SUBJECT: Business Process Review for Child Care Services (CS09065) (City Wide)

RECOMMENDATION:

(a) That Report CS09065, respecting the Business Process Review for Child Care Services, be received.

(b) That staff be directed to forward a program enhancement request, for an increase to the Social Development and Early Childhood Services Division staff complement, for the Child Care Services Management Program, by 1.5 FTEs at a cost of $120,000 with no impact on the net levy.

Joe-Anne Priel
General Manager,
Community Services Department

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Social Development and Early Childhood Services Division undertook a two phased Business Process Review (BPR) of the Child Care Fee Subsidy and the Child Care Systems Management programs in 2007. The extensive review, which was completed in August 2009, has resulted in the creation of a new service delivery model that has achieved significant increases in program efficiencies and effectiveness, and the integration of program service and delivery into the broader context of early years services thus furthering the Best Start vision in our community and improving service for families with young children.
The review took into account current program strengths and gaps, stakeholder input, examination of practice from peer communities, recommendations from program audits, research of the ‘drivers’ of public’s confidence in government, and knowledge gained through piloting various new approaches to service delivery during the design phase of the review.

The review has resulted in the creation of a new service delivery model that included merging the two former programs into one, which is now referred to as the Child Care Services Management Program (Program). Program components and functions have been rationalized and aligned to ensure efficiencies, improve customer service, facilitate compliance with provincial and City of Hamilton program audits, and improve staff job satisfaction.

In addition to the efficiencies gained through the BPR process, staff has identified a shortfall in staff resources required to support the full implementation of the model and compliance with audit requirements. As a result, staff is recommending referral of a program enhancement request to increase program staff resources by 1.5 FTE to the 2010 budget process.

**BACKGROUND:**

Prior to July 1999, the City of Hamilton (Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth) had a narrowly defined role in the provision of child care; specifically 1) the determination and distribution of child care fee subsidies to increase access for families to licensed child care; and, 2) the operation of one child care program (Red Hill Family Centre).

As a result of the re-alignment of the provincial roles in the management of social and community health services, the Regional Municipality as the local Consolidated Municipal Service Manager (CMSM), assumed a broader scope of responsibility with respect to child care including system planning and management of the entire child care system in our community in July 1999. The Ministry of Children and Youth Services (MCYS) document “A Framework for Child Care Service Planning”, set the policy direction and accountability requirements of this new municipal role.

Newly acquired municipal responsibilities included: development and implementation of multi-year child care system plans, determination and distribution of wage subsidies, distribution of provincial pay equity payments, special needs resourcing funding to enhance access to licensed child care for children with special needs, administration of major and minor capital, and funding to support professional and care giver resource centres. A discreet new program, the Child Care Systems Program, was created to manage the additional municipal child care responsibilities. The City developed its first Child Care Service Management Plan by May 2001, in accordance with Ministry guidelines.
The Child Care Fee Subsidy Program and Red Hill Family Centre continued to carry out their pre-existing mandates with no change to their organizational functions or structure at that time.

**What Prompted the Child Care Business Process Review?**

Since the Municipality began managing the Child Care System, the system has experienced considerable expansion. Many significant changes have also occurred in policy directions, business processes, accountability requirements, and funding.

**Provincial Changes**

Some of the key changes to provincial policy direction and funding since 2000 include:

- **2000** - Creation of the Ontario Child Care Management System (OCCMS) by the Province to support the administration of Child Care Fee Subsidy Assistance, Wage Subsidy, Pay Equity/Budgets, Contract Management and Provincial Reporting Requirements; upgrades to the technology continue on a regular basis;

- **2003** Multi lateral framework for early learning and child care – priority focus on children aged 2.5 – 5 years of age, to access fee subsidy within the broader school community; resulting in an expansion of the Child Care Fee Subsidy Program caseload;

- **2005** Best Start Initiative – priority on child care expansion in schools and integration of services amongst the broader early years system serving children 0 – 6 years of age resulting in i) a rapid expansion of child care spaces through Capital projects, ii) a corresponding increase in the number of fee subsidies available for children and their families, iii) an increase in the amount of wage subsidies to be distributed to child care operators, and iv) a ‘call to action’ for all early years service providers to examine how they plan for and deliver their programs and services;

- **2007 Day Nurseries Act**; legislative changes regarding determination of child care fee subsidies (income test) – resulting in an immediate impact on caseloads, business processes and policies including the need for each CMSM to develop fee subsidy waitlist management strategies aligned to provincial policy directions; and,

- Accountability measures and system reporting requirements (complexity & frequency) have increased significantly with the introduction of new provincial funding and policy changes.

**Growth in the Local System**

Since the development of the first Child Care Service Management Plan in 2001 there has been rapid expansion in Hamilton’s child care system.
This growth is summarized in Table 1 below.

### Table 1: Growth in Hamilton’s Child Care System 2001 - 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service - January to December (inclusive)</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Child Care Sites</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Based Licensed Child Care Capacity</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>8,927</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children Served</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>5,733</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Families Served</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>4,438</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children with Special Needs Served</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>186%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Subsidized Child Care Spaces</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>3,011</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children on the Fee Subsidy Waitlist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Staff *</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Funding – gross **</td>
<td>28,876,500</td>
<td>43,720,442</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Funding – net</td>
<td>5,864,560</td>
<td>5,917,750</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- * Represents the total number of staffing both the Child Care Fee Subsidy Program and the Child Care Systems Management Program.
- ** Represents the gross program and administrative costs.

### Other Local Factors

- Child Care Fee Subsidy Program staff identified workload issues, co-worker cohesion, and impact of job on personal life as three issues requiring action during the Employee Survey process which took place during 2007;
- On-going communication/discussions with staff, as well as internal and external stakeholders, identified system and process inefficiencies in both the Child Care Fee Subsidy Program and Child Care Systems Program; and,
- The development of a sustained and growing waitlist for child care fee subsidies resulted in the need for staff to ‘manage’ caseloads of both active and ‘waiting’ clients.

The Social Development and Early Childhood Services Division, in partnership with the Strategic Services Division, undertook a Business Process Review (BPR) of the Child Care Fee Subsidy and Child Care Systems programs in 2007. The review was conducted using a two phased approach, with the final phase being completed in August 2009.
ANALYSIS/RATIONALE:

The Business Process Review - Phase One

The BPR sought to improve and streamline business practices, identify best practices, enhance customer satisfaction, ensure program compliance with provincial legislation and City of Hamilton policies and procedures, and identify resources required to meet these stated objectives. The review’s scope included the Child Care Fee Subsidy Program, and the Child Care Systems Management Program, and linkages with Best Start, Ontario Works, Finance and Administration, Home Management, and the Learning, Earning and Parenting (LEAP) program. Red Hill Family Centre was not included in the review.

Phase one of the review was completed in February 2008. The Childcare Systems Business Process Review described the current program, summarized findings from stakeholder input and the comparator municipalities, assessed program strengths and challenges, proposed a new service delivery model framework, and made a series of recommendations regarding the 'build' and implementation of the new service delivery model.

The service delivery model framework described in the Childcare Systems Business Process Review, positions those we serve and community partners at the centre of a service delivery model that integrates internal child care program functions, and demonstrates commitment to integrated community service planning and delivery. The framework articulated a significant shift or change in how service will be delivered in the new service delivery model, and what type of structure would be required to support this new approach to service delivery.

