

Arizona Department of Education
Health & Nutrition Services
Family Child Care Homes Advisory Council
Tuesday, July 29, 2008
9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
JULY MINUTES

Kenny Barnes – Family Child Care Homes (FCCH) Advisory Council Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Advisory Council Attendees:

Deanna Barrowdale	Mid-State Child Care & Nutrition
Lori Mendoza	Association for Supportive Child Care
Phyllis Montgomery	Child & Adult Community Resources
Cathleen Moore	Food for Children
Kenny Barnes	Arizona Department of Education

Other Attendees:

Stacey Gyenize	Community Nutrition Resources
Katie O’Neill	BJ Enterprises
Cathleen Reagan	Az Association of Family Day Care Providers

Public Participation Request forms to Advisory Council Chair.

Welcome and Introductions:

- Is everyone doing good – now don’t everyone answer at once. Let’s go ahead and get started. What we’re going to do today is – I’ll give you an update on the AA Standards, an update on the new Permanent Agreement and then I’m just going to turn it over to you guys. I want you to give me your comments on what you thought about the training that we had about a week or so ago and what you liked about it and what you didn’t like about it. What would you like to see next year, things like that – it’s never too early to start planning because I don’t want to get caught behind the eight-ball. And, because this is such a short meeting or short agenda, I should say anything out there that anybody wants to talk about is open for discussion.

AA Standards: (K. Barnes)

- As far as the AA Standards and where we are today. They were sent off to USDA to get their blessing and they sent it back that there were a couple of areas that they wouldn’t buy-off on and right now, we are in the process of making the changes that USDA wants to change. Because of that, we still have to send it over to our AG’s and make sure that the changes that USDA wants are okay from a legal standpoint and make sure that both sides are coming together. I just got that response yesterday – so once we get everybody’s blessing... and when I say that, I’m talking about the AG’s and USDA. What we are going to do is then setup a meeting with you guys and the purpose of that meeting will be to go over the new AA Standards, all right. Now, these will be the AA Standards. Again, these will be the AA Standards that have been Okayed by the AG’s and these will be the Standards that have been Okayed by USDA. The purpose of that meeting is to kind of let you know the changes

that have been made from the draft that was given to you all a month or so ago all right. At that time any kind of comments that you have pertaining to those revisions you can make them at that time, okay. Any questions? (K.Barnes)

- P. Montgomery arrival at meeting and Kenny now taking time to give Phyllis the same information.
- Once the AG signs off on it and USDA signs off on it then we will send them to you guys again. Get everybody in here and go over those revised AA Standards and let you know what those changes were from that initial draft that we gave you about a month ago. Unfortunately, I don't have a date as to when that meeting is going to be because I don't know when we're going to get the official "okey-dokey" from both the AG's and USDA. (K.Barnes)
- So, we will be allowed to make comments and suggestions after you do that? (P.Montgomery)
- Yes, now – I'm sorry, go ahead. (K.Barnes)
- I was going on the same wavelength – Will we be able to make changes after that? (K.O'Neill)
- No. No it's not. (K.Barnes)
- So what is the point of us giving comments – this sounds like a lesson on futility. Really Kenny – if you give us a meeting for us to make comments and then listen to your reasoning behind it. (C.Reagan)
- No, wait – your comments were taken into consideration. Changes were made to those Standards from your comments. (K.Barnes)
- How do we know Kenny, we just can't take your word – we took your word before on Standards. (P.Montgomery)
- You're not taking my word – You're not taking my word – You're going to see the final draft. I mean, if this is just a matter of you just taking my word for it, we wouldn't have assembled you all together again – We would have said -- here are the new AA Standards. (K.Barnes)
- The purpose of that meeting would be to participate not just look at the final draft. The purpose of the meeting is to have some influence on what is said on the final draft. We don't just want to see the final draft and just make comments. (K.O'Neill)
- Actually, in a letter to the Sponsor's Network organization, isn't that what Tom Horne said – That a meeting of all the affected parties would be held prior to the final draft. That's how I understood it. (C.Moore)
- Will be held prior to the final draft? (K.Barnes)
- Yes, he did – All the concerned parties. And that's what you know – this does not seem like a "user friendly thing" that you're doing. I don't see what keeping us in the dark – coming with, why take it as you say – you didn't have to do that. That's why we started this committee and one of the other things that I would really like to question is that: When we request an 'emergency meeting' – Why is it that we are not getting that emergency meeting until you guys feel like it. That's not the setup of this Advisory Committee and if it is then it's just a failure of process that we can't get a meeting when we request one until you guys want to scratch your head and come up with one. And then come up with one like you're doing now, where it's not for comments it's just for a (?) reading of Standards. (P.Montgomery)
- I don't know about anybody else, but did you get a copy of the Advisory Committee Policy? Phyllis question to C.Moore. (P.Montgomery)

