



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

h

May 21, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #1047

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

Programs to Improve Child Care Quality and Availability (DWD -- Economic Support and Child Care)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 739, #12]

CURRENT LAW

The indirect child care allocation funds programs to improve the quality and availability of child care. It provides funds for the Office of Child Care in the Department of Workforce Development (DWD), child care licensing activities in the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) and other activities designed to improve the quality and availability of child care. The allocation for 2000-01 is \$15,879,700 and is funded entirely with federal dollars from the child care and development fund (CCDF).

Under federal law, the state is required to use 4% of certain federal and state funding sources for child care quality improvement. In addition, some of the CCDF discretionary funds are earmarked for certain child care quality improvement activities: (a) quality expansion; (b) infant and toddler quality improvement; and (c) school-aged resource and referral. The estimated amounts of these required expenditures are shown in Table 1 below. The estimates for the 4% quality requirement include additional CCDF funds recognized in Paper #1041, which provides reestimates for the TANF program.

TABLE 1

Estimated Federal Quality Requirements

	<u>2001-02</u>	<u>2002-03</u>	<u>Total</u>
4% of Federal Funds for Quality Activities	\$6,016,400	\$7,208,900	\$13,225,300
Quality Expansion	4,520,200	2,583,000	7,103,200
Infant and Toddler Quality Improvement	2,617,800	1,495,900	4,113,700
School Aged Resource and Referral	<u>464,100</u>	<u>265,200</u>	<u>729,300</u>
Total	\$13,618,500	\$11,553,000	\$25,171,500

GOVERNOR

Increase funding for indirect child care by \$326,300 FED in 2001-02 and \$510,500 FED in 2002-03. Funding totaling \$16,206,000 FED in 2001-02 and \$16,390,200 FED in 2002-03 would be allocated under the bill for programs to improve child care quality and availability. The first column in Table 2 below represents base level funding for each program. The second and third columns show the total funding under the Governor's recommendation and the last two columns show the proposed change in funding. The amounts in the table have been revised to reflect correct application of standard budget adjustments for the DWD Office of Child Care. In addition, a reduction in the amount for DHFS licensing of \$1,000 in 2002-03 was made to be consistent with the allocation in DHFS. These corrections are made in Paper #1041.

TABLE 2

**Funding for Programs to Improve Child Care Quality and Availability
Under the Governor's Budget Bill**

	Base	Total		Change	
		2001-02	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03
Funding for DWD					
Quality Improvement Grants	\$1,407,900	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	-\$407,900	-\$407,900
Resource and Referral Agencies	1,700,000	2,105,300	2,105,300	405,300	405,300
Low-income Subsidy	1,000,000	0	0	-1,000,000	-1,000,000
Sick Child Care Grants	1,000,000	0	0	-1,000,000	-1,000,000
State Level Start-up and Expansion	400,000	0	0	-400,000	-400,000
Technical Assistance	914,900	995,300	995,300	80,400	80,400
Child Care Scholarships	4,127,200	6,007,200	6,007,200	1,880,000	1,880,000
Safe Child Care	580,000	580,000	580,000	0	0
DWD Office of Child Care	794,600	786,500	786,500	-8,100	-8,100
Subtotal	\$11,924,600	\$11,474,300	\$11,474,300	-\$450,300	-\$450,300
Funding for DHFS					
Licensing Staff	3,745,200	3,889,500	4,059,800	144,300	314,600
Licensing Staff -- Matching Funds	0	660,000	673,900	660,000	673,900
Background Checks	27,700	0	0	-27,700	-27,700
Milwaukee County Foster Parent Day Care Administration	182,200	182,200	182,200	0	0
Subtotal	\$3,955,100	\$4,731,700	\$4,916,900	\$776,600	\$961,800
TOTAL	\$15,879,700	\$16,206,000	\$16,390,200	\$326,300	\$510,500

The bill would eliminate funding for four programs: low-income subsidy, sick child care grants, state level start-up and expansion and child care provider background checks in DHFS. Funds would be decreased for quality improvement grants and DWD's Office of Child Care. The bill would also provide new funding for licensing in DHFS that would require DHFS to provide a 41% match, Increased funding would also be provided for: (a) resource and referral agencies; (b) technical assistance; (c) child care scholarships; and (d) DHFS licensing staff.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. This paper presents alternatives for reducing programs in the indirect child care program to help pay for child care subsidies in the Wisconsin Shares program. This paper also provides background information on programs proposed to be eliminated in the Governor's budget bill. There is not currently sufficient information to evaluate the level of need or effectiveness of most of the indirect child care programs. In addition, the bill would provide funds greatly exceeding the amount the federal government is anticipated to require the state to spend on child care quality improvement in 2001-03. Therefore, the Committee may decide that providing additional funding

for the Wisconsin Shares program should have a higher priority than programs that improve quality and accessibility of child care.

Technical Modifications

2. Both the bill and current law include statutory language specifying what the funding in the indirect child care program can be used for. To be consistent with the programs recommended for funding by the Governor, the statutory provisions relating to the indirect child care allocation should be revised to delete use of funds for start-up and expansion grants and to allow funds to be used for a child care scholarship and bonus program, safe child care activities and the DWD Office of Child Care.

Required Federal Earmarks

3. As noted, federal law requires DWD to fund activities to improve the quality of child care. The programs DWD uses to meet the 4% quality requirement include the programs in the indirect child care program, the local pass-through program, TANF funds spent for the Head Start program, and TANF funds spent for the early childhood excellence initiative. A portion of the funding for the scholarship and bonus programs are used to meet the quality expansion and infant and toddler earmarks. In addition, a portion of the technical assistance funds are used to meet the school aged resource and referral earmark. The funds allocated for DWD's Office of Child Care are for administration and are not used to meet any quality requirements.

4. Paper #1041, which provides reestimates of the TANF program, identifies \$2,382,000 in additional CCDF funds earmarked for quality improvement in federal fiscal year (FFY) 2001. According to federal officials, the state can apply its existing CCDF-funded quality improvement programs towards the new earmark requirements, which would free up \$2,382,000 in CCDF funds in 2000-01 to be used for subsidies without having to add any additional quality improvement programs. However, the actual net amount of revenue that could be added for child care subsidies totals only \$1,080,600 over the biennium, due to an adjustment needed to correct double counting of revenue in past years and a revised federal matching rate. An alternative to utilize the \$1,080,600 in net additional CCDF funds is included in Paper #1046.

5. This office has worked with DWD to identify programs in the Governor's budget bill that can be used to address these additional child care quality earmarks. The appendix provides detail on how the state could meet the federal child care quality requirements (including the untapped \$2,382,000 available in FFY 2001), with expenditures included in the bill. As the appendix shows, the state would meet the anticipated amount of each requirement. In addition, the state is projected to exceed the 4% quality requirement by \$29.4 million in 2001-02 and \$31.7 million in 2002-03. The amount of each earmark is subject to actual federal requirements imposed in future federal fiscal years. In addition, the actual amount by which the 4% requirement would be exceeded would depend on the degree to which local governments access the local pass-through program.

Expanded Programs

a. *Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies*

6. The Governor proposed increasing funding for Wisconsin's 17 Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies (CCRAs) by \$405,300 annually for a total allocation of \$2,105,300 per year. According to the administration, the increase in funding would be used to augment services already being provided and reflects a larger workload for the CCRAs. The CCRAs help parents select child care by providing information on available providers and helping to locate specialized care (such as care for children with disabilities, sick children and for families who need care during non-traditional hours). The agencies also work to increase the supply of child care and offer technical assistance and training. Finally, CCRAs staff work with communities, school districts, employers and W-2 agencies to solve child care problems. Although the agencies serve all families regardless of income, 35% of inquiries made in 1999 were from families known to be receiving a child care subsidy. Currently, annual CCRAs grants range from \$79,167 in Stevens Point to \$169,420 in Milwaukee. The new annual grants would range from \$98,041 in Stevens Point to \$209,812 in Milwaukee.

7. According to a 1999 report, CCRAs agencies received referral requests from 20,569 families for 32,724 children statewide, which was a 5% decrease in the number of families from 1998. The requests for child care for children with disabilities (1,366) increased by 39% since 1998. In addition, CCRAs agencies received 84 requests for care for mildly ill children, which represents a 95% increase over 1998. A total of 698 training events for 16,007 child care staff were provided in 1999, which represented an increase of 2% in the number of participants over the prior year. Data is not yet available for 2000, but since the number of families receiving child care subsidies in calendar year 2000 increased by 30% from 17,990 to 23,362, it is reasonable to assume that the workload of the CCRAs increased during that time as well. The funding increase for the CCRAs would represent a 23.8% increase.

8. An alternative would be to deny or reduce the proposed increase for CCRAs because the budget would provide funds greatly exceeding the required 4% quality set-aside and instead use the savings to help fund the Wisconsin Shares child care subsidy program, which is projected to have a shortfall of \$32.0 million in 2001-02 and \$63.1 million in 2002-03.

b. *Technical Assistance*

9. The bill would provide additional funding of \$80,400 annually for technical assistance for a total allocation of \$995,300. The types of activities funded under this program include: (a) on-site technical assistance, training and peer support for providers in preparation for accreditation; (b) the child care information center, which is an information clearinghouse that provides materials for child care providers throughout the state; (c) training on integrating child care for disabled and non-disabled children (inclusive child care); (d) printed and media materials through the child care resource and referral network; (e) development of school-age child care; (f) venture development grants to employers who are considering developing on-site child care; and (g)

an early childhood credentialing system and clearinghouse for training information. For 2000-01, DWD has awarded seven grants totaling \$914,900. In addition, DWD provides training using its own staff. The increased funds would primarily be directed to the child care information center and on-site technical assistance, training and peer support for providers in preparation for accreditation.

10. An alternative would be to deny or reduce the proposed increase for technical assistance because the budget would provide funds greatly exceeding the required 4% quality set-aside and instead use the savings to help fund child care subsidies.

c. Child Care Scholarships and Bonuses

11. The Governor proposed providing the most additional resources for the child care scholarship and bonus programs administered by the Wisconsin Early Childhood Association because these programs were cited as the highest priorities of the DWD Child Care Council. These programs were authorized by the Joint Committee on Finance for 2000-01 at a level of \$4,127,200. For the next biennium, a total of \$6,007,200 would be provided annually, representing an annual increase of \$1,880,000.

12. Funding of \$4,007,200 annually would be provided for the TEACH (teacher education and compensation helps) early childhood Wisconsin scholarship and bonus program, which is modeled after a program that has been operating in North Carolina for over 10 years. This program provides scholarships to child care providers to attend technical or private colleges or universities to achieve a higher educational level.

Each scholarship recipient receives a certain amount of money to help with the costs of college tuition, books and travel. Maximum scholarship amounts have been established for each program, ranging from 80% to 90% of tuition costs and 90% of the cost of books. All scholarship recipients also receive a salary increase through either a raise of 1.5% to 2% and/or a bonus of \$200 to \$500 after completing a certain amount of coursework following the contract period. To be eligible for a scholarship, the participant and the sponsoring child care program are required to pay a portion of the costs. Depending on the scholarship model chosen, the participant is usually required to pay 10% to 20% of the cost of tuition and 10% of the cost of books. The sponsoring child care provider is usually required to pay 10% of tuition and a raise or bonus. Participants are also required to make a commitment to remain in the sponsoring child care program or other child care program for six months to one year beyond the contract period, depending on the scholarship model.

There are a variety of scholarship models for participants to choose from, including: (a) an infant/toddler professional credential consisting of 12 credits; (b) a Wisconsin professional credential for child care administrators consisting of 18 credits; (c) a mentoring scholarship where mentors must complete five to six credits and protégés complete three credits; and (d) the eight to nine credit model that does not necessitate completion of a specific credential. A report on the effects of the program on reducing turnover is expected by January, 2002.

In 2000-01, a total of \$3,127,200 was provided for the program and 830 scholarships were

awarded at an average of \$3,800 each. For the next biennium, \$4,007,200 would be provided annually representing approximately 1,057 scholarships at an average of \$3,800 each.