The framework also identified four key components to the new service delivery model, specifically; access to service, system planning funding and support, child care service teams, and specialized services co-ordination.

A preliminary list of business functions required to support the four key components of the new service delivery model, was generated as a starting point to further development and refinement of the proposed new service delivery model in Phase two of the BPR.

The Childcare Systems Business Process Review identified five themes (effective use of resources, efficient service delivery, service standard focused, streamlined data and information, and strong team focus) that would serve as the criteria that the proposed new service delivery model would be required to meet. Fourteen service delivery model objectives were developed as the benchmark for the creation of report recommendations and to ensure that the new service delivery model would remain true to the identified themes. (Refer to page 11 of Appendix A to Report CS09065).
Phase one of the BPR was completed in the spring of 2008. Phase two of the process began thereafter, and focused on re-finining the design and implementation of the new service delivery model.

**The Business Process Review (BPR): Phase Two – Design and Implementation**

**Emerging and Influencing Factors 2008**

**Program Audits**

In 2008, two audits of the Child Care Fee Subsidy Program and the Child Care System Management Program were conducted; one by the City of Hamilton, Corporate Services Department (Internal Audit), and the second by the Ministry of Children and Youth Services. The Management Action Plans completed by staff in response to these audits are attached as Appendices B and C to Report CS09065). Themes reflecting program gaps or deficiencies emerged from both of the audit processes. Identified deficiencies were consistent with the findings identified in Phase one of the BPR.

The audit themes reflected a need for:

- Separation of incompatible duties (in particular the separation of the subsidy approval and placement of children process from the review and approval and/or adjustment of service provider invoices);
- Peer and/or supervisory review of specific work efforts to ensure accurate determination of client eligibility, per diem calculation and invoice approval;
- Consistent enforcement of compliance requirements of contracted service providers;
- Development and maintenance of up-dated policies, procedures and work aids to reflect improved business processes and to ensure consistency in application; and,
- Improved linkages with Ontario Works Program to facilitate subsidy over-payments recovery.

**Public Service Value Chain**

In 2008, the Community Services Department began to explore the ‘best practice’ work that has been underway in a number of other municipalities and various ministries in both the senior levels of government, with respect to understanding the ‘drivers’ of the public's confidence in government. That work which is commonly referred to as the public service value chain underscores the strong linkages between three key building blocks; specifically, employee engagement, service satisfaction, and trust in public institutions. The principles that support those building blocks and the linkages between them were interwoven into the service delivery model design and implementation process. Input was sought from employees, departmental partners, current and potential recipients of fee subsidy, other stakeholders and community partners.
Release of the Citizens First 5 Report by the Institute for Citizen-Centred Service

In September 2008, the ICCS released its Citizens First 5 Report, a national survey of over 6,700 Canadians that examined how our citizens experience government services. The Citizens First series of reports have measured citizen satisfaction with services provided by all levels of government across Canada. The report identified five ‘drivers’ of citizen satisfaction with public service; specifically timeliness (the single most important driver across all services, all governments), staff (critical dimensions are knowledgeable staff who treat citizens fairly and ‘go the extra mile’), positive outcome (I got what I needed), ease of access, and citizens’ recent experiences with service.

The report also identified service level expectations such as: the time it should take program staff to return a phone call or e-mail inquiry, the maximum number of people citizens should have to deal with to get service, the maximum time to wait in any line-up at a government office, etc.

Citizens First 5 provided evidence-based guidelines for the development of key performance indicators (KPIs) during the design and implementation phase of the BPR process.

Approach to Service Delivery Model Design, Build and Implementation

The BPR’s design and implementation phase was incremental in nature, building, evaluating, and integrating to ensure system cohesiveness, seamlessness, and effectiveness.

A staff workgroup was given the mandate to build on the recommendations from the BPR - Phase One, to design and implement the proposed service delivery model. The intentional decision to fully engage staff in both phases of the review ensured that the outcome was richer and fully informed by the program experts. Audit recommendations were built into the new service delivery model to further strengthen the system. The knowledge gained from the public service value chain best practice findings and Citizens First 5 Report, were particularly informative in shaping the service delivery model and identifying appropriate benchmarks for service level expectations and resulting key performance indicators. The new service delivery model incorporates the best elements of centralized and decentralized approaches to service delivery. Each component represents a specialized collection of service functions which, when considered together, meet the five themes and the fourteen objectives identified in phase one of the BPR.

The New Service Delivery Model

Prior to the BPR program, functions were completed by two distinct units, Child Care Fee Subsidy and Child Care Systems Management, which reported to separate program managers. In order to implement the efficiencies identified in the service
delivery model and strengthen the integration of delivery of service, it was determined that these units should be merged and report to one program manager.

The creation of the four program components and related work function areas, provided opportunities for efficiencies by streamlining duties while facilitating the separation of incompatible duties in order to provide improved accountability, transparency and accuracy.

Appendix D, attached to Report CS09065, provides a high level over-view of the components of the service delivery model, service improvements and a sample of the key performance indicators (KPIs) in the various program components being achieved through implementation of the service delivery model.

Continuous program/system improvements will be identified and realized over the next six to eight months as the model is fully implemented.

**Staffing for the New Service Delivery Model**

The following steps were undertaken in order to determine the human resource requirements of the new service delivery model:

- All current job descriptions /categories were reviewed to determine if they meet the requirements of the new service delivery model; and,
- Appropriate service delivery standards were determined in each component of the service delivery model and corresponding key performance indicators (KPIs) were set.

In order to maximize existing Departmental staff resources to support the implementation of the service delivery model, management and supervisory resources across all Divisional child care programs have been assessed and re-assigned as required. Further, the Department has undertaken the conversion of existing job functions where required to align with the new service delivery model. This work was done in consultation with the Human Resources Department to ensure compliance with all related corporate policies and to ensure obligations under various collective agreements were honoured.

**Additional Staffing Resources Required to Ensure Compliance with Audit Recommendations**

Once all BPR efficiencies have been realized through the implementation of the new service delivery model, and after the re-assignment of existing Divisional management and supervisory staff, as well as the conversion of existing staff positions to align with the new service delivery model's functions there remains a shortfall of 1.5 FTE staff in order to meet the service delivery model's deliverables (KPIs) and ensure compliance with the City of Hamilton and Ministry of Children and Youth Services audits. As a result staff are recommending that consideration be given to referring a request for a
program enhancement to increase the Division’s staff complement by 1.5 FTE to the City’s 2010 budget process.

The model’s structure positions the Division to respond to potential future growth in the child care sector driven by increase in demand for service and/or changes to provincial policy and funding. Staff can now quickly assess impact on any of the program components and determine what if any, additional resources would be required in the future.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:**

Committee could chose to not refer the request for additional staff resources to the 2010 budget process. If the current staff complement is not increased by 1.5 FTE, fee subsidy eligibility service levels will be reduced in order for current resources to be re-assigned as required to ensure compliance with the Day Nurseries Act requirements related to maintenance of the current fee subsidy caseload and to meet the recommendations/requirements related to service provider compliance with contractual obligations identified in both the Ministry of Children and Youth Services and City of Hamilton audits.

A reduction in fee subsidy eligibility service levels will result in children remaining on the wait list for fee subsidies longer periods as there will be fewer appointments available for new applicants who are eligible to be removed from the wait list.

**FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:**

Financial:

Staff estimate that $120,000 gross is required to support the increase of 1.5 FTE to the staff complement required in order to fully implement the service delivery model and audit recommendations. The cost of administration budget is negotiated annually with the Ministry of Children and Youth Services through an annual Service Contract with some costs funded 100% by the Province and some being cost shared 50% Provincial 50% City.

Further, in 2007, the City of Hamilton established the Best Start Reserve, (Best Start Initiative Reserve Report (ECS07055)). The reserve was established to be utilized to sustain the gains made in Best Start in Hamilton. As indicated in Report ECS07055 one of the areas of focus identified for utilization of the funds was the Best Start/Child Care administrative costs as required when not fully funded through the annual Ministry Service Contract.

The cost to increase staff complement by 1.5 FTE will be absorbed into the 2010 administration budget, which will be negotiated with the Ministry of Children and Youth Services and any portion of the administration budget unfunded through that process will be funded through the Best Start Reserve in 2010.
Table 2 below highlights the current administrative budget and the impact of the proposed 1.5 FTE increase in complement using the 2010 draft budget guidelines.

**Table 2: Child Care Cost of Administration**

**Impact of proposed increase of 1.5 FTE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Expenditures</td>
<td>3,347,733</td>
<td>3,467,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% Provincial Funding</td>
<td>(721,055)</td>
<td>(721,055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% Provincial Funding</td>
<td>(1,475,261)</td>
<td>(1,475,261)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Start Reserve</td>
<td>(56,804)</td>
<td>(176,804)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Levy</td>
<td>1,094,613</td>
<td>1,094,613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staffing:**

It has been identified through the BPR process that an increase of 1.5 FTE to the current staff complement is required in order to fully implement the service delivery model and audit recommendations.

**Legal:**

The City of Hamilton, as CMSM, is accountable to the Province through a negotiated annual service contract that aligns with the approved Child Care Service Management Plan. The CMSM negotiates funding with service providers through Service Agreements, which include annual service level reviews and amendments.

**POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:**

Hamilton’s Best Start Initiative reflects the provincial policy direction of building a system of integrated early years services that are responsive and seamless from the child and family’s perspective. The Business Process Review and the new service delivery model have resulted in further integration within the broader early years services; thus furthering the Best Start vision and the City of Hamilton’s vision to be the best place in Canada to raise a child, promote innovation, engage citizens and provide diverse economic opportunities.

The newly released *With Our Best Future in Mind: Implementing Early Learning in Ontario* report of Dr. Charles E. Pascal, Special Advisor on Early Learning to the Premier of Ontario recognizes the important role of Municipal Government which is recognized in the report as “a leader among leaders” and viewed as being uniquely positioned to take on an enhanced (lead) role in early years system management of the
community network of Best Start Child and Family Centres. The new service delivery model readies the City should Dr. Pascal’s report be endorsed by the Provincial Government and the report recommendations be implemented.

The development of the City of Hamilton’s Human Services Plan (HSP) will shape a progressive vision that directs investment and enhances coordination of human services such as affordable housing, employment services, public health services, recreation, child care, long-term care, transit, neighbourhood renewal, community safety and emergency services - all services that will be impacted by physical growth, residential intensification, and/or demographic changes such as immigration. The Business Process Review took into account the need for integrated planning and service delivery with partners across the broad human services systems in our community.

**RELEVANT CONSULTATION:**

Throughout the Business Process Review process staff have consulted with current and potential program clients, child care operators, and other community stakeholders. Internal stakeholders also consulted include; Human Resources Department, Corporate Services Department; Finance and Administration Section (Budgets and Finance Division), the Learning Earn ing and Parenting (LEAP) Program, Ontario Works programs (Employment and Income Support and Benefit Eligibility) and the relevant C.U.P.E bargaining units.

**CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:**

By evaluating the “**Triple Bottom Line**”, (community, environment, and economic implications) we can make choices that create value across all three bottom lines, moving us closer to our vision for a sustainable community, and Provincial interests.

**Community Well-Being is enhanced.** ☑ Yes ☐ No

Families will be better served by a child care system that is based on best practices, is positioned within the broader early years service system and increases access for families and service providers.

**Environmental Well-Being is enhanced.** ☐ Yes ☑ No

**Economic Well-Being is enhanced.** ☑ Yes ☐ No

The efficiencies realized through the Business Process Review will ensure that program funding is utilized in the most effective manner. Clients accessing fee subsidies will improve their families’ economic well being and reduce the depth of poverty in the community. An adequately funded child care sector has a positive impact on the local economy.
Does the option you are recommending create value across all three bottom lines? □ Yes ☑ No

Do the options you are recommending make Hamilton a City of choice for high performance public servants? ☑ Yes □ No

The Business Process Review engaged staff as program experts in the review, design and build of new service delivery model. The resulting model will support staff in their goal of providing high quality, timely and value added service to the community.
Social Development and Early Childhood Services

Childcare Systems
Business Process Review

Hamilton

- February 2008 -
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1. PROJECT OVERVIEW

Due to a number of changes and issues impacting Child Care Systems, a Business Process Review was requested as a way to address those challenges with a productive, improvement-focused approach.

The changes and issues that led to this review are as follows:

- A number of workload-related issues identified by staff;
- The new subsidy eligibility Income Test introduced by the Province of Ontario that had an immediate impact on caseloads, processes and policies;
- The implementation of Best Start as a new context for the management and provision of child care in our community, creating an even greater impetus for programs and services to be seamless, responsive and collaborative;
- The organizational change in 2006 of bringing together Social Development & Early Childhood Services;
- System and process inefficiencies that indicate the probable need for a new service delivery model.

This review encompasses the Subsidy Eligibility Program, and the Child Care Systems Management Program, and reviews linkages with Best Start, Ontario Works, Finance, Home Management, and the Learning, Earning and Parenting (LEAP) program. Red Hill Family Centre was not included in this review.

1.1 BPR Objectives

The Business Process Review had several objectives:

1. Examine and evaluate current child care systems practices and services including key linkages to other departmental services such as LEAP, Ontario Works and Finance;
2. Identify current system gaps that may exist and make recommendations to reduce/eliminate them through implementation of a new or enhanced streamlined service model;
3. Recognize best practices currently within our system and also within the systems of identified peer municipalities;
4. Integrate practice and policy changes initiated by the new Income Test for fee subsidy;
5. Identify and fast-track "Quick Hit" opportunities;
6. Include any needed resources in project recommendations.

1.2 Emerging Influencing Factors
After the business process review was initiated in February 2007, several factors were identified that had significant relevance to the process review. While not originally included in the scope of the process, they were analyzed in order to inform the outcome of the review. The factors were:

- Best Start: Hamilton’s Early Learning and Care Community Plan – 2007/2008;
- The impact of growth in the Child Care system;
- Ontario Municipal Social Services Association’s (OMSSA) Guide to Thinking about Human Services Integration;
- Development of a Human Services Plan by the City of Hamilton;
- Employee Survey.

Each factor is briefly outlined below.

**Best Start: Hamilton’s Early Learning and Care Community Plan – 2007/2008**

Hamilton’s Early Learning and Care 2007/08 Community Plan was developed using the Ministry of Children and Youth (MCYS) service planning guidelines for Best Start, Ontario Early Years Centres (OEYC) and Child Care Service System Management. The Plan represents a significant shift; rather than developing three separate but linked service plans as in the past, one community plan was developed that speaks to Hamilton’s system of early years services, holistically and comprehensively. The ultimate goal of the Provincial Best Start Vision is for local communities to develop an integrated, responsive system of services that is seamless from the child and family’s perspective. This plan highlights progress achieved to date and strategies for moving forward in reaching that goal at the neighbourhood level across our whole community.