- The Bylaws? (C.Moore)
- Yes, the Bylaws and this is just so that we can get that meeting. So, what I am saying to you is, if we are to work together – that’s one of the major things that we are supposed to work on together. Is that when we request a meeting it’s taken them – it’s been over two months almost and we still have not gotten this Emergency Meeting but yet still you come to us telling us that you’re going to drop the Standards on us with no suggestions from us – you’re commanding us that this is going to be AA Standards. We are the stockholders in this along with the providers and all we are doing is asking that we be allowed to see what they are doing and to suggest or even show where that some of the things that they suggesting may not be beneficial to the people that we serve nor to the State. We don’t know the reasoning of why the Standards were changed – there was nothing wrong with it them prior to.
(P.Montgomery)
- The big question is – What was ADE not in compliance with? (K.O’Neill)
- That I’m not sure but I just know that USDA made their management evaluation and said that the Standards that were in place were not good enough. That they were not ‘strong enough’. (K.Barnes)
- That’s not what we were told by your workers. We were not told that – we were told that this is something that you guys have to change – have nothing to do with the Feds they didn’t have a problem with the – this is once again ... (P.Montgomery)
- No, I don’t mean to cut you off but they did have a problem with it, because like I said – not all that came about because we told by USDA that the Standards that were currently in place were not strong enough and that we needed to go ahead and revise them. (K.Barnes)
- Well, that’s not what your worker expressed – That’s when we called Mandy.
(P.Montgomery)
- I can’t speak for Mandy or anybody else upstairs – but I do know that all this came about because of what we were told by USDA at our ME. Okay, what Mandy told you or anybody else told you – I’m not going to put my foot in my mouth and speak for them. (K.Barnes)
- I’m not asking you to. (P.Montgomery)
- Okay, I’m just letting you know. It’s not like we just woke up one morning and said “you know what, let’s change the AA Standards – I’m not feeling my best. Everything that we do is a result of something that happened or something that we’ve been told by USDA that we have to act on, okay. When we took on this task of revising the Standards, it was in response to something that we were told by USDA and again, what it was specifically that we weren’t in compliance with or wasn’t strong enough – that, I don’t know. But I do know that USDA did tell us based on one of the ME’s that we had that the Standards currently in place were not strong enough and that’s the reason we had to go back and revise them. (K.Barnes)
- Can you find out specifically what it was that ADE was not in compliance with directly out of the ME? (K.O’Neill)
- I’d be glad to find out, that is not a problem. (K.Barnes)
- Yes, because that would be the reason to change - If you can find out specifically and have ADE make those changes to the Standards and leave everything else alone. (K.O’Neill)
- The health stuff – that all come probably about a year after I started – the AA Standards situation and as far as revising it because it wasn’t strong enough that all happened within the past 12-18 months. That’s not a problem, but again, I don’t want anybody walking out of here thinking that, you know – if he doesn’t have anything else better to do then just pull something arbitrarily or create or revise something – you know my motto is, “if it’s not broke don’t fix it”, okay. (K.Barnes)