13. Funding is also provided for the REWARD (rewarding education with wages and respect for dedication) program totaling \$2,000,000 annually. This initiative provides a stipend directly to child care teachers, providers and directors based upon their current level of education specific to the child care field. Stipends are awarded to individuals who are at level 7 or higher on the registry career ladder, which is equal to a Bachelor's degree with 25 related credits in the early childhood field of education. To be eligible for the program, the child care worker must be working 20 or more hours per week in a regulated child care program and must have worked for a minimum of two years in the same child care program. The goal of the program is to retain child care providers and teachers who have attained education specific to the child care field.

In 2000-01, a total of \$1,000,000 was provided for the program and 1,000 reward payments were provided at an average of \$1,000 each. For the next biennium, \$2,000,000 would be provided annually representing approximately 2,500 stipends at an average of \$800 each.

14. An alternative would be to deny or reduce the proposed increase for child care scholarships and bonuses because the budget would provide funds greatly exceeding the required 4% quality set-aside and instead use the savings to help fund child care subsidies.

Program With No Funding Change (Safe Child Care)

15. The bill would maintain funding for the safe child care program at \$580,000 annually. This program is intended to increase the level of safety and health in certified day care homes by increasing the number of site visits to certified homes and providing increased technical assistance to certified providers. Funds are provided to the Wisconsin Child Care Information Center and to certifying agencies. Funds have been used in the past for safety items such as first aid kits and smoke detectors, as well as home visits and technical assistance. For calendar year 2000, \$80,000 was allocated to the Wisconsin Child Care Information Center and \$500,000 was allocated to certifying agencies.

16. An alternative would be to reduce the level of funding for the safe child care program by \$50,000 or some other amount, because the budget would provide funds greatly exceeding the required 4% quality set-aside and instead use the savings to help fund child care subsidies.

Programs Reduced or Eliminated

a. *Quality Improvement Grants*

17. The bill would reduce funding for quality improvement grants by \$407,900 annually, resulting in an allocation of \$1,000,000 annually. According to the administration, this program was reduced because the child care scholarship program was cited as the highest priority by the DWD Child Care Council.

18. For the 1999-01 biennium, two types of grants were provided: (a) quality improvement grants; and (b) quality staff retention grants. The objective of these grants was to help child care providers meet Wisconsin's high quality standards and to keep skilled staff. The high quality standards include accreditation, training standards for staff, benefits and low turnover. Applicants had to be licensed or certified for three years to be eligible for grants and had to provide a 25% match. The types of activities funded included: accreditation fees; staff and substitute time to complete accreditation; child development associate degrees for teaching staff; advanced staff training; materials and equipment for accreditation; and improved staff compensation. Grants could be awarded for up to four consecutive years for licensed group centers and for up to three years for licensed family providers. Grantees were required to achieve the Wisconsin high quality standards within four years of the initial grant. In calendar year 2000, 69 new grants and 164 continuation grants were awarded. In calendar year 2001, 37 new grants and 137 continuation grants have been awarded and approximately 12 additional grants are expected to be awarded by the end of fiscal year 2000-01 for a total of \$2,815,800 over the biennium.

19. An audit by the Legislative Audit Bureau on child care in January, 2001, found that many quality improvement grantees were not meeting the high quality standards. For grantees that began the program in 1995, 16% of licensed group providers were meeting the standards and 62% of licensed family providers were meeting the standards. In addition, the percentage of grantees meeting the standards has dropped consistently from 1992 to 1995. The Audit Bureau recommended that DWD work to ensure that adequate management information is available to assist it in determining whether stated goals or outcomes for all local grant programs are achieved and that it develop corrective action plans for providers who do not achieve them.

20. DWD proposes to phase out the current program and instead provide grants as a reward for becoming accredited. Funds would be used to help providers recover some of the costs they incurred in becoming accredited and grants could be provided every year that programs remain accredited. Statutory revisions that are not included in the bill would be required to make this program change. At the end of February, 2001, there were 228 accredited child care centers and 40 family child care centers in the state. The new program would begin in Spring 2002 and would provide grants to approximately 300 accredited child care centers and 100 accredited family centers. A total of \$1,400,000 in grants would be allocated as follows: (a) 100 grants to family providers at \$1,000 per grant; (b) 100 grants to child care centers with enrollments of 60 or fewer children at \$3,000 per grant; and (c) 200 grants to child care centers with enrollments of over 60 children at \$5,000 per grant.

21. To phase out the current quality grant program, DWD proposes not to award any new quality grants but would provide funding to each existing grantee that qualifies for additional grants. There are currently 98 grantees that are eligible for one or two additional years of funding. Each would be provided with one to two years of additional funding in Spring of 2002 for a total cost of \$600,000 over the biennium.

22. While the proposed quality grant program would eliminate the current problem of grantees that do not meet the required outcomes of the grant, it is unclear whether the proposed

program would help increase the number of accredited child care centers in the state. Child care providers would be required to pay the costs of becoming accredited before they qualify to compete for a grant. It is unclear how many providers would be able to pay these costs up front. An option would be to keep the current program intact, but reduce the number of grantees and use some of the funds for intensive technical assistance to help grantees meet the required outcomes. As recommended by the Legislative Audit Bureau, DWD could develop corrective action plans for providers who do not meet the high quality standards.

23. As stated above, the Legislative Audit Bureau found that many child care quality improvement grant recipients were not meeting the standards set by DWD. Another alternative would be to further reduce the amount available for child care quality grants by \$100,000 or some other amount, because the budget would provide funds greatly exceeding the required 4% quality set-aside, and instead use the savings to help fund child care subsidies.

b. Low-Income Subsidy and Sick Child Care

24. The Governor proposed to eliminate \$1,000,000 annually for low-income subsidy grants and \$1,000,000 annually for sick child care grants. According to the administration, these programs were eliminated because the child care scholarship program was cited as the highest priority by the DWD Child Care Council. In the 1999-01 biennium, these two programs were combined into one grant program administered by the CCRRs. The funds were to be used for: (a) enhancement of needed services in each CCRR delivery area; (b) development of sick child care; (c) grants to providers who hire current or former W-2 participants; and (d) start-up, expansion, retention and quality improvement. A 25% match was required for the sick child care funds. The CCRR agency or the grantee could provide the match. Data is not available at this time on how many agencies received these funds.

c. Start-up and Expansion Grants

25. The Governor also proposed eliminating funding of \$400,000 annually for start-up and expansion grants. According to the administration, this program was eliminated because the child care scholarship program was cited as the highest priority by the DWD Child Care Council. A total of \$800,000 is anticipated to be awarded in 1999-01 biennium to 53 grantees for one-time expenses related to starting or expanding licensed child care services. Funds could be used for staff training, a portion of operating costs, personnel costs, supplies, equipment and minor remodeling to meet licensing codes. DWD recommends eliminating state level start-up and expansion grants because additional funds for start-up costs and related technical assistance would be available through the CCRRs, technical assistance grants, licensing by DHFS, the local pass-through program, and W-2 community reinvestment funds.

d. DWD Office of Child Care

26. Funding for DWD's Office of Child Care would be reduced by \$8,100 annually from the base budget for a total allocation of \$786,600 annually. The total staff in the Office of Child

Care would remain 11.55 FTE. The reduction was included in DWD's budget request and the administration states that the reduction reflects the fact that there are no new programs or major modifications proposed in the 2001-03 budget.

Funding for DHFS

27. A child care center that provides care for four or more children under the age of seven must be licensed by DHFS. As part of the licensing process, the Department conducts background checks on providers and their staff. The bill would increase funding from the indirect child care allocation for DHFS by \$804,300 in 2001-02 and \$988,500 in 2002-03 for a total allocation of \$4,549,500 in 2001-02 and \$4,733,700 in 2002-03. The 2002-03 allocation has been corrected as discussed in the section on the Governor's recommendation above. According to DHFS, the Department needs additional CCDF funding to fully fund existing licensing positions. The increase results from: (a) standard budget adjustments; (b) increases in travel, internal accounting and personnel costs, and transfer of 4.6 FTE positions from fee funding to CCDF.

28. A portion of the increased CCDF funds to DHFS require a 41% match. The amounts needing a match are \$660,000 in 2001-02 and \$673,000 in 2002-03. DHFS has identified county crisis respite day care expenditures to serve as a match for the additional funding.

29. A separate paper has been written on child care licensing in DHFS, which provides options to increase licensing fees in order to free-up funds for child care subsidies.

30. The Governor would eliminate \$27,700 annually in CCDF funding for background checks because this service will be paid for using fee revenue in DHFS. As part of the 1999-01 budget act, DHFS may charge a fee for providing information to an entity to enable it to comply with the requirement that child care providers get information on reports of child abuse and neglect and licensing for their first background check and for subsequent checks required every four years.

31. The bill would also maintain the current funding level from the child care indirect allocation for administration of the Milwaukee County foster parent day care program. In the last biennium, this administration funding was budgeted separately because Milwaukee County foster parents were not included in DWD's client assistance for reemployment and economic support (CARES) computer system and were instead included in a separate computer system. However, since fall of 2000, all foster parent cases have been incorporated into the CARES system and this separate administration funding is no longer needed. Under current law, Milwaukee County can access administration funds through the direct child care program totaling up to 5% of reimbursements it pays to child care providers. The Committee could therefore reallocate this funding for child care subsidies.

Additional Expenditure Reduction Options

32. This paper mainly provides options to deny proposed increases in the Governor's budget for programs to improve the quality and availability of child care. Additional program reductions could be made into the base funding for these programs if the Committee decides that providing additional funds for child care subsidies is a higher priority.

Summary of Alternatives

33. The alternatives in this paper are structured as follows:

- Alternative 1 would approve the Governor's recommendation.
- Alternative 2 would make technical modifications to the Governor's recommendation.
- Alternative 3 would make a program modification to the quality improvement grant program.
- Alternatives 4 and 5 would provide options to decrease child care quality programs and instead provide these funds for child care subsidies.
- Alternative 6 would deny the net increase in the overall indirect child care program and instead allocate these funds for child care subsidies.
- Alternative 7 would maintain current law.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Increase funding for indirect child care by \$326,300 FED in 2001-02 and \$510,500 FED in 2002-03 as recommended by the Governor and corrected in Table 2. Total funding would be \$16,206,000 in 2001-02 and \$16,309,200 in 2002-03.

Technical Modification

2. Modify the Governor's proposal to revise the statutory provisions relating to the indirect child care allocation for 2001-03 to delete the use of funds for start-up and expansion grants and to allow funds to be used for a child care scholarship and bonus program, safe child care activities and the DWD Office of Child Care.

Program Modifications to Quality Improvement Grant Program

3. Modify the Governor's proposal to revise the statutory provisions relating to child care quality improvement grants to allow grant funds to be used for child care providers who have already gained accreditation.

Funding Modifications

4. Decrease funding for indirect child care to reflect a reduction in one or a combination of the following programs and increase funding for child care subsidies by the same amount.

<u>Program</u>	<u>Potential Reduction</u>	
	<u>2001-02</u>	<u>2002-03</u>
Funding for DWD		
Quality Improvement Grants	\$100,000	\$100,000
Resource and Referral Agencies	405,300	405,300
Technical Assistance	80,400	80,400
Child Care Scholarships	1,880,000	1,880,000
Safe Child Care	50,000	50,000
Subtotal	\$2,515,700	\$2,515,700
Funding for DHFS		
Milwaukee County Foster Care Admin.	\$182,200	\$182,200
Total	\$2,697,900	\$2,697,900

5. Make additional reductions to the indirect child care programs listed in Table 2 and instead use the funds for child care subsidies.

6. Deny the increase in the indirect child care program of \$326,300 FED in 2001-02 and \$510,500 FED in 2002-03 and instead increase funding for child care subsidies by \$326,300 FED in 2001-02 and by \$510,500 FED in 2002-03.