**Impact of Growth in the Child Care System 2007 – Infusion of Additional Best Start Funds**

The Province provided significant increases in child care funding in April and June 2007 in response to pressures in the system created as a result of:

- Substantial expansion to the system in 2006
- The increase in demand for fee subsidies that resulted from the introduction of the income test in January 2007

The resulting growth increased the workload in all areas of the Child Care System and Fee Subsidy programs. Further, the number of children receiving fee subsidies grew by approximately 18.5% in the period December 2006 to December 2007. This growth was incremental and sustained.

While increases in provincial funding in 2007 enabled the program to continue to accommodate this growth to year end, it is anticipated that the program, like many others across the province, will soon have reached its capacity and will be required to
implement a waitlist for service. This ‘new’ reality and the resultant change to program business processes will influence the development of a new service delivery model.

A Guide to Thinking about Human Services Integration – A Joint Project of the Ontario Municipal Social Services Association and the Service Manager Housing Network

This guide, which was released in September 2007, provides a theoretical framework and practical suggestions for municipal service system managers to explore key learnings about human services integration in four areas; specifically;
(i) what Human Services Integration is,
(ii) how to think of Human Services as a system – with interdependent parts working together for a common purpose,
(iii) how to ensure a people centered approach to service, and
(iv) the need to evaluate Human Service Integration to determine if this approach to system planning and delivery is effective and efficient.

City of Hamilton Human Services Plan

The development of the City of Hamilton’s Human Services Plan (HSP) will shape a progressive vision that directs investment and enhances coordination of human services such as affordable housing, employment services, public health services, recreation, child care, long-term care, transit, neighbourhood renewal, community safety and emergency services - all services that will be impacted by physical growth, residential intensification, and/or demographic changes such as immigration.

Employee Survey

During 2007, Divisional staff continued to move through the employee “action planning” process of the Employee Survey work. Child Care Fee Subsidy Program staff determined that workload, co-worker cohesion and impact of job on personal life were their top three items requiring action at the local level. The “root cause” categories identified during this process fully aligned with the issues identified by the same team during the BPR process.

Recognizing that the above factors significantly impact the environment in which the Child Care Services operate, the scope of the review was expanded to include an examination and understanding of these important initiatives.
2. PROJECT METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS

The project methodology for gathering valuable input was diverse and inclusive of all stakeholders, key documents, systems and processes. Examined were: current model gaps, strengths and opportunities; customer and staff needs; best system designs and practices; and other important policy initiatives that affect/are affected by the service delivery system and processes.

2.1 Stakeholder Consultations

Three key groups comprised of internal and external stakeholders were consulted through various initiatives, specifically surveys, one-on-one observations, communiqués, and group working sessions. These stakeholder groups were staff, fee subsidy recipients, potential applicants, as well as departmental and community partners. Through these consultations, several reiterative themes emerged and were captured, clarified, and detailed from a variety of stakeholder perspectives. Electronic copies of stakeholder feedback documentation is provided on the Community Services N: Drive folders listed at the end of this report.

2.1.1 Staff

Throughout the entire Business Process Review, numerous and diverse consultations were conducted with staff and management from the Systems Management and Fee Subsidy programs. These consultations provided the opportunity to thoroughly examine and address current strengths and weaknesses in service delivery, stay fully informed about BPR progress and findings, and regularly provide functional expertise in a structured, progressive format. The input gathered each time was continuously collected, condensed and brought forward for use in all future staff consultations.

Four methods were used to consult with staff:

**Surveys**
The implementation of the new Income Test for fee subsidy eligibility created an immediate impact on service delivery at the beginning of 2007. This change coincided with the start-up of the BPR process. A survey was conducted with Fee Subsidy program staff to get early feedback on how the Income Test was impacting families and staff, as well as to learn of suggestions for improvements and note any potential future concerns.

**Meetings and Working Sessions**
At a meeting in February of 2007, Systems Management and Fee Subsidy program staff attended a kick-off presentation about the start of the Business Process Review, its purpose, objectives, expected benefits, and opportunities for staff participation.
Update meetings and working sessions were held monthly and sometimes semi-monthly with staff to provide updates about BPR progress; explore gaps and opportunities in the current system; present, consider, and integrate findings to date; identify improved service delivery opportunities; check communication satisfaction and effectiveness; ensure the BPR process fostered a collaborative team approach; maximize advantage by inclusion of all necessary expertise. These sessions were typically a half-day in length with formalized agendas, objectives, processes and tools, and documented outcomes. Several were conducted off-site to accommodate working space for break-out teams, and to ensure productivity by reducing interruptions.

**Job Shadow Sessions**
Twelve of these “work-with” events were completed by the project manager and individual staff members representing key system functions. The purpose was to examine mapped and unmapped work flows, documents, tools, processes, technology; best practices; consistency in application of policies and procedures; necessary system flexibility and rigour; and adequacy of supports and resources. These events also provided the opportunity to observe and discuss current and potential links to other stakeholders, services, and departments.

**Communiqués**
Communication between the BPR team, management team, Systems Management and Fee Subsidy program staff was a priority throughout the process and was on each BPR team weekly meeting agenda. To ensure consistency of information and communication in the time between formalized sessions, a variety of communication devices were employed including: email; BPR discussions at staff meetings; question and answer boards; open access by staff to project manager, BPR team, division managers; N: Drive postings of all BPR material.

Key findings that resulted from staff consultation include:

- The new Income Test created an increase in eligible families and therefore caseloads, yet reduced application interview time. It was still too early in the Income Test utilization to determine precise impacts beyond initial impressions;
- Current system design, organizational structure, and physical distance of Systems Management and Fee Subsidy program staff create inadvertent gaps and impede streamlining of system, communication, and leveraging of processes, procedures, and tools;
- Processes and procedures that once worked have become less effective and efficient over time;
- Separation of Pre-screen, Intake and Case Management functions create unintended inefficiencies, rework, miscommunication, and fractured team performance. From a customer perspective, parents have likely explained the reason for their request for subsidy to at least three staff members during the application process which can then take several more days to complete;
There is a need for timely, user-friendly, consistent policies and procedures;
- Strengths of the current system include caring and knowledgeable staff with valuable skills and experience committed to improving service delivery and an improved, well supported service delivery model would make better advantage of these strengths.

2.1.2 Fee Subsidy Recipients and Potential Applicants

To collect feedback about satisfaction with the fee subsidy application process and customer service, a survey of fee subsidy recipients and applicants for fee subsidy was conducted during the month of June, 2007. Fee subsidy recipients who had update appointments during this period, and individuals applying for fee subsidy with intake appointments during this period, were asked to complete a voluntary satisfaction survey. Completed surveys were somewhat low in number and there was some speculation as to how questions may have been interpreted.

Key findings include:
- The main reasons for applying for fee subsidy were due to work, school or job searches;
- Over 90% of surveyed individuals reported that the fee subsidy application experience was friendly;
- Challenges individuals had in attending intake or update appointments at the office were primarily around issues with transportation by both car and bus to the office and finding time from their work schedule to attend appointments;
- Suggestions for improvement to services include: providing extended office hours, reducing paperwork, developing a system to allow applicants to fax/email required documents prior to the appointment and using an online application process.

