

CCDF Plan Areas to Consider 2022-2024 Plans

The CCDF Plans for 2022 are rolling out. Section 1.3.2 of the plan talks about the public hearing dates so note that first. The below lists some possible areas where afterschool advocates can be on the look-out for opportunities. CCDF is funded with almost \$6 billion in regularly appropriated funds for 2020, which means at about \$540 million for the 9% quality set aside. Moreover, there are were \$10 billion in extra funds as of Dec 2020 allocated to CCDF through the Covid Relief package (CRRSA) and there is a bill making its way through Congress now (the American Rescue Plan) for an additional \$39 billion.

As with any funding stream, a large opportunity is always in becoming a partner and consultant in the plan formation and ongoing decision making processes.

Other opportunities include – supporting professional development and quality improvement specific to school age, devising a licensing system that works for school-age programs, looking at the state’s use of grants and contracts to increase program supply and/or improve quality, and promoting standards in SEL and HEPA.

1. Consultation (1.4.1) Subsection (a)(xvi)

a. Rationale - The updated CCDF Plan Document for REQUIRES that states consult with statewide afterschool networks. Being explicitly mentioned in the plan cements the network as a resource to the state as well as to families and providers; it also ensures a strong advocate and voice for the many school aged children served by CCDF funds is present throughout the plan

b. Ask

- a. Can we proactively reach out to the state with ideas on all the ways and areas we might partner?
- b. Were we specifically consulted on this plan?
- c. How strong is our relationship with the lead agency?
- d. What influence/input might we like to have?

c. Example

1. New Hampshire (2016): The Network Lead for the State’s Mott-funded, New Hampshire Afterschool Network (NHAN) participated regularly in the CCDF Plan Task Force. The CDB also has a permanent seat on the NHAN and provides updates to the NHAN regarding the development of the Plan

d. See also: *Public Private Partnerships (1.6); Partnerships to make information available to families (2.1)*

2. Licensing and Exemptions (5.1.1), Includes a list of providers subject to licensing (5.1.2) and those Exempt from licensing (5.1.3); Discusses the process of inspection (5.4.2 and 5.4.3) and the training of licensing inspectors (5.4.4)

a. Rationale – Some of the standards for licensing in early care, such as physical space, transportation, and procedures, do not apply to school-age care and if applied may make the entry so prohibitive that programs would not accept CCDF vouchers. Therefore, states may offer exemptions – which can be useful in encouraging providers to operate. However, note that because licensing is often a component of Quality Rating systems (QRIS) it is also important to know how license exempt programs are treated in other areas of the law so that they can continue to get pay increases and other incentives.

b. Ask

- a. Will any of the current licensing requirements, because they are more geared to early care, disincentivize school-age care operators from accepting vouchers?
- b. Does the exemption process exclude license exempt providers from training or tiered reimbursement structures?
- c. Are licensing inspectors trained to differentiate between early care and school age care?

c. Example:

1. Georgia (2019 Draft) GA exempts government owned and operated programs by state, county, federal or municipal government (includes schools and parks and rec); and School age day camp programs. Notes “in some areas of the state there is a lack of licensed care, meaning that day camps are the only resource available to working families for care outside school hours. Without this exemption category and the opportunity for subsidy children to attend, families and children would be put at risk”

-
3. **Recruiting a Qualified Workforce with PD Framework (6.1)** and How PD requirements are appropriate to providers including those serving different age groups (such as specialized credentials for school-age children) (6.2.4). Sec 6.3.1 (a)(ix) specifically asks how the state might be using funds to provide support for the positive development of school age children

- a. Rationale – For years plans focused on early development, so it’s important to make the case for out-of-school time specific professional development, flexibility, and exemptions from unnecessary trainings (if possible) for school-age providers to get the most out of the required hours of training. Networks that can offer standards, or PD are particularly well – situated. States have advisory committees for professional development, so ensuring school-aged perspectives on the committee will also be helpful.

b. Ask:

- a. Are there school-age representatives on the PD advisory committees?
- b. Does PD offer options for differentiated trainings for school-aged programs?
- c. Does the state or could the state offer a school-age credential?
- d. How can the network support outreach, training, evaluation, etc?

c. Example:

i. IL – 2019 Draft Plan:

1. Public act 096-0864 gives the lead agency the authority to operate Gateways to Opportunity, the IL Professional Development System, and to award the following credentials: Illinois Director Credential; ECE Credential; Infant Toddler Credential; and the **School Age and Youth Development Credential**. (The career lattice has 6 levels and includes these credentials as well)
2. Members of the Child Care Advisory Council and PDAC represent providers of all classifications, The state also has professional development opportunities accessible to providers of other sectors of the early childhood and school-age field....**School-Age/Youth Development Credential Level 1 training series**

- d. *See also: How the state developed its PD Developmental Guidelines mainly for 0-5 but “at the option of the state early learning and development guidelines for out of school time may be developed (6.4.1); and if relevant offer to weigh in on training on health and safety, SEL*
-

4. **REVIST - Quality Improvement Funds**– How the state will assess (7.1.1) and spend (7.1.2) quality improvement funds based on the needs assessments; How funds will be used in supporting training and PD including positive development of school aged children (7.3.1 (a)).

a. Rationale – School age children make up a large percent of those served with CCDF funds – anywhere from between about 20 to 40% of reimbursements come from this age group

b. Ask

a. Does the needs assessment look at school-age populations?