7. Deny the increase in the indirect child care program and maintain current law.

<u>Alternative 7</u>	<u>FED</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$836,800

Prepared by: Victoria Carreón

APPENDIX

DWD Proposals to Meet Estimated Federal Child Care Quality Requirements

	4% Requirement		Quality Expansion		Infant & Toddler		School Aged Resource & Referral		Total	
	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03
Quality Improvement Grants	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Child Care Resource and Referral										
Agencies	1,641,151	1,840,072	0	0	0	0	464,149	265,228	2,105,300	2,105,300
Technical Assistance	995,300	995,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	995,300	995,300
Scholarship and Bonus Program	0	1,928,373	4,520,170	2,582,954	1,487,030	1,495,873	0	0	6,007,200	6,007,200
Safe Child Care	580,000	580,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	580,000	580,000
Licensing Staff	3,889,500	4,059,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,889,500	4,059,800
Licensing Staff- Matching Funds	660,000	673,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	660,000	673,900
Milwaukee County Foster Parent										
Day Care Administration	182,200	182,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	182,200	182,200
Local Pass-Through Program*	16,403,700	16,390,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,403,700	16,390,500
Head Start	3,712,500	3,712,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,712,500	3,712,500
Early Childhood Excellence Centers	6,369,252	7,500,000	0	0	1,130,748	0	0	0	7,500,000	7,500,000
Total Proposed by DWD	\$35,433,603	\$38,862,645	\$4,520,170	\$2,582,954	\$2,617,778	\$1,495,873	\$464,149	\$265,228	\$43,035,700	\$43,206,700
Total Estimated Requirement	\$6,016,363	\$7,208,862	\$4,520,170	\$2,582,954	\$2,617,778	\$1,495,873	\$464,149	\$265,228	\$13,618,460	\$11,552,917
Amount in Excess of Requirement	\$29,417,240	\$31,653,783	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$29,417,240	\$31,653,783

* 95% of the local pass-through program is assumed to be for quality improvement activities.



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 21, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #1048

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

Child Care Licensing Funding (DHFS -- Children and Families)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 392, #11]

CURRENT LAW

The Bureau of Regulation and Licensing (BRL) in the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS), Division of Children and Family Services, is responsible for licensing and regulating child care and day care facilities, children's group homes, child caring institutions (CCIs), shelter care facilities and child placing agencies for foster care and adoption.

Currently, BRL has 98.95 FTE positions, including 62.8 FTE licensing specialists and program specialists who inspect and issue licenses to qualified new applicants, conduct ongoing monitoring visits and license continuation reviews, investigate complaints, take enforcement actions against non-compliant facilities and provide technical assistance, training and information to providers and the public.

BRL costs are currently supported from several funding sources, including federal funds the state receives under the child care and development fund (CCDF), the social services block grant (SSBG), program revenue (PR) from licensing revenues and GPR.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$369,100 PR in 2001-02 and \$382,600 in 2002-03 to reflect the net effect of: (a) transferring support for 4.6 FTE current child care licensing positions from licensing fee revenue to monies from the CCDF transferred from DWD; and (b) providing additional CCDF funds to support increases in the cost of travel, personnel, accounting and indirect services for current child care licensing staff. The bill would increase expenditures supported by CCDF by \$660,000

in 2001-02 and \$673,900 in 2002-03 and reduce expenditures supported by licensing fees by \$290,900 in 2001-02 and \$291,300 in 2002-03. [Under the bill, the increased CCDF transfer from DWD to DHFS would be \$804,300 in 2001-02 and \$988,500 in 2002-03. These numbers are higher than those in the DHFS budget because they contain reserves for pay plan, fringe benefits, and rent increases per DOA budget instructions.]

DISCUSSION POINTS

Bureau of Regulation and Licensing

1. The number of child care facilities licensed by BRL has remained relatively stable over the last few years, increasing from 5,265 facilities as of April 1, 1999, to 5,443 facilities as of April 1, 2001, an increase of 3.4% over a two-year period. However, there has been more significant growth in the number of licensed facilities in the southeast region of the state, where the number of licensed child care providers in Milwaukee County increased 32%, from 729 in 1998 to 962 in 2000. Table 1 identifies the current number of facilities licensed by BRL as of April, 2001, and the maximum number of children these facilities are licensed to serve.

TABLE 1

**Number of Licensed Facilities and Total Capacity
April 2001**

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Capacity</u>
Family Day Care	2,822	22,541
Group Day Care	2,295	118,158
Day Camp	74	3,848
Group Home	123	925
Child Caring Institution	38	1,656
Shelter Care	28	412
Child Placing Agency	<u>63</u>	<u>10,468</u>
Total	5,443	158,008

2. The Governor's budget recommendations are intended to transfer more of the program's costs from licensing fee revenue to CCDF funds to continue to fund the program at the current level without increasing licensing fees. Table 2 compares the source of funding for BRL positions in the DHFS base and under the Governor's recommendations.

TABLE 2

**Fund Source for BRL Positions
Fiscal Year 2000-01 and Under Governor's Bill**

<u>Fund Source</u>	<u>2000-01</u>		<u>Governor's Bill</u>	
	<u>Positions</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Positions</u>	<u>Percent</u>
GPR	11.25	11.4%	11.25	11.4%
PR (License Fees)	14.89	15.0	10.29	10.4
PR (CCDF)	65.01	65.7	69.61	70.3
FED (SSBG)	<u>7.80</u>	<u>7.9</u>	<u>7.80</u>	<u>7.9</u>
Total	98.95	100.0%	98.95	100.0%

Program Deficits

3. DHFS currently projects that there would be a deficit of \$124,000 PR in the licensing fee appropriation and \$137,300 PR in the CCDF appropriation at the end of the 2000-01 fiscal year unless a portion of the program's costs are funded from other DHFS appropriations. DHFS has not determined how it will address these projected deficits. The revenue from fees has been insufficient to support program costs in recent years because of the modest growth in the number of licensed facilities. At the same time, program costs have increased each year to reflect increases in operating costs, including salary, travel and rent costs.

4. In the past, DHFS has funded increases in costs for BRL with funds budgeted from other appropriations, including the Division of Children and Family Services general program operations appropriation and federal indirect funds. The proposed funding in the Governor's budget was partially intended to address DHFS' request to make the child care licensing program self-sufficient by reducing the need for DHFS to fund program costs from other appropriations.

5. However, even under the Governor's budget, DHFS projects that BRL program costs would exceed budgeted funds by an estimated \$204,500 in 2001-02 and \$198,600. This deficit is primarily due to the manner in which DHFS allocates its information technology infrastructure costs to all DHFS programs, including BRL.

In its 2001-03 budget submission, DHFS requested \$3,294,800 (all funds) in 2001-02 and \$2,154,300 (all funds) in 2002-03, including \$40,000 PR in 2001-02 and \$44,800 PR in 2002-03 from licensing fee revenue and \$177,100 FED in 2001-02 and \$198,300 FED in 2002-03 of CCDF funds to support DHFS departmentwide IT infrastructure costs. When the Governor chose not to fund this item, the administration assumed that BRL would not be charged for these IT costs. However, DHFS is required to allocate infrastructure costs for federally-funded programs in a manner that prevents DHFS from exempting certain programs, such as BRL, from paying its proportionate share of these costs. For this reason, DHFS will continue to assess IT infrastructure

costs to BRL, even though no additional funding would be provided in the Governor's budget to support these costs. This will require BRL to either: (a) continue to fund program costs from other DHFS appropriations; or (b) reduce staff in BRL and use the funding that would otherwise support staff to instead support these infrastructure costs.

5. The Committee could choose to provide funding for licensing activities to fully fund projected program costs. However, to do so, either additional CCDF funds would need to be transferred from DWD (\$204,500 in 2001-02 and \$198,600 in 2002-02) or licensing fees would need to be increased by approximately 27%, effective October 1, 2001.

6. Alternatively, if no additional funding is provided for DHFS to support BRL, DHFS has indicated that it will no longer fund at least 4.0 positions in BRL, rather than continue to support the program from other DHFS appropriations. DHFS indicates that the functions it supports with the Division of Children and Family Services general program operations appropriation are no less of a priority than the DHFS licensing function. For this reason, even if the Committee adopts the Governor's recommendations regarding the CCDF funds, it could delete 4.0 positions, which would be consistent with the DHFS plan to address the program deficit. Funding that would otherwise be used to support these positions would instead be used to support BRL supplies and services costs.

Use of CCDF Funds

7. The CCDF funding increase in the Governor's bill is intended to support the child care licensing functions in BRL without increasing fees. This is why the bill would transfer support for 4.60 positions (\$299,100 in 2001-02 and \$300,600 in 2002-03) from licensing fees to the CCDF.

8. In addition, the Governor's budget proposes to increase the level of CCDF funds transferred from DWD to DHFS by \$660,000 in 2001-02 and \$637,900 in 2002-03 to support staff salaries, travel, infrastructure and other program costs. These amounts do not include reserves for pay plan, fringe benefits and rent increases that are included in the amount DWD would transfer to DHFS. These funds have a match requirement. DHFS has identified \$467,600 in 2001-02 and \$478,500 in 2002-03 in county crisis respite day care expenditures to meet this match requirement.

9. CCDF funds can be used for activities to improve the quality of child care services. These activities may include, but are not limited to: (a) improving the monitoring of, compliance with and enforcement of applicable state, local and tribal requirements pursuant to federal regulations; (b) providing training and technical assistance in areas appropriate to the provision of child care services; and (c) improving salaries and other compensation (including fringe benefits) for full- and part-time staff who provide child care services for which assistance is provided with CCDF funds. Therefore, supporting licensing activities is an appropriate use of these funds.

10. However, there are some arguments for increasing the proportion of BRL program costs funded with licensing revenue. As indicated in Table 1, 15.0% of the total BRL positions are supported with revenue from licensing fees, but under the Governor's bill, only 10.4% of these costs are supported with this revenue. In addition, the Committee may wish to maximize the use of

CCDF funds available for other eligible purposes, such as the child care subsidy program. For these reasons, the Committee could increase licensing fees to reduce the amount of CCDF budgeted to support BRL.

11. The current biennial licensing fees are structured as follows: (a) \$60.50 for family day care; (b) \$30.25 and \$8.47 per slot for group day care; (c) \$121 plus \$18.15 per slot for residential day care; (d) \$254.10 for a child placing agency; and (e) \$60.50 plus \$18.15 per slot for shelter care.

12. Alternatively, some would argue that fees should not be increased, and that additional CCDF funds should be used instead to support increasing program costs. First, licensing fees were last raised by 10% annually in the 1997-99 biennium. Second, increasing licensing fees would require facilities to either absorb these costs or pass the costs on to families with children enrolled in their programs. Third, licensing fees are currently higher than child care certification fees in some counties. Certification fees are established by counties and cannot be more than 150% of the licensing fee. In 2001, certification fees range from \$0 to \$75.

13. As previously indicated, the Committee could address the program's deficit under the Governor's budget. Increasing fees by 27% would provide sufficient revenue to support the program's projected deficit in the 2001-03 biennium. Alternatively, additional CCDF funds could be transferred to DHFS from DWD to support licensing functions and to maintain the current staffing levels. However, this would reduce the level of CCDF funds available for other purposes.

14. Alternatively, the Committee could increase licensing fees by a specified percentage, for example, 20%, which would partially offset the amount of CCDF needed by DHFS to fund the level of spending specified in the Governor's budget. Under this alternative, assuming the rate increase was effective October 1, 2001, the level of CCDF would be reduced by \$44,200 in 2001-02 and \$210,300 in 2002-03 and replaced with a corresponding amount of funding from licensing fees, revenue would increase by \$109,600 PR in 2001-02 and \$147,200 in 2002-03 and 4.00 positions in BRL would be eliminated. The difference between the increased revenue and decreased CCDF funds would fund compensation reserves for the remaining positions.

However, deleting these BRL positions, as DHFS intends to do if the Governor's recommendations are adopted, could negatively affect licensing performance. Therefore, to maintain the current staffing level, the Committee could increase licensing fees by 20%, beginning October 1, 2001 and provide \$160,300 PR in 2001-02 and delete \$11,700 PR in 2002-03 in CCDF funds and provide \$109,600 PR in 2001-02 and \$147,200 PR in 2002-03 in licensing fee funds.

15. Finally, the Committee could delete all of the Governor's recommendations to increase support for BRL with the CCDF. To maintain the level of expenditure authority as recommended by the Governor, licensing fees would need to be increased 185%, beginning October 1, 2001, and 4.0 positions would be deleted in BRL. To fully support the current licensing staff level, fees could be increased by 215%, beginning October 1, 2001.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Adopt Governor's recommendation to provide \$369,100 PR in 2001-02 and \$382,600 in 2002-03 to reflect the net effect of: (a) transferring support for 4.6 FTE current child care licensing positions from licensing fee revenue to monies from the federal child care development block grant (CCDF) transferred from DWD; and (b) providing additional CCDF funds to support increases in the cost of travel, personnel, accounting and indirect services for current child care licensing staff. In addition, adopt one of the following:

a. Delete 4.0 PR positions in the BRL, beginning in 2001-02.