2.1.3 Departmental and Community Partners

The City's Child Care staff works with several community partners and other City departments to deliver child care services to the public. As such, consultation sessions were held to collect input from these stakeholders as part of the business process review. Four different sessions were held with representatives from:
- Child Care Providers/Managers. For example, the Supervisor's Network and the Consolidated Municipal Service Managers (CMSM) Child Care Working Group;
- Departmental and Community stakeholders such as the Best Start Integrating Committee and Referring Agents such as the Children's Aid Society, Catholic Children's Aid Society, City of Hamilton's Public Health Services, City of Hamilton's Family Health Division Staff, LEAP, and Ontario Works.
The sessions were held as open forum discussions facilitated by the BPR team around the challenges and successes of working with the City and also the challenges and successes experienced by families in their interactions with the City.

As the sessions were held with representatives from the various partner and community stakeholder groups, a Child Care Services Business Process Review email address was established and given to these representatives to capture additional feedback and input not expressed in the sessions, and to provide those unable to attend a means of having their input included. It also provided an opportunity for discretion. The emails were gathered and responded to by the Project Manager and a Program Analyst member of the BPR team and the input was then included in the body of information received through the sessions.

Community partners did provide feedback from their own perspective as well as the perspective of the families they represent. Key findings include:

- Clear and timely communication is challenging for families due to a number of reasons including; limited or no phone access by families during office hours, office hours being the same as work/school hours, transportation difficulties, misunderstandings about required paperwork and procedures;
- Families often believe if they have communicated with one City operation (i.e. Employment and Income Support) that this information is automatically forwarded to another (i.e. Child Care Fee Subsidy) if they are served by both;
- When families are notified of eligibility for fee subsidy support they assume certain special supports are also available such as needed therapies and other special needs related assistance;
- Families find repeating their story several times can be stressful;
- Having subsidy workers meeting families out in the community has been very helpful;
- The City is very good at working with community partners in a collaborative, responsive way;
- Therapeutic/Special Needs is very responsive, participates on committees, and is involved with community and other City department partners;
- More ESL (English as a Second Language) supports needed, i.e. interpreters, to help immigrant families;
- Positive communication with LEAP and Public Health Nurses;
- Partnerships with Ontario Works to conduct information sessions such as orientation for new staff or sharing information about program changes/updates at staff meetings is important to service delivery for mutual customers;
- The small working committee started in 2007 of Employment and Income Support, Benefit Eligibility and Fee Subsidy staff members working together on mutual issues is a benefit to customers, such as standardizing Service Delivery Model Technology (SDMT) notes to improve how information is communicated on customer files;
- Improved notification for budget submission requirements and information about funding changes from the province would be helpful. Highlighted changes on funding documents would reduce confusion and errors;
- New Service Provider Orientation training sessions are very helpful in providing information to potential new service providers about operating a child care business successfully;
- ASCY (Affiliated Services for Children and Youth) has good relationships with City departments (Public Health, Community Services) – everyone very willing to communicate about issues – work and dialogue together to get what each other needs;
- The City's participation in past 4 – 5 years at Supervisor's Network, community events/meetings is a good way of relationship and trust building and is making their presence in the community stronger;
- Efforts by City to ensure a clear, transparent process for budget submissions and per diem review is appreciated.

2.2 Mapping of Current Processes

Mapping current Child Care Services system processes provided an objective, informative view of service provision. Key documents were reviewed and found to be limited in providing information for developing the maps and therefore, facilitated sessions were held with Systems Management Program and Fee Subsidy Program staff to review basic versions of the maps and to populate these with needed information about procedures, secondary processes, job functions, and tools. Staff also applied their knowledge to critique and expand the maps, to capture gaps, measures, and opportunities.

Key findings include:

- Process steps or gaps that create delays in communication internally and externally, application delays and rework, back-log due to missed or rebooked appointments, and too many points of contact for those accessing information or service;
- Reception is currently the sole point of access for all information or service, resulting in bottlenecks for customers;
- Potential for delays or misses in urgent cases requiring immediate action;
- Families arriving to appointments without the necessary documentation creating confusion, frustration and rebooking of appointments;
- Current separation of duties among staff limits the capacity to provide service when colleagues are unavailable due to illness or responding to other unforeseen circumstances;
- Lack of integration of processes and of systems. Important information that could be leveraged across several functions must be re-entered at various points in the process, increasing the potential for missed and/or inconsistent information. Example: booking system and Ontario Child Care Management System (OCCMS);
- Policies and procedures need updating; a practice for ensuring timeliness, clarity and usability of policies and procedures is not in place;
- Inconsistent application of policies and procedures identified;
• The important process of reviewing monthly service provider “Records of Attendance” to ensure accurate and timely payment is time consuming and workers are unable to see families during this 3-5 day period – caught between two equally important priorities;
• Best practices exist within pockets of the organization but are not always used universally;
• Fee subsidy applicants deemed to be ineligible should receive, in writing, information about the decision and the appeal process available to them – process also needs updating.

2.3 Environmental Scan

The purpose of the environmental scan was to gather information from peer municipalities regarding business practices, processes, policies, infrastructure and expertise of various departments in order to help inform process improvements and set benchmarks for programs within the Social Development and Early Childhood Services Division. This scan was conducted in the form of a questionnaire, designed with management and staff, and sent to peer comparators in London, Windsor and Ottawa.

The questionnaire was:

• sent to municipalities which have similar child care needs and demographic, socio-economic composition and characteristics to the City of Hamilton;
• 16 pages in length, divided into six sections, 10 to 15 questions per section, plus summary page;
• comprised of Organizational, Fee Subsidy, Systems Management, Wait List, Finance and Administration, and Reporting and Planning categories;
• thoroughly reviewed when results were returned from peers to examine the detailed answers and related documents (policies, procedures, tools, organization charts);
• followed by recorded teleconferences with BPR team members and peer representatives, and a methodical post-teleconference transcribing and reporting of results.

Key findings include:

• all peer organization charts reflected somewhat different structures and had all been impacted by restructuring and alignment by virtue of service review or amalgamation;
• new income test had reduced time spent in eligibility process with families in London and Windsor but increased number of families entering the system;
• all peers have different waitlist service strategies;
• all peers have staff dedicated to the Best Start initiative providing services including management, administration, coordination and analysis;
• ratio of worker to customer varies greatly depending on the functions of the fee subsidy case worker role, the definition of customer being family or child, and the approach to case management. i.e. financial functions re invoicing being part of case management or handled by other unit;
peers currently do few off-site visits. Ottawa and London are considering an increase, Windsor has no plans to do so;

- varied practices for service provider management in each municipality and no quality assurance in place;
- peers very interested in a number of our current processes and procedures: best practices on collaborative, decision-making relationships with community groups and committees – have sent them copies of our New Service Provider Orientation sessions, Business Case Function Plan for Service Providers, City funded quality assurance program, “Raising the Bar”;
- each peer community had service level standards in place;
- all three peer municipalities very interested in our BPR process and results to help them in dealing with challenges they face.

2.4 Condensed Themes

A large amount of information and feedback was collected through the preceding methodology, then reviewed and analyzed in-depth by the BPR team. A number of themes were identified and became the criteria that a proposed service delivery model must meet. These themes are:

1) Effective Use of Resources
   - The proposed model should maximize the potential of existing staff and material resources required for service delivery.

2) Efficient Service Delivery
   - The proposed model should ensure the streamlining of customer service paths by reducing and clarifying the points of contact required to obtain service and reducing workload by minimizing duplication of work efforts.