- Then where did it go? (P.Montgomery)
- Well, according to USDA, it was and that's who we take our direction from. And so when they say, "this is not strong enough we need to revise it – We are not in a position to say: Well, yes it is and we're not doing it. (K.Barnes)
- Yea, but if it wasn't strong enough, Kenny – I don't see why you couldn't tell us and the State couldn't tell us what wasn't strong enough – I don't see why we couldn't have, we are the stockholders in this as well as the people we serve and if we are doing something wrong I don't see why it couldn't have been brought to our attention in a much better way that what you guys have done.
- Okay, now we can open to a whole separate issue – Now because first, the issue was that we changed the Standards when there wasn't anything wrong with it, when we do things like that. Now we're being told by USDA that the Standards aren't strong enough. Now it's a matter of – How come we didn't tell you what it was. Honestly, it wasn't going to make any difference what we told you what was wrong or wasn't wrong – because when they said you need to change them and make them stronger – that's what we have to do. (K.Barnes)
- Have they changed any wording in there Federal Regs, because that wording was clear in there – so have they changed it? If you didn't understand it – (P.Montgomery)
- As far as what, As far as what though? (K.Barnes)
- That's what I'm saying, has any of the wording been changed in the Federal 7.2.63 or whatever – has any wording been changed in that, in the requirements? (P.Montgomery)
- That would still be wrong because AA Standards are direct from the Regs. (C.Moore)
- That's what I'm trying to figure out – where is he coming out with it? Is it something that the State is requiring because they wanted to adjust them, because so far – we see nothing in writing where the Feds said that they wanted to do any change. (P.Montgomery)
- Actually, I think I emailed you some questions I sent to Jesus Mendoza(?) (C.Moore)
- That is what was so bewildering because he said the specific regulation and I haven't heard back from him, so that's what is so bewildering to me – is that why USDA is saying these aren't strong enough or these are not regulatory when they clearly are in the Federal Regulations. (C.Moore)
- Whoa – you're questions is? How come the Standards aren't strong enough when, for the most part the are clearly in the regs. (K.Barnes)
- Yes, I think along with Katie – we need to get some specifics: What are USDA's objections to using the Standards? (C.Moore)
- Or the questions that we had asked in our letter to them (USDA) is what is broke – Nobody is clear to us in anything – even the Standards that they require. I really think that a lot of this is – I mean, this ties to it – Is that why? Once again, it gets back to the Advisory Committee. Requesting a meeting whether you have these answers ready or not we should have been allowed to have that meeting in a timely fashion instead of 2-months later. That really bewilders me because that is why we are up here for and if can't go by the policy in which we established as a group that the State went along with – What are we here for? I don't see any reason to be here if that be the case. None of us should, because that's what we're here for - we want to work together and that surely shows me – there's no working together. That's a 1-sided thing when they want to call the carpet then 'that's it' and that's not the way it's supposed to be. And we all have to stand for something, we all need to question this and get to the bottom of it because we are going to have other issues down the road. Are they going to be settled like this – where the people that we serve are the ones who get cut?

Because this is what this is going to affect and my goal is to help people that are lower migrant income families, those are the ones I reach out the most to. (P.Montgomery)

- Then one response I'll make to your comment as far as this being 1-sided and I'll just put it out there. If it was actually 1-sided then nobody in this room would have had an opportunity to make any kind of comments – we would have made changes and would have passed them out as your new revised Standards. So it's not 1-sided, it may be 1-sided in your opinion. (K.Barnes)
- Kenny, I'm going to get into that with you – you can go. I'm not going to get into that with you, that is petty to me. Still my understanding is that we are an Advisory Committee and when we set this committee up; this committee was setup to handle situations like those that we are dealing with now. When we have issues with our providers, rules and regulations and policies that we discuss now and we be a part of. What you telling me – You didn't give me no privilege – that ain't no privilege to make comments, that was my duty to do that. (P.Montgomery)
- That was one of the privileges I was asked for to give you a 10-day comment period. That's what you asked for that's what you get. (K.Barnes)
- No, as far as I'm concerned and I know a lot of us think the same way – is that the Advisory Committee that is not our policy. Our policy is to assist our providers and any type of policies and rules that come up that we look at it and to assure that it's doesn't disenfranchise the people that we serve that need this program. And, what you're telling me now is that you gave me the privilege – I don't think you gave me the privilege. That's no privilege; you can make comments all day if nobody listens to them then that's no privilege. (P.Montgomery)
- But you know what – you saying nobody listens to them – you haven't seen the final draft. How do you know nobody listens? (K.Barnes)
- Why is it hiding – why couldn't you show me this draft that you said you have. (P.Montgomery)
- Who said it's hiding – why would we have you comment before we send them off to USDA.
- Why are you telling me that I'm no going to have any more comments that can be made if I see something that is not feasible for my clientele and you tell me that it is going to be point blank – this is a given and not a give and take. Then that tells me it's a 1-sided thing. (P.Montgomery)
- No – and that your opinion and you are more than entitled to it. You know, but what I'm saying is – I give you a draft and whatever changes we've made based on your comments – we give you a draft, okay – you looked at it and you say, Okay, this looks pretty good. We still have to send it off to USDA for them to okay it. Then they come back and say, well this is wrong – we don't like this blah, blah, blah. Now we make changes and it might have been something you had been okay with – Now ... (K.Barnes)
- They should have done it as a draft – it shouldn't have come to us as a final and saying this is what the Standards are going to be. (K.O'Neill)
- No, this was a draft – cuz I made it clear – If it wasn't a draft then I wouldn't have asked for your comments. It might not have “draft” stamped on it but that was the whole purpose of it. It was a draft – Because if it wasn't a draft – Then why would I give it to you initially to take and make comments. (K.Barnes)
- Well, because you are required to by the Ombudsman. (K.O'Neill)