Alternative 1a	PR
2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	- 4.00

b. Provide \$204,500 PR in 2001-02 and \$198,600 PR in 2002-03 in CCDF funds to support current BRL staffing levels. Increase CCDF funding in DWD by a corresponding amount.

Alternative 1b: DHFS	PR
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$403,100

Alternative 1b: DWD	FED
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$403,100

c. Increase fees by 27%, effective October 1, 2001, to the levels identified in the attachment and increase projected revenue by \$148,000 in 2001-02 and \$198,700 in 2002-03 to support the current BRL staffing levels. Provide an additional \$148,000 PR in 2001-02 and \$198,700 PR in 2002-03 to support BRL program costs.

Alternative 1c	PR
2001-03 REVENUE (Change to Bill)	\$346,700
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$346,700

2. Increase licensing fees for child care facilities by 20%, effective October 1, 2001, to the levels shown in the attachment and increase projected revenue by \$109,600 PR in 2001-02 and \$147,200 PR in 2002-03. Provide \$109,600 PR in 2001-02 and \$147,200 PR in 2002-03 in licensing fee funds to DHFS to fund BRL program costs. Reduce CCDF funding in DWD and DHFS by \$44,200 PR in 2001-02 and \$210,300 PR in 2002-03. In addition, adopt one of the following:

- a. Delete 4.00 PR position in BRL.

Alternative 2a: DHFS	PR
2001-03 REVENUE (Change to Bill)	\$256,800
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$2,300
2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	- 4.00

Alternative 2a: DWD	FED
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$254,500

- b. Provide \$204,500 PR in 2001-02 and \$198,600 PR in 2002-02 in CCDF funds to support the current BRL staffing levels.

Alternative 2b: DHFS	PR
2001-03 REVENUE (Change to Bill)	\$256,800
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$405,400

Alternative 2b: DWD	FED
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$148,600

3. Delete all of the Governor's recommendations by reducing funding in the bill by \$369,100 PR in 2001-02 and by \$382,600 PR in 2002-03 in DHFS. Reduce funding by \$804,300 FED in 2001-02 and \$988,500 FED in 2002-03 in DWD. In addition, adopt one of the following:

- a. Increase licensing fees by 185%, effective October 1, 2001, to the levels identified in the table in the attachment and increase revenue by \$1,014,100 PR in 2001-02 and \$1,361,500 PR in 2002-03. Provide \$1,014,100 PR in 2001-02 and \$1,361,500 PR in 2002-03. Delete 4.00 PR positions in the Bureau of Regulation and Licensing in DHFS.

Alternative 3a: DHFS	PR
2001-03 REVENUE (Change to Bill)	\$2,375,600
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$1,623,900
2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	- 4.00

Alternative 3a: DWD	FED
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$1,792,800

b. Increase licensing fees by 215%, effective October 1, 2001, to the levels identified in the attachment to enable DHFS to maintain current staffing levels. Provide \$1,178,600 in 2001-02 and \$1,582,300 in 2002-03 to support BRL. In addition, increase revenue by \$1,178,600 PR in 2001-02 and \$1,582,300 PR in 2002-03.

Alternative 3b: DHFS	PR
2001-03 REVENUE (Change to Bill)	\$2,760,900
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$1,981,800

Alternative 3b: DWD	FED
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$1,792,800

Prepared by: Yvonne M. Arsenault
Attachment

ATTACHMENT

Licensing Fees

	Current Fees	Alternative 1c (27% increase)	Alternatives 2a & 2b (20% increase)	Alternative 3a (185% increase)	Alternative 3b (215% increase)
Family Day Care	\$60.50	\$76.84	\$72.60	\$172.43	\$190.58
Group Day Care	30.25	38.42	36.30	86.21	95.29
-- Per Slot	8.47	10.76	10.16	24.14	26.68
Residential Day Care	121.00	153.67	145.20	344.85	381.15
-- Per Slot	18.15	23.05	21.78	51.73	57.17
Child Placing Agency	254.10	322.71	304.92	724.19	800.42
Shelter Care	60.50	76.84	72.60	172.43	190.58
-- Per Slot	18.15	23.05	21.78	51.73	57.17



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 21, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #1049

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

Child Care Local Pass-Through Program (DWD -- Economic Support and Child Care)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 739, #13]

CURRENT LAW

The local pass-through child care program was created through a request to the Joint Committee on Finance in July, 2000. A total of \$25,965,700 FED was provided in the 1999-01 biennium; base year funding is \$14,520,900 FED. The program is administered by the Department of Workforce Development (DWD) and provides federal child care monies from the child care and development fund (CCDF) to local governments and tribal governing bodies for programs that improve the quality of child care. As currently administered, funds cannot be used for direct child care services unless the funds are used for children in need of protective services. These funds are allocated based on a 59% federal/41% local matching share. There are not currently any statutory provisions for the program.

GOVERNOR

Increase funding by \$2,974,100 FED in 2001-02 and \$2,960,200 FED in 2002-03 for the local pass-through program for a total allocation of \$17,495,000 in 2001-02 and \$17,481,100 in 2002-03. The bill would create statutory provisions requiring DWD to award grants under the program to local governments and tribal governing bodies to fund programs to improve the quality of child care. DWD would also be required to promulgate rules to administer the grant program, including eligibility criteria and procedures for awarding the grants. Although not specified in the bill, the administration indicates that the local agencies would have to provide the required match.

DISCUSSION POINTS

Technical Modifications

1. Since the release of the budget, the administration has requested that the amount of the allocation for the local pass-through program be corrected to reflect funding of \$17,267,100 in 2001-02 and \$17,253,200 in 2002-03. This correction represents a decrease from the bill of \$227,900 annually. These corrections have been included in Paper #1041, which contains other reestimates and corrections for the TANF program. The revised amounts for the program are used throughout the remainder of this paper.

2. The Committee may want to consider amending the proposed statutory language for the local pass-through program to clarify that local governmental agencies would be required to provide the matching funds required to receive the federal child care funds, since this provision was not included in the bill.

Background

3. For 2000-01, there have been two grant cycles for the local pass-through program. The first grant cycle occurred in fall 2000 and allocated \$11.4 million for a contract term of October 1, 2000, through September 30, 2001. A request for proposals was released in March, 2001, to allocate \$14.5 million for the second grant cycle. The contract term for the second cycle is anticipated to be from July 1, 2001, through September 30, 2002. Due to this timeline, approximately \$2.7 million from the first grant cycle and the entire \$14.5 million from the second grant cycle will not be spent in the current (1999-01) biennium. Funds are allocated based on the number of births to residents and the proportion of children in poverty in each county.

4. For local pass-through funds allocated in the current biennium, funds can be used for activities that increase the supply, quality or accessibility of regulated child care services, activities to help parents make informed choices on child care and activities that educate the public on child care. Examples of programs include: (a) maintaining a pool of substitute providers; (b) reducing turnover of child care providers by maintaining access to health insurance or providing bonuses or stipends to staff; (c) providing technical assistance or training to improve the skills of child care providers; (d) providing start-up grants to meet gaps in services; (e) technical assistance to providers that care for special-needs children; (f) purchase of equipment for special needs children; (g) providing public information on choosing child care; (h) setting up a service that will care for mildly sick children; and (i) local collaborative planning for child care to improve service delivery of early care and education services to children and their families. Funds cannot be used for direct purchase or payment of child care services, unless the child is receiving or is in need of protective services. DWD estimates that approximately 95% of the funds for the local pass-through program are used for quality improvement initiatives.

5. The bill would provide approximately \$17.3 million annually in the 2001-03 biennium for the child care pass-through program. As originally portrayed by the administration, these funds were intended to equal the amount of federal matching funds anticipated to be received

in the next biennium for which no state matching funds were available. Under this interpretation, having the local pass-through program would allow the entire amount of federal matching funds available in the 2001-03 biennium to be utilized.

6. However, the administration now indicates that the \$17.3 million allocated in 2001-02 is intended to be used for the \$14.5 million anticipated to be allocated through DWD's current RFP as well as contractual obligations from the first round of grants of approximately \$2.7 million through September, 2001. In 2002-03, DWD would have \$17.3 million for new grants. Under this interpretation, the state would not be drawing down all available federal matching funds in 2001-02. In addition, due to an anticipated change in the federal matching rate for FFY 2003, the state will not have enough matching expenditures to draw down the federal funds recognized in the Governor's budget bill in 2002-03. This results in \$81,100 in untapped federal funds in 2002-03. The state could receive \$17.3 million in 2001-02 and \$81,100 in 2002-03, if it allocates a GPR match (or other state funds) of approximately \$12.3 million in 2001-02 and \$57,600 in 2002-03.

7. There are also matching funds still available from the FFY 2001 grant award that have not been accessed by the state totaling \$2.0 million. A match of approximately \$1.4 million would be necessary to access these funds. The state must obligate these funds by September 30, 2001, or they will be reallocated to other states. Adding these federal funds to the unaccessed federal funds identified in the point above, brings the total untapped federal funds in 2001-02 to \$19.4 million. The state could access all \$19.4 million if it allocates a GPR match (or other state funds) of \$13.7 million for total funding of \$33.1 million.

Funding Modifications

8. Under the Governor's budget bill, the child care subsidy program is facing an estimated shortfall of \$32.0 million in 2001-02 and \$63.1 million in 2002-03. Based on the assumption that not all federal matching funds would be accessed under the Governor's proposal, an alternative would be to access the untapped federal matching funds of \$19.4 million in 2001-02 and \$81,100 in 2002-03 by appropriating \$13.6 million GPR in 2001-02 and \$57,600 in 2002-03 for child care subsidies. This option would provide an additional \$33.1 million for child care subsidies over the biennium and would not have any impact on the local pass-through program.

9. A second option would be to not provide funding for new local pass-through grants of \$17.3 million in 2002-03. These funds could be accessed for child care subsidies by appropriating \$12.2 million GPR in 2002-03. This option could be combined with the first option in order to provide \$19.4 million FED and \$13.6 million GPR in 2001-02 and \$17.3 million FED and \$12.3 million GPR in 2002-03 for child care subsidies. While this option would provide \$62.6 million for child care subsidies over the biennium, it would eliminate all \$17.3 million proposed for the local pass-through program in 2002-03.

10. An option to obtain a larger amount of funding for child care subsidies would be to do the following: (a) not enter into contracts in 2001-02 for the \$14.5 million being solicited through the current RFP and instead provide approximately \$10.0 million GPR to access these federal funds for child care subsidies; (b) utilize the untapped federal grant funds of \$19.4 million in

2001-02 and \$81,100 in 2002-03; and (c) not provide funding for new local pass-through grants of \$17.3 million in 2002-03. This option would provide federal funds totaling \$33.9 million in 2001-02 and \$17.3 million in 2002-03. The amount of GPR match needed would total \$23.6 million in 2001-02 and \$12.3 million in 2002-03. This option would provide \$87.1 million for child care subsidies over the biennium and would end the current local pass-through program at the close of the initial contract period (September 30, 2001).

11. An option to provide sufficient funding for the entire \$95.1 million estimated child care shortfall would be to combine the above option with additional GPR of \$8.0 million in 2002-03.

12. Other alternatives could be constructed that would reduce only a portion of the local pass-through program in order to provide funding for child care subsidies. As with the alternatives discussed above, GPR would have to be appropriated to satisfy the federal matching requirement.

Program Modifications

13. If the Committee chooses not to allocate GPR but would like to require that the funding for new local pass-through grants of \$17.3 million in 2002-03 be used for direct child care services, it could modify the proposed statutory language to state that the funds must be used for the provision of child care services for families eligible for the Wisconsin Shares child care subsidy program and not for child care quality improvement. Under this option, local agencies would receive funds to pay for the cost of child care for participants eligible for the Wisconsin Shares child care subsidy program. Since the care of these participants would be paid for by the local pass-through grant, the child care providers would not be eligible to receive reimbursement for this care through the Wisconsin Shares child care subsidy program. In order to make this program similar to the Wisconsin Shares program, families would be required to pay the same copayment they would under the Wisconsin Shares program. Administratively, parents would continue to go to W-2 agencies and counties to determine eligibility for the Wisconsin Shares program and their copayment amount. If parents choose to receive care at an agency participating in the local pass-through program, then the child care provider would not be reimbursed by Wisconsin Shares but the family would be required to pay the applicable copayment to the provider.

