



CITY OF KINGSTON

**ARTS, RECREATION & COMMUNITY POLICIES
COMMITTEE**

Report No.: ARCP-11-017

TO: Mayor and Members of Council
FROM: Lanie Hurdle, Commissioner, Community Services
RESOURCE STAFF: Adèle Lafrance, Director, Community and Family Services
DATE OF MEETING: November 24, 2011
SUBJECT: 2011-14 Childcare Management Strategies

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

As the provincially designated service manager for Childcare funding for the City of Kingston and the County of Frontenac, Community and Family Services is responsible for the oversight of a dedicated funding envelope of approximately \$9.9M in annual program operating funds as well as the balance of an unconditional grant (Best Start) of \$590K, currently held in a reserve fund.

The current childcare service system, both provincially and locally, is in the midst of a significant transition period as 2011 marks the second year of the 5 year implementation period of the new full time kindergarten, school based Full Day Early Learning Kindergarten Program (FDK). The FDK is predicted to attract approximately 20% of the children currently served in licensed childcare and consequently will require existing childcare programs to assess their ongoing operating viability and remodel their existing programs, if feasible.

The principal service management challenges fall into two principal categories:

- The ongoing challenge of administering the fixed funding allocation for the three principal program services: fee subsidies, wage subsidies and special needs resourcing, all of which are experiencing either funding shortfalls or increasing service demands;
- The time limited transitional challenge of mitigating potential negative impacts on families and supporting childcare service providers, as they respectively adjust to the new full time kindergarten, school based Full Day Early Learning Kindergarten Program.

The Childcare Management strategies recommended in this report have been developed to address both short term challenges and longer term enhancements (see Exhibit A – Recommended 2011-2014 Childcare Management Strategies).

November 24, 2011

- Page 2 -

Childcare Operators (Service Providers) have provided input into the development of the strategies, both in person and through written submissions. Additional targeted input through parent surveys, and allied agency outreach has also been solicited where warranted in the development of the strategies.

The Province regularly requires Childcare service managers to develop Service Management Plans as part of the provincial service contracting process. While the strategies presented in this report, complement those submitted in the most recent (2010-2012) provincial service plan submission, these strategies have been developed specifically to direct childcare program oversight in the context of the City's Strategic Plan- 2011-2014.

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Council approve the Childcare Management Strategies for 2011-2014 (Exhibit A); and

THAT Council confirm the allocation of up to \$93,600 of the Best Start Unconditional Grant, for use over the course of the Full Day Early Learning Kindergarten Program implementation, as one time stabilization and transitional funding for existing Kingston and Frontenac Childcare service providers with viable post Full Day Kindergarten business plans, the eligibility criteria to be developed in consultation with Childcare Service Providers and other stakeholder agencies; and

THAT Council approve that the remaining unallocated Best Start Unconditional Grant balance of approximately \$496,800 plus accumulated interest of approximately \$277,000, be retained in a municipal reserve fund, for future use to be determined.

November 24, 2011
- Page 3 -

AUTHORIZING SIGNATURES:

_____ Lanie Hurdle, Commissioner
_____ Gerard Hunt, Chief Administrative Officer

CONSULTATION WITH THE FOLLOWING COMMISSIONERS:

Cynthia Beach, <i>Sustainability & Growth</i>	N/R
Denis Leger, <i>Transportation, Properties & Emergency Services</i>	N/R
Jim Keech, <i>President and CEO, Utilities Kingston</i>	N/R

(N/R indicates consultation not required)

November 24, 2011

- Page 4 -

OPTIONS/DISCUSSION:

Background:

On January 1, 2000, the City of Kingston became the designated Service Manager for provincial childcare programs in Kingston and Frontenac. This designation included responsibility for eligibility determination of subsidy applications, administration of a \$ 7.0M (gross) cost-shared funding envelope, and responsibility for local service planning and ongoing management.

Over the course of the next 11 years, several changes to the childcare service system have occurred. While the three principal programs funded by the Province – fee subsidy for parents, wage subsidy for childcare centre staffing, and special needs resourcing for childcare centres– remain, many new provincial initiatives have been introduced and have included different funding streams and cost share formulas, as well as a number of time-limited and one-time funding initiatives.

The total childcare funding allocation for Kingston and Frontenac has grown to approximately \$9.9M (gross) in 2011 (See Exhibit C for overview of Operating Programs and Funding).

In addition to the above operating funds administered annually by the city, a one-time unconditional grant of \$2.3 M was received as part of the Best Start initiative in 2005. Some 332 additional childcare spaces operated by 13 agencies were created with these funds from 2005 to 2010 (see Exhibit D for Best Start Grant Expenditure and Expansion Summary). A balance of approximately \$590,400 remains in a dedicated reserve fund. This balance includes the \$93,600 recommended to be used for one time stabilization and transitional funding.

In 2010, the Province introduced the Full Day Early Learning Kindergarten Program (FDK) – which commenced providing full-time kindergarten to four- and five-year-olds at selected schools in Ontario in September of 2010 (see Exhibit E for a matrix of Schools and Childcare centres in Kingston & Frontenac).

Funding Allocations and Cost Sharing:

Childcare funding is cost shared at three different ratios with the province. The original (DNA) and Early Learning and Child Care (ELCC) funding is cost share on an 80/20 basis for program allocations and on a 50/50 basis for administrative allocations. Funds received under Best Start, Early Learning and Child Development (ELCD), Extended Day and Stabilization/Transition funding are 100% provincial.

The net municipal share of childcare funds is cost shared between the City and the County on the basis of weighted assessment for Administration and Wage Subsidies and on the basis of recipient residency for Fee Subsidies and Special Needs resourcing.

November 24, 2011
- Page 5 -

The following table provides a high level representation of the cost sharing for childcare between the Province and the Municipality as well as the sharing of the net municipal portion between the City and the County (LSR cost sharing). Figures used are based on the approved MEDU allocations for 2011.

Annual Operating Funding Program	2011 Gross Allocation	Provincial Share	Municipal Share	Net City Share	Net County Share
Administration	\$ 636,181	\$ 347,981	\$ 288,200	\$ 234,436	\$ 53,764
Fee Subsidy	\$ 5,124,203	\$ 4,298,982	\$ 825,221	\$ 770,509	\$ 54,712
Special Needs	\$ 784,914	\$ 656,909	\$ 128,005	\$ 117,350	\$ 10,655
Wage Subsidy*	\$ 3,362,438	\$ 2,838,501	\$ 523,937	\$ 426,197	\$ 97,741
Other **	\$ 18,997	\$ 18,997	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL	\$ 9,926,733	\$ 8,161,370	\$ 1,765,363	\$ 1,548,492	\$ 216,870

* includes pay equity, wage improvement

** includes small water works & transition minor capital

Exhibit C – Childcare Program Funding Overview provides on both 2010 actual expenditures as well as 2011 budget at the program specific level along with program description.

The Challenges:

Service management challenges fall into two principal categories:

Ongoing Challenge:

Effective and sustainable allocation of limited subsidies to support responsive, affordable childcare services

Time Limited (Transitional) Challenge:

Mitigation of potential negative impacts on families and Childcare service providers as they respectively adjust to FDK, and while service providers assess their future operating viability and determine the most feasible course of action whether it is program remodelling, relocation, downsizing or closure

Exhibit A – 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies provides more detailed descriptions of the challenges identified for each of the major childcare program management components.

November 24, 2011

- Page 6 -

The Strategies:

The Province regularly requires Childcare service managers to develop Service Management Plans as part of the provincial service contracting process. The most recent provincial Childcare Service Management Plan, submitted in the spring of 2010, included ongoing strategies that address the current funding pressures and very broad strategies related to FDK implementation as the impact of this initiative was unknown at the time.

While the strategies presented in this report reiterate or complement the provincial service management plan, they have been updated to address the initial impacts of FDK and to reflect new business practices introduced by MEDU. As this report presents the strategies in the municipal context, strategies have also been refined to direct and reference childcare program oversight in the context of the City's Strategic Plan- 2011-2014.

Exhibit A – 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies, presents a summary of the major childcare program components, principal objectives, challenges and detailed strategies. While many of the recommended strategies are refinements of the status quo policies and procedures, some propose new or different approaches to addressing current challenges. Exhibit B – Service Provider Consultation Summary details the input received from service providers as well as staff response and where applicable revision of the proposed strategies presented. The information in this exhibit provides insight into the challenges, diverse views and opinions of service providers and differing interests of service provider versus service manager.

Recommended strategies representing the most significant change or controversy are detailed below for Council's consideration:

Fee Subsidy Strategies:

The current limitations on service level for referral childcare is recommended to continue as a means of avoiding a fee subsidy wait list (strategies FS01-04) a new means of allocating the limited number of "referral" fee subsidies available is proposed:

FS.05: Effective May 2012, for September 2012 – Maintain Status Quo Referral Childcare service levels and priorities AND implement a new business process providing referral allocations to referring agencies and requiring them to prioritize space assignment

Special Needs Resourcing Funding:

The original strategies proposed reflected the provincial intention of refocusing special needs resourcing on children 0-4 years of age however this strategy was strongly criticized by childcare operators and the special needs service provider alike, who indicated that the present school based special needs supports have not yet been developed to fully meet the needs of

November 24, 2011

- Page 7 -

school age children attending B&A programs. In response to this input, the strategy was modified to move more slowly and inclusively toward the provincial intention:

- **SN01: Consult with Special Needs Resourcing Programs on transitioning to serve younger children and developing a protocol for serving children 4-12 year of age**

Wage Subsidy Strategies:

The fixed and presently underfunded wage subsidy allocation is distributed to service providers based on an equitable distribution formula (% of entitlement) with some long standing providers receiving a higher level of funding described as “benchmarked” in recognition of the previous provincial funding method. This distribution model, approved by Council in 2007 was adopted as a sustainable means of distributing the fixed funding envelope to a growing childcare service provider system without the addition of 100% municipal funding. Inherent in this model is that system expansion results in a reduced share of entitlement for the majority of operators (except those with benchmark funding).

