

# Child Care Contribution Tax Credit Meeting Agenda

February 6, 2007

1:00-3:00

OCCRRN

805 Liberty Street NE

Salem 97301

People Present: Dawn Norris, Tom Olson, Stephen Guntli, Bobbie Webber, Beth Green, Sonia Worcel, Sakre Edson, Sonja Svenson, Sue Norton, Marilyn States, Heidi McGowan via conference call.

## Share tax credit sales for 2006

Dawn shared we were \$8,340 short in contributions this year. We discussed the issue around tax credits during a kicker year and how CPAs are not as likely to advise their client to pay part of their tax liability through a tax credit because it affects their kicker refund. Basically the kicker is currently being calculated on line 41 on the Oregon 40 form and should be calculated from line 31 which is the tax liability before credits. Dawn has been working with David Foster from Housing and he took the information to the Department of Revenue and feels this is an issue they need to look into since it affects all tax credit programs. Heidi shared they tried to address this issue with Legislative Council but they did not understand exactly what we were talking about and how to change the wording to reflect the “kicker” problem.

**Action: Dawn will follow up with David Foster, making sure he is still working with the housing credits, and follow up with the Department of Revenue to determine the appropriate course for getting this changed.**

## Update on current legislative efforts

Heidi shared there are currently two draft bills being reviewed which gives Rep. Flores a chance to get other co-signers on the bills. One is to remove the sunset and the other to eliminate the cap. Tom suggested we add the sunset language into the bill which is lifting the cap.

## Share other tax credit ideas

Stephen passed out some information on his ideas for additional funding for the R&R system using tax credits. He requested feedback on a list of people he is interested in talking with about his ideas and who he should or should not speak with during this legislative session. Laura Smith would be a good person to talk with bringing a historical perspective and knowledge of how to move a bill through. Tom feels Stephen should not speak to anyone until we get the bill dropped.

**Action: Stephen will continue to research on his own without bringing attention to this additional tax idea.**

## Discuss recommendations from Year 1 evaluation and implications for Year 2 of the project and evaluation efforts

Provided an overview of Year 1 evaluation using the Executive Summary and highlighted the data collection system. Proposed modifications to the provider data collection for Year 2 were discussed and the group felt they were all appropriate changes.

Proposed modifications to the parent data collections for Year 2 were discussed.

Have already built in the parent consent with the provider up front so when the provider adds a child to their program they will not need to get consent at a later date. Have built in stipends for parents to fill

out the forms but it was difficult to get the parents to fill out the consent forms. Could look for incentives for providers to receive the consent forms from the parents. The amount of the incentive could be based on the level of consent forms returned.

Bobbie would like this project to always look at ALL the people. One question that might be interesting is for the families who are not receiving subsidies why they think they should be receiving subsidies. May look to parallel the questions of the CCEP parent survey to get at the financial aspect from all parents. Heidi shared that from a political perspective it is important to look at all the families to show we impacting children and families.

Discussed the discrepancies between the income levels and look at how to ask the questions to try and get a consistent response between the hard data and the self-report data.

#### **Decisions for NPC to incorporate:**

- **Work with programs to make the consent process part of the intake process.**
- **Keep the non-CCEP parents as part of the study.**
- **Creative strategies for comparison parents – Pizza party, toy party, reduction in child care certificate, and work with the provider to encourage parents to respond to the survey.**
- **Eliminate the parent interview and put a lot of energy into increasing the parent responses on the parent interview.**
- **Thinking conceptually of all parents in the program not just the CCEP parents.**
- **Need to look at the quarterly report and make sure the correct data is being collected.**
- **NPC needs to change the title of the Year 1 evaluation to the title of the project.**

#### **Meeting dates/Frequency**

Will meet quarterly and as needed.

#### **Update on 2<sup>nd</sup> pilot and decide on next steps**

The contract has been held up in the Attorney Generals office but should be in the signature process by next week. The project is called the Child Care Community Fund and has a few changes from the first pilot. The parent income level has been reduced from 85% to 70% to serve more people. The project will occur in Multnomah County including Milwaukie and will recruit child care providers who are at a Step 4 or below. Wage bonuses will be given a flat rate for each step as they move up the registry. There was some concern around this and the project will be looking at the flat rate system as the project proceeds. The project is looking to serve 10-12 family providers and 2 centers for a total for 100 children.

#### **Discuss evaluation for 2nd pilot**

The RFP has been held up in the Attorney Generals office but should be in the signature process by next week. It is very close to the original RFP with some additions from DAS and a change of dates. The same forms are being required and it is very prescribed in the design. Bobbie, Clara, Dawn and Claudette will be on the review panel for the RFPs. Sonja will check with DAS and see if the interview team needs to be present or not to see if Clara can participate.