14. Converting the local pass-through program to a direct services program could help reduce some of the demand faced by the Wisconsin Shares program. However, it is important to note that the provision of direct child care subsidizes has traditionally been a state responsibility. Therefore, local governmental agencies may not be as interested in providing direct child care services as in providing quality improvement services, and may not utilize all federal funds available. If all of the federal funds are accessed by local governments, the number of children served by the federal funds would be approximately 3,000 per month in 2002-03.

15. According to the administration, the local pass-through program was designed to focus on quality improvement instead of direct services to avoid duplication of effort. However, because the child care subsidy program has a projected shortfall, duplication of effort may not be as much of a concern as when the local pass-through program was first created in 1999-00.

16. Alternatively, the Committee could deny the increase proposed by the Governor for the local pass-through program. This would result in the state not accessing \$2.7 million in federal funds annually. In addition, there would be untapped federal funds available totaling \$19.4 million in 2001-02 and \$81,100 in 2002-03. These federal monies could be viewed as a reserve that could be accessed if the Legislature subsequently decides to provide increased state funding for child care.

Summary of Alternatives

17. Several alternatives are presented in the following section:

- Alternative 1 would approve the Governor's recommendation.
- Alternative 2 would make a technical modification to clarify that local governmental agencies would be responsible for providing the matching funds required to receive federal funds.
- Alternatives 3 through 7 would provide additional funds for child care subsidies. Alternative 3 would not reduce the local pass-through program, but would appropriate additional GPR to match untapped federal dollars in 2001-02. Alternative 4 would combine Alternative 3 with an option to eliminate funding for the local pass-through program in the second year of the biennium and appropriate GPR for the match. Alternative 5 would provide the maximum amount for child care subsidies by eliminating the local pass-through program in both years of the biennium and drawing down the untapped federal dollars in 2001-02. Alternative 6 would combine alternative 5 with sufficient GPR to address the entire \$95.1 million child care shortfall. Alternative 7 would allow the Committee to adopt some other combination of reduced funding for the local pass-through program and increased GPR.
- Alternative 8 would modify the local pass-through program to require funds to be used for direct child care services in lieu of child care quality programs.
- Alternative 9 would maintain current law.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Increase funding for the local pass-through child care program by \$2,746,200 FED in 2001-02 and \$2,732,300 FED in 2002-03 as recommended by the Governor (with the correction requested by the administration). Adopt the statutory provisions regarding the program recommended by the Governor.

Technical Modification

2. Modify the Governor's proposal to specify in the statutes that local governmental agencies would be required to provide the matching funds required to receive federal child care and development funds through the local pass-through program.

Funding Modifications

3. Increase funds for child care subsidies by \$19,356,200 FED and \$13,649,600 GPR in 2001-02 and by \$81,100 FED and \$57,600 in 2002-03 for a total of \$33,144,500 over the biennium. This option would draw down untapped federal funds and would not impact the local pass-through program.

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>FED</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$13,707,200	\$19,437,300	\$33,144,500

4. Provide increased funds for child care subsidies totaling \$62,647,200 over the biennium by making the following modifications: (a) increase funds for child care subsidies in 2001-02 by \$19,356,200 FED and \$13,649,600 GPR; (b) decrease funds for the local pass-through child care program by \$17,253,200 FED in 2002-03; and (c) increase funds for child care subsidies in 2002-03 by \$17,334,300 FED and \$12,307,100 GPR. This option would draw down untapped federal funds in 2001-02 and 2002-03 and would eliminate the local pass-through program in 2002-03.

<u>Alternative 4</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>FED</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$25,956,700	\$19,437,300	\$45,394,000

5. Provide increased funds for child care subsidies totaling \$87,138,500 over the biennium by making the following modifications: (a) decrease funds for the local pass-through program by \$14,520,900 FED in 2001-02; (b) increase funds for child care subsidies in 2001-02 by \$33,877,100 FED and \$23,620,000 GPR; (c) decrease funds for the local pass-through child care program by \$17,253,200 FED in 2002-03; and (d) increase funds for child care subsidies in 2002-03 by \$17,334,300 FED and \$12,307,100 GPR. Delete the statutory provisions recommended by the Governor. This option would require DWD to not enter into contracts for its current RFP for the local pass-through program, would draw down untapped federal funds in 2001-02 and 2002-03 and would eliminate the local pass-through program in 2002-03.

<u>Alternative 5</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>FED</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$35,927,100	\$19,437,300	\$55,364,400

6. Provide increased funding for child care subsidies totaling \$95,100,000 over the biennium by adopting alternative 5 and providing \$7,961,500 in additional GPR. This option would require DWD to not enter into contracts for its current RFP for the local pass-through program, would draw down untapped federal funds in 2001-02 and 2002-03, would eliminate the local pass-through program in 2002-03 and would provide sufficient additional GPR to meet the estimated \$95.1 million child care shortfall.

<u>Alternative 6</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>FED</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$43,888,600	\$19,437,300	\$63,325,900

7. Adopt some other combination of reduced funding for the local pass-through program and increased GPR and federal funds for direct child care subsidies.

Program Modifications

8. Modify the Governor's proposal to require funds allocated through the local pass-through program to be used for the provision of child care services for families eligible for the child care subsidy and not for child care quality improvement. Require DWD to develop a plan to administer this program. Local agencies would receive funds to pay for the cost of child care for participants eligible for the Wisconsin Shares child care subsidy program but child care providers would not be eligible to receive reimbursement for this care through the Wisconsin Shares child care subsidy program. Parents would be responsible for the copayment required under the Wisconsin Shares program. Because participation in this program is uncertain, it is not possible to estimate the impact on the child care subsidy program shortfall.

Maintain Current Law

9. Deny the proposed funding increase for the local pass-through child care program and do not create statutory provisions requiring DWD to award grants under the program to local governments and tribal governing bodies to fund programs to improve the quality of child care. This would result in the state not accessing \$2,746,200 FED in 2001-02 and \$2,732,300 FED in 2002-03. In addition, there would be untapped federal funds available of \$19,356,200 in 2001-02 and \$81,100 in 2002-03.

<u>Alternative 9</u>	<u>FED</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$5,478,500

Prepared by: Victoria Carreón



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 21, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #1050

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

Kinship Care Funding (DHFS – Children and Families)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 391, #7]

CURRENT LAW

Creation. The state's kinship care program was created in 1995 Wisconsin Act 289, which also created the Wisconsin Works program to replace the former aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) program. Under AFDC, non-legally responsible relatives who provided care for children were eligible for an AFDC payment based on the income of the child.

Eligibility and Benefits. The Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) reimburses counties (other than Milwaukee County) for kinship care benefit payments counties make to eligible relatives. In Milwaukee County, DHFS makes these payments directly to eligible relatives. Kinship care relatives who provide care and maintenance for a child may receive a kinship care payment of \$215 per month if:

- The county or DHFS determine that there is a need for the child to be placed with the kinship care relatives and that the placement with the relative is in the best interests of the child;
- The county or DHFS determines that the child meets one or more of the criteria for children in need of protection or services or juveniles in need of protection or services, or that the child would be at risk of meeting one or more of these criteria;
- The county or DHFS conducts a background investigation of the kinship care relative, any employee and prospective employee of the kinship care relative who has or would have regular contact with the child for whom kinship care payments would be made and any other adult resident in the kinship care relative's home to determine if the kinship care relative,

employee, prospective employee or adult resident has any arrests or convictions that could adversely affect the child or the kinship care relative's ability to care for the child;

- The kinship care relative cooperates with the county or DHFS in the application process, including applying for other forms of assistance for which the kinship care relative may be eligible; and

- The child for whom the kinship care relative is providing care and maintenance is not receiving supplemental security income (SSI) benefits.

At least every 12 months, the county or DHFS reviews the case of a relative receiving kinship care to determine if the conditions under which the case was initially determined eligible still exist. If those conditions no longer exist, the county or DHFS discontinues making the kinship care payments.

Eligibility for kinship care is different from eligibility for the former AFDC payment to a non-legally responsible relative in two ways. First, there is no financial eligibility requirement for kinship care, other than prohibiting payment on behalf of children who receive SSI payments. Second, the relative and the child placed in the relative's home must meet certain nonfinancial criteria, as described above, in order to be eligible for a kinship care payment. Under AFDC, there were no eligibility requirements other than the financial criteria and the requirement that the child actually reside in the relative's home.

Funding. Kinship care benefit payments are funded entirely with federal temporary assistance to needy families (TANF) block grant funds transferred to DHFS from the Department of Workforce Development (DWD). In 2000-01, \$24,719,500 PR was budgeted in DHFS to fund kinship care benefit payments. This amount includes a supplement of \$197,800 PR approved by the Joint Committee on Finance in March, 2001, under s. 16.515 of the statutes. As of February, 2001, kinship care payments were made on behalf of approximately 8,600 children statewide.

GOVERNOR

Delete \$1,420,400 PR annually to reflect a reestimate of the amount of funding that will be required to fully fund kinship care payments in the 2001-03 biennium. The bill would provide a total of \$23,101,300 PR for kinship care benefits in each year of the 2001-03 biennium.

DISCUSSION POINTS

Funding

1. For the period between January, 2000, through February, 2001 (the last month for which caseload data are available), DHFS and counties made kinship care payments on behalf of an average of 8,780 children monthly, including 5,534 children in Milwaukee County and 3,245

children in other counties. The data do not indicate a trend in monthly caseload changes. Consequently, the total amount of funding required to support kinship care benefit payments in the 2001-03 biennium can be estimated by applying average caseloads during this period, adjusting this number to reflect known waiting lists, and applying the \$215 monthly payment.

2. By using this method, it is estimated that the costs for kinship care benefit payments in the 2001-03 biennium will total \$23,198,000 PR annually, or \$96,700 more in each year than the amounts that would be provided in the bill. Consequently, if the Committee wished to provide an amount of funding for benefits payments that reflect the statewide estimated costs of the program, it could modify the bill by providing an additional \$96,700 PR in each year to support kinship care benefits in the 2001-03 biennium.

3. However, the program was not created as a statewide benefit program, nor is it administered in this manner.

DHFS allocates kinship care benefits funding to counties on a calendar year basis. These allocations were originally determined by a formula that factored in county and statewide caseload and total funding budgeted for the program. First, DHFS used each county's average monthly caseload in the most recent full calendar year for which there was data, determined the county's percentage of the total kinship care statewide caseload (in non-Milwaukee counties) and allocated to each county its respective percentage of the total appropriation. Funding for Milwaukee County's payments is budgeted separately within the total kinship care benefits appropriation.

Calendar year 2001 kinship care benefit allocations to counties were reduced 4% from calendar year 2000 levels, because the overall kinship care benefit funding level was reduced by this percent. DHFS chose to adjust all county allocations equally, rather than use the formula to allocate funds in calendar year 2001, which would have reduced some counties' allocations by amounts greater than 4%.

4. DHFS has established a process (referred to as "deobligate/reobligate") under which counties with projected shortfalls in their kinship care funding may receive additional funding from the state at the end of the calendar year. DHFS asks each county whether the county will have surplus funds for the calendar year or if the county is in need of additional funds to make payments for eligible persons who are on a waiting list. DHFS will then reallocate the excess kinship care funds from counties with projected surpluses to those counties in need of funds. DHFS currently conducts this process within DHFS administrative regions. The additional cases that receive monthly payments are then considered part of the county's actual caseload figure. There is no guarantee that counties will receive extra funds at the end of the year, but this process has, to some extent, allowed DHFS to adjust funding allocations based on need.

5. There are two points to consider regarding the original allocation formula. First, waitlisted cases are not included in the actual caseload from the previous year. Actual caseload indicates the number of children who have a kinship care relative receiving monthly payments for them. Second, if, after the deobligate/reobligate process, there are still cases on the waiting list, these cases are not included in the actual caseload figure.