While this model has worked well to promote system expansion in the past, with the priority objective of stabilization replacing expansion, a “hold” on wage subsidy eligibility for both new operators and expansions by existing operators is recommended as a stabilization strategy. This temporary policy change is seen as a means of stabilizing wage subsidy to providers during the transition and thus reducing the risk of a sudden operator failure due to rapid funding reduction if ongoing system growth was to continue:

- **WS01: New centres opening on or after January 1, 2011 and otherwise eligible to access wage subsidies in 2013, will be placed on “hold”**
- **WS03: Existing sites in receipt of WS who expand on or after Jan 1, 2012, will have their expanded wage subsidy entitlement limited to a net increase of 5 additional spaces above their most current site license and this expanded entitlement will be recognized once only during the “hold” period**

One Time Health and Safety Funding:

Under the new oversight of Ministry of Education, Service Managers have been provided with authority to approve One Time Health and Safety Funding requests from Fee Subsidy surpluses without MEDU approval. In the course of consulting with service providers on a suitable approval policy, it was learned that while many appreciate the funding, there is a preference to reallocate any fee subsidy surplus on regular operating subsidy shortfalls, in particular, wage subsidy and in the case of a few other providers toward increasing referral care service levels. While a limited (\$25,000) allocation of fee subsidy surplus will be utilized for 2011 one-time health & safety items/equipment, if available, the original strategy proposed for future years has been significantly revised to reflect service provider input:

November 24, 2011
- Page 8 -

- **HS02: for 2012 and onward fund "license critical" one time health and safety requests as surplus fee subsidy will allow as a second priority, only if wage subsidy entitlement is paid out above 90% of entitlement**

Stabilization/Transition Operating Funding:

Since 2010 the province provides an allocation of funds to primarily address fee subsidy pressures during FDK implementation. Two operators, Helen Tufts Nursery School and The Child Centre in Sharbot Lake are currently experiencing operating challenges. In the case of Helen Tufts, the challenge is due to the limited service levels for referral care for stay at home parents, as this centre specializes in serving disadvantaged children funded through "referral fee subsidies" while in the case of The Child Centre, the enrollment reduction is attributed to FDK implementation. While stabilization funding as fee subsidies for centre dedicated "referral care" was approved for these two centres as a stabilization strategy in 2010-2011 and is proposed again for 2011-2012, both city staff and other service providers, support the requirement that this funding only continue to be dedicated to these two centres for a third year (Sept 2012-June 2013) if the centres are able to demonstrate viable post FDK business plans.

City staff is in regular contact with both centres and will continue to do so, however, it will be incumbent on the staff and boards of these centres to prepare and submit these plans by December 31, 2011 if dedicated funding for stabilization is extended for a third year.

- **SFOp01: Helen Tufts Nursery School (HTNS) and the Child Centre will continue to be allocated dedicated funding for 8 referral children each for the September 2011 to June 2012**
- **SFOp02: Repeat these dedicated allocations for an additional term for Sept 2012 to June 2013 upon submission and approval of transitional plans which demonstrate long term post FDK viability**

Best Start Unconditional Grant:

As referenced in the "Background" section of this report, a one-time unconditional grant of \$2.3M was provided to the City by the Province as part of the original Best Start initiative in 2005.

The following table summarises previous expenditure, interest earned and current balance of the unconditional grant and overall Fund balance:

November 24, 2011

- Page 9 -

Best Start Unconditional Grant			
	Revenue	Expenditure	Balance
Opening Balance	\$ 2,320,000		
Expansion Expenditures*		\$ 1,427,200	
Other Best Start Expenditures		\$ 302,400	
Remaining Grant			\$ 590,400
Accumulated Interest	\$ 277,300		
Total Fund Balance**			\$ 867,700

* includes 1 estimate pending reconciliation

** reflects sum of reserve and balance in capital project fund

As part of the 2010 provincial Childcare Services Management Plan Council approved dedication of \$93,600 for childcare stabilization and transition funding for existing Kingston and Frontenac Childcare service providers over the course of FDK implementation and the balance of the funds to be retained in reserve, possibly to fund, in part, integrated service hubs (Child and Family Centres). This allocation is not noted in the above summary of expenditures.

The revised strategies, propose reconfirmation of up to \$93,600 for one time stabilization and transitioning funding. A second new strategy proposes use of unconditional funds for the acquisition and start up of the on line centralized childcare wait list registry. The third resolution anticipates that service providers or other children's service agencies may solicit funding from the unconditional grant as either a source of operating funds or alternately to offset operating deficits. In line with the corporate fiscal responsibility and sustainability principles, the third strategy restricts the use of the fund for such unsustainable purposes:

- **BSU01: Reconfirm previous Council allocation of up to \$93,600 of the Best Start Unconditional Grant for use over the course of the FDK implementation , as one time stabilization and transitional funding for existing Kingston and Frontenac Childcare service providers with viable post FDK business plans**
 - service provider eligibility criteria for one time stabilization/transitional funding to be developed in consultation with Childcare Service Providers and other stakeholder agencies
- **BSU02: Fund the acquisition and start up costs associated with the implementation of an on-line, Web Based Centralized Childcare Wait List Registry for Kingston and Frontenac;**
 - staff to seek Council approval once research on feasibility, cost and recommended product (by RFP) have been completed;

November 24, 2011
- Page 10 -

- **BSU03: Do not utilize Best Start Unconditional funds for Childcare Service Provider operating deficits, either as a stabilization strategy or as an ongoing funding practice.**

The following stakeholders were consulted in the development of the strategies:

- Kingston Frontenac Early Learning and Childcare Network,
- Limestone District School Board Full Day Early Learning Kindergarten Program representatives,
- Algonquin and Lakeshore Catholic School Board Full Day Early Learning Kindergarten Program representatives,
- Frontenac County staff representatives.

Parents have been surveyed on the usefulness of the proposed on-line centralized childcare waitlist registry. Referral Agencies have been consulted to discuss the new “allocated” referral process for Sept 2012 implementation.

EXISTING POLICY/BY LAW:

The *2011-2014 Childcare Management Strategies for Kingston Frontenac* update the previous strategies detailed in the provincially mandated and Council approved *2010-2012 Kingston Frontenac Childcare Service Management Plan (Meeting No. 20-2010 on Sept 7, 2010, Report #119, Clause 1)*.

NOTICE PROVISIONS:

Not applicable

ACCESSIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS:

This report is available in alternative formats upon request including French Language translation.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

There are no financial approvals associated with this report. Funding for strategies is anticipated to come from the existing levels of annual operating funds or from the unspent Best Start Unconditional Grant monies in the case of the acquisition of the On-line Centralized Childcare Wait List Registry and specific allocation of \$93,600 dedicated for one time transitional costs.

CONTACTS:

Lanie Hurdle, Commissioner, Community Services ext. 1231
Adele Lafrance, Director, Community and Family Services, ext 4801
Laura Austin, Supervisor, Childcare Programs ext 4812

November 24, 2011

- Page 11 -

OTHER CITY OF KINGSTON STAFF CONSULTED:

Cheryl Hitchen, Manager, Social Planning and Policy, Community Services

Katie Clarke, Manager, Program Delivery, Community and Family Services

Stephanie Crawford, Admin Officer Childcare Programs, Community and Family Services

Amy Ruttan, Best Start Co-ordinator, Childcare Programs, Community and Family Services

EXTERNALS CONSULTED:

Susan Beckel, Deputy Clerk, County of Frontenac

EXHIBITS ATTACHED:

Exhibit A – Recommended 2011 -2014 Childcare Management Strategies

Exhibit B – Service Provider Consultation Summary

Exhibit C – Childcare Programs Funding Overview

Exhibit D – Unconditional Grant & Best Start Expansion Summary

Exhibit E – Full Day Early Learning Kindergarten Program Schools and Childcare Centres
Matrix

Principal Goals:

- ✓ Optimize use of the fixed childcare funding allocation to maximize the number of families served and continue to make childcare more affordable through provision of fee, wage, special needs resourcing and one time subsidies.
- ✓ Stabilize Childcare Service Providers, during the ELP and Extended Day implementation through provision of service manager expertise and limited financial assistance, so they may determine their respective post FDK service provision feasibility based on evolving service demand and their longer term financial viability.
- ✓ Optimize service access (both choice and ease of registration) for families requiring childcare.
- ✓ Participate in all required components of BS Child and Family Centre Planning and Implementation.

Recommended Strategies:

Program Components and Objectives	Challenges	Strategy <i>Note: (numerals) cross reference to Exhibit B - Service Provider Consultation Summary</i>
<p><u>Fee Subsidy:</u> (DNA, ELCC, all 100% prov incl: ELCD/CCFS/ Stabilization/Ext Day)</p> <p><u>Objective:</u> Manage Fee Subsidy demand within fixed funding envelope without resorting to the implementation of a wait list</p>	<p><u>Challenges:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand exceeds funding • Competition for fee subsidy between working/in school families and at home referral families • Childcare Centre per diems increasing 	<p>FS.01: Maintain current business processes to address funding pressures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limitation of payments for days of absence from care • Non- payment of parental contribution debts/arrears • no new subsidy approvals for job searchers (except OW) <p>FS.02: Maintain current service priority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Families with parents engaged in employment or education and training activities outside of the home (1.01) • Provide limited referral subsidies for stay at home parents with special needs children or children with developmental delays.(1.02) <p>FS.03: Increase Flexibility and Eligible Hours for Part Time Schedules as funding becomes available:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for 2013, contingent upon available fee subsidies, increase flexibility and eligible hours of care for families with irregular schedules that are not eligible for full-time care (1.03)

Program Components and Objectives	Challenges	Strategy
		<p>Note: (numerals) cross reference to Exhibit B - Service Provider Consultation Summary</p> <p>FS.04: For Sept 2011-June 2012 - Maintain Status Quo Referral Childcare service level, priorities and business processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continue 20 subsidies for children with special needs or developmental delays and give 1st service opportunity to those that were active between February and June 2011(1.04, 1.05) • continue care for children of eligible parents/primary custodians with verified medical frailty (1.06) • continue additional 16 dedicated 16 subsidies (8 for Helen Tufts Nursery School (HTNS)and 8 for The Child Centre - Sharbot Lake through Stabilization/Transition Funding (1.10) <p>FS.05: Effective May 2012, for September 2012 – Maintain Status Quo Referral Childcare service levels and priorities AND implement a new business process providing referral allocations to referring agencies and requiring them to prioritize space assignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each major referring agency (child service agencies and institutions such as Community Living Kingston, CAS, Better Beginnings, Pathways, Child Development Centre, KFL&A Public Health) will be allocated a set number of referrals (based on past three years referral activities) (1.07) • A small number of referrals will be unallocated to accommodate doctor and new agency referrals (1.08) • A new referral form will provide a common objective screening tool so agencies can determine which children are best served by the limited available referral childcare • Referral Subsidies will reflect the school year of Sept to June (1.09) • The objective of this new referral screening process is twofold; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ it will ensure that limited fee subsidy funds are spent on those children in greatest need of child development and learning supports and ○ Promote greater communication and case conferencing among the agencies.

