Mission: To promote high-quality school readiness, voluntary pre-kindergarten and after school programs, thus increasing all children’s chances of achieving future educational success and becoming productive members of society. The Coalition seeks to further the physical, social, emotional and intellectual needs of Miami-Dade and Monroe County children with a priority toward the ages before birth through age 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Welcome &amp; Introductions</th>
<th>Rick Beasley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. Approval of Minutes</td>
<td>Rick Beasley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Motion to approve May 6 2019 Minutes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Love Thy Kids Academy II</td>
<td>Bob de la Fuente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Miami Springs Baptist Preschool</td>
<td>Bob de la Fuente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Candy House Day Care</td>
<td>Bob de la Fuente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Public Comments</td>
<td>Rick Beasley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Adjourn</td>
<td>Rick Beasley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provider Services Committee Meeting
May 6, 2019; 2:00 PM
ELC Board Room

Committee Attendees: Rick Beasley, Loreen Chant (via conference call), Jenni Roig, Abilio Rodriguez

Absent Committee Member:

Staff Attendees: Evelio Torres; Angelo Parrino; Lisa Sanabria; Ileana Vallejo; Miguel Alfonso; Vanessa Aguilar; Amy Tongson; Jackye Russell; Fiorella Altare; Victor Caballero; Ana Rodriguez; Lisney Badillo; Amanda Gil; Sandra Rodriguez; Mercy Castiglione

General Attendees: Bob de la Fuente; Inez Thomas; Crystal (Crystal Learning Center); Tanisha Stokes; Patrick & Julianne (Children’s Academy); Ariana Lopez; Yoleicy Alvarez; Yorely Alvarez

I. Welcome and Introductions

   Rick Beasley

II. Approval of Minutes

   Rick Beasley
   o Motion to approve by L. Chant.
   o Motion seconded by J. Roig.
   o Motion unanimously passed.

III. Crystal Learning Center

   Bob de la Fuente

   • B. de la Fuente stated that the Crystal Learning Center had a gap in there Certificate of Insurance. The providers Liability Policy expired 06/09/2018 and renewed on 11/16/2018. The Contract Manager confirmed with the insurance agent that the Provider did not have coverage with them during the gap period. The provider was contacted by the ELC and stated she did not have insurance coverage with another insurance carrier during the gap period. The current insurance company is unable to cover the gap period. Prior to this occurrence provider, had another gap in coverage, policy expired 05/19/2017 and renewed on 06/09/2017.

   • I. Thomas stated she thought she had coverage until she received a call from the ELC. I. Thomas stated that the broker had missed placed the paperwork. I. Thomas presented a letter from broker stating this. B. de la Fuente stated that ELC staff called the insurance agent and they stated that the provider came in to renew the insurance policy but never followed up with the agent to finalize the paperwork. J. Roig stated that she receives an email from the ELC 30 days
prior to expiration. Crystal stated that she did not receive this email.

- After reviewing all documents and hearing the providers' testimony, the committee, voted to place the provider on a one year Corrective Action Plan. The CAP requires that there will be no gaps in the insurance policy and if the provider receives any class 1 or 2 violation they void the right to appeal and will be revoked for 5 years.
  - Motion to approve by A. Rodriguez.
  - Motion seconded by A. J. Roig.
  - Motion unanimously passed.

IV. Children’s Academy #3

- B. de la Fuente stated that Children’s Academy #3 had received three class 2 violations in a 12-month period within the same standard (Outdoor Play Area/Fencing CCF Handbook, Section 3.5 (Form OEL-SR-6202, Section 7 Planned Activities, Pages 19-20), (Form OEL-SR-6202, Section 10.7 Outdoor Play Area and Section 10.8 Fencing, Pages 25-26)