6. As a matter of policy, DHFS has directed counties and tribes not to place court-ordered kinship care cases on waiting lists. Counties must accommodate these cases and thus, reserve some funding to ensure that these court-ordered cases receive payments. However, the statutes do not make a distinction between court-ordered and non-court-ordered cases.

7. In summary, the program is not structured or administered as a statewide benefits program with a single budget. For this reason, although total funding provided for the program may be sufficient on a statewide basis to support the kinship care program, individual counties and tribes may have surpluses and shortfalls in their kinship care budgets when their actual caseloads do not correspond with the initial allocations they receive. DHFS can make interim adjustments to counties' allocations through the "deobligate/reobligate" process, which can reduce, to some extent, the problem.

By continuing to budget kinship care benefits costs as if there was a single, statewide budget for the program, some counties and tribes will continue to place eligible families on waiting lists, either because: (a) differences exist between initial allocations of funds among counties and the amount of funding each county needs to support actual caseloads in a calendar year; (b) counties reserve funding for court-ordered cases; or (c) the total funding budgeted for the program (based on the current estimate), may be insufficient to support statewide actual program costs.

Entitlement and the Use of Waiting Lists

8. The level of funding the Committee chooses to provide for kinship care benefit payments should be based on its determination of whether the kinship care program is, or should be, an entitlement program. If the Committee determines that the program is, or should be, an entitlement program, state or counties must make payments to all eligible families. If the Committee determines that the program is an entitlement, then it must determine whether the state or whether counties are financially responsible for the costs of kinship care benefits. Alternatively, if the Committee determines that the program is not, nor should be, an entitlement program, then the Committee may budget any funding amount for the program that it determines appropriate, weighing the needs of eligible families with other uses of TANF and county funds.

9. Under s. 48.57(3m)(am) of the statutes, DHFS and counties "shall make payments in the amount of \$215 per month to a kinship care relative who is providing care and maintenance for a child..." if the relative and child meet the kinship care eligibility requirements. However, because the provision refers to a sum-certain appropriation, DHFS staff interpret this provision to imply that the total payment amounts are limited to the amounts the Legislature budgets for the program.

10. This interpretation suggests that the Legislature can and should budget any amount for the program that it believes is appropriate to meet the program's objectives. The Committee has used this approach in past biennial budget deliberations to estimate the statewide caseload and budget an amount that would fully support payments based on this caseload. However, as indicated in the first section of this paper, this method is likely to result in some counties maintaining waiting lists for benefits payments. On the other hand, this method of budgeting for the program may effectively control state kinship care benefits costs because DHFS and counties may only expend

their allocated amounts.

11. Under this interpretation, kinship care can be viewed in the same manner as other county-administered human services programs, such as the community options program and the family support program, under which counties may place eligible individuals on waiting lists for services if funding is insufficient to meet program demand.

12. Alternatively, it could be argued that the kinship care program is, or should be, an entitlement program. From an equity standpoint, it can be argued that all families that meet the program's eligibility criteria should receive kinship care benefits and new applicants for benefits should not be disadvantaged because a county or DHFS has insufficient funding to support benefit payments. Relatives placed on waiting lists have been determined eligible for kinship care because the county or DHFS have already determined that it would in the best interests of that child to be in the relative's home and that the child is at-risk of being in need of protection or services.

However, since there is no legal obligation for the relative to provide care and maintenance for the child (unless a court order places the child in the relative's home), if the relative is placed on a waiting list, it is not clear what would happen to the child. The relative could refuse to provide care and maintenance to the child, requiring the child to return home or go elsewhere. Alternatively, the relative could provide care and maintenance for the child without the kinship care payment.

13. Under proposed administrative rules submitted to the Legislative Rules Clearinghouse on April 9, 1999, agencies would have been permitted to place an approved applicant for kinship care on a waiting list if the agency had expended its kinship care benefit allocation. However, a Legislative Council staff review of the proposed rule questioned the statutory authority for DHFS to propose a rule that would authorize waiting lists. Specifically, the Legislative Council staff review states: "the statutes are ambiguous as to whether kinship care or long-term kinship care are entitlement programs and waiting lists are not allowed or whether they are not entitlements and waiting lists are allowed. The issue of whether a county department must make a payment when the state appropriation to reimburse counties has been depleted has not been resolved." These rules are still under review in DHFS.

14. The basis for the Legislative Council staff statement regarding authority to establish waiting lists is based on the Finance Committee's action to maintain current law when this issue was discussed during the Committee's 1997-99 biennial budget deliberations. At the time, the Committee considered that the kinship care statutes were ambiguous regarding the issue of entitlement. Two separate alternatives were discussed, one that would have clarified that kinship care was an entitlement, the other would have clarified that kinship care was not an entitlement. Neither alternative was adopted.

15. The Committee had a similar discussion during the 1999-01 biennial budget deliberations. At that time, the Committee discussed four alternatives, any of which would have clarified the issue of entitlement. The Committee approved providing \$500,000 PR in 1999-00 for a supplemental kinship care fund budgeted in DHFS and a corresponding increase in TANF funds

budgeted in DWD. Expenditures from this fund could only be used to supplement a county's kinship care allocation or the DHFS allocation for kinship care benefits in Milwaukee County in order to prevent the need to place eligible kinship care relatives on a waiting lists if payments for kinship care benefits exceed the amount allocated. However, the Governor vetoed this provision. Consequently, the statutes remain ambiguous about the issue of entitlement.

16. Without further clarification by the Legislature, it is anticipated that DHFS and counties will continue to administer the kinship care program as a non-entitlement program. If funding budgeted for the program is insufficient to support benefits, DWD and DHFS may, but are not required to, seek supplemental funding for the program. In determining whether the use of waiting lists is acceptable under the kinship care program, the Committee should consider what effect statutory language changes would have on the ability to supplement kinship care allocations in the future if waiting lists develop.

In March, 2001, under s. 16.515 of the statutes, the Committee increased funding for the program by \$197,800 in 2000-01 to eliminate waiting lists on December 1, 2000, for the kinship care program. Under s. 16.515, with the approval of the Committee, the DOA Secretary may supplement any sum certain PR appropriation that is determined insufficient because of unforeseen emergencies or insufficient to accomplish the purpose for which it was made, if it found that an emergency exists. If the statutes specify that kinship care is not an entitlement or that waiting lists are allowable, it would be more difficult to argue that development of kinship care waiting lists constitutes an emergency and ground for supplementation under s. 16.515.

17. If the Committee wants to ensure that kinship care payments are provided to all eligible kinship care relatives, the Committee could delete current references to the sum certain appropriation to reflect that DHFS' and counties' liability for kinship care payments would not be limited to the amounts appropriated by the Legislature. The practical effect of such a change would require that if demand for kinship care exceeds the amounts appropriated by the Legislature, the county would be required to fund any additional need unless the Legislature approves additional funding to address waiting lists in those counties. Since DHFS is responsible for making kinship care payments in Milwaukee County, if additional need developed in Milwaukee County, DHFS would be required to seek additional expenditure authority from the Legislature. In this way, the kinship care program would be considered in the same manner as the medical assistance (MA) program, in which benefits funding is budgeted in a sum certain appropriation. If projected MA benefits costs exceed budgeted amounts, DHFS must seek additional funding from the Legislature to supplement the appropriation.

18. Under other human services programs, which are clearly not entitlement program and waiting lists are authorized, such as COP and the family support program, the statutes specify that counties' liability to provide services under those programs is limited to the amount of funding available for those programs. To be consistent with other human service program that are not entitlements, a similar provision could be adopted for kinship care which would limit DHFS' and counties' liability for kinship care payments to the appropriation amounts, rather than addressing the issue of entitlement specifically.

19. Alternatively, if the Committee believes that kinship care is, or should not be, an entitlement program but wants to minimize the use of waiting lists when demand exceeds funding, the Committee could establish a reserve of funding available to supplement a DHFS or county kinship care allocation when DHFS' or a county's expenditures for kinship care exceed the amounts allocated. This reserve could be established by providing \$500,000 PR (TANF) in 2001-02. Since the funding would be provided in an annual appropriation, the Committee could specify that DHFS could carry any unused amounts of the reserve into 2002-03 to address waiting lists in that fiscal year. However, this alternative needs to be weighed against the availability of TANF funds and other TANF programs, such as child care.

20. Some may argue that if kinship care is clarified to be a non-entitlement program and waiting lists are allowed, the Committee may not have the authority to supplement the kinship care benefit appropriation. Therefore, if the Committee believes that kinship care is not, nor should be, an entitlement program, but wants to be able to provide additional funding for the program when demand exceeds available funding, current statutes could be modified to provide the Joint Committee on Finance the explicit authority to supplement the kinship care benefit appropriation if the amounts budgeted for the program are insufficient to fully fund payments to persons who are eligible for the program.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

A. Kinship Care Benefits Funding Level

1. Approve the Governor's recommended funding level for kinship care benefits.

2. Increase funding for kinship care benefits by \$96,700 PR annually to reflect current estimates of kinship care payments made by DHFS and the counties. Total funding for kinship care benefits would be \$23,198,000 PR annually. Increase FED TANF funding in DWD by corresponding amounts.

Alternative A2: DHFS	PR
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$193,400

Alternative A2: DWD	FED
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$193,400

3. In addition to Alternatives (A1) or (A2), provide \$500,000 PR in 2001-02 for a supplemental kinship care fund budgeted in DHFS and a corresponding increase in TANF funds budgeted in DWD and specify that DHFS could only make expenditures from this fund to supplement a county's kinship care allocation or the DHFS allocation for kinship care payments in Milwaukee County in order to prevent the need to place eligible kinship care relatives on a waiting list if payments for kinship care exceed the amount allocated. Further, specify that DHFS could

carry any unused funding from this provision to 2002-03. Increase FED TANF funding in DWD by corresponding amounts.

Alternative A3: DHFS	PR
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$500,000

Alternative A3: DWD	FED
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$500,000

B. Entitlement

1. *No Entitlement.* Specify that, despite meeting the eligibility criteria for kinship care or long-term kinship care, a kinship care relative providing care and maintenance for a child is not entitled to receive either kinship care payments or long-term kinship care payments. Specify that a county department of human services or social services *may* make kinship care or long-term kinship care payment to an eligible relative. Specify that DHFS' and counties' responsibility relating to kinship care funding is limited to the funds appropriated for this purpose. In addition, authorize DHFS and counties to establish waiting lists for families that meet the program's eligibility criteria.

2. *Authorize JFC Supplements.* Clarify that the kinship care program is a non-entitlement program and that DHFS and counties may establish waiting lists for families that meet the program's eligibility criteria. However, authorize the Joint Committee on Finance to supplement the kinship care appropriation under s. 16.515 if the amounts budgeted for the program are insufficient to fund benefits payments to eligible families.

3. *State Entitlement.* Clarify that a kinship care relative providing care and maintenance for a child and who meets the eligibility criteria for kinship care of long-term kinship care is entitled to receive either kinship care payments or long-term kinship care payments and waiting lists are not allowed. In addition, specify that the state is responsible to fully fund this program. Delete references to the current appropriations to clarify that DHFS' responsibility to support kinship care payments is not limited to the amounts appropriated by the Legislature.

4. *DHFS/County Entitlement.* Clarify that a kinship care relative providing care and maintenance for a child and who meets the eligibility criteria for kinship care of long-term kinship care is entitled to receive either kinship care payments or long-term kinship care payments and that DHFS and counties may not establish waiting lists for the program. In addition, specify that it is the county's responsibility, and in Milwaukee County, the state's responsibility, to fully fund the program, notwithstanding state and county kinship care allocations. Delete references to the current appropriation to clarify that counties' and DHFS' responsibility for kinship care payments is not limited to the amounts appropriated by the Legislature.

Prepared by: Yvonne M. Arsenault



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 21, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #1051

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

Food Stamps for Qualified Immigrants (DWD – Economic Support and Child Care)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 741, #17]

CURRENT LAW

Under current law, state-funded food stamps are required to be provided to immigrants who are not eligible for federally-funded food stamps. Funds for this program come from the temporary assistance for needy families (TANF) program. In many cases, immigrants are not eligible for federal food stamps if they entered the country after August 22, 1996, or were present in the United States prior to that date but have reached the age of 18. The classifications of immigrants who are only eligible for the state food stamp program are shown in the Appendix.

