NEVADA STATE DIVISION OF PUBLIC AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH
CHILD CARE REGULATION REVIEW

WORKGROUP 4
Staffing Requirements-Number of Children- NAC432A.520-NAC432A.546AGENDA

Thursday November 12, 2015
Time: 1:00-3:00

MEETING LOCATIONS

Videoconference Locations:

Las Vegas Location
4220 S Maryland Pkwy Building D Suite 810
Large conference room

Carson City Location
727 Fairview Dr. Suite E

Workgroup Members Present

Carrie Paldi-Creative Kids
Laurie Ciardullo-Roots and Wings Daycare
David Walton-Challenger School Foundation
Kelly MacFarland-Solaegui-Challenger School Foundation
Kathy Okazaki-Merryhill (via phone)
Bev Anderson-Sunflower
Wendy Van Worth-Sierra Vista Children's Academy

Workgroup Members Not Present

Bev Anderson-Sunflower
Christina Lindsay, Sunflower
Jan Rhodes-Miss Jan's Family Child Care
Michael Thompson-Kids R Kids

Child Care Licensing Staff Present

Diane Hardy
Lisa Roberts

Other Attendees

Ethel Chambers (Via phone)
Shelly Nye, Nevada Registry (Via phone)
Cindy Johnson, Office of Early Care and Education (via phone)
Jared Busker-Children's Advocacy Alliance (via phone)
April Cannoy-Under the Magic Pine Tree
Lorie Powell-Sunshine & Rainbows
Laura Supko-St. Theresa CDC

Opening remarks, Introductions, and Roll Call- Carrie Paldi, Chair

Quorum was established with 7 members @ 1:06 p.m.

Removal/Appointment of Workgroup members

Added Sue Joyner-motion made by Bev Anderson and was unanimously approved by members

Approval of minutes from previous meeting- Carrie Paldi, Chair

Fixed:
Spelling of Laurie Ciardullo
Spelling of Merryhill
Laurie Ciardullo expressed that her statement on page 2 line 10 should read: There are only a handful of providers like me licensed and anyone can have up to 4, and that's a business.

Review current regulations and discuss objectives, rationale and related research

Carrie handed out copies of the regulations in review

Discuss regulations and make recommendation regarding changing/not changing regulations

Carrie: Asked for public comment on previous item 4 & 5 but there was no public comment.

Section 432A.52 section 4; visited Dave Walton's research on adding a definition for proper supervision. Dave read a sample for a definition of supervision.

Laurie: This would allow for baby monitors.

Walton: It covers the "seeing and hearing" aspect, the only challenge is implications with other areas of regulations.

Carrie: Interesting because the other work group discussed direct supervision but there appears to be no definition.

Walton: No there's no definition

Carrie: If required, we can make recommendations if licensing is willing.

*At this point we could not hear all of the group members so we dialed through the phone.

Walton: Discussed making motion to include his proposed definition of direct supervision and strike NAC 432A.521 subsection 4 and add "direct" in front of first supervision.

Carrie: Motion passed unanimously

Carrie: Move down to NAC 432A.522 regarding infants and toddlers. Asked for questions from licensing

Diane: Will talk to Latisha

Carrie: Should we address separately? The only deviation is overnight care. She asked Diane if it was easier for enforcement purposes to have multiple areas or one.

Diane: Personally, one would be fine

Carrie: 432A. 522-524 looked at as combined age groups- nighttime should be separate.

Walton: Can we take action understanding infants and toddlers can be removed later?

Carrie: Motion to address and calling it one. Strike current and add wording to 524 and strike 432A .522 as a chair I cannot make that.

Walton: With the understanding we merge with 432A. 524, making a general chart or format.

Carrie: Motion seconded and passed unanimously Motion made, now it is time for ratios.

Walton: Subsection 2 of previous 522 regulation might want to consider as we look at ages.

Carrie: Good thought, David. Any thoughts on where to start with ratios? Is birth-1 good age? Please provide feedback from the fields from those with babies.

Carrie: Is birth-1 a good age?

Bev: We do newborn on up and when they are mobile and start to crawl we move them to a connected room.

Carrie: Should be birth-9 or would the ratio be the same?

Bev: Birth-9mos, 9-15mos. and then toddler.

Kathy: There's a distinction from birth to 8-9 months.

Carrie: I pulled previous group information and I based it on that. We are not talking accredited standards but a good environment for children. It's important to hear what is necessary and give accurate an in depth thoughts. Many people have difficulty calculating ratios and need a cut-and-dry formula.

Diane: I don't know how they came up with it. It's a good gauge with averaging ages. You are always going to have a mixed age.

Carrie: Bev, do you keep the infants together then move at 9 months, correct?

Bev: Yes.

Carrie: What is the ratio with that group, infant-9months, 9mos-15mos, up to six kids?

Kelly: Age is a good indicator because in my experience most are ready at 2.9 for preschool.