- The facility’s fencing walls or gate area had gaps that could allow children to exit the outdoor play area. CCF Handbook, Section 3.5.1, B (Section 10.8, number 2) [SR]
  - 8/17/2018: The facility has a gate (which does not close) that leads to another fenced area next to the facility. This fenced area has another gate that is open, leads to the street, and has a broken gap in the fence that also leads to the street. FSC advised to have the gate fixed so that it can be closed properly and to fix the gap in the other part of the fence. Due date was 8/31/2018.
  - 10/11/2018: Upon arrival, the FSC observed that in one area of the fence a gate was open that leads into the play area from the street. Another area of the fence is broken that also leads to the street. The gate was closed during the time of inspection. FSC advised to have the fencing fixed and to not let the kids play outside until the fencing is fixed. The due date was 10/24/2018.
  - 11/27/2018: The fencing in the outdoor play area has a gate that cannot be closed properly leaving the gate wide open. In another section of the fence, the fence is broken with a gap that leads to the street. As technical assistance, the outdoor play area must have adequate fencing or walls a minimum of 4 feet in height. Fencing, including gates, must be continuous and must not have gaps or opening larger than 3 inches that would allow children to exit the outdoor play area. The base of the fence must remain at ground level, and be free from erosion or build-up to prevent inside and outside access by children or animals. These areas must have at least two exits, with at least one being remote from the buildings. If an outdoor play area was approved for usage by the Department prior to the effective date of this rule, no new exits are required to be added to meet this standard. However, if outdoor play area fencing is changed then the standard would apply and two exits must be provided. The due date was 12/11/2018.
B. de la Fuente stated that Children’s Academy Preschool #6 was terminated in December 2018 for the same violations.

B. de la Fuente stated that while reviewing the supporting documents it was found the provider was placed on a CAP November 2015 for serious deficiencies with the Florida department of Health Bureau of Child Care Food Program.

T. Stokes stated that the first violation occurred because the company doing the landscaping could not get through and opened a hole in the fence. T. Stokes stated that with the second violation, the gap in the fence was there for years. The provider had placed a latch on the gate but the inspector said it was not in compliance and to purchase a bike chain. Julianne state that this area was not part of the playground.

A. Rodriguez stated that these discrepancies should have been rectified with DCF and not here with the committee. Julianne stated that the violations were not appealed with DCF they were fixed onsite and she was not aware she could appeal.

V. Aguilera stated that the provider should be allowed to finish out their VPK contract because it is too late in the year to transfer the VPK students.

After reviewing all documents and hearing, the providers’ testimony the committee decided to terminate the provider’s contract and revoke eligibility for 5 years.

- Motion to approve by A. Rodriguez.
- Motion seconded by J. Roig.
- Motion unanimously passed.

V. Children’s Academy #4

B. de la Fuente stated that Children’s Academy #4 had received five class 2 violations in a 12-month period within the same standard (17-02. The facility's outdoor play area contained litter, nails, glass or other hazards that posed a threat to the health, safety or well-being of the children. CCF Handbook, Section 3.5, A (Section 10.7, number 1)

The facility’s fencing walls or gate area had gaps that could allow children to exit the outdoor play area.

- 04/26/2018: Part of the fencing in the outdoor play area is under 4 feet in height. Technical assistance given to have the fence higher than 4 feet. In the form of efforts to assist licensees, any future violation of this standard will result in disciplinary sanctions being progressively enforced by the Department in accordance to s. 402.310 and/or Chapters 65C-22/65C-20, Florida Administrative Code. Due date given 5/8/2018.
08/17/2018: FSC observed parts of the fence in the playground area to be under 4 feet in height. FSC advised to have the fence adjusted to meet the minimum requirement. Due date given 8/31/2018.

10/11/2018: In the outdoor play area there is a small gate in the back that is broken and a fence that leads to the street is broken and wide open. Due date given 10/24/2018.

3/21/2019: 17-02 some fencing materials in the outdoor play area, which are accessible to the children, could pose as a hazard to the children. Technical assistance given to have that fencing material locked away in an area where the children cannot have access to it. Per the handbook, the outdoor play area must be clean and free from litter, nails, glass and other hazards.

3/21/2019: 17-06 A gate in the fence cannot be closed properly outside that leads to fencing materials that could be accessible to children. Technical assistance given to have locks on the gate. Per the handbook. The outdoor play area must have adequate fencing or walls a minimum of 4 feet in height. Fencing, including gates, must be continuous and must not have gaps or opening larger than 3 inches that would allow children to exit the outdoor play area. The base of the fence must remain at ground level, and be free from erosion or build-up to prevent inside and outside access by children or animals. These areas must have at least two exits, with at least one being remote from the buildings. If an outdoor play area was approved for usage by the Department prior to the effective date of this rule, no new exits are required to be added to meet this standard. However, if outdoor play area fencing is changed then the standard would apply and two exits must be provided.

- T. Stokes stated in reference to the first violation, the fence had been there for many years. The inspector on this occasion stated that it was to short, must be 4 feet or more, it was replaced with a 6-foot fence. V. Aguilera stated that DCF regulations have changed and that might be why it had not come up before. Julianne again stated that she did not know they could appeal. A. Rodriguez stated that after searching online he could see that in 2016 they had the same problems. Julianne stated that this was not the playground area. J. Roig stated that even if it is not the playground area it is part of you allotted space and must be secured.