Program Components and Objectives	Challenges	Strategy <i>Note: (numerals) cross reference to Exhibit B - Service Provider Consultation Summary</i>
<p><u>Extended Day Fee Subsidy:</u></p> <p><u>Objective:</u> Optimize service access for families requiring childcare and fee subsidy assistance</p>	<p><u>Challenges:</u> Surplus is anticipate until 2012 as only a few school based Extended Day programs are operational;</p>	<p>ED01: Reallocate any available surplus for fee subsidy (1.12, 1.13)</p>
<p><u>Special Needs Resourcing:</u> (incl DNA, ELCC, 100% ELCD)</p> <p><u>Objective:</u> Manage limited Special Needs Resourcing Funds to ensure children with greatest needs are supported</p>	<p><u>Challenges:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service providers must serve higher volumes and more complex needs with fixed funding allocation • Provincial expectation of refocusing Special Needs Funding on pre FDK programs 	<p>SN01: Consult with Special Needs Resourcing Programs on transitioning to serve younger children and developing a protocol for serving children 4-12 year of age (2.01)</p> <p>SN02: Exclude special needs resourcing provision to Board operated extended day programs(2.02)</p> <p>SN03: Limit provision of “enhanced support” funding to school site B&A programs, except when significant safety and security concerns have been identified (2.03)</p> <p>SN04: Standardize data collection and reporting of special needs service delivery to better understand, evaluate and plan future delivery within the limited funding allocation (2.01)</p>
<p><u>Wage Subsidy:</u> (incl DNA, ELCC & 100% ELCD)</p> <p><u>Objective:</u> Stabilize Childcare Service Providers and the overall service system during the implementation of</p>	<p><u>Challenges:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing funding shortfall results in most operators being funded below their maximum calculated entitlement • Funding 	<p>WS01: New centres opening on or after January 1, 2011 and otherwise eligible to access wage subsidies in 2013, will be placed on “hold” (3.01)</p> <p>WS02: New centres opening in 2011, 2012, 2013 will submit WS worksheets in 2014 for access to wage subsidy funding in 2015</p> <p>WS03: Existing sites in receipt of WS who expand on or after Jan 1, 2012, will have their expanded wage subsidy entitlement limited to a net increase of 5 additional spaces above their most current site license and this expanded entitlement will be</p>

Program Components and Objectives	Challenges	Strategy <i>Note: (numerals) cross reference to Exhibit B - Service Provider Consultation Summary</i>
<p>FDK While maintaining longer term goal of achieving equitable funding distribution</p>	<p>reductions due to system expansion</p>	<p>recognized once only during the "hold" period (3.02)</p> <p>WS04: Existing sites expanding in 2012, 2013 and/or 2014, will have their expanded wage subsidy entitlement for spaces over the "net 5" recognized and funded in 2015</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above strategies, provincially prescribed funding formulas and entitlement maximums and the local application of equitable percent distribution for all fiscal funds will continue to be utilized during the stabilization period</p>
<p><u>One Time Health & Safety:</u> (available 100% ELCD, CCFS & Extended Day)</p> <p><u>Objective:</u> To provide financial assistance for "license critical" items using identified fee subsidy surpluses when all other operating pressures have been met.</p>	<p><u>Challenges:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient surplus may not exist in fee subsidy streams to reallocate adequate funds to address all eligible One Time H&S requests • there is competing priority to allocate any available surplus fee subsidy toward the wage subsidy shortfall 	<p>HS01: for 2011, allocate an upset limit of \$25,000 to fund "license critical" one time health and safety requests as surplus fee subsidy will allow</p> <p>HS02: for 2012 and onward fund "license critical" one time health and safety requests as surplus fee subsidy will allow as a second priority, only if wage subsidy entitlement is paid out above 90% of entitlement (4.01)</p> <p>HS03: Where funding approvals exceed projected surpluses, funding will be distributed on a proportional basis (4.02)</p>

Program Components and Objectives	Challenges	Strategy <i>Note: (numerals) cross reference to Exhibit B - Service Provider Consultation Summary</i>
<p><u>Stabilization/ Transition Funding- Minor Capital</u></p> <p><u>Objective:</u> To provide transition funding for minor renovations to childcare Providers to re-engineer their programs to serve younger children based on changing service demands</p>	<p><u>Challenges:</u> Provincial guidelines for use of One Time Minor Capital Stabilization costs are prescriptive and restrictive; very little uptake was experienced in 2010</p>	<p>SFCap01: Staff will review previous application process for requesting Stabilization Minor Capital funds and will simplify where feasible to afford the greatest uptake possible within the criteria prescribed by MEDU (5.01 & 5.02)</p>
<p><u>Stabilization/ Transition Funding- Operating</u></p> <p><u>Objective:</u> Stabilize Childcare Service Providers during the FDK and Extended Day implementation by providing service system management expertise and limited financial assistance</p>	<p><u>Challenges:</u> Existing childcare operators must assess future program feasibility including whether to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • downsize/close • refocus services on the younger 0-3yr8mo cohort • Modify programs and services to attract new clients (evenings, 	<p>SFOp01: Helen Tufts Nursery School (HTNS) and the Child Centre will continue to be allocated dedicated funding for 8 referral children each for the September 2011 to June 2012 (1.10, 5.03)</p> <p>SFOp02: Repeat these dedicated allocations for an additional term for Sept 2012 to June 2013 upon submission and approval of transitional plans which demonstrate long term post FDK viability (1.11)</p> <p>SFOp03: Utilize Stabilization/Transition Operating Funding flexibility to its full extent to increase operating revenue to service providers (5.04) including through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoidance of a fee subsidy wait list • increasing flexibility in hours of care for employed/education engaged families with PT schedules • limited augmentation of the referral care service where need is

Program Components and Objectives	Challenges	Strategy <i>Note: (numerals) cross reference to Exhibit B - Service Provider Consultation Summary</i>
expertise to providers while they determine their future service provision	weekends, flex care hours) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocate to higher demand areas 	demonstrated AND year to date fee subsidy utilization & projected year end surplus indicated capacity to fund additional referral care
<p>Best Start Child and Family Centres/System</p> <p><u>Objective:</u> Participate in all required components of BS Child and Family Centre Planning and Implementation</p>	<p><u>Challenge:</u> Province has yet to release information on local planning process, service model, governance and funding</p>	<p>C&FC01: Childcare Programs Staff will represent the Childcare Service Manager in all Best Start Child and Family Centre/System consultation, planning and information sharing events (6.01).</p> <p>C&FC02: Strengthen data collection tools & statistical reporting to assist with Planning efforts (6.02).</p>
<p>Best Start Unconditional Grant:</p> <p><u>Objective:</u> Continue oversight of the remaining Unconditional Grant funds ensuring they are used to optimize service access and delivery to families</p>	<p><u>Challenge:</u> Availability of unconditional funds a one time opportunity.</p> <p>While operating pressures exist in all provincial childcare funding streams, use of the Unconditional Grant for operating</p>	<p>BSU01: Reconfirm previous Council allocation of up to \$93,600 of the Best Start Unconditional Grant for use over the course of the FDK implementation , as one time stabilization and transitional funding for existing Kingston and Frontenac Childcare service providers with viable post FDK business plans (7.02, 7.03);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> service provider eligibility criteria for one time stabilization/transitional funding to be developed in consultation with Childcare Service Providers and other stakeholder agencies <p>BSU02: Fund the acquisition and start up costs associated with the implementation of an on-line Web Based Centralized Childcare Wait List Registry for Kingston and Frontenac(7.01);</p>

Program Components and Objectives	Challenges	Strategy
requiring childcare and related children services and in the best interest of the community	pressures or deficits is not sustainable	<p>Note: (numerals) cross reference to Exhibit B - Service Provider Consultation Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • staff to seek Council approval once research on feasibility, cost and recommended product (by RfP) have been completed (8.03). <p>BSU03: Do not utilize Best Start Unconditional funds for Childcare Service Provider operating deficits, either as a stabilization strategy or as an ongoing funding practice</p>
<p><u>Service System Management and Administration</u></p> <p><u>Objectives:</u> Optimize use of the fixed childcare funding allocation to maximize the benefit provided to the families served and the broader child service sector</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>Stabilize Childcare Service Providers and the overall service system during the FDK Implementation</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>Optimize access and stability for families requiring childcare</p>	<p><u>Challenges:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing fixed funding allocations with service pressures in all three major program components • Managing the service system through FDK with identified but as yet not quantified impacts on existing service providers • limited access to reliable data on service needs and potential future clients 	<p>SM01: Enhance and strengthen relationship with Childcare Operators and Stakeholders (8.01)including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ongoing participation in community planning tables and forums, • provision of timely and accurate written information bulletins and memos • hosting of information and consultation sessions as warranted • opportunities for one on one meetings with childcare programs admin staff to discuss operational concerns including stabilization and future service delivery viability • ongoing review, revision and simplification of local policies and business processes to ensure rationalization with MEDU requirements, optimum use of funding for its intended purpose and reduced bureaucracy for service providers wherever possible <p>SM02: Enhance and strengthen relationships with School Boards(8.02)</p> <p>SM03: Investigate feasibility of implementing an internet accessible/Web based centralized childcare waitlist Registry (8.03):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as a customer service enhancement for families seeking childcare options • as a tool for both Childcare Operators and the Service Manager with the potential to increase efficiencies, • as a marketing tool to attract new clients • as means of enhancing data collection for planning purposes.

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations
-------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------------------

Note: 44 Service Providers (those that have service contracts) were asked to participate in the consultation, of which we received 17 responses representing 12 agencies. Comments were not provided for all proposed strategies.

Fee Subsidy Funding																											
No	Fee Subsidy Strategy																										
	Objective: Manage fee subsidy demand within fixed funding envelopes without resorting to the implementation of a wait list	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of these strategies appear to be current practice and is working as well as can be expected. <p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> service priorities and service level limitations are applied to manage within the prescribed provincial funding envelopes while avoiding the need to invoke a wait list for families applying for fee subsidies 																									
1.01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain current service priorities; serving families engaged in employment, education and training activities 	<table border="1" data-bbox="493 690 945 885"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> </tr> </thead></table> <p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> in 2009, a hold was imposed on applications for all new fee subsidies to ensure that the expenditures would not exceed the prescribed provincial funding allocation in 2010, applications for fee subsidies for families with parents engaged in employment/education resumed, but the hold was maintained for referral care (except for cases with medically fragile parents/caregivers) in February 2011, upon finalization of year end 2010, referral care was reopened at a reduced service level, approving 20 children only, for part time care, limited duration care. <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintain this strategy status quo, with no changes to current fee subsidy service priorities 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					0	2	4	4	4
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																								
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
0	2	4	4	4																							
1.02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide limited referral care subsidies for stay at home parents 	<table border="1" data-bbox="493 1250 945 1445"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </thead></table> <p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Centres & services whose client base is predominantly composed of children "referred" for care (at home parents) have experience revenue restrictions due to referral care service level limitation imposed in 2009, while centres who predominantly serve employment-education engaged parents support this strategy as their fee subsidy revenue has been less impacted and this strategy is seen as a means of avoiding a 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					4	2	2	1	5
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																								
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
4	2	2	1	5																							