GOVERNOR

Increase funding for food stamps for qualified immigrants by \$130,000 FED annually for a total allocation of \$550,000 annually.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. 1997 Wisconsin Act 296 created a state food stamp benefit for qualified immigrants who had become ineligible for federal benefits under the 1996 federal welfare reform legislation (P.L. 104-193). After passage of Act 286, a new federal law was enacted which restored federal food stamp benefits to certain qualified immigrants. The state program provides benefits to qualified immigrants that remain ineligible for federal food stamp benefits.
2. As of March, 2001, seven other states had food stamp programs for immigrants.

Like Wisconsin, three states serve all legal immigrants who are ineligible for the federal food stamp program: California, Maine and Nebraska. The other states only serve specific populations. Illinois serves persons who were in the U.S. on August 22, 1996, who are parents of food stamp eligible children or are age 60 to 64. Maryland serves children under age 18 who arrived in the U.S. after August 22, 1996. New York serves persons age 60 to 67 who have been living in the same county since August 22, 1996. Ohio is phasing out its program but serves supplemental security income (SSI) recipients who resided in Ohio as of August 22, 1996. Five other states are running separate state programs outside of the federal option program: Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Rhode Island and Washington. These states add a state-funded account to food stamp recipients' electronic benefit transfer (EBT) cards.

3. The 2000-01 allocation for the state food stamp program is \$420,000. Based on current caseload estimates, the projected need for the program in 2000-01 is \$575,000, which exceeds the Governor's recommendation of \$550,000 annually for the next biennium. The Department of Workforce Development (DWD) has the authority to reallocate funds within its budget to address shortfalls, subject to approval by the Department of Administration. The administration indicates that the projected deficit in 2000-01 could be funded if savings are identified in 2000-01 exceeding those assumed in the Governor's year-end projection for the TANF program. This funding need has been taken into account when estimating the TANF carryover balance in Paper #1041.

4. The number of participants in the state food stamp program rose from 834 in March, 2000, to 1,063 in March, 2001, representing a 27.5% increase. According to DWD, this increase is due to the fact that many immigrants who entered the country after 1996 are not eligible for federal food stamps, and this population grows annually as more immigrants enter the state. In addition, DWD indicates that the caseload has also been growing because many immigrants become ineligible for federal food stamps when they turn 18.

5. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, new immigration into Wisconsin averaged 2,725 persons annually from 1990 to 1999 and immigrants are approximately 3.6% of the state's population. Immigrants have become an increasing portion of the state's annual population change, ranging from a low of 3.5% in 1991, to a high of 12.5% in 1997 and 1998.

6. From July, 2000, through March, 2001, the caseload for the state food stamp program has been increasing at an average rate of 1.9% per month. Assuming this growth rate continues, the caseload would increase to 1,770 by June, 2003. At this rate of growth, state food stamps would cost approximately \$745,000 in 2001-02 and \$950,000 in 2002-03. Since current law requires the state to provide these benefits, the Committee could provide an additional \$195,000 in 2001-02 and \$400,000 in 2002-03 to meet this anticipated demand.

7. Because the state food stamp program is not required by federal law, the Committee could choose not to provide any additional funds beyond the Governor's proposal. If savings in other TANF-funded programs are identified throughout the biennium, they could be allocated to the program. However, it is possible that no savings would be available because the child care subsidy

program has a large projected shortfall and it could be argued that fully funding child care subsidies should take precedence over other funding increases.

If no additional funds are provided, the state statutory provision authorizing this program would have to be modified to require the state to only provide benefits under the program to the extent funds are available. In addition, the state would have to modify its plan with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to describe how it would limit participation in the program. The state could have a waiting list, provide a smaller benefit amount than in the federal food stamp program, serve only certain populations, and/or adopt stricter eligibility limitations. DWD indicates that it would seek to modify the plan if insufficient funds were available for the program, but has not yet formulated specific options. The Committee may want DWD to submit any revised plan to the Committee for approval through a 14-day passive review process prior to sending it to USDA.

8. Alternatively, the Committee could opt to maintain current law and not provide any additional funding for the state food stamp program in order to allocate more funds to child care subsidies. As with the alternative above, the statutory provision authorizing this program would have to be modified to require the state to only provide benefits under the program to the extent funds are available. In addition, the state would have to modify its plan with the federal government to state how it will limit participation in the program. Options for how to limit participation are discussed in the point above. The Committee may want DWD to submit its revised plan to the Committee for approval through a 14-day passive review process prior to sending it to USDA.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to increase funding for the state food stamp program for qualified immigrants by \$130,000 FED annually.

a. Modify the statutes to require the state to only provide benefits under the program to the extent funds are available.

b. Require the Secretary of DWD to submit any plan to limit participation in the state food stamp program for immigrants to the Joint Committee on Finance prior to submitting it to USDA. DWD would not be permitted to send the plan to the USDA until it has been approved by the Committee through a 14-day passive review process.

2. Provide an additional \$195,000 FED in 2001-02 and \$400,000 FED in 2001-02 for the state food stamp program for qualified immigrants to reflect recent caseload projections.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>FED</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$595,000

3. Delete the Governor's recommendation and maintain funding at \$420,000 annually.

a. Modify the statutes to require the state to only provide benefits under the program to the extent funds are available.

b. Require the Secretary of DWD to submit any plan to limit participation in the state food stamp program for immigrants to the Joint Committee on Finance prior to submitting it to USDA. DWD would not be permitted to send the plan to the USDA until it has been approved by the Committee through a 14-day passive review process.

Alternative 3

FED

2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)

- \$260,000

Prepared by: Victoria Carreón

APPENDIX

Classifications of Immigrants Eligible Only for the State Food Stamp Program

The following classifications of immigrants who entered the United States before August 22, 1996, are only eligible for the state food stamp program:

- Persons legally admitted for permanent residence and parolees who: (a) have not worked for at least 10 years; (b) do not have a United States military connection; (c) are not blind or disabled; (d) are not Hmong or Laoation; (e) were not age 65 or older on August 22, 1996; or (f) are age 18 or older.
- Refugees, asylees, Cubans, Haitians, Amerasians, and persons whose deportation has been withheld who have been in the country for more than seven years and: (a) have not worked for at least 10 years; (b) do not have a United States military connection; (c) are not blind or disabled; (d) are not Hmong or Laoation; (e) were not age 65 or older on August 22, 1996; or (f) are age 18 or older.

The following classifications of immigrants who entered the United States on or after August 22, 1996, are only eligible for the state food stamp program:

- Persons legally admitted for permanent residence and parolees who: (a) have not worked for at least 10 years; (b) do not have a United States military connection; or (c) are not Hmong or Laoation.
- Refugees, asylees, Cubans, Haitians, Amerasians, and persons whose deportation has been withheld who have been in the country for more than seven years and: (a) have not worked for at least 10 years; (b) do not have a United States military connection; (c) are not blind or disabled; (d) or are not Hmong or Laoation.



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 21, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #1052

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

Fatherhood Initiative (DWD -- Economic Support and Child Care)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 744, #29]

CURRENT LAW

1999 Wisconsin Act 9 (the 1999-01 biennial budget act) provided \$150,000 (\$75,000 TANF and \$75,000 in federal income augmentation funds transferred from DHFS) in 1999-00 for DWD to provide grants to promote fathers' involvement in their children's lives. Because all of the funding provided in Act 9 was budgeted in 1999-00, no funding is included in the Department's base budget to maintain funding for this grant program in the 2001-03 biennium.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$200,000 FED (TANF) annually to fund grants to community organizations, administration and to distribute educational materials that promote fathers' involvement in parenting.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. In 1999-00, DWD entered into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Board (CANP Board) to distribute the fatherhood initiative grants authorized in Act 9. The Board received 134 grant applications and awarded 35 grants, each totaling \$4,000, so that \$140,000 in grant funds was distributed to a variety of public and private agencies. Although the Board distributed the grants in 1999-00, grant recipients were permitted to use the grant funds through the 2000-01 fiscal year. The Board expended the remaining \$10,000 to fund costs of administering the program.

2. Grant recipients used these funds to conduct a variety of activities to promote fathers' involvement in parenting, including media campaigns, positive parenting education for fathers, activities designed for fathers and their kids, fatherhood awards, support groups for expectant, new, never married, divorced, step, teen, or single dads and parenting resources for fathers. Several of the programs are intended to target a particular population or culture. The attachment to this paper provides a list of the agencies that received grants with the funding provided in Act 9 and a brief description of how each grant recipient used this funding.

3. TANF is an appropriate source of funding for this grant program. One of the four broad purposes of TANF funds is to encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services specifically lists initiatives to promote responsible fatherhood and increase the capacity of fathers to provide emotional and financial support for their children as examples of activities that can be supported with TANF funds. Moreover, these types of activities need not be targeted to low-income populations in order to meet TANF requirements.

4. The grant funding authorized in Act 9 was one component of a broader initiative the administration began in 1998, to encourage fathers to support their children both emotionally and financially. By executive order, the Governor: (a) instructed all state agencies to examine their programs and policies and make the necessary administrative modifications to ensure that fathers are not discouraged through programmatic or financial disincentives from involvement in the development and care of their children; (b) provided that modifications to programs and policies requiring statutory changes be identified by state agencies to DWD; and (c) directed DWD to coordinate all legislative action necessary to ensure that programs and policies comply with (a).

5. The initiative also included: (a) a summit of scholars, practitioners, policymakers and community leaders to share information and develop strategies to reduce fatherlessness in Wisconsin, which was held in May, 1999, in Wisconsin Dells; and (b) a public awareness campaign to help fathers and mothers understand the key role that fathers have in child development and to encourage fathers to become involved.

6. The executive order from Governor Thompson assigned the responsibility of coordinating the fatherhood initiative to DWD. DWD has coordinated all legislative action necessary to ensure state agency programs and policies comply with the executive order and works with other state agencies, organizations and groups to provide employment services to fathers, targeting low-income fathers. DWD reported that, for the most part, agency programs and policies already complied with the executive order. In addition, DWD administers W-2, which has a goal to strengthen the responsibility of both parents to care for their children.

7. In light of the demand for the grant funding that was provided in the 1999-01 biennium and the purposes for which states may use TANF funds, the Committee may wish to approve the Governor's recommendations to provide increased, ongoing support for the program.

8. However, there are several reasons why the Committee may wish to modify or

delete the Governor's recommendation. First, it is not clear that either the administration or the Legislature intended that the fatherhood grant program would be an ongoing program. Act 9 provided all of the funding in 1999-00, presumably so that the program would be reviewed as part of the 2001-03 biennial budget. Further, Act 9 did not create any permanent statutory provisions relating to the program. In announcing the grant awards in March, 2000, Governor Thompson indicated that the grant funds would be used to develop independent programs designed to bring fathers closer to their children. In the request-for-proposal (RFP) for the fatherhood grants, it was stated that the grants would be one-time awards and were to support a project and/or activity that communicates the message that fathers are important in the lives of children.

9. Second, the need to increase or maintain funding for this grant program should be weighed against other programs supported with TANF funds, such as Wisconsin Shares, the child care subsidy program. If the Committee wishes to maintain funding for the grant program, it could modify the amount of funding in the bill to equal either the annual level established in Act 9 (\$150,000 FED in both 2001-02 and 2002-03) or the biennial level established in Act 9 (\$75,000 FED in both 2001-02 and 2002-03).

10. Finally, if the Committee wishes to make this grant program a permanent, ongoing program, it could establish statutory program specifications. For example, the Committee could transfer the program from DWD to the CANP Board to reflect that the CANP Board currently administers the program under a memorandum of understanding with DWD. Further, DWD intends to have the CANP Board administer the program under a MOU in the 2001-03 biennium.

However, DWD is the lead agency on the administration's other fatherhood activities. Further, the Committee rejected this proposal as part of its 1999-01 biennial budget deliberations. For these reasons, the Committee may wish to retain the program in DWD, which would enable DWD to continue to administer the program through a memorandum of understanding with the CANP Board if DWD does not want to distribute the grants.

11. The Committee could also specify maximum grant amounts, such as \$8,000 per grant, to recognize that a limited amount of funding is available for grants, but to maximize the number of entities that could receive grants. In addition, grant recipients could be required to provide matching funds equal to 15% of the state grant amount to ensure that grants are provided to entities that invested local resources in the effort. The CANP Board required recipients to match the grant through cash or in-kind services equal to 5% of the state grant amount and specified that grants could not be used to supplant existing funds.