- V. Aguilera stated that the provider should be allowed to finish out their VPK contract because it is too late in the year to transfer the VPK students.

- After reviewing all documents and hearing, the providers’ testimony the committee decided to terminate the provider’s contract and revoke eligibility for 5 years.

  - Motion to approve by A. Rodriguez.
  - Motion seconded by J. Roig.
  - Motion unanimously passed.
B. de la Fuente stated that Kid’s Club Academy failed to notify the ELC of Change of Ownership within 30 days per contract. On Thursday, March 21, 2019, the provider met with ELC for a change of ownership, in which at the time the provider notified the ELC that a change in Sunbiz had occurred January 2019. Owner A. Lopez (President and Secretary) removed herself from Sunbiz and added Yoleicy Alvarez (President and Secretary) and Yorely Alvarez (Vice President), the corporation was sold to the new owners.

Kids Club Academy representatives were in need of an interpreter and accepted an ELC staff member to serve as the interpreter. A. Lopez stated that she the childcare center to her mother and Aunt and was unaware of the 30-day notification. Y. Alvarez stated that she realize that they did not do things in right order but they were depending on guidance received from DCF. DCF set up a meeting to meet with the ELC, the change of ownership was completed in January and the meeting was scheduled for March. B. de la Fuente stated that an email sent from DCF stated the following: “A forensic review of my e mail indicates that I did request information from the provider after a phone call on 3/6/2019. I then attempted to set up a partner meeting with ELC/DCF to conduct a change of ownership; it was for March 14 and by provider requested to change to 3/21/2019. It was during that meeting that DCF and ELC learned that the provider had already made changes to the cooperation in January of 2019 prior to this meeting. A seller/buyer must contact DCF to inform us of a change of ownership and at that time a determination is made as to whether the seller has a contractual relationship with ELC. If so then I request information, license number and name of the facility as well as who is buying/selling, and once received a meeting is set between DCF and ELC to explain the process and the responsibilities of all parties (buyer and seller). It should be noted that ELC and DCF have had this partnership for the change of ownerships since 2015. DCF has no statutory authority with a provider and their contractual arrangement with ELC.”

A. Rodriguez stated that due to the change of ownership there is an investigation that takes place. Through this investigation, it was discovered that A. Lopez was receiving SR and never informed the ELC that she was an owner. A. Lopez applied for SR claiming she was a teacher making 8.00 per hour maximum 10. Her aunt signed these employee verifications. A. Rodriguez stated that she sent letter to A. Lopez stating that she owed the coalition 11,000. A. Lopez called A. Rodriguez and claimed that she would reimburse this amount but this has not occurred.

A. Lopez stated that when she applied for SR the childcare center was not making enough funds so the salary she claimed was accurate. A. Lopez stated that she did not know she could not apply being an owner. A. Rodriguez also stated that A. Lopez application stated she was a single parent but during the investigation, it was discovered that this was also false. A. Lopez stated that in 2013 she was not with the child’s father but later did get back together. A. Lopez stated that in 2017 when the childcare center was doing better then she opted out of SR.
E. Torres asked if A. Lopez needed to declare that was a business owner on the SR application. A. Rodriguez responded that “yes to receive SR you must be below the 150% poverty line and with the income she receives from the ELC and the food program she is over income”

B. de la Fuente stated that the fraud case is not the reason for this termination but because of the delay in informing the ELC of the change of ownership. A. Rodriguez stated that he did not agree with mixing the two accusations and this decision should solely base on the change of ownership and it is up to ELC if they chose to contract with the new owners.

L. Badillo stated that the Kid’s Club Academy is presently operating without a contract and OEL will not honor this.

After reviewing all documents and hearing, the providers’ testimony the committee decided to terminate the provider’s contract (A. Lopez).

- Motion to approve by A. Rodriguez.
- Motion seconded by J. Roig.
- Motion unanimously passed

VII. Public Comments

Rick Beasley

VIII. Adjourn

Rick Beasley
Action Requested: The Executive Leadership Team recommends termination of the SR and VPK Contract for the 2018-2019 FY and revocation of eligibility for a period of five (5) years subject to provider testimony and verification of supporting documentation submitted by provider.