c. Examples:

i. GA – 2019 Draft Plan

1. (7.1.2) The challenges in Georgia’s primary goals for overarching quality improvement include:...”**Increasing supports for teachers of specialized age groups particularly infant/toddler teachers and school-age/afterschool teachers**”
2. (7.3.1 (a)) Licensed care and DOD sites that serve school age only populations are eligible to participate in quality rated, and receive training and technical assistance in best practices for school-age care and education. In 2017, a school-age care position was created at the lead agency as a join position with quality rated and childcare licensing. The role of school age care is to focus on quality improvements for school age programs monitored by the lead agency throughout the state and to create a path for school age programs housed in child care centers to participate in quality rated. **The school age specialist works closely with the Georgia After School Network (GSAN)**

5. **Quality and Quality Rating and Improvement (QRIS) System** – Does the state have a QRIS system (7.3.1) and who is required to participate (7.3.2) including check boxes for school age and license exempt. Does the state have reciprocity with (d) programs that meet all or part of the state school age quality standards (7.3.3)? Is licensing embedded in QRIS (7.3.4 (B)) Are there financial incentives through QRIS (7.3.5)? Does the state use any tools to measure child, family, classroom or provider improvements (7.7.1)? Is accreditation offered for programs serving infants, toddlers, pre-k and school age children (7.8.1)? Describe how state plans to develop or adopt high quality program standards including (c) school age children (7.9.1). And (4.2.6) are there differential rates for providers for higher quality (often related to QRIS) says states may use other quality indicators such as school age quality standards?

a. Rationale – These systems are often how programs are evaluated and can get higher reimbursements, they are also connected to some of the reporting and accountability measures for agencies operating the CCDF funds – so afterschool programs should definitely have a way of taking part which requires a system differentiated enough to offer meaningful trainings and evaluation tools for school age providers. In some state’s licensing plays a role in the QRIS system, so if certain school–age programs are exempt from licensing, ensure there is a way for them to take part. . Quality training should be distinct for different age groups. In a survey of state networks, the majority of respondents felt they could play the largest roles in CCDF plans through “building quality programming.” The afterschool field has quality standards, observational tools and field specific training that could add significant value if included.

b. Asks

- a. Is there an easy path for licensed and license exempt school age programs to take part in the QRIS system?
- b. Does the QRIS system have specific tiers for school age providers?
- c. Do those evaluating under the QRIS system understand the distinctions/have the tools to distinguish between quality early care and school-age care?
- d. Does the state conduct needs assessments to determine quality funding? Is school age a component?

- e. Does quality improvement funding go to training and PD for positive development of school age children? Is the box checked and well-explained? If not, why?
- f. If so, does or can the network help flesh out a more detailed system?
- g. Can the network or a partner provide some of the PD, TA, or evaluation work in coordination with the lead agency to support the QRIS system?
- h. If tied into an accreditation system, are school-age accreditation programs included?

Examples: GA – 2019 Draft Plan

- Georgia’s primary goals for overarching quality improvement include:...”**Increasing supports for teachers of specialized age groups particularly infant/toddler teachers and school-age/afterschool teachers**”
- Licensed care and DOD sites that serve school age only populations are eligible to participate in quality rated, and receive training and technical assistance in best practices for school-age care and education. In 2017, a school-age care position was created at the lead agency as a join position with quality rated and childcare licensing. The role of school age care is to focus on quality improvements for school age programs monitored by the lead agency throughout the state and to create a path for school age programs housed in child care centers to participate in quality rated. **The school age specialist works closely with the Georgia After School Network (GSAN)**

6. **Health and Wellness, SEL, HEPA** – These themes occur throughout the plan including how the lead agency partners with parents, providers and the public with research and best practices including HEPA (2.4.4); optional standards for nutrition physical activity developmental guidelines on areas like SEL; supporting training and PD of workforce including SEL/HEPA; and program standards on health, mental health, nutrition, physical activities

7. **Consumer Education Websites (Secs 2.3)** – May be good to understand what this system looks like for programs and parents and how to ensure it is user friendly and effective. References include

8. **Grants and Contracts:** Does the state agency offer child care services through grants or contracts (4.1.6 a) and does it offer for school age children 4.1.6 b (iii)? States can give funding rather than a voucher with the student for a service to increase program supply or quality in a number of areas including to programs to serve school age children. Illinois for example provides contacts to community based agencies. These grants may provide more program stability which can also help to build out quality over time.

9. **Health and Safety training (5.3), [Trainings are required of all providers](#)**, including license exempt. However, it is expected to be relevant and age appropriate, so there may be flexibility for school-age providers to receive necessary training but not necessarily training on sleep practices and or SIDS. States have a minimum required number of hours of training – if the state is open to ideas- networks might think to offer alternative trainings on the health and safety needs of older students such as healthy choices against drugs and alcohol, safe technology use, trauma informed care etc. Some states provide funding to help comply with the minimum health and safety requirements (7.3.5) See also: Uses of quality funds (7.2.2) and other boxes on training and PD (7.3.1) including SEL/HEPA, parent engagement and culturally responsive instruction

10. **Background Checks (5.5)** the new law requires more extensive background check requirements for programs. This section outlines the states system for background checks. Having a system that’s relatively

inexpensive, timely, and easy to navigate will be important to keep programs invested in accepting CCDF vouchers. Illinois for example: does not charge providers for fees incurred to conduct background checks. All costs incurred are paid for by the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (IDCFS). IDCFS in accordance with the inter-government agreement bills the lead agency for all costs incurred for conducting background checks for the license exempt provider population.