3) Service Standard Focused
   - The proposed model should incorporate the development of service standards so that benchmark measures of success can be set and monitored on an ongoing basis.

4) Streamlined Data and Information
   - The proposed model should ensure that information and data related to customers and service delivery is recorded in a consistent manner so to ensure consistent and efficient customer service and allow accurate reporting of service delivery levels.

5) Strong Team Focus
   - The proposed model should ensure that all Child Care Services staff work together as a unit and that there is a sense of increased whole team cohesion, flexibility, communication, consistency and cooperation amongst staff.
2.5 Proposed Services Model Objectives

To meet the above “themes” of the model criteria, 14 objectives were developed to serve as the benchmark for recommendations:

1. Reduce the number of customer points of contact with City of Hamilton staff to secure service
2. Improve quality of the service provider billing and payment reconciliation process
3. Eliminate the separation of the fee subsidy prescreen, intake and case management processes
4. Increase rate of success of customer service being confirmed at first appointments
5. Improve communication/access between customer and City of Hamilton
6. Improve quality and timeliness of system management decisions (including fee subsidy)
7. Improve integration with the Best Start initiative
8. Facilitate workload peaks and/or shifts in caseload management (focus on activating vs. wait listing families)
9. Provincial legislation and guidelines are achieved
10. Service provided is cost effective and efficient
11. Service is seamless from a customer perspective
12. Streamline current business processes
13. Consistency in processes and processing
14. Improve internal communication with our staff and external communication with our customers

2.6 Staff Reference Group – Building the Straw Model

After the BPR team had secured all the inputs and identified the objectives any proposed services delivery model would have to achieve, frontline staff were engaged in the development of ‘straw model(s)’. These were tested against the objectives and then refined as required to ultimately lead to the final proposed model of services delivery. The practicality of involving all staff in this process was prohibitive, therefore, with management and staff support, a small group of staff representing all aspects of the system met during 11 working sessions. These were facilitated by the project manager, and always attended by at least two representatives from the BPR team. This Reference Group had access to all collected inputs and designed a model to meet the 14 objectives set by the BPR team. The Reference Group met with the BPR team three times during this process and a preferred model was chosen to be presented to all staff and then to go forward as the proposed services delivery model for implementation.
3. PROPOSED CHILD CARE SERVICES DELIVERY MODEL

The proposed Child Care Services Delivery Model represents our continued commitment to exceptional community partnerships, strong support of families and children in Hamilton, excellence in customer service, leadership among our peers, and a reflection of the Community Services Departmental Mission, Vision and Values.

3.1 Overview of the Model

The proposed model developed for Child Care System Services delivery provides a roadmap for the overall structure. It positions customers and community partners at the centre of a service delivery model that integrates internal Child Care program “functions” in new ways, and demonstrates commitment to integrated community service planning and delivery. (Figure 1)

The focus of our model is on improving service to our customers, who we define to include children, their families, child care service providers, and Community Services Departmental programs as well as community partners who provide services/supports to children and families in Hamilton.

With this customer focus, business functions that support our customers are grouped into four components: Access to Service, System Planning, Funding & Support, Child Care Service Teams, Specialized Services Coordination.

![Proposed Child Care Services Delivery Model & Components](image)

*Figure 1*

*Each component represents a specialized collection of service functions which, when considered together, represent the services provided by staff.*
Examples of the “functions” that support the four components:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Access to Service</th>
<th>System Planning, Funding &amp; Support</th>
<th>Child Care Service Teams (CCSTs)</th>
<th>Specialized Services Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Development &amp; Knowledge Transfer</td>
<td>Child Care Service Management Plan</td>
<td>Income Test eligibility</td>
<td>Therapeutic/ Special Needs Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Self-Screening Process:</td>
<td>Contract Admin</td>
<td>Liaise with Neighbourhood Service Provider Team Members</td>
<td>Community groups related to specialized supports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web</td>
<td>Ministry Reporting</td>
<td>Team Members</td>
<td>Preschool Universal (PSU) Child Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Service Provider Funding</td>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2*

Each component is explained below, and the relationship between these components is shown in Figure 3.

3.1.1 Access to Service

The model proposes that we significantly change how customers learn about programs and services, how communication will occur between customers and staff, and how customers will actually access service. In considering access to service, we view customers as inclusive of departmental and community partners, families with children, and service providers.

Staff consultations and process mapping exercises clearly highlighted the importance of providing potential customers with easy and efficient access to clear information about our programs, as well as access to service from City staff. For example, current processes and tools do not provide families seeking child care subsidies easy access to comprehensible information on subsidy criteria, their obligations if subsidies are provided, or other information they may need to determine if they should apply for subsidy. The current access available for families is to call our office during business hours, which usually results in messages being taken, attempts at call returns, and in time an appointment being scheduled during business hours.

The proposed model recommends an interactive website that provides families with tools to determine their potential eligibility based on family income and to book an appointment. This website is part of a larger communication effort to improve the quality and accessibility of
service and program information in the community for customers and the access options available to them, including a well-designed website. Regardless of the format and media utilized, customers will be able to learn about our programs and access staff in a more user-friendly and proactive manner.

All customers and stakeholders will be addressed in a similar manner:

- Families will benefit by a streamlined, customer friendly access process because it removes or greatly minimizes the barriers to service that were identified in the stakeholder consultations. They will receive the information or service they seek promptly and effectively.
- Staff would benefit greatly by an improved service access component for customers in order to better provide information and service, manage case loads, and support service providers and other community partners in their roles in providing service within the City of Hamilton.
- For service providers and community partners, a more direct, informative and streamlined access component would discern between their different inquiries and streamline the path to get them to the information they seek.

Many phone calls and appointments could be avoided if clear and useful information was available, at a time and in a format more convenient for all customers.

3.1.2 System Planning, Funding & Support

This component of the model represents the foundational and over-arching management of Child Care Services for the City of Hamilton. The Child Care Service Management Plan is created through extensive collaboration and consultation with both internal and external stakeholders to meet the needs and priorities of the child care community and to address the long term vision. Once this plan has been approved, the Ministry of Children and Youth Services provides the City with funding to manage, direct, and monitor the delivery of service to provide support to the community.

Functions attached to this component of the proposed delivery model are service contract negotiation and reporting to the Province, evaluation, administration of service agreements with service providers, managing system wide quality assurance initiatives with service providers through programs such as “Raising the Bar”, distribution of funds in accordance with the service management plan and liaising with the province for system improvements and continued benefits for all.

Stakeholder feedback during this BPR bears witness to the importance and success of Child Care Services continued community involvement. This is featured significantly in the design of the proposed service model and the intent is to not only increase it where it currently exists as in the preceding examples, but to expand and integrate this practice throughout the system.
3.1.3 Child Care Service Teams (CCSTs)

A major shift from current practice will be the consolidation of the fee subsidy eligibility prescreen, intake, and case management functions into a team oriented approach called Child Care Service Teams (CCSTs). Each CCST will align with an Ontario Early Years Centre Neighbourhood that is also served by a comprehensive community team comprised of Early Childhood Educators, Public Health Nurses, Preschool Speech and Language Specialists, Social Workers, School Board Personnel, and others. In the new model, aligning the Child Care System CCSTs with community partners demonstrates our commitment to working in a collaborative manner.

The illustration of how the CCSTs are aligned with the OEYC neighbourhoods is depicted in Figure 3.