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																									
		<p>wait list for fee subsidy eligible families.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintain this strategy status quo; future referral care service level to be increased based on fee subsidy availability (see strategies 1.04-1.11 for details) 																									
<p>1.03</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> as a longer term strategy, increase flexibility and hours of care to families with irregular schedules 	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 513 932 703"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th>Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sometimes not very flexible/study time/etc. 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral	Benefit			1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					0	1	2	2	9	<p>Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current eligible hours policy is both a provincial requirement and local means of managing overall fee subsidy demand within the program funding envelope provided; some flexibility is afforded service managers in the administration of the policy difficulties with childcare schedules for parents employed or in school part time is confirmed by many centres <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adopt strategy, recognizing that its implementation will be dependent on fee subsidy funding capacity realized through FDK implementation and should be balanced with increasing the referral care service level
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral	Benefit																									
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
0	1	2	2	9																							
Referrals for all Centres (2011-2012)																											
<p>1.04</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Sept 2011- June 2012 – Maintain Status Quo Referral Childcare service level, priorities and business processes: ie: Provide subsidies for 20 referral children from September 2011 – June 2012 using 	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 1005 932 1195"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th>Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral	Benefit			1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					1	0	4	3	6	<p>Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> in 2009 a hold was applied for referral care fee subsidies in order to avoid invoking a wait list for all fee subsidy eligible families (including working families) in 2011 with additional funding and the 1st phase of FDK, referral care fee subsidies were again made available but at a lower service level (ie:limited to 20 children). Screening criteria were also imposed ie: children with either special needs or experiencing developmental delays; children referred for socialization & interaction opportunities were not included 2011-2012 referral care service level will be maintained, ie: = 20 subsidies @ 5 half days or 2-3 full days (based on space availability) for 10 months (Sept- June) objective of limited service level is to serve as many children as
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral	Benefit																									
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
1	0	4	3	6																							

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																									
existing referral form and process		<p>possible, without limiting service access to employment/education engaged parents or exceeding the provincial funding allocation and incurring 100% municipal expenses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> current process is based on first come first served basis and does not include any prioritization of children (see strategy 1.07 & 1.08 which will add a referral care prioritization component effective Sept 2012) <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adopt strategy, recognizing it does not provide the maximum service level but rather maximizes the number of children served within the existing funding allocation; service level will be increased as fee subsidy if available 																									
1.05 • First opportunity for September 2011 referral care will be given to referral children that were active between February and June 2011	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 737 930 922"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feel it is important to give first opportunity to children active between Feb & June 2011 Benefit to those returning - challenge to others 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					0	2	3	2	7	<p>Administrative Undertaking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> first opportunity offered to Feb-June 2011 children in recognition of the short period of service provided to them in 2011 This strategy will be applied for September 2011 only due to the shortened service period.
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																								
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
0	2	3	2	7																							
1.06 • Medically fragile parents/ guardians will continue (in addition to 20 referral children)	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 1154 930 1339"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are medically fragile included in the #'s. Had family try this option and denied twice. 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					1	2	1	0	10	<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> referral care for children with medically fragile parents/guardians is in addition to the 20 referrals in 1.04. eligibility criteria for "Medical fragile" are objective, well defined & require health practitioner confirmation <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintain this strategy status quo
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																								
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
1	2	1	0	10																							

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																									
<u>Referrals for all Centres (2012-2013)</u> – Implement new referral process:																											
1.07 Effective May 2012, for September 2012 – Maintain Status Quo Referral Childcare service levels and priorities AND implement a new business process providing referral allocations to referring agencies and requiring them to prioritize space assignment. Referring agencies will be allocated a maximum number of referrals using a new referral form	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 337 928 529"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </thead> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do we have an idea how many referrals to each agency Are the allotments going to be the same # (ie. 20 referrals, 36 referrals total) Need more information. Who are the agencies? Will each agency use their allotment? Will children who need care get care? 20 spaces are not enough. Therefore, we feel that it will be important to monitor the unused allotments carefully. Referring agencies that have met their allotment must be able to tap into the unused allotments of other agencies in order to make further referrals. 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					2	1	4	5	2	<p>Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> referral allocations to participating agencies will be based on their past year referral level history; the objective of implementing referral allocations to child service agencies and institutions is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to promote pre-referral screening to ensure children with the greatest need are served first to foster consultation and collaborative case management among agencies so that referral care is a service option rather than a default service activity major referral originators include: Community Living Kingston, CAS, Better Beginnings, Pathways, Child Development Centre (Hotel Dieu), KFL&A Public Health. a separate outreach to referring agencies is underway; identified concerns and feedback will be addressed in development of strategy implementation procedures allotments will be increased if any fee subsidy surplus is realized through FDK implementation <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> effective June 2012, adopt strategy; maintain ongoing communications with both referring agencies and service providers to develop process and assess allocations
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																								
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
2	1	4	5	2																							
1.08 A small allocations under "other" will be provided to accommodate doctor referrals & new	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 1312 928 1494"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>6</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </thead> </table>	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					0	0	6	4	3	<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this strategy proposes that in addition to the referral allocations assigned to referring agencies, a small number (3-5) will be kept unassigned for referrals that originate from sources "other" than agencies with allocations so that these too can be considered. Detailed
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																								
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
0	0	6	4	3																							

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																									
agency referrals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't understand "small allocation" under "other" for doctor referrals and new agency referrals 	<p>procedures will be developed prior to June 2012 implementation in conjunction with referring agencies and service providers.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> as proposed, include a few(initially 3-5) unallocated referrals as part of broader referral allocation strategy 																									
1.09 Subsidized care will be provided from September to June each year	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 516 949 701"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th>Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenge to find for 2+ months. 12 months would be ideal. What happens to child in summers? 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral	Benefit			1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					4	2	2	1	5	<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the September to June service period for referral care is recommended because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it follows the school year cycle; it will either initiate both the child & parent to this calendar cycle or coincide with the existing calendar of school age siblings; parents and referring agency should seek alternative child development opportunities/venues during the summer to assist in the child's development financially, more children are served for the same amount of funding, ie: the cost of care for 5 children over 12 months is very similar to the cost of serving 6 children over 10 months, hence a 16.6% increase in the number of children served it allows for review of associated year to date expenditures and a determination of the affordable service level for the last 4 months of the current year and the first 6 months of the next year <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adopt strategy
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral	Benefit																									
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
4	2	2	1	5																							
Stabilization Strategy for Helen Tufts & the Child Centre																											
1.10 For 2011-2012 The Child Centre and Helen Tufts will be allocated 8 referral children each and subsidized care will be provided from September 2011 until	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 1227 949 1412"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th>Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> <td>0</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need is there; approach is 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral	Benefit			1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					0	0	5	0	7	<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the unique and important services provided by both Helen Tufts Nursery School and The Child Centre in Sharbot Lake are recognized the need to provide financial stabilization to these centres during both FDK implementation and the Referral Care restructuring were a priority for Phase 1 and 2 FDK implementation (Sept 2010 & Sept 2011) also see 5.03 and 5.04
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral	Benefit																									
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
0	0	5	0	7																							

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																									
June 2012	questionable. ie. exclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different in rural and urban 	Recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adopt strategy 																									
1.11 Transitional plans will be submitted by both agencies for review prior to approving an extension of this stabilization funding for 2012-2013	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 402 949 594"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th>Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> <td>6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although we agree with the stabilization funding being extended to 2012, we would expect that their transition plans would include strategies for their centres to be viable beyond 2012. 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral	Benefit			1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					0	1	4	2	6	Response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> stabilization funding is intended to be a time limited transitional buffer to assist service providers to determine the feasibility of their ongoing service delivery and to allow the re-structuring of their service delivery to a viable post FDK model, likely including limited referral care service levels Stabilization funding must be one time short term as there is no funding available to mitigate ongoing operating deficits of childcare service providers as 2012-2013 will mark the third year of dedicated stabilization funding for Helen Tufts and The Child Centre, the requirement for submission of detailed business plans that demonstrate the viability of each service provider reflective of full FDK implementation and ongoing limited referral care service levels, is a reasonable requirement to secure the third and final year (2012-2013) of dedicated funding Recommendation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adopt strategy
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral	Benefit																									
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
0	1	4	2	6																							
<i>Extended Day –</i>																											
Objective: Optimize service access for families requiring childcare and fee subsidy assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need more information. Regarding surplus child care dollars, I would suggest the following: 50 % to WEG, 25 % to Enhanced Support, 25 % to Health and Safety money. 	Response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extended day surplus cannot be for wage subsidy It is not possible to forecast surplus in sufficient time to reinvest it in Special Needs Enhanced Support as surplus can only be reasonably forecast in fall (late Q3-Q4) of the year 																									
1.12 Reallocate any identified extended day fee subsidy surplus to broader fee	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 1377 949 1487"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th>Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral	Benefit			1	2	3	4	5	Response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overall Extended Day allocation is only \$32K and as such any surplus is likely better allocated fully to fee subsidies which assists more families and is accessible to all centres with fee subsidy 										
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral	Benefit																									
1	2	3	4	5																							

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																									
subsidy envelope (option 1)	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 285 955 363"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specifically referrals Use projected fee subsidy surpluses toward wage subsidy pressures. Would need to know where and what other pressures are. 	SCORES					1	0	2	2	7	<p>agreements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Childcare funding pressure currently exist in all three major funding programs: fee subsidy, wage subsidy and special needs surplus Extended Day fee subsidy can be reallocated toward regular fee subsidy, special need resourcing or one time health and safety requests surplus Extended Day fee subsidy cannot be reallocated to wage subsidy or wage improvement. while the application of surplus extended day funding can include increased referral care, the first priority for fee subsidy remains employment/education engaged families; <p>Recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adopt strategy, allocating any unused extended day fee subsidy funding to broader fee subsidy envelope as permitted under MEDU childcare funding flexibility guidelines 															
SCORES																											
1	0	2	2	7																							
1.13 Reallocate any identified extended day fee subsidy surplus to One-time health & safety requests (option 2, if no fee subsidy pressures exist)	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 883 955 997"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="491 997 955 1075"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> <td>6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will small centres always benefit? 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					0	0	4	1	6	<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> service provider input suggest the reallocation to broader fee subsidy (option 1 above) is the preference <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dedicate any extended day surplus to fee subsidies per 1.12 above
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																								
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
0	0	4	1	6																							

Special Needs Resourcing Funding

<p>Objective: Manage limited Special Needs Resourcing funds to ensure children with the greatest needs are</p>		
---	--	--

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																										
	<p>supported and mitigate pressures in enhanced support funding.</p>																											
2.01	<p>For 2012 begin re-focus special needs supports on children 0-3 years 8 months of age</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 431 949 623"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="center">1</td> <td align="center">2</td> <td align="center">3</td> <td align="center">4</td> <td align="center">5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">6</td> <td align="center">1</td> <td align="center">0</td> <td align="center">1</td> <td align="center">6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is supporting enhanced support for the 6-12? • Must ensure families have family support case manager if leaving services to school Board. • I agree that the focus should be on children ages 0-3.8 but not limited to them when others need it as well that may be in a licensed centre older than 3.8 • Why penalize children over 3.8 who need support? • All children in licensed childcare should still have focus. 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					6	1	0	1	6	<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consensus input from service providers indicates that special needs resourcing requirements remain great once children commence school. • The Special Needs Resourcing service provider clearly articulated concerns that by moving to quickly to refocus on children 0-3.8 years could create a gap in service for special needs children 4-12 years of age. <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise strategy as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consult with Special Needs Resourcing Programs on transitioning to serve younger children and developing a protocol for servicing children 4 – 12 years of age. 2. Standardize data collection and reporting of special needs service delivery to better understand, evaluate and plan service delivery within the limited funding allocation.
RANKING																												
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																									
1	2	3	4	5																								
SCORES																												
6	1	0	1	6																								

