no cost (1)

- 3 month orientation is too quick for new staff to complete (2)
- Concern over the change in limiting relative care: (infant/toddler any hours and 3-12 yrs. only non-standard hours) for families with children across age groups it creates scheduling/ transportation problems. (4)
- Difficult for all unlicensed providers to get licensed by July 1, 2016 (2)
- Notification of completed background checks results should be more timely (5)

Section 6: Recruit and Retain a Qualified and Effective Child Care Workforce

- 3 month orientation is too quick for new staff to complete (4)
- Concern over 18 hour orientation training and how those hours would count towards degrees and course credits in the larger professional development system. (3)
- More training on infant mental health and social emotional development. (7)
- Build the professional development system through regional networks that are currently available and work with entities such as AFP and School Readiness Councils. (6)
- Concern over lack of clarity of CQI. (4)
- Concern over requiring higher credentials for staff without a higher salary. (5)
- The Early Learning and Development Standards (ELDS) are well done and should be included as a part of all trainings. (3)

Section 7: Quality Improvement

- Keep quality enhancement funding at local level through councils. (7)
- Lack of communication and details regarding Quality Improvement System (QIS) (8)
- Build on what is happening in local communities like the family child care networks and Family Resource Centers. (7)
- United Way is not seen as the center for quality improvement. (3)
- Keep the AFP support in the regions of the state. (6)

Section 8: Program Integrity

- Keep the AFP support in the regions of the state (3)
- Do not move contract to United Way (2)

General Comments:

- Limited Federal Funding for adequate reimbursement (7)
- Low wages for child care staff should include a minimum wage of \$15 per hour. (12)
- Currently some relative providers use the C4K subsidy as income to pay rent and put food on the table. By changing the relative care options this will endanger the stability of these families. (5)
- Build on what is happening in local communities like the family child care networks and Family Resource Centers (4)
- Happy with the early childhood programs (7)
- Love the C4K program, don't cut it (8)
- AFP should be regional and do not cut the program (4)