- Okay, but still though – you know, and again that’s your interpretation – that’s your comment. It may have not been stamped “draft” at the top but I thought I made it real clear when I passed them out that it was a draft. (K.Barnes)
- This Advisory Council seems like a real waste of time – you just can’t sit around a table and talk about this and then send it to USDA and get it done. This is a facade. (C. Reagan)
- And that’s what the people that we serve feel like when we go back and talk to them about this and we as Sponsors, we need to get all our Providers in on this because if we don’t this is going to continue to happen. Why do we have an Advisory Committee when we have no input into something that’s already been put in place? They don’t even go by the policy that we made, when we make comments – and ask them to be corrected. I don’t get another revised note saying that it’s been corrected. All I know is that it’s in the final draft is that those minutes, if you see any changes – I haven’t been seeing them come back to me with the corrected changes on them. So, that’s another thing but also, the major thing is – Why, we need to question – What is the Advisory Committee for? All of us need to question that – because if this is going to take my time up then I don’t need to be here. I can be helping the clients that I serve. Because I not helping them by doing what we’re doing with these Standards. We take this back to our Providers – just think how they feel? (P.Montgomery)
- Okay, so you tell me – How would you have liked to have seen this happen? (K.Barnes)
- The correct way – Where you like us and work with us as a team. (P.Montgomery)
- Well, you have to be more specific, not just the right way. (K.Barnes)
- We need to know the objective – Why they want to change what they’re changing? What were we not doing to make them feel that this was something that needed to be changed? What is the objective? And, what was the concern? (P.Montgomery)
- Going back to the history of the AA Standards – and how a group from DES, ADE, and Sponsors created and implemented them. Katie to provide minutes and information of when original Standards were put into place. (K.O’Neill)
- I agree in – the Advisory Council was set up so that we could be the voice of our Providers and for Sponsors to participate. I don’t know what this would do to participation. Providers rely on this program and we want to have more involvement. (L.Mendoza)
- What is the goal? – We need to go over point-by-point and make a new meeting. (C.Reagan)
- In June 2007, we received a letter that said “No more Alternately Approved homes” in Arizona – then it took us until December before we could resolve this issue. Yes, this would have been something to bring back to the to the Advisory Council. (C.Moore)
- The things that are going and my Providers are constantly been giving me calls lately. Is that, with the cost of living changes – and when I say cost of living; everything – the gas, the food, everything has gone up extremely high and why would we want to pull the carpet from underneath the people that we serve for the children and I know this for a fact – I get calls constantly saying that – you know that milk is going up, bread is going up – this is a heck of a thing to do at this time that will cause us Providers to go underground and not be a part of this program and not be able to serve those balanced and nutritious meals. The reason why we even exist is because that should be our objective and goal is to feed those children and to be sure, that they get those balanced nutritious meals without putting roadblocks and stumps in their way. Their going to do their share – they have to go under – they are because I have providers that have told us: You know what, this program is awfully good, and I’m going to have to keep the kids regardless. And you know – just meeting the goals of having to buy the food. You have to consider that is not payment for childcare this is reimbursement. I don’t know anybody in here that can go even to McDonald’s and get a good meal for \$2.18 a

lunch. I mean, even McDonald's has gone up to \$6.00 for a Happy Meal and I don't like it. You know, I mean but that's just a part of it and that is something that we have to consider to bring another change into these Providers homes at this time. It's going to be costly to them and we are going to bear those costs – they can't because if they could – a lot of them wouldn't have been on the program and that is what we need to consider. We are here to serve the children – We are forgetting what our goal – I don't think we as Sponsors are but I think the State is forgetting what this program is setup. It's for the nutrition for the children that are out there. Most of the children that I serve and the parents that I serve and the Providers – they are low and moderate income families that never new there were 4-different food groups until we came along to educate them. And now that we're doing it and we're getting some feedback and getting them to go the right direction then we have this roadblock in the way that they have to come up with more money to get some of the things that you require that need to be done that they can't afford. And we have grandparents to some of these children that – how are they going to attend school, 180 hours worth of school that you guys had in there before and then come in the next day and take care of the children – something is going to have to lack. In order to let them get their homework done, some child is going to stick their hand in the plug cuz they're too busy trying to get their homework done for tomorrow night. So, we have to consider all of that and that is why I'm asking all of you ladies here. Get your Providers and we're going to do what we gotta do. We've gotten to that point. Because we as Sponsors, we are not meeting the goals with the Advisory Committee – I think that we are just making noises and nobody is hearing us because Kenny can't answer all the questions so send us somebody that could have, you know.
(P.Montgomery)