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations
2.01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource Consulting is beginning to experience a shift in the involvement of Resource Consultants with families and children. Our experience has been, for many families, to have a long service relationship. The realistic timeframe for involvement will be not 3.8 years but 2.8 years as most families are not looking for licensed care until the child is one year. Because of a lengthy relationship many side benefits were realized. The Resource Consultants got to know children very well in order to provide effective strategies and resources. RC's helped families form their foundation regarding their value on inclusion. Parents learned how to be effective advocates for their child. We were able to connect families with needed resources, provide them with useful information that assisted beyond their child's time in childcare. There is a concern that although the 	

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations							
		<p>child care needs will be met in FDK other less tangible benefits of the RC service will not have time to be nurtured. The experiences that families have had in childcare often shape their expectations of services and education going forward. The role of the Resource Consultant has been instrumental in parents learning path, increased confidence and expectations for education regarding inclusion. The expertise of the RC's to educate and facilitate the implementation of inclusive practices in critical in the continued work toward best practices in inclusion. The function that RC's provide that impact children and families beyond the child care setting are at risk of being diminished. RC's should ideally follow children and families through to the transition to Grade one or to the end of licensed care in children are in B & A.</p>							
2.02	Exclude special needs resourcing	<table border="1"> <tr> <td align="center" colspan="3">RANKING</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Challeng</td> <td>Neutral</td> <td>Benefit</td> </tr> </table>	RANKING			Challeng	Neutral	Benefit	<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MEDU rate setting model for Board operated Extended day programs
RANKING									
Challeng	Neutral	Benefit							

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																									
provision to Board operated extended day programs	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 285 911 438"> <tr> <td align="center" colspan="5">e</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">1</td> <td align="center">2</td> <td align="center">3</td> <td align="center">4</td> <td align="center">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center" colspan="5">SCORES</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">3</td> <td align="center">0</td> <td align="center">6</td> <td align="center">1</td> <td align="center">4</td> </tr> </table> <ul data-bbox="491 446 945 1136" style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not adequate information to comment on Board operated B and A programs yet. Information is not known if B and A ratios and the special needs funding allotment is enough to ensure a quality care and learning environment. If an RC is not involved with families in board operated B and A then families need to be offered another service provider for the support, information and resources that will be absent without the RC's involvement. • They should fund their programs with Board funds 	e					1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					3	0	6	1	4	<p>includes a universal base funding component for special needs service provision and as such, should be a self funded expenditure; it is City Childcare Programs staff's understanding that where fee subsidy is provided for Board operated extended day care, the per diem rate will include the special needs cost component</p> <ul data-bbox="982 479 1995 617" style="list-style-type: none"> • Local School Boards have indicated that there are no immediate plans to implement direct Board operated extended day programs at this time and therefore while this strategy may be recommended for approval, it is not likely to be applied for the next few years. <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul data-bbox="1024 698 1260 730" style="list-style-type: none"> • adopt strategy 					
e																											
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
3	0	6	1	4																							
2.03 Limit provision of Special Needs Resourcing to school site B&A programs, except when significant safety & security concerns have been identified	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 1136 911 1364"> <tr> <td align="center" colspan="5">RANKING</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">Challenge</td> <td align="center">Neutral</td> <td align="center">Benefit</td> <td align="center">e</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">1</td> <td align="center">2</td> <td align="center">3</td> <td align="center">4</td> <td align="center">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center" colspan="5">SCORES</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">6</td> <td align="center">1</td> <td align="center">4</td> <td align="center">1</td> <td align="center">2</td> </tr> </table> <ul data-bbox="491 1404 945 1511" style="list-style-type: none"> • Children in B&A and families need to have access to needed supports. Ratios are 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral	Benefit	e		1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					6	1	4	1	2	<p>Response:</p> <ul data-bbox="1024 1185 2016 1291" style="list-style-type: none"> • Service provider input rightly requires that the Resource Consulting service be separated from the Enhanced Support service of the Special Needs Resourcing Services <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul data-bbox="1024 1372 1974 1511" style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise strategy to: "Limit provision of enhance support funding to school site B/A programs, except when significant safety and security concerns have been identified"
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral	Benefit	e																								
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
6	1	4	1	2																							

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations
	<p>too high and environment often not appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit Provision to school site B and A – Enhanced Support services are already limited by the funding available. The current practice is to provide limited Enhanced Support, primarily for situations defined as safety concerns. However an RC is always available to assist with strategies and resources to ensure quality program and inclusion. We would not want to limit the RC involvement in the B and A programs or as a resource to the family. • As an operator of many before & after school programs, we are very concerned about the lack of special needs resource funding for children from 3years 9 months– 12 years. Unless all of the B & A programs are taken over and supported by the Board of Education, these children will “fall through the cracks” with no support given to them. 	<p><i>The intention of the revision is to recognize that Resource Consultant services will continue to be available at the request of the B/A staff.</i></p>

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																				
Wage Subsidy Funding																						
<p>Objective: Stabilize Childcare Providers and the overall service system during the implementation of the full day early learning kindergarten program (FDK) and extended day programs by limiting access (of new and expanding childcare sites) to wage subsidies for the period of 2012-2014.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't understood this statement • Always taking money and spreading it further. Need more monies. 	<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current wage subsidy distribution model (approved by Council in 2007) prescribes a fair, equitable and sustainable, method of distributing a fixed funding envelope to a growing childcare service provider system without the addition of 100% municipal funding • the current model accommodates growth and expansion by calculating the equitable distribution (share) of the fixed funding envelope among all eligible licensed centres (system expansion = reduced share of entitlement) • in view of the reduced childcare service need forecast, this strategy will stabilize the entitlement rate somewhat while existing operators assess and transform their programs to meet changing needs 																				
<p>3.01 New centres opening in 2011 and otherwise eligible to access to wage subsidies in 2013, will be placed on "hold"</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 1024 940 1211"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> <tr> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> <td>2</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2010 even better • Why do new centres not have to wait and be included – all centres need wait periods, lists to start. This would allow centre to be open and viable and stop existing pots of money from 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5	0	0	5	2	7	<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the current policy requires a minimum 1 year waiting period for new operators before they can complete a wage subsidy entitlement application, imposing the hold retroactively is not recommended as it could be seen as rescinding a funding commitment (ie: to centres that opened in 2010 and were provided the current policy) • As no new centres have opened to date in 2011, in the event that a new operator commences operations, notification will be issued along with the policy request indicating that the policy is under review (before Council) and that policy changes related to the waiting period and eligibility of new operators are anticipated. • The objective of this set of strategies is to "stabilize wage subsidy funding for existing service providers" by limiting the growth of the
RANKING																						
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																			
1	2	3	4	5																		
0	0	5	2	7																		

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																				
	<p>stretching further. Increase funding pots based on #'s and need.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expansion has been overdone in the past few years. This needs to be discouraged in the future. The "hold" on wage subsidy should help with this. 	<p>overall entitlement pool(wage subsidy is currently distributed equitably based on relative entitlement of each service provider within a fixed funding allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service expansion in the past few years has dropped the allocation rate from approximately 97% entitlement to about 71% entitlement. <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adopt strategy, with an effective hold date for new operators of January 2011 																				
<p>3.02 Existing sites in receipt of wage subsidy who undergo expansion, will have their expanded wage subsidy entitlement limited to a net increase of 5 additional spaces above their most current license, effective January 2012</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 656 940 846"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> <tr> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>7</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>SCORES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need more information. What if only key for Centre to remain open and viable – they increase more spaces to remain open. Change 16 preschool spaces to 15 toddler spaces? Although we are in support of limiting the random opening of new centres, we are concerned about the limitation of the funding to only 5 additional spaces for legitimate viable expansions (such as Third Party extended day). Expansion for only 5 spaces is not financially viable (The School 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5	1	1	7	1	2	<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> while existing service provider rating of this strategy is much less favourable than for the limitation of wage subsidy access to new providers (3.01 above), in order to achieve the stated goal above (3.01) to “stabilize wage subsidy funding for existing service providers”, both restriction of new centres opening and restriction of expansion by existing providers is required the 5 space expansion limitation will assist those service providers who re-engineer existing programs due to FDK implementation, but maintain a level playing field between new providers and existing providers who undertake significantly larger expansions or development of additional sites (for example new in school extended day or B&A programs). restricting new service providers without restricting expansions of existing service providers would not protect all existing service providers equally from funding fluctuations but rather would simply favour existing providers who elect to expand <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adopt strategy with an effective hold date for existing providers of January 2012
RANKING																						
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																			
1	2	3	4	5																		
1	1	7	1	2																		

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																				
		Boards have noted 20 as the viable number for an Extended Day program).																				
3.04	Expanded entitlement will be recognized only once during the "hold" period	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 435 949 623"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> <tr> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>7</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="491 630 865 662">• Need more information</p>	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5	2	1	7	1	2
RANKING																						
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																			
1	2	3	4	5																		
2	1	7	1	2																		
	<p data-bbox="974 438 1134 470">Response:</p> <ul data-bbox="974 477 1314 509" style="list-style-type: none"> • same as 3.02 above <p data-bbox="974 548 1239 581">Recommendation:</p> <ul data-bbox="974 587 1953 695" style="list-style-type: none"> • adopt strategy, with an effective hold date for existing providers of January 2012 and limiting 5 space expansion to once only for the duration of the hold period 																					

One-Time Health & Safety Funding																						
	<p data-bbox="172 847 466 1237">Objective: Provide funding for licence critical items using projected fee subsidy surpluses without resorting to the implementation of a fee subsidy wait list</p>																					
4.01	When in-year projections identify fee subsidy surpluses, "licence critical" requests will be reviewed for possible funding	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 1247 949 1435"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> <tr> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>5</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="491 1442 949 1507">• I think any surplus should be divided between referral</p>	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5	1	1	5	3	3
RANKING																						
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																			
1	2	3	4	5																		
1	1	5	3	3																		
<p data-bbox="974 1250 1134 1282">Response:</p> <ul data-bbox="974 1289 2016 1507" style="list-style-type: none"> • strategy initially proposed as service manager ability to assist with one time H&S funding in past few years has been limited; Service providers have indicated a greater preference for reinvestment of any surplus fee subsidy to wage subsidy funding or maintained within fee subsidy to increase referral care is noted • service providers indicate preferred use of available funding to 																						

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																									
		<p>subsidy dollars for families to attend a centre and towards wage subsidy (HTNS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same centre as always • Using identified surpluses to fund licensed critical items only rewards those centres who are not financially responsible in their budgeting process • Transfer monies to other areas as needed. I.e. subsidy for childcare <p>address wage wage pressures or increase referral care service level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the estimated value of all requests received for 2011 is approximately \$ 50,000, however not are eligible using the "one time" and "licence critical" criteria <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for 2011, allocate an upside limit of \$25,000 toward funding "licence critical" one time health and safety requests as surplus fee subsidy will allow • for 2012 and onward, fund "licence critical" one time Health and Safety requests as surplus fee subsidy will allow, as a second priority, only if wage subsidy entitlement is paid out above 90% of entitlement . 																									
4.02	When funding approvals exceeds projected surpluses, funding will be distributed on a proportional basis	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 808 940 997"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th>Neutral</th> <th colspan="3">Benefit</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </thead></table> <p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strategy is associated with 4.01 <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adopt this component, in conjunction with revised strategy 4.01 above 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral	Benefit			1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					0	1	4	3	5
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral	Benefit																									
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
0	1	4	3	5																							

Stabilization (Transition) Minor Capital Funding		
<p>Objective: Provide transitional funding for minor renovations to Childcare Providers to re-engineer their programs to serve younger children</p>		<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eligible expenses are for minor renovations such as adding a wall to create an infant sleep room in a previous JK/SK room, renovating a playground space and renovating washrooms for toddlers etc.