Carrie: My concern is how it is interpreted.

Walton: For example, potty training 2.5 many are there, at 3 almost all are.

Carrie: I am thinking birth-9 mos., 9-18mos, like currently.

Walton: 2.5 years to 4.

Carrie: 2.5 to 3 as a compromise?

Walton: 18 mos.to 2.5.

Carrie: Is 18 mos.to 2.5 reasonable?

Laurie: 18 mos. to 3 years is a big difference. It is easier if we make it statewide. With homecare do we need to change ratios?

Carrie: Mixed groups are popular. In our chart it is important to have an average age formula.

Cindy: There's very specific language in mixed-age groups in previous work groups.

Carrie: What was the average age?

Cindy: So many between 2.5 -3 mixed ages, primarily preschool. I have it electronically.

Walton: Kelly's point is we have age group can bring in 2 to 3, but at our center they must be potty trained. This gives the flexibility to centers to do that. Ratios can restrict you, so we must be careful how we define ratios.

Carrie: We better go to 18 months-2 years.

Walton: 18 months to 2 years is not significant, 2-3 absolutely.

Carrie: 18 months to 2.5 as next group.

Walton: 2.5 to 4, but difference with 2.5-3.

Kelly: 2.9 is not much different from 3 years.

Laurie: Do we feel it matters? Will kids be safe, I agree with all

Carrie: It appears we are s tuck as a group, let's open to the Public.

April: I like how it is now

Carrie: The block grant asked for specific breakdown

Walton: The ratio can be, there's a group size at some point, if 2+ currently works, consider group sizes. This doesn't change discussion on group size. Licensing must have a good perspective.

Carrie: Under the current regulations, overall the center ratios are pretty typical.

Diane: We go in and see mixed ages.

Jared: States are not required to use them, we can look at recommendations.

Carrie: I reviewed NAEYC ratios.

Kelly: Should be 2.9-4 or 5.

Carrie: 1.5 to 3 with 1 or 2 groups.

Public: If all the same ratio, why separate and break down?

Kelly: My opinion is there is no difference with 2.5 class then 4 year old and up.

Walton: ratios have a big fiscal impact. Be careful, our ratios now as we get higher we will have more kids and fewer teachers.

Public: We need to do more homework.

Carrie: These sections will take up the bulk of our meeting time. Today with 30 minutes left, let's agree on ages at least.

Walton: Part of the homework is how you look at it. Many use NAEYC standards so often we have fairly low ratios. Some states are exempt if licensed by other agencies and providing childcare don't fall under these. Without that provision it will have a fiscal impact on many centers and parents.

Carrie: I agree, it is important we remember regulations are minimum standards. The best practice centers opt into. We have challenges others don't have. We must find something we can live and function under.

Walton: Carrie good job articulating. I would like to ask licensing with the current system are we having level of problems resulting from mixing ages?

Diane: I am a proponent of mixing ages because they can learn from one another. I had mixed ages, I worked with homeless and 2 year old could not sit with 5 year olds but it was a good model. I feel mixed ages is ideal.

Walton: To your knowledge, are we having unusual problems as a result of having mixed age groups?

Diane: No, not at all.

Lisa: We have centers in old homes, not classrooms.

Walton: Up north do you have a lot of issues to resolve?

Lisa: No, not necessarily. Ratios are maybe 1 to something.

Cindy: May I jump in? Not necessarily, we see lack of supervision. No group sizes and there are health and safety issues.

Walton: I agree, I am thinking 2.5 and up

Cindy:0-3 year olds are missing social and emotional. Mixed age must have a skilled teacher.

Carrie: In my mind let's get ages then reduce ratios, then group sizes. 1.5-3 then 3 and up

Kelly: I still think 2.8mos.-2.9mos. is an ideal age.

Carrie: Maybe NAEYC is the way to look at this.

Cindy: Mixed age's 2.5-5 ratio to majority age instead of average age.

Carrie: 2.5 months-4 years then 4 years-and up?

Cindy: There's two different ways to group by age.

Jared- @ 2:55 left all to join other meeting.

Carrie: I just read the original proposed age groups. These were from other people in the industry. We will to QRS eventually but we are at least five years out, is that correct, Cindy?

Cindy: They will always be volunteer to some extent. There will be more and more programs to participate in because of funds.

Kelly: Cindy what is your opinion?

Cindy: The same legislation, some get it, some not so familiar. QRIS is about experience for the children.

Walton: That document makes sense to me.

Carrie: We will revisit at the next meeting. We will send proposals.

Laurie: Do you have suggestions on where to check for research?

Carrie: Find ratios with accredited agencies.

Carrie encouraged members of the workgroup to look at other states regulations regarding ratios to see how the age groups were broken down and to bring recommendations to the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned @3:10

No public comment.

Future Agenda Items
Items will be standing, moved to item 7 and adjourned at 3:01 p.m.

Public comments were taken throughout the meeting and included in each specific area