As a further extension of the model, CCST members will serve customers not only from current City offices, but also at community locations within each of the five OEYC neighbourhoods. This approach builds on the current practice and is more intentional in its design.

3.1.4 Specialized Services Coordination

An integral part of providing support to families in our community and a key aspect of the proposed model is the availability of specialized services. This was another area of stakeholder feedback from the BPR that values and commends the results of the Therapeutic and Special Needs services coordinated by the City of Hamilton. This component provides critical support to families with children requiring special needs resources, vulnerable families in high-risk situations, and those families referred by community professionals for therapeutic assistance.
Geographic Representation of Delivery Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OEYC Neighbourhood 1</th>
<th>OEYC Neighbourhood 2</th>
<th>OEYC Neighbourhood 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEYC Neighbourhood 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>OEYC Neighbourhood 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remaining 3 components of the Delivery Model will have City-wide responsibilities

- Access to Service
- Specialized Service Coordination
- System Planning, Funding & Support

Figure 3

1 “Neighbourhoods” as defined by the Provincial ridings for the Ontario Early Years Centres in Hamilton such as: Stoney Creek, Hamilton East, Hamilton West, Ancaster/Dundas/Flamborough, and Hamilton Mountain.

3.2 Benefits of the Model

The proposed model incorporates the best elements of centralized and decentralized approaches to service delivery. The centralized aspects ensure benefits such as whole team cohesiveness, and efficiency and economy of shared supports and resources. The decentralized aspects promote and strengthen relationships with customers and community partners in a more significant way through geographic design, specifically leveraging the ‘neighbourhood’ as defined by Hamilton’s Best Start Network. Constructing the proposed model allows for streamlining of the system and processes while building on existing structures, systems and programs.

Benefits of the proposed model will include:

- Creation of alignment with the Best Start Initiative, and readying of the Child Care System for further integrated human service planning and delivery with other Departmental programs and services;
• Integration of new provincial standards (i.e. income test) into practice for system effectiveness rather than just process effectiveness;
• Elimination of re-work and streamlining of process flows addresses current workload concerns expressed by staff through greater efficiencies and improved available supports;
• Improved decision making, systems planning, and monitoring capacity;
• Improved customer service and satisfaction;
• Performance measures for staff that support service system management;
• Flexible and innovative service delivery;
• Practices and standards reflect best practices by undertaking benchmarking against provincial service models and best-in-class.
4. RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Recommendations

A series of recommendations have been developed through the Business Process Review and are outlined as follows:

- That the Social Development and Early Childhood Services (SDECS) Division adopt the proposed Child Care Services Delivery model
- That the SDECS Management Team establish an Implementation Team to oversee the refinement and achievement of the proposed Child Care Services Delivery model that includes the following key features:
  1. Consolidated prescreen, intake and case management functions that offer a "full service" case management function with equitable distribution of cases
  2. Child Care Service Teams (CCSTs) aligned with OEYC neighbourhoods
  3. Financial processes and procedures to support the entire system
  4. Every important aspect of service performance that will be measured and reported is identified
  5. A customer-friendly, front-end information and service access website and tools that will significantly impact the development of all other model components

4.2 Implementation Overview

As the Business Process Review concludes, the Implementation Phase will begin. It will be incremental in nature, building, evaluating, and integrating to ensure system cohesiveness, seamlessness, and effectiveness. The Implementation Team will oversee the completion of all short, medium, and long-term plans as outlined below:

4.2.1 Short-Term Plan

Included in short-term planning are identified "Quick Hits", meaning those activities that have begun recently or are soon to commence. For instance:

- updating and writing of Policies and Procedures that provide guidance and support to staff and management;
- redistribution of fee subsidy caseloads;
• information sessions and training: Best Start; New Child Care Service Provider Orientation; Ontario Early Years Centre (OEYC’s) visits; Ontario Child Care Management System (OCCMS) 6.2 training; joint team meetings;
• discussions with Ontario Early Years Centres (OEYC’s) about proposed service delivery model.

Other short-term plans include:

• engage Marketing and Information Services to help develop the “Access to Service” component of a strong services delivery system based on the service model objectives (Section 2.5);
• continuous follow-up and monitoring of redistribution of caseloads.

4.2.2 Medium-Long Term Plan

The Implementation Team will oversee the development of the work going forward. For example:

• Examine all funding and payment processes to streamline and build efficiencies throughout the entire system, i.e. fee subsidies, child care service provider wage subsidies;
• Identify and implement necessary standards and measures for desired service performance such as timely, efficient, effective service provision;
• System monitoring, evaluation and reporting from Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s), and internal and external stakeholder consultations;
• Communication structures, processes, and tools that support the proposed design, meet service standards, and flow necessary information in a timely, comprehensive, effective way as appropriate to internal and external stakeholders.

4.3 Supports and Measures

Critical to the success of the proposed Child Care Services Delivery model are well designed and implemented supports such as the following:

• Proactive, positive performance management of staff to provide support and guidance during and after transition to new methods of business;
• Financial processes and procedures designed to support and sustain the proposed delivery model;
• Communication strategy, processes and tools that keep staff, service providers, and customers informed and engaged;
• Development and training that provides ongoing, timely, applicable tools, knowledge, and skills for producing successful results with the proposed services delivery model;
• Policies and procedures that are meaningful to staff and help them in their roles;
Identify and provide necessary resources for the proposed model that may include, for example, technology, information systems, people, job tools;
Tools and resources to continuously monitor and evaluate the system, providing important information about internal and external stakeholders, activities, and issues of significance.

KPI's are essential for timely and accurate planning, evaluation, diagnosis, and improvement. They provide staff and management a constant, effective way to monitor and measure the performance of work processes. The following is a representative example of measures to be implemented with the proposed delivery model:

- Total caseloads
- Total caseloads by team
- Time from application to determination of eligibility
- Total # of people who use on-line/electronic eligibility self-screening tool (when implemented),
  - # who do not apply as they've screened themselves out
  - # who apply and are determined eligible
  - # who apply and are determined ineligible
- Time from first customer contact to service
- Time related to payments
- Communication measures: i.e. notifications, appeals
- Training timeliness and frequency: i.e. policy/procedures, technology
- Deadlines, i.e. reporting, budgets

In keeping with the concept that performance measures need to be easily understood, collected and used, development of these performance measures will occur as processes are refined and support systems are improved.

4.4 Resource Implications

Resources will be required to fully accomplish the proposed model. Full examination of all necessary resources is integral to the implementation phase as each key feature of the model is examined, designed and developed. A preliminary list of anticipated implementation costs include:

- Development of program policies and procedures;
- Potential minor capital costs for any required accommodation changes/moves;
- Communication costs such as website development and communication tools to support system access;
- IT database upgrades or development;
• Team building and other training.

Changes to ongoing costs of operating the model are still to be determined but could include:
• ongoing communication and IT expenses;
• increased travel expenses;
• potential costs related to Human Resource implications.

Funding to support implementation costs not covered by existing budgets can be provided through the Best Start Reserve fund.

4.5 Business Process Review Observations

Though not specifically addressed in the project charter and objectives, the BPR provided an opportunity to more fully involve staff in identifying what needed to change in order to move to an improved service delivery model. As important in this process was how it also provided an opportunity to collaborate as a team with managers on a design that supports an improved, sustainable service delivery culture. Taking the time to be inclusive throughout this process created challenges, including extended timelines, but even greater rewards in that there is a sure "readiness" for implementation that will contribute to a successful result.