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																									
5.01	For 2011 as per previous process, agencies will complete an application to request funding	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 285 940 477"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </thead> </table> <ul data-bbox="491 483 953 1036" style="list-style-type: none"> • These centres need to be answered separately • User friendly applications? • Need more friendly process earlier • The current criteria used for the funding limits agencies from applying unless they are impacted that year. This does not allow for preparation for future impact. The development of a more user friendly process needs to be implemented now • Some tweaking required 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					2	0	5	3	2
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																								
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
2	0	5	3	2																							
5.02	For 2012, develop a process with Service Provider input that is more "user friendly"	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 1042 940 1230"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> <td>2</td> <td>6</td> </tr> </thead> </table> <ul data-bbox="491 1237 865 1269" style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more information 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					0	0	5	2	6
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																								
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
0	0	5	2	6																							

Stabilization (Transition) Operating Funding		
Objective: Stabilize Childcare		

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																														
<p>Providers during implementation of the full day early learning kindergarten program by providing limited financial assistance and service system management expertise</p>																																
<p>5.03 Helen Tufts Nursery School (HTNS) and the Child Centre will continue to be allocated dedicated funding for 8 referral children each for September 2011 to June 2012. Repeat these dedicated allocations for an additional term for Sept 2012-June 2013 upon submission and approval of transitional plans which demonstrate long term post FDK</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 727 940 915"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> <tr> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefits to 16 families is high, however it is a challenge for the centres not to have 12 months and to have only part-time enrollment. 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5						SCORES					0	1	3	1	7	<p>Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> see comments in 1.09 – 1.11 <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adopt strategy
RANKING																																
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																													
1	2	3	4	5																												
SCORES																																
0	1	3	1	7																												

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations
-------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------------------

	viability																											
5.04	One-time costs for program transitioning to younger age groups or for required relocations out of schools due to FDK implementation	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 324 940 511"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="3">Neutral</th> <th>Benefit</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>7</td> <td>2</td> <td>4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul data-bbox="491 511 940 738" style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more information. • What happens to consult with program in schools? <i>(note: - this input statement not understood by City Childcare Programs staff)</i> 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral			Benefit	1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					0	0	7	2	4	<p>Response:</p> <ul data-bbox="976 365 2005 730" style="list-style-type: none"> • Intention of proposed strategy was to fund limited one-time costs that are not eligible under Stabilization (Transition) Minor Capital Funding as now permitted by expanded MEDU flexibility • service provider input does not suggest this is a high priority for them • service provider input to other strategies suggests access to maximum regular operating revenue, including avoidance of a fee subsidy wait list, augmentation of wage subsidy allocations and referral care service level are greater priorities both on a regular basis and during the FDK transitioning period and are more universally beneficial <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul data-bbox="976 812 2005 1128" style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise Strategy as follows: “Utilize Stabilization/Transition Operating Funding flexibility to its full extent to increase operating revenue to service providers including through: <ul data-bbox="1123 958 2005 1128" style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Avoidance of a fee subsidy wait list ○ limited augmentation of the referral care service level where need is demonstrated AND year to date fee subsidy utilization & projected year end surplus indicate capacity to fund additional referral care.
RANKING																												
Challenge	Neutral			Benefit																								
1	2	3	4	5																								
SCORES																												
0	0	7	2	4																								

Best Start Childcare and Family Centre/System			
---	--	--	--

6.01	Participate in all provincial and local planning	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 1209 940 1404"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="3">Neutral</th> <th>Benefit</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> <td>9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul data-bbox="491 1404 940 1510" style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to know what is going on and what is coming • We need more information 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral			Benefit	1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					0	0	3	1	9	<p>Response:</p> <ul data-bbox="976 1258 2005 1502" style="list-style-type: none"> • Provincial undertaking to date has included multi sector children services consultation; it is anticipated that the provincial direction to be taken will not be announced until after the Provincial Election in October • City Childcare Programs staff have shared all available information to date with service providers and concur that more information is required; the intention of the strategy is to ensure that timely access
RANKING																												
Challenge	Neutral			Benefit																								
1	2	3	4	5																								
SCORES																												
0	0	3	1	9																								

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																									
		and the ability to have input into this section																									
6.02	Strengthen data collections tools & statistical reporting to assist with planning efforts	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 548 949 737"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th>Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> <th></th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> <td>1</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </thead> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depends on the type of data collected 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral	Benefit			1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					0	0	5	1	7
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral	Benefit																									
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
0	0	5	1	7																							
		<p>to the information and local planning based on the provincial direction is realized</p> <p>Administrative Undertaking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff will represent the Childcare Service manager in all Best Start Child and Family Centre/System consultation, planning and information sharing events. 																									
		<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purpose of data collection is two fold: both to assist in regular childcare service management mandate and secondly to inform Best Start Child and Family Centre/System planning <p>Administrative Undertaking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will pursue data collection to fulfill Childcare Service Management role as required 																									

Best Start Unconditional Grant																											
7.01	Acquisition and start-up costs associated with purchase of internet accessible/Web based Centralized Childcare wait List Registry	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 930 949 1118"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th>Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> <th></th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> <td>6</td> </tr> </thead> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cautiously support this I have given this a lot of thought and spoken some more to directors who already maintain their waiting list on the computer. I do not see any advantage to us as I do not see maintaining a waiting list as much work at all..I still estimate that I might spend 30 minutes per week 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral	Benefit			1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					0	0	4	1	6
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral	Benefit																									
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
0	0	4	1	6																							
		<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> service provider are cautiously supportive approximately 80% of 91 families applying for fee subsidy who were surveyed during a 4 week period in July 2011, indicate they would use/access this service (either instead of, or in addition to other research and care selection strategies including word of mouth, individual childcare centre website viewing, telephone and in person contact with centres) Further research and reporting back to Council required on: feasibility, cost and potential/recommended supplier (see Strategy 8.03) In addition to the acquisition and start-up costs associated with purchase of the application, it is recognized that funding should be made eligible to childcare service providers to update their IT requirements to ensure they experience the full benefit of the application as well 																									

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																														
	<p>on it. I do see an advantage to parents if the parameters are open enough although it is a very cold way of registering your child. The few families I spoke to could see an advantage but they would still call to speak to a director to discuss philosophy/ concerns/ updates for time lines etc. The only true advantage I see for spending so much money when child care money is in short supply is for gathering stats to hopefully get more money for our area.</p>	<p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt strategy, and pending deliverables of related strategy 8.03 																														
<p>7.02 Fund shortfalls in Stabilization/ Transition Operating allocation (2012-2014)</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 984 940 1172"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> <tr> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would hope that the intent of funding shortfalls in Stabilization (Transition) Operating allocation (2012-2014) would not be used to fund Helen Tufts and the Child centre again. There will be other centres struggling during the 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5						SCORES					1	1	4	5	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • input suggests some service provider support of utilizing Best Start Unconditional funds for One time transitional costs • Council previously approved dedication of \$93,600 in Best Start Unconditional Funds over the 5 year FDK implementation period to assist with transitional costs for existing Kingston and Frontenac Childcare service providers with viable post FDK operating plans • recognizing that these funds are limited and not renewable, recommended expenditures should be for one-time costs only and should not be used to respond to service providers experiencing operating shortfalls (deficit funding) as this use would be both unsustainable in childcare and create a troublesome precedent beyond the childcare service sector for the city
RANKING																																
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																													
1	2	3	4	5																												
SCORES																																
1	1	4	5	1																												

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																									
	<p>transition and they should have access to support as well.</p>	<p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise Strategy as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconfirm previous Council allocation of up to \$93,000 in Best Start Unconditional grant for use over the course of the FDK implementation as one time stabilization and transitional funding for existing Kingston and Frontenac Childcare service providers with viable post FDK business plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>eligibility criteria to be developed in consultation with Childcare Service Providers and other stakeholder agencies</i> • Do not utilize Best Start Unconditional funds for Childcare Service Provider operating deficits 																									
<p>7.03 As a municipal contribution, in addition to provincial funding, provide funding for the development and/or start-up of the Kingston Frontenac Child and Family Centre/System</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 737 940 922"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th colspan="2">Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more information – this is not familiar • More information required • Need more info when available • Do not know about the Kingston Frontenac Child and Family Centre/System • Is this what Best Start Grant should be for? Core childcare losing more money. • We would not support funding the development and/or start up of Kingston Frontenac Child & Family 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral		Benefit		1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					2	1	4	4	0	<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • principal concern shared by service providers and City staff alike is the lack of information from the Province regarding Best Start Child and Family Centres/Systems <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eliminate this strategy until more information is provided by the Province on Best Start Child and Family Centres/System and a more fulsome local consultation on the matter, including input from Childcare Service Providers has been completed • Defer use of remaining Best Start Unconditional funds for any use other than the On-line Centralized Childcare Wait List Registry (7.01) and one time transitional funding for existing viable Childcare Service Providers (7.02).
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral		Benefit																								
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
2	1	4	4	0																							

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations
	<p>Centre/System from the Best Start unconditional grant funding. It is our understanding that this funding was for the licensed childcare sector and we would like to see it used for this purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has not been enough information shared with the childcare community on the Kingston Frontenac Child & Family Centre/System. 	