12. Further, the Committee could specify that grants only be provided as "seed money" to enable recipients to develop ongoing programs that would not require additional state matching funds. In this way, grant recipients would not rely on future grants under the program to support their activities.

13. Alternatively, the statutory language changes are included to reduce the demand for grants. However, if the Committee adopts the Governor's recommendations, it may not need to

limit the demand for these grants. Also, the Committee should consider that including statutory language limiting the funding level of grants would not allow larger, more comprehensive projects to be funded.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

A. Funding

1. Adopt the Governor's recommendation to provide \$200,000 FED (TANF) annually to support grants.
2. Reduce funding in the bill by \$50,000 FED (TANF) annually so that \$150,000 would be budgeted annually to support grants.

<u>Alternative A2</u>	<u>FED</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$100,000

3. Reduce funding in the bill by \$125,000 FED (TANF) annually so that \$75,000 would be budgeted annually to support grants.

<u>Alternative A3</u>	<u>FED</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$250,000

4. Maintain current law by deleting all funding in the bill to support grants (-\$200,000 FED (TANF) annually).

<u>Alternative A4</u>	<u>FED</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$400,000

B. Administration

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to retain the program in the DWD.
2. Transfer the program to the CANP Board. Increase PR-S funding for the CANP Board by amounts that correspond to the funding alternatives under (A).

C. Statutory Changes

1. In addition to Alternatives (A1), (A2) or (A3), choose any or all of the following alternatives.
 - a. Limit grant awards to no more than \$8,000 in a year to a single agency.
 - b. Require grant recipients to provide a 15% match to the state grant amount and specify that grant recipients could meet the match requirement either with cash or in-kind services.
 - c. Prohibit grant recipients from using state grants to supplant other funds.
 - d. Require grant recipients to demonstrate that programs funded with the state grants are, or will be, ongoing programs that will not rely on future state grant funds to continue.
 - e. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: Yvonne M. Arsenault

Attachment

ATTACHMENT

Wisconsin Fatherhood Initiative Grant Recipients February, 2000

Adams County Department of Social Services; Friendship

"Building Bridges" -- A series of pre-planned, pre-paid shared experiences by fathers and children such as camping, fishing, bowling. Community collaboration resulted in several in-kind donations to cover expenses of outings.

Agriculture and Resource Center; Altoona

"A Celebration of Fatherhood in the Chippewa Valley" -- Events during the month of June, 2000 will include a presentation by UW Professor Dave Riley, with media coverage and interactive father-child activities in Chippewa, Dunn and Eau Claire Counties.

Atwood Fatherhood Alliance; Madison

This initiative will include group prepared meals, discussions, speakers, field trips, a resource library, parenting classes and forums to a larger community of fathers to provide positive parenting and create community among fathers.

Barron County Health Department; Barron

A month of activities and media blitzes culminating with an inservice/brunch in honor of fatherhood. Emphasis will be on the importance of fathers in child rearing; educational inservice will include education on early brain development.

Center for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc.; Brookfield

"Dad and Me" is a project aimed at providing support and education to fathers of deaf and hard of hearing children. Meetings and interactions with other dads, sign language instruction and fun activities for dads and their children will be provided on a monthly basis.

Ellsworth Head Start; Ellsworth

The Pierce County Fatherhood Program will provide education and activities for fathers including a keynote speaker, a Fatherhood Fair, and a newsletter for fathers providing information about positive discipline, activities, communication and other pertinent family concerns.

Family and Child Learning Centers of N.E.W., Inc.; Rhinelander

The Fathering Center will host "Dads Connecting" on a monthly basis for support, socialization and learning. Also, father/child activities will be held on a bi-monthly schedule and an annual community conference will enable outreach to fathers.

Family Education and Resource Center; Manitowoc

"Celebrating the Importance of Fathers in the Lives of Children" is a two-part program. One, a media campaign will be a 12-month public awareness campaign stressing the importance of fathers; two, "Together with Dad" is a four seasonal interactive and fun events for fathers and children 2-10.

Family Forum, Inc.; Superior

"Fathers, Too" -- An effort to impact attitudinal change by increasing community awareness of the importance of fathers in children's lives; to provide education and training to increase understanding of fatherhood issues with parents, community members, local, county and city officials and schools to create communities where families are valued and parents are partners.

Family Resource Center of Iowa County, Inc.; Dodgeville

"Dads Make a Difference" is a project that increases the awareness of the importance of fathers being actively involved in their children's lives. Makes fathering resources more accessible to a rural community and brings together community members to develop a sense of responsible fatherhood for the next generation of dads.

Family Resource Centers of Sheboygan County; Plymouth

Provide opportunities for men and their babies, toddlers and preschoolers to spend more time together. Age appropriate activities and child development information will be provided. "Calling All Single Dads" will help never married, separated and divorced fathers build confidence in family relationship and financial stability.

First American Prevention Center; Bayfield

The Red Cliff Fatherhood initiative project will sponsor a community awareness/action campaign to develop and display in the community, positive fatherhood posters incorporating messages and pictures of local fathers and their children. Also, provide incentive for fathers to become involved with their children in the First American Prevention Centers' abstinence based adolescent pregnancy prevention project.

First Time Parent Program; Beloit

First time fathers will increase knowledge of and skills in using communication techniques with their young children. The communication is boosted by portraits of first time fathers with their infants and will provide fathers with a lasting reminder of the joy of soul-connection with their infants.

Forward Service Corporation; Rhinelander

New Expectations Fatherhood Awareness Campaign is designed to reach out to the community at large in order to emphasize the importance of fatherhood and help fathers and mothers understand the key role fathers play in child development. A dad & me picnic at a local park and a fatherhood awards program is planned as well as a media campaign.

Harley & Associates; Milwaukee

"Building Strong Families... By Building Strong Fathers" is a multi-media campaign designed to reach father sin all the different areas that fathers get their information. Promote good fatherhood by providing parenting tips, linking fathers to a growing list of parenting resources and recognizing the father as the head of the household.

LaCrosse County Human Services; LaCrosse

A "Resource Fair" is planned for father sin which fathers and various community organizations will meet to network and develop collaborative ways of linking resources to fathers. A special focus of this project is to have non-custodial fathers be contacted to enhance their degree of contact with their children to acknowledge the important role fathers have in children's lives.

Learning Together Family Literacy, Inc.: Holmen

Create public awareness of the key role father splay in child development and provide fathers with a wide range of tools and techniques to strengthen their role of parent. Community awareness, fatherhood parent education classes and father and child activities will be featured.

Lutheran Social Services (SCAN) Program: Racine

The project will be participant driven; the fathers will decide and can choose from including a guest speaker, parent education classes, a special event for the whole family or planning a field trip for their children and themselves. The local newspaper will design an "ad" that will highlight the importance of fathers in the lives of their children.

M & M Fatherhood Alliance: Marinette

This alliance has been a vehicle in encouraging fathers to become more fully involved with their children, and helping them to understand their role in child development. Continued outreach will include a monthly "Fathers Make a Difference Aware", a "Second Annual Fathers Unlimited Banquet", "Family Camp", "YMCA Family Day" and other educational events.

Marion Area Coalition for Healthy Communities: Marion

The Marion Area Fathering Initiative builds on existing programming and infrastructures to enhance the involvement of fathers. All initiative programming involves the input from fathers. All initiative programming involves the input from fathers. Programming includes: father/child asset Olympics, media/publicity campaign, mentoring and additional activities as determined by father input.

Mental Health Association in Portage County: Stevens Point

Young Fatherhood Initiative will provide innovative activities and parenting education to the teen fathers attending the local high schools and those who are incarcerated in the Portage County Jail. The goal is to increase the awareness of the parenting responsibilities that fathers incur, help strengthen their parent-child interaction and support them in their relationship with their child's mother.

Merrill Community Center: Beloit

PADDLE (Practical Activity for Dads Developing Longstanding Engagement) with Kids. Positive parenting interaction and engagement works best in a meaningful context. Building a family canoe will result in a tangible product that can be used in continued father/child interaction and perhaps establish a family ritual of father/child canoe trips.

Northcentral Technical College: Wausau

Fathers from the Southeast Asian community will learn more about being a successful father in today's changing society. Professional Hmong fathers from the Wausau area will share their success stories about the challenges. Participants will engage in a learning activity with their children and receive a book to take home for continued sharing with their family.

Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin: Oneida

The Native American Fathers Fair will increase the father's knowledge of child development, cultural appropriate behaviors, age appropriate expectations, parent/child roles and empathy for the child's needs. A father's support system will be developed.

Price County Family Preservation & Support; Phillips

The Price County Fatherhood Initiative is a multifaceted program that recognizes fathers for what they contribute to child development. It has an educational component targeted at the whole community on the merits of fatherhood. Finally, the program offers a celebration of Fatherhood.

Racine Correctional Institution; Sturtevant

A Father's Fair will be developed at Racine Correctional Institution. Community agencies will be asked to attend to promote their offerings and packets of material will be available for the men to take for self-study and to promote the existing Parenting class. Update materials, handouts, and brochures will be purchased to enhance the Parenting class.

Rosalie Manor Community and Family Services, Inc.; Milwaukee

Supporting Dads Today will be a program outreach to dads whose partners have been approached in the hospital at the time of delivery. This program will include parenting materials for dads, a "Fathers' Fair", support groups for dads, and a Father's Nurturing Program. Four fathers will be trained as Nurturing Program Co-facilitators.

Sixteenth Street Community Health Center; Milwaukee

"Papa's Only" -- Parenting Classes for Expectant Fathers -- To develop a strong father-child relationship from pregnancy on, this program will offer perinatal classes and a support group exclusively for Spanish-speaking expectant fathers. It is anticipated these father will be more comfortable discussing parenting issues in their primary language and with other men.

St. Croix Family Resource Center; Baldwin

"Celebrate Fathers" is an informational/activity fair for fathers and children. The intent of the fair is to encourage men who are the primary male role model or support for a child to take an active role in the lives and development of their children. By providing information in an enjoyable, non-threatening environment, men will better understand the important role they play in their child's life.

Spirit of Truth Worship Center; Milwaukee

Men After God's Own Heart (MAGOH) Project is a parent support group designed to serve teen and adult males in the Milwaukee community. The mission is to strengthen the identity of males, clarify roles and responsibilities in father/child relationships and to establish a network of support with other males. Each participant actively engages in scheduled activities to enhance relationships and demonstrate modeling.

Spooner Citizenship Committee; Spooner

All the FACTS (Fathers and Children Together Strongly). A core group of experienced and exemplary father will be given a child development framework and then together will compose and refine a curriculum to be used to educate 30-40 fathers in the community. Especially targeted will be divorced, never married, step, teen and grandfathers. This will be done with the leadership of a national family wrap-around trainer who is a member of the community.

Stockbridge-Munsee Community; Bowler

The Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Department of Family Services, proposes to develop a parenting workshop for fathers. This workshop will seek to help Mohican fathers and grandfathers become better communicators and more involved as parents/grandparents. The workshop will address cultural issues and will give fathers the knowledge and tools they need to achieve physical, emotional, mental and spiritual health.

Watertown Family Center; Watertown

The "Father Connection" offers fathers an opportunity to spend quality time with their children in a non-threatening environment. Three types of programming will be available; father/child playgroups, father/child outings and fathering speaker workshops. These programs coupled with a media campaign will motivate fathers to interact with their children more frequently and motivate community members to be more supportive of this interaction.

Wisconsin Conservatory of Lifelong Learning; Milwaukee

"A Dad for the New Millennium" is a program that provides a series of activities and resources for the ever-changing role of the father in our modern technological world. The goal of the program is to increase the availability of parenting resources to fathers and through providing positive interactions with children, to recognize the important role of the father in the overall development of their children.

Wisconsin Heights School District; Mazomanie

"Time with Fathers" will consist of six activities promoting positive, structured interactions between fathers and children. A Love and Logic session for fathers will be offered, followed by activities where fathers and children write and illustrate their own story make a bookbag and build a bookshelf. High school youth will assist fathers and children as they create their bookbags and bookshelves; creating an opportunity for students in high school to view and experience positive father/child interactions as they learn about parenting skills.