- We need to consider the impact of what changes will do to Providers (K.O'Neill)
- I agree, enrollment is dramatically down already by 50% DES dropped. There could have been a better approach – the program was put into place to serve nutritious meals to children and it's just depleted. (D.Barrowdale)
- Kenny, when you introduced Standards and told us to comment – well, we also need to have a plan as to “how to implement”. Are the old Providers going to be grandfathered in? Give us a plan to implement the new Standards so that we all do the same thing. (C.Reagan)
- And, also – we need to make sure that when we leave here today – that he come back to us with some information on the Advisory Committee Policy that we are not abiding by. We need to know, because when we ask for a meeting we don't need to have this come down like this anymore. We need to be shared into whatever process or policy that they put in place and we need to know that we have power as a group to work with them and not for them ‘only’ – cuz that is the way it is setup. Now is that why we're here and we don't know anything except to come to us with a letter or some proposal that none of us had input for. So, you know that policy – what is it good for if we are not going to abide by it. Now Kenny, when we request a meeting, what's the deal at we can't get a meeting within the timeframe. Whether you have the answers from the Feds or not we should still we should still be able to meet and express our concerns as an Advisory Committee. (P.Montgomery)
- We would have had a bit of a heads-up on that Kenny. (C.Reagan)
- We didn't get any comments from you on that as a future and immediate fix on - when we as an advisory committee meeting we need to be able to meet and when we ask for an emergency meeting we need to follow our policy and not tell us – when we get we'll meet with you. We haven't met with you yet. We understood that you may not have known that but you knew that last time – so that shouldn't be a reason to keep us from getting together

and when we call an emergency meeting to respond to questions that we have.
(P.Montgomery)

- I can ask that question for you. I still take my direction from Melissa and Mary and they felt that an emergency meeting was not necessary at that time. (K.Barnes)
- I understand that you take your direction from them – but it would have been good for you to give us that information in writing. We would have loved to have that in writing, that comment – that they didn't feel we needed to have that meeting. We would love to have that in writing so that we can make sure that we all understood that's why we couldn't. We didn't get anything in writing just your word of mouth. So anything like that when they deny us a meeting – we want it in writing, so that we can make sure that when our Providers call and we tell them that – they have to say, well as soon as we get back those Standards we have a group of Providers that represent the communities that we serve we took this to them and that was the first thing they put up on the line. It's by us not telling them “we don't know” this is just going to be the Standard – just think how irate they were about the Standards being changed with no input and how they looked upon it. So it would have been good to get that in writing so that they will also know that we doing all we can possibly to stand for what we should be doing as the Advisory Committee for them and to speak for them. (P.Montgomery)
- Where is the document from the State? Where are the Standards? (L.Mendoza)
- We all need to be on the same page. (K.O'Neill)
- Do you want more of a Work Group or an Advisory Council? (K.Barnes)
- They are one and the same. (K.O'Neill and C.Reagan)
- We want what we have but we want it to work. This isn't working because evidently if it was we wouldn't be in the situation that we're in now. We would not be distraught over what you guys are doing behind closed doors that you don't include us as the workers. We are the ‘worker bees’ we are the ones who deal with these Providers from day-to-day. What you tell us, we have to take back to them, so if you inform us wrong then we're telling them wrong. If the puzzle fits together – we should have been working together from Day One. (P.Montgomery)
- Can the Advisory Committee have a copy? (C.Moore)
- I'll check. (K.Barnes)
- Kenny, you know how we all felt about this thing. I don't see why you couldn't have relayed that in the meeting when you as caseworkers had the meeting with Melissa and Mary. Why you couldn't express that to them and how concerned we were about that, because we hold you as our highest man. (P.Montgomery)
- They know how concerned you are. (K.Barnes)
- Evidently, somebody must have been telling like cuz that went ahead doing what they were doing without getting input from us. They delayed the emergency meeting that we requested. (P.Montgomery)
- I guess my question is not just to you but everybody – What do you want me to do in an instance like that. (K.Barnes)
- I want you to do the right thing. (P.Montgomery)
- And what is the right thin. (K.Barnes)
- The right thing would have been to get up and say – You know what before we go any further with this meeting, I have some concerns from the Advisory Committee members that are very concerned about that and I think that there input would be great. (P.Montgomery)
- Okay. (K.Barnes)