Service System Management & Administration																															
8.01	Enhance and strengthen relationships with Childcare Operators and Stakeholders	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th>Neutral</th> <th>Benefit</th> <th colspan="2"></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing – these should always be a priority to move forward • Need regular childcare program hosted meetings 				RANKING					Challenge	Neutral	Benefit			1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					0	0	0	2	11	Strategy underway and ongoing
RANKING																															
Challenge	Neutral	Benefit																													
1	2	3	4	5																											
SCORES																															
0	0	0	2	11																											
8.02	Enhance and strengthen relationships with School Boards	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th>Neutral</th> <th>Benefit</th> <th colspan="2"></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				RANKING					Challenge	Neutral	Benefit			1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					0	0	0	2	11	Strategy underway and ongoing
RANKING																															
Challenge	Neutral	Benefit																													
1	2	3	4	5																											
SCORES																															
0	0	0	2	11																											

**Responses to Comments to the 2011-2014 Childcare Programs Management Strategies
ARCP-11-017 Exhibit "B"**

Proposed Strategy	Service Provider Comments	Staff Responses and Recommendations																									
<p>8.03 Investigate feasibility of implementing an internet accessible/ Web-based Centralized Childcare Wait List Registry</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 289 940 477"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">RANKING</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th>Neutral</th> <th colspan="2">Benefit</th> <th></th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">SCORES</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </thead> </table> <ul data-bbox="491 483 953 1388" style="list-style-type: none"> • The \$10,000 to maintain web-based application – where would it be taken from? • Need more information • I am not sure about the web based application, I understand the one in the Sault is suppose to be really helpful, however it seems like a lot of money, and I can see that money going towards more subsidy dollars, which would benefit children, families and wages for ECE's that are staying in the Child Care field. Maybe I am not seeing the big picture as I tend to have tunnel vision for the children and families only. • Too costly. Nice idea though • We are in support of the exploration of the web based childcare wait list registry 	RANKING					Challenge	Neutral	Benefit			1	2	3	4	5	SCORES					1	0	2	2	7	<p>Response:</p> <ul data-bbox="982 329 2007 776" style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing operating costs will be covered from funds allocated for childcare administration • Survey of fee subsidy recipient families indicates support for this service enhancement • This application will significantly increase service accessibility • Increased information access will assist in marketing licensed childcare, a good mitigation strategy to offset FDK impact • MEDU consulted and supportive of initiative • KFL&A United Way recommended a similar initiative in their 2008 Success by Six "Early Learning & Child Care, Kingston, Frontenac, Lennox & Addington 2008 Review". • Further research on feasibility, cost and suitable applications required <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul data-bbox="1024 857 1959 922" style="list-style-type: none"> • adopt strategy, as a first step with reporting back to Council on feasibility, estimated costs and recommended product provider
RANKING																											
Challenge	Neutral	Benefit																									
1	2	3	4	5																							
SCORES																											
1	0	2	2	7																							

Program Name	2010 Approved Budget	2010 Actual Expenditure	2010 Surplus/ Deficit	2011 Approved Budget	Ministry/ City Cost Share	Description of Program
DNA Fee Subsidy	\$ 2,793,978	\$ 2,789,646	\$4,332	\$ 2,793,978	80/20	Provides fee subsidy to children aged 0 - 12 in licenced non-profit and profit child care sites.
DNA Special Needs	\$ 595,023	\$ 595,022	\$1	\$ 595,023	80/20	Provides funding for special needs children. We have a contract with 2 providers, one is on-site and the other is itinerant. The on-site serves children aged 2.5 to 6 years of age. The itinerant provider serves children 0 - 12 years of age.
DNA Administration	\$ 504,000	\$ 504,000	\$0	\$ 504,000	50/50	Provides funding to the municipality for administrative costs.
DNA Wage Subsidy, Non-Profit	\$ 2,150,932	\$ 2,152,501	(\$1,569)	\$ 2,130,643	80/20	Enables licenced child care programs and special needs resourcing services to enhance the salaries & benefits of staff filling permanent positions. Also, this includes some pay equity which provides operators of non-profit child care programs the opportunity to increase wages in keeping with their pay equity obligation. Flexibility between DNA Wage Subsidy, Non-Profit and Profit.
DNA Wage Subsidy, Profit	\$ 433,755	\$ 429,500	\$4,255	\$ 454,044	80/20	
Memorandum of Settlement Pay	\$ 149,651	\$ 149,651	(\$0)	\$ 149,651	100	As a result of the Memorandum of Settlement, the province provided additional pay equity funding for eligible non-profit service providers.
OW Formal Fee Subsidy	\$ 615,250	\$ 689,974	(\$74,724)	\$ 690,250	80/20	Provides fee subsidy to children aged 0 - 12 in licenced non-profit and profit child care sites. Only applicants in receipt of Ontario Works are eligible for this funding. Flexibility with OW Informal Fee Subsidy.
OW Informal Fee Subsidy	\$ 90,000	\$ 15,276	\$74,724	\$ 15,000	80/20	Provides fee subsidy to children aged 0 - 12 in non-licenced care. Only applicants in receipt of Ontario Works are eligible for this funding. Flexibility with OW Formal Fee Subsidy.
ELCC Administration	\$ 72,400	\$ 72,005	\$395	\$ 72,400	50/50	Provides funding to the municipality for administrative costs.
ELCC Fee Subsidy	\$ 626,875	\$ 619,911	\$6,964	\$ 626,875	80/20	Provides fee subsidy to children aged 0 - 12 in licenced non-profit and profit child care sites.
ELCC Special Needs	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$0	\$ 45,000	80/20	Provides funding for special needs children aged 0 - 12. This funding is only given to the itinerant provider
ELCC Wage Subsidy, Non-Profit	\$ 28,140	\$ 28,140	\$0	\$ 27,818	80/20	Same as DNA wage subsidy except no pay equity funding is included in this envelope. Flexibility between ELCC Wage Subsidy, Non-Profit and Profit.
ELCC Wage Subsidy, Profit	\$ 6,860	\$ 6,860	\$0	\$ 7,182	80/20	

Program Name	2010 Approved Budget	2010 Actual Expenditure	2010 Surplus/ Deficit	2011 Approved Budget	Ministry/ City Cost Share	Description of Program
Wage Improvement, Non-Profit	\$ 257,492	\$ 248,431	\$9,061	\$ 243,968	100	Enables licenced child care programs and special needs resourcing services to improve salaries and benefits of existing program staff and private home providers working directly with children aged 0 - 12.
Wage Improvement, Profit	\$ 58,308	\$ 67,369	(\$9,061)	\$ 71,832	100	Administration staff are not eligible for this funding. Flexibility between Wage Improvement, Non-Profit & Profit.
Small Water Works	\$ 10,597	\$ 7,472	\$3,125	\$ 10,597	100	Provides funding to day care providers that are required to comply under Ontario Regulations 505/01 and 170/03, Drinking Water Protection. We fund 2 providers. NOTE: funded by MCYS
ELCD Operating (\$1,079,400)						Flexibility between Administration, Fee Subsidy, Special Needs and Wage Subsidy.
Administration	\$ -	\$ 14,507	(\$14,507)	\$ 59,781	100	Provides funding to the municipality for administrative costs.
Fee Subsidy	\$ 657,209	\$ 547,702	\$109,507	\$ 597,428	100	Provides fee subsidy to children aged 0 - 6 in licenced non-profit and profit child care sites.
Special Needs	\$ 144,891	\$ 144,891	\$0	\$ 144,891	100	Provides funding for special needs children aged 0 - 12. This funding is only given to the itinerant program.
Wage Subsidy, Non-Profit	\$ 222,949	\$ 282,266	(\$59,317)	\$ 220,398	100	Same as DNA wage subsidy except no pay equity funding is included in this envelope. Flexibility between Non-Profit and Profit.
Wage Subsidy, Profit	\$ 54,351	\$ 90,034	(\$35,683)	\$ 56,902	100	
ELCD 100% Fee Subsidy	\$ 171,500	\$ 180,411	(\$8,911)	\$ 171,500	100	Provides fee subsidy to children aged 0 - 6 in licenced non-profit and profit child care sites. Flexibility between ELCD 100% Fee Subsidy and Extended Day 100% Fee Subsidy.
Repairs & Maintenance	\$ 32,837	\$ 29,971	\$2,866		100	To assist child care providers with costs associated to Health and Safety issues in order to comply with the Ministry's licencing requirements. Funding for this is through the use of in-year projected fee subsidy surpluses.
Extended Day 100% Fee Subsidy	\$ 12,375	\$ 3,465	\$8,910	\$ 32,198	100	Provides fee subsidy to children in JK/SK participating in before and after school programs at Full Day Kindergarten sites.
Transition - Operating	\$ 85,400	\$ -	\$85,400	\$ 196,974	100	Provides fee subsidy to children aged 0 - 12 in licensed non-profit and profit child care sites. This funding includes \$64,050 of funding deferred by the City until Q1 of 2011

Program Name	2010 Approved Budget	2010 Actual Expenditure	2010 Surplus/ Deficit	2011 Approved Budget	Ministry/ City Cost Share	Description of Program
Transition - Capital	\$ -	\$ -	\$0	\$ 8,400	100	Provides one-time funding to support licenced child care programs as they transition to serve children ages 0 - 4. This funding is targeted to non-profit programs where 4 and 5 year olds are moving to the Full Day Kindergarten program.
TOTAL	\$ 9,819,773	\$ 9,714,005	\$ 105,768	\$ 9,926,733		
Redirected to 2011			\$ 64,050			
NOTE: The above figures reflect previous and current provincial funding allocations and may differ from municipal budget allocations due to differing budget and funding confirmation cycles.						