Background

**Love Thy Kids Academy II**
- License Capacity: 80
- Care Level offered: 2 months – 8 years
- Approximate Children enrolled for SR: 23
- Approximate Children enrolled for VPK: 8
- Number of providers within the same zip code offering the same services: 16
- Accreditations/Gold Seal: N/A
- Provider has been offering services since: 2000
- 2017-2018 reimbursements: Approximately $130,315.00

**Issues**

**Disqualified List**
- On 4/16/2019 the Contracts Department was informed via email the Provider was placed on the Florida Child Care Food Program (CCFP) USDA Disqualified Providers List on April 15, 2019.

Comments:
Provider has not had any previous CAP's, terms, or non-compliances.
**Early Learning Coalition Review Hearing Committee**

**May 30, 2019**

**Miami Springs Baptist Church Kindergarten – C11MD1090**

378 Westward Drive, Miami Springs, Fl. 33166

**Action Requested:** The Executive Leadership Team recommends termination of the SR and VPK contract for the 2018-2019 FY and revocation of eligibility for a period of five (5) years subject to provider testimony and verification of supporting documentation submitted by provider.

---

**Background**

**Miami Springs Baptist Church Kindergarten**

- License Capacity: 99
- Care Level offered: 3 months – 4 years old
- Approximate Children enrolled for SR: 5
- Approximate Children enrolled for VPK: 7
- Approximate Number of providers within the same zip code offering the same services: 11
- Accreditations/Gold Seal: N/A
- Provider has been offering services since: 1991

---

**Issues**

**Did not renew Workers Compensation**

- Workers compensation expired on 02/05/2019. As of today Provider has not renewed the policy.

Comments:
Provider has no previous terms or CAP.
Early Learning Coalition Review Hearing Committee

May 30, 2019

Candy House Day School Inc – C11MD0253
1628 NW 6th Street Miami, FL 33125

Action Requested: The Executive Leadership Team recommends termination of the SR and VPK Contract for the 2018-2019 FY and revocation of eligibility for a period of five (5) years subject to provider testimony and verification of supporting documentation submitted by provider.

Background

Candy House Day School Inc

- License Capacity: 138
- Care Level offered: 1 week – 6 years
- Approximate Children enrolled for SR: 28
- Approximate Children enrolled for VPK: 14
- Approximate Number of providers within the same zip code offering the same services: 28
- Accreditations/Gold Seal: N/A
- Provider has been offering services since: 1993
- 2017-2018 reimbursements: Approximately $113,249.69

Issues

One Class 1 Violation during CAP period


- 03/21/2019: Provider received 1 class 1 violation in 04. Supervision CCF Handbook, Section 2.4 (Form OEL-SR-6202, Section 5Supervision, Pages 16-17)

04-18 An unscreened individual was left alone with children in care. s.435.06 (2) (a), F.S. (Section 19.5) [SR]

Continuation on page 2
Early Learning Coalition Executive Leadership Team

May 30, 2019

Candy House Day School Inc – C11MD0253
1628 NW 6th Street Miami, FL 33125

Comments

- When FSC entered daycare provider was noticed to have an unscreened individual watching over the small toddlers (Infant - 1-year-old). FSC approached the individual and asked for her name. Individual informed FSC that she does not work in facility. Stating, “she is here with her friend.” Her friend is the staff member over the 2-year-old class.

- FSC asked who then is watching over the four children with her, to which she replied that she was. FSC walked away to find the director, but first snapped a picture of individual alone with children. After walking through entire facility FSC was made aware that Director and Lead Teacher had left for the day. Staff, to come into compliance, combine the classes to ensure level 2 screened individuals were supervising children in care. While conducting inspection, FSC noticed that the parents picking up children seemed very familiar with the unscreened individual. FSC made the decision to return the following day to speak with lead teacher.

- Following day, the FSC spoke with the lead teacher. Per the lead teacher, the director, who is normally in charge of the infant and one-year-old class, had left early. She was left in charge of the class but had an emergency and also had to leave. She reached out to the usual substitute, who unfortunately could not make it. So, she instructed the four-year-old's teacher to combine her class with the afterschool class and then watch over the infants and one-year-old kids. She then left. While the four-year-old kid’s teacher combined the classes the trusted unscreened individual stood guard over them. It was during this time that the FSC entered the facility.

- FSC asked provider for proof of identity from the unscreened individual. Provider informed FSC that since the individual did not work for daycare, no such document could be produced. This was completed at the time of inspection.