- That's all you would have to say. (P.Montgomery)
- Okay and I've said that and now what? (K.Barnes)
- Well evidently, you didn't say it cuz we didn't get it. (P.Montgomery)
- How are you going to say evidently, I didn't? When did I say that? (K.Barnes)
- You already done told me you didn't – when I talked to you earlier. (P.Montgomery)
- Kenny, you say that and then you still deny it and then contact us and say I did the best I could with it. (C.Reagan)
- Yeah, cuz we have honor in you. (P.Montgomery)
- So at least we know that you tried. (C.Reagan)
- Anybody have comments? (K.Barnes)
- No other comments given here.

Permanent Agreement: (K. Barnes)

- The Revised Permanent Agreement – Mary Szafranski and our Attorneys are meeting this afternoon to go over that. Once we get word on whether it's okay or not and if we need to make any changes. We'll let you know and we'll then send it out. I believe there is only one change that was actually made to the Agreement. So, other than that the P.A. will stay the same. (K.Barnes)
- Do you know what that change was? (C.Moore)
- I believe it was in regards to the Immigration Bill. Having to actually be a citizen to be in the program. (K.Barnes)
- Would this be legal citizen? (C.Moore)
- You can phrase it anyway; you want to base on what the House Executive Order was. Now if it uses of the verbiage that you just said then we can go with that – all right. That is the change that was made to the Permanent Agreement. (K.Barnes)
- Do the Providers have to do that? (C.Reagan)
- The contract with the State and the subcontract with the Providers. (K.Barnes)
- Then the Providers don't have to? (C.Reagan)
- And you know what - That, I haven't had any kind of communication on. (K.Barnes)
- So will there be some kind of written note? (C.Reagan)
- We need a definition of contractor and subcontractor and how changes will affect our program. Also, get the AG's written comments on those changes. I want to know before signing off on a Permanent Agreement with the State. (C.Reagan)
- Would you like something like that – because I wouldn't know? (K.Barnes)
- Well yes, because I need to know the definition to give that at training. Clearly, I read it as pretty clearly, as if you don't get a monetary benefit from the person you subcontract to – then they are not subcontractors. I don't get a monetary benefit from them so therefore why have it on the agreement – I'm not an attorney so don't understand why you need to have it. You need to explain to me – For everybody that already on the program? (C.Reagan)
- I have down here that in addition to the Permanent Agreement you would like an explanation as far as what a contractor is.... (K.Barnes)
- I have a handout from the National Association of Family Care Providers on the food program. I think this was from USDA and it's a piece on CACFP participation regardless of immigration status. I think that this actually was sent to Melissa and Mary and Tom. Did you have any response? The handout given to Kenny to review and give to Mary to take to AG's office for comments. (L.Mendoza)

- Melissa made a response to Mary. I saw it while I was at home last week because I wasn't in the office. I only saw the email – I'll take a look at this. (K.Barnes)
- Do you want to comment on this Lori since you handed this out and know what it is. (K.Barnes)
- Well, this is a FRAC publication – and my interpretation of this is that the immigration status of the child does not affect eligibility to participate in program. About 20% of children come from migrant families. (L.Mendoza)
- Please share with Mary before the AG's meeting this afternoon. (K.O'Neill)
- Now as far as this Social Security number deal – I know what we do for Centers. It's not so much the fact that the Center itself doesn't have to list the SS# but the family. So, if I'm taking my son to a childcare center but don't have a SS# – as a parent I'm the one who writes 'none' on that income affidavit. That doesn't pertain to the Director of that childcare center. So that's what I'm referring to what it says here on where you should write the word 'none'. (K.Barnes)
- Child Care Centers have to be licensed. (C.Reagan)
- Was Mary copied on the email or was it just Melissa and me. (K.Barnes)

Comments about the recent Training:

- I want to get you comments on the training we recently had – whether you liked it. What you liked about and what you didn't like about it. What you would like to see next year and any additional training that you think you would like to have before next year, anything like that. I'll go ahead and take your comments.
- Why weren't there any Power Points with this training? (D.Barrowdale)
- I thought the presentation was well prepared and we had the opportunity to ask questions. I liked the activities. However, I was overwhelmed with the civil rights and the responsibility to train the Providers. It's not an area that we have given much attention to – We need training on how to train the providers. (L.Mendoza)
- I would have liked a budget packet to look at during the meeting so that we could ask questions and see what has changed rather than getting a million of emails two days later. Maybe the State is thinking this is paperwork reduction, but it's not – if we just have to open each email and print it on our end and as I say, it would have been nice to have it and ask questions. (C.Moore)
- I agree that the civil rights were overwhelming. I agree that was the major thing is that budget packet needed to be available right then so we could go thru it if I had any questions. You were very helpful when I called and Mandy got back to me very quickly. (P.Montgomery)
- Okay, let me stop you right there and go back to civil rights. (K.Barnes)
- Yes, it was a little bit overwhelming – because you know, we're not used to all that language and Tracey couldn't answer any questions. She was telling us that Melissa and Mary were getting with other agencies. When there is something that is not resolved then I think it should be brought to us at a Training Meeting when you can't answer questions and don't have the people there that could answer. So I agree with Cathy that really struck me that the budget wasn't there so I could look thru it and see if there was something I couldn't understand that might have been new. And then to get it on email – and when I called to ask questions you guys are right there, but I just think that if we would have had it then it probably would have made me more sure of the budget when I started working on it. And one more little thing – like E-verify, I think they should have gone with us step-by-step with

the system to do E-verify. I know it may be easy but I know that, I just thought that maybe anything to do with input on the system that they should have walked thru it real good because I went on there before a long time ago and when I went to do some printing I had about 40-50 pages. I would have like to have been walked thru that directly with a spreadsheet telling me exactly and not just giving me something and say go register with E-verify. (P.Montgomery)

- I still would have liked to have that spreadsheet. (P.Montgomery)
- I liked the meeting and new format. I agree the civil rights were overwhelming. Give us a hard copy of the budget packet so that we can ask questions. It also helps us to estimate how long it will take to complete. Mandy and Tracey did a great job! (K.O'Neill)
- The training was good and everyone was prepared. The civil rights were overwhelming for us and how it relates to the Providers. Give us training on civil rights. (C.Reagan)
- The other thing is, how am I going to translate the civil rights to Spanish? I didn't understand half of it, so I'm not sure how a lot of this will translate over to the Provider. (C.Reagan)
- I liked the training and thought it was well prepared. Are there any rules that we get trained before – I don't think it was for us to train the Providers? What is our responsibility to the Provider? We are still waiting for information before we can print our Sponsor/Provider agreement on information regarding the Provider not being home. Do we need an Addendum if item is not listed on the Sponsor/Provider Agreement? (S.Gyenizse)
- How much does it pertain to the Providers? Sounds like everybody is in agreement that you guys felt the civil rights portion was a little overwhelming and that you would like more clarification or maybe additional training on whatever like that in as far as what needs to be relayed to the Providers. (K.Barnes)
- Information that we didn't have to give to you for your Sponsor/Provider agreement. I don't think that there is anything formal written but I just kind of makes sense that we want to get you what you need. It is our job to give to you any information that you need in order for you to go ahead. (K.Barnes)
- That's why I processed a change on Wednesday and then we were told by Tracey to wait – now one of the things that was going to change is if the Providers aren't home they need to call in the office. You guys remember that? (P.Montgomery)
- Are you talking about the Permanent Agreement or the Sponsor/Provider agreement? (K.Barnes)
- We're talking about the Sponsor/Provider Agreement. (D.Barrowdale)
- Only as far as I know – and Jen if you know of anything additional you can let me know. The only change that I know that you guys had to make to your Sponsor/Provider agreements was in relation to the Provider being at home. I thought I clarified that. (K.Barnes)
- There was a green sheet of paper provided at the training that lists the items needed on the Sponsor/Provider Agreement. (K.Barnes)
- There was a list of other issues and that we couldn't take money out of their reimbursement and the list that we got was all jumbled about – part was Provider and part was for Sponsor. (C.Reagan)
- I'll find out, and again Jen you can step in whenever you want.
- If I'm not mistaken, I sent clarification out after the last meeting. Now Deanna you had emailed me or talked me about this. There was a sponsor arbitrarily taking money for different services – I don't know if it was inspections, or trainings or whatever like that, I don't know and it was in the Sponsor/Provider Agreement saying that they can do that. I told