BEST START UNCONDITIONAL GRANT
SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES 2005-2011

INITIATIVE	BUDGET	EXPENDED	REMAINING
Transition Plan 2005	67,940.00	67,937.58	2.42
Planning	25,000.00	1,606.50	23,393.50
Technology	110,000.00	98,053.58	11,946.42
Marketing	20,000.00	0.00	20,000.00
Consultation	40,000.00	7,178.26	32,821.74
Wage Improvement	133,100.00	127,627.38	5,472.62
Childcare Expansion (see attached summary)	1,923,860.00	1,379,187.68	496,672.32
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	2,319,900	1, 681,590.98	638,309.02
Expansion Funds committed – not yet expended		48,000.00	(48,000)
TOTAL EXPENDITURES + COMMITTED FUNDS	2,319,900	1,729,590.98	590,309.02

Summary of Best Start Licenced Childcare Expansion:

YEAR APPROVED	ORGANIZATION	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT	PROJECT STATUS	SPACES CREATED	FUNDING APPROVED/ EXPENDED
2005	Bayridge Drive Childcare Centre	Expansion of existing program.	Complete	25	* \$18,173.54
2005	Kingston Family YMCA	Expansion of existing program.	Complete	5	* \$9,029.38
2005	Wee Watch	Expansion of existing program.	Complete	15	* \$2,864.46
2006	The Child Centre	Capital construction for the expansion of an existing rural program.	Complete	12	\$266,232.10
2007	La Garderie Croque Soleil	Capital construction for the expansion of existing Francophone program.	Complete	36	\$319,455.78
2007	Pladec Day Care Centre	Re-location and expansion of childcare centre to new location within the same geographic area.	Complete	13	\$185,103.00
2007	Frontline Day Care	Expansion of Nursery School Program to a full time Childcare Program.	Complete	27	** \$28,295.98
2007	Treehouse Day Care	Minor capital funding to support the opening of a new centre on Wolfe Island. Note: <i>Program closed Dec/2010 – equipment redistributed.</i>	Complete	16	\$39,360.00
2008	Healthy Horizons	Re-location and expansion of childcare centre to new location within the same geographic area.	Spaces Operational	12	*** \$107,165.00
2009	Bayridge Drive Childcare Centre	Minor capital funding to support the opening of a new centre in West Kingston.	Complete	54	\$149,180.16
2009	Corner Clubhouse Day Care	Minor capital funding to support the opening of a new centre in Central Kingston.	Complete	40	\$133,051.37
2009	Limestone Advisory	Minor capital funding to support the expansion of an existing program.	Complete	6	\$17,000.00
2009	Pladec Day Care Centre	Capital construction funding to support the creation of a new centre in East Kingston.	Complete	71	\$200,000.00
2005-2011 Total Expansion Investment				332	\$1,474,910.72
OFFSETTING NON UNCONDITIONAL GRANT CONTRIBUTIONS					
2005	*Provincial funding provided prior to Unconditional Grant receipt and Reserve Fund establishment				\$24,834.24
2007	** Funding allocated from surplus fiscal DNA allocation as "one-time" (through special permission)				\$22,642.80
2011	*** Balance of Committed Funds pending reconciliation upon completion of playground installation				\$48,246.00
Net Childcare Expansion Funded by Best Start Unconditional Fund					\$1,379,187.68

Full Day Implementation	School Name & Location	Associated Childcare
		Centre Name
2010	First Avenue Public School 85 First Avenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ Circle of Friends - 38 Cowdy St ÿ Healthy Horizons - 880 Victoria St ÿ High Hopes - 674 Victoria St
2010	Frontenac Public School 38 Cowdy Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Circle of Friends * Better Beginnings ÿ Mulberry School - 25 Markland St ÿ Old MacDonald's - 237 Sydenham ÿ Something Special -10 Chapman St ÿ Une Ecole - 221 Queen St
2010	Perth Road Public School 1084 Walsh Road, Perth Road	
2010	Prince Charles Public School 6875 Hwy. 38, Verona	
2010	Sharbot Lake Public School 1083 Garrett Street, Sharbot Lake	The Child Centre 1004 Art Duffy Rd Sharbot Lake
2010	Holy Family Catholic School 114 Wiley Street	Oakwood - 33 Compton St
2010	St. James Major Catholic School Hwy. #38 Sharbot Lake	The Child Centre 1004 Art Duffy Rd Sharbot Lake
2010	St. Patrick Catholic School 3889 Wilton Rd, Harrowsmith	Harrowsmith NS - 3870 Harrowsmith Rd
2010	St. Peter Catholic School 48 Seventh Ave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ Healthy Horizons - 880 Victoria St ÿ High Hopes - 674 Victoria St
2011	J. G. Simcoe Public School 90 Wiley Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Better Beginnings · Oakwood - 33 Compton St
2011	Rideau Heights Public School 77 MacCauley Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Better Beginnings · Oakwood - 33 Compton St
2012	Bayridge Public School 1066 Hudson Drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * YMCA · Bay Park - 775 Progress Ave
2012	Catarauqui Woods Elementary School 1255 Birchwood Drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * FCCC · Bayridge Dr - 1035 Bayridge Dr
2012	Centennial Public School 120 Norman Rogers Drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * FCCC ÿ Complex NS - 47 Van Order Dr ÿ FCCC - LCVI - 153 Van Order Dr ÿ Kingston Montessori-1134 Johnson St ÿ Little Angels - 1206 Johnson St
2012	Harrowsmith Public School 4121 Colebrooke Road, Harrowsmith	Harrowsmith NS - 3870 Harrowsmith Rd
2012	Hinchinbrooke Public School 1021 Long Lake Road, Parham	The Child Centre 1004 Art Duffy Rd Sharbot Lake
2012	NEW SCHOOL Combining École Lundy's Lane & JE Horton Kingston EAST	Program Scheduled for Co-Location <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ Kid's Club - CFB Kingston ÿ Sunshine Playhouse - CFB Kingston · Rideau KDI - 235 Gore Rd · Pladec East - 671 Innovation Dr
2012	John XXIII Catholic School 736 High Gate Park Dr	Collins Bay KDI - 4075 Bath Road
2012	St. Martha Catholic School 455 St. Martha Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * St. Martha's KDI ÿ Rideau KDI - 235 Gore Rd ÿ Pladec East - 671 Innovation Dr

Full Day Implementation	School Name & Location	Associated Childcare
		Centre Name
2012	St. Thomas More Catholic School 234 Norman Rogers Dr.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ Complex NS - 47 Van Order Dr ÿ Kingston Montessori-1134 Johnson St ÿ Little Angels - 1206 Johnson St ÿ West End - 5 Miles Avenue
2013	Central Public School 237 Sydenham Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Old MacDonald's ÿ Circle of Friends - 38 Cowdy St ÿ Mulberry School - 25 Markland St ÿ Something Special - 10 Chapman St ÿ Une Ecole - 221 Queen St
2013	Clarendon Central Public School Box 17, 7356 Highway 506, Plevna	The Child Centre 1004 Art Duffy Rd Sharbot Lake
2013	Collins Bay Public School 4075 Bath Road	* Collins Bay KDI · Henderson CCC - 180 Henderson Blvd
2013	Glenburnie Public School 2252 Battersea Road, Glenburnie	* FCCC
2013	James R. Henderson Public School 361 Roosevelt Drive	* FCCC ÿ Building BI NS - 130 Lakeview Ave ÿ Henderson CCC - 180 Henderson
2013	Joyceville Public School 2903 Joyceville Road, Joyceville	
2013	Land O'Lakes Public School 1447 Mountain Grove Road	The Child Centre 1004 Art Duffy Rd Sharbot Lake
2013	Lord Strathcona Public School 251 McMahon Avenue	* YMCA ÿ Active World - 76 Smithfield Cres ÿ Rubber Duckie - 342 McMahon Ave
2013	Marysville Public School 53 Victoria Street, Wolfe Island	
2013	Storrington Public School 4576 Battersea Road, Battersea	
2013	Truedell Public School 641 Truedell Road	* YMCA · Bay Park - 775 Progress Ave
2013	Holy Name Catholic School 370 Kingston Mills Rd.	* Little Bits · Little Bits - 370 Kingston Mills Rd
2013	St. Patrick Catholic School 158 Patrick Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ Circle of Friends - 38 Cowdy St ÿ Mulberry School - 25 Markland St
2013	St. Paul Catholic School 266 McMahon Avenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ Active World - 76 Smithfield Cres ÿ Rubber Duckie - 342 McMahon Ave
2014	Elginburg Public School 2100 Unity Road, Elginburg	* FCCC
2014	Lancaster Drive Public School 1020 Lancaster Drive	* FCCC ÿ Bayridge Dr - 1035 Bayridge Dr ÿ Bayside Montessori-1212 Woodbine ÿ Kid's Place - 1044 Lancaster Dr ÿ Limestone NS - 930 Woodbine Rd
2014	Loughborough Public School 4330 Wheatley Street, Sydenham	* FCCC

Full Day Implementation	School Name & Location	Associated Childcare
		Centre Name
2014	Polson Park Public School 165 Robert Wallace Drive	* YMCA * La Garderie Educative ÿ Complex NS - 47 Van Order Dr ÿ FCCC - LCVI - 153 Van Order Dr ÿ Kingston Montessori-1134 Johnson ÿ Little Angels - 1206 Johnson St ÿ West End - 5 Miles Avenue ÿ YMCA CCC - 100 Wright Cres
2014	R. G. Sinclair Public School 19 Crerar Blvd	* FCCC ÿ Building BI NS - 130 Lakeview Ave ÿ Henderson CCC - 180 Henderson
2014	Rideau Public School 9 Dundas Street	* FCCC ÿ Corner Clubhouse- MacDonnell & Mack ÿ Frontenac Club - 442 Albert St ÿ High Hopes - 674 Victoria St ÿ Pladec - 349 Mack St ÿ PAL - 671 Brock St
2014	Sydenham Public School 5 Clergy Street East	* YMCA ÿ Allen Det NS - 10 Union St ÿ Gently RH - 259 Albert St ÿ Helen Tufts NS - 211 Johnson St ÿ Queens Daycare - 169 Union St
2014	W.J. Holsgrove Public School 1414 Sproule Street, Westbrook	Bayridge Dr 1035 Bayridge Dr
2014	Welborne Avenue Public School 190 Welborne Avenue	* FCCC ÿ Building BI NS - 130 Lakeview Ave ÿ Henderson CCC - 180 Henderson
2014	Winston Churchill Public School 530 Earl Street	* YMCA ÿ Corner Clubhouse - MacDonnell & Mack ÿ Gently RH - 259 Albert St ÿ Pladec - 349 Mack St ÿ PAL - 671 Brock St ÿ Queens Daycare - 169 Union St
2014	Archbishop O'Sullivan Catholic School 974 Pembridge Crescent	* YMCA ÿ Bay Park - 775 Progress Ave
2014	École catholique cathédrale 301 Johnson Street	ÿ Gently RH - 259 Albert St ÿ Helen Tufts NS - 211 Johnson St ÿ Something Special - 10 Chapman St ÿ Une Ecole - 221 Queen St
2014	Mother Teresa Catholic School 1044 Lancaster Drive	* Limestone Kid's Place ÿ Bayridge Drive - 1035 Bayridge Dr ÿ Bayside Montessori - 1212 Woodbine ÿ Limestone NS - 930 Woodbine Rd
2014	Our Lady of Lourdes Catholic School 20 Cranbrook Street	ÿ Building BI NS - 130 Lakeview Ave ÿ Henderson CCC - 180 Henderson ÿ Bayd

Full Day Implementation	School Name & Location	Associated Childcare
		Centre Name
2014	Sacred Heart Catholic School #27 Road 95, Wolfe Island	
2014	St. Marguerite Bourgeoys Catholic School 355 Waterloo Drive	* YMCA · Trillium KDI - 790 Edgar St
2014	St. Joseph/St. Mary Catholic School 671 Brock Street	* PAL ÿ Corner Clubhouse-MacDonnell & Mack ÿ Frontenac Club - 442 Albert St ÿ Pladec - 349 Mack St

* Centre Name in bold indicates it is located in the School