Deanna – and Deanna you can correct me if I’m wrong: If there is anything that you are going to withhold money from the Provider for whatever service, it needs to be listed in the Sponsor/Provider Agreement. (K.Barnes)

- Yes, because then you are okay. (C.Reagan)
- Like I said, when Deanna emailed me, it totally caught me off guard and I had to check with Melissa. I guess what I trying to say is that it’s nothing new that we’re adding – it’s more of a clarification, all right. So now Stacey, I’m not sure just what you were told. You say you got a list of things? (K.Barnes)
- Yes, it was in regards to my sponsor in Tucson. There was a list of things to review with the Sponsor. (S.Gyenizse)
- Now the way I understood it at the training and now this, but that I can take money out of Providers accounts but the Agreement doesn’t count as where they have given me permission and that I have to have a separate piece of paper giving me permission. (C.Reagan)
- Absolutely yes, we were told that we need a separate piece of paper. (P.Montgomery)
- So, now I trying to think logistically – how am I going to do this and how I am going to take this money? You know we are not allowed to charge for training. (C.Reagan)
- Now I just threw that out there – okay. (K.Barnes)
- Well now I’m not sure do I leave it in – do I take it out or do I need another piece of paper? (C.Reagan)
- I don’t know – have you heard? (K.Barnes)
- Yea, because I haven’t heard. The issue not being home and that’s been taken care of. And then, Deanna emailed me an issue a couple of weeks ago and it was in relation to.... And I think what it is
- What it said is if it was specifically for fire, health, or fingerprint fees that it was okay and so that’s how we have worded our Agreement. It already, actually said that – it just won’t ever say program fees anywhere. (D.Barrowdale)
- Right, and I think what the issue was and there saying is a separate piece of paper. If you have – and I’ll check of this – if you’re Sponsor/Provider Agreements have already been printed then you would add an Addendum to it. Okay and I’ll clarify that – it seems that there is about two or three different stories out there. (K.Barnes)
- It looks like I’ll have to take that all out and I’ll need a preliminary approval for my Sponsor/Provider Agreement but I’d like to put it back in because it’s something that is needed. (S.Gyenizse)
- I’ll find that out right away and I’ll get that out to you before the minutes come out. So you’ll know by this afternoon.
- Specifically on the fingerprinting for them and us. (D.Barrowdale)
- And I agree – that’s the way I interpret this. When I asked Melissa – She said, if it not already listed in your Sponsor/Provider Agreement then you need to create and Addendum saying: Blah-blah.....blah blah blah.
- Can you do me a favor and fax me your list of things. You say it’s a list that was included in the training. Okay, then I’ll just get a copy from Mandy. (K.Barnes)
- Okay, do you have any other comments? None. (K.Barnes)
- ***Public Participation and Closing Remarks:***
- We have Public Participation now but for the most part it has been an ‘Open Meeting’ anyway – Does anyone else have anything they would like to comment on – I mean anything? Okay, then I’ll just go on down the line. (K.Barnes)

CACFP FCCH Meeting – Continued
July 29, 2008

- No comments from Advisory Council.
- We've been on a roll so far no sense in stopping now - (K.Barnes)
- Well thank you for letting us participate during in the meeting. We really appreciate it. (K.O'Neill)
- And you know we've talked about this before – the reason why it was set up the way it was because there had been some issues in the past and for lack of a better term – order wasn't maintained and we want to make sure that we don't have to call the riot squad. So that why we have this format. I don't mind this type of discussions, as long as it's kept in an orderly fashion and I'll stick by that as long as all of us, including myself can maintain a sense of order and professionalism. Honestly, I have no problem. (K.Barnes)
- I'll find out about the issues with the Sponsor/Provider Agreement as far as what needs to be in there and I'm pretty sure that's what the issue was – but I'll just make sure and let you all know and this will come out before the minutes come out. So don't be expecting the minutes today – but in response to this, you will get this sometime this afternoon. (K.Barnes)

Closing Remarks:

- Thank you very much.
- Note that the next meeting is pushed back because August and September are our renewal months and we need to focus on that. In the interim if, you have any questions, comments please contact your specialists or me. Thank you very much – You guys have an outstanding rest of the summer.

Meeting concluded at approximately **10:30 a.m.**

Next Advisory Council Meeting: Tentatively Scheduled for October 28, 2008, 9:00A-12:00P in Conference Room 106.