The thorough exploration of inefficiencies and gaps was very informative, yet often uncomfortable and laborious, however, also offered a greater awareness and appreciation of significant strengths within the division. A will to continue this process of improvement exists and the work has begun. It is important to recognize what has been accomplished already, and to support and celebrate the remarkable efforts by staff and management in this direction.

The Community Services values of Integrity, Respect, Courage and Empathy were very much present throughout this Business Process Review. Change requires openness to a new way of doing things and the courage for self-examination, learning and improvement. Respect for self and others and a commitment to providing care in a just, considerate, informed manner was ever-present in the design of this proposed model.

The BPR facilitated an examination of the City of Hamilton's child care services contribution to improving the lives of children and families in Hamilton in a larger context, such as Best Start, the City of Hamilton Human Services Plan, and Human Services Integration in the province of Ontario. To be well aligned within our organization and with those we serve in the community allows us to do our part in "Making Hamilton the Best Place to Raise a Child".
### Attachment A: Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASCY</td>
<td>Affiliated Services for Children and Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMSM</td>
<td>Consolidated Municipal Service Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP</td>
<td>Learning, Earning and Parenting program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCYS</td>
<td>Ministry of Children and Youth Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCMS</td>
<td>Ontario Child Care Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEYC</td>
<td>Ontario Early Years Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMSSA</td>
<td>Ontario Municipal Social Services Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMT</td>
<td>Service Delivery Model Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment B: Electronic Appendices

The following is a list of folders that contain the documents, tools, and processes that have been referenced in this Business Process Review Report. They can be found through the “N Drive” by clicking on the following links in the electronic report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electronic Folders</th>
<th>N Drive Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPR Report</td>
<td>N:\Social Dev &amp; Early Childhood\Child Care BPR\BPR Report\Final BPR Report.doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>N:\Social Dev &amp; Early Childhood\Child Care BPR\Charter\Project Charter SDECS BPR Draft.doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Subsidy Intake Process</td>
<td>N:\Social Dev &amp; Early Childhood\Child Care BPR\Child Care Subsidy Intake Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Testing</td>
<td>N:\Social Dev &amp; Early Childhood\Child Care BPR\Income Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Agendas and Minutes</td>
<td>N:\Social Dev &amp; Early Childhood\Child Care BPR\Meeting Agendas and Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>N:\Social Dev &amp; Early Childhood\Child Care BPR\Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Comparator</td>
<td>N:\Social Dev &amp; Early Childhood\Child Care BPR\Peer Comparator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>N:\Social Dev &amp; Early Childhood\Child Care BPR\Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Maps</td>
<td>N:\Social Dev &amp; Early Childhood\Child Care BPR\process maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group</td>
<td>N:\Social Dev &amp; Early Childhood\Child Care BPR\Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; Working Team Sessions</td>
<td>N:\Social Dev &amp; Early Childhood\Child Care BPR\Staff &amp; Team Working Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Consultations</td>
<td>N:\Social Dev &amp; Early Childhood\Child Care BPR\Stakeholder Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Plan</td>
<td>N:\Social Dev &amp; Early Childhood\Child Care BPR\Workplan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Calculation of Per Diems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>OBSERVATION OF EXISTING SYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION FOR STRENGTHENING SYSTEM</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | Subsidies paid to child care providers are based on per diem rates determined using an established formula that incorporates each provider's expenditure projections as well as the provider's licensed capacity for each age group. As such, per diem rates are different for each provider as they are based on each provider's specific circumstances. When calculating per diems, staff often make discretionary adjustments to the formula in an attempt to allocate costs away from infant and toddler categories to pre-school and school age groups. The actual cost of care for younger age groups generally exceeds maximum per diems paid by the City. Therefore, staff consider the adjustments to be a 'weighting mechanism' to compensate providers for the high cost of infant and toddler care. However, when making the adjustments, staff do not include notes that provide the rationale for the adjustments. While the necessity for the formula to recognize the higher cost of care for younger age groups can be appreciated, the lack of a consistent methodology and the extensive reliance on individual staff discretion could undermine the integrity of the calculation. In addition, because the calculation is not independently reviewed, errors and resulting overpayments may not be detected in a timely manner. In January 2007, one provider's per diem rates were incorrectly calculated due to an error in the formula. As the calculation was not independently reviewed, it has remained undetected for over 17 months, resulting in a net underpayment to the provider of approximately $15,150. | That the formula for calculating per diem rates be revised and formalized to incorporate a consistent weighting mechanism that recognizes the higher cost of care for younger age groups. | The Child Care System initiated a Business Process Review (BPR) in February 2007. Phase I of the review was completed in March 2008. Phase II, the design and implementation phase immediately followed and continues. It is estimated that phase II will be completed in Q.1 2009 at which time a report will be presented to the Emergency and Community Services Committee of Council. Agreed. Staff are currently revising formulas. Policies and procedures are being updated with an expected completion date of Q.2 2009. |}

Agreed. Effective September 2008, a second review of per diem rates has been implemented as an interim measure until the recommendations from the Business Process Review (BPR) are reviewed and new business processes are implemented. Expected completion date of the BPR is Q.1 2009.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>OBSERVATION OF EXISTING SYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION FOR STRENGTHENING SYSTEM</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Submission of Documents</td>
<td>The service agreement signed with child care providers requires each provider to submit annual financial statements to the City within four months of the child care provider’s year end. In addition, the provider is required to purchase general commercial liability and automobile liability insurance and submit certificates of insurance as proof of coverage to the City annually.</td>
<td>That management enforce the requirement for the annual submission of financial statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>About 50% of providers sampled have never submitted financial statements or last submitted in 2005. For those providers that have been submitting regularly, there is no indication that the financial statements are reviewed by staff and compared to the provider’s operating budgets. A comprehensive review of financial statements serves as a vital control mechanism when assessing the reasonableness of the provider’s budget on which per diem rates are based as well as an indicator of financial sustainability.</td>
<td>That, once received, financial statements be reviewed and compared to submitted provider operating budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None of the providers sampled had valid insurance certificates on file. Some insurance certificates showed expiry dates as far back as December 2000.</td>
<td>That management enforce the requirement for an annual submission of insurance certificates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no indication of staff follow up for providers that are not in compliance with the above requirements.</td>
<td>Agreed. The program does not have the capacity at the present time to consistently enforce this requirement. These three recommendations will be integrated into the new business processes forthcoming as a result of the BPR recommendations expected to be completed Q.1 2009. Implementation of this recommendation will be dependent upon resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreed. See above. Implementation is expected Q.4 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreed. See above. Implementation is expected Q.2 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBSERVATION OF EXISTING SYSTEM</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION FOR STRENGTHENING SYSTEM</td>
<td>MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Evaluation of Applications for a Service Contract</strong></td>
<td>That a decision model that clearly defines qualification thresholds for assessing service contract applications be developed and implemented. That the evaluation of a child care provider’s application be reviewed by a peer before the finalization of a decision to approve or decline. Evidence of such peer review should be documented.</td>
<td>Agreed. This task will be identified as part of the Child Care System’s 2009 work plan with an estimated completion date Q.2 2009. Agreed. The program does not have the capacity at the present time to implement a peer review of provider applications. This recommendation will be integrated into the new business processes forthcoming as a result of the BPR recommendations. Implementation of this recommendation will be Q.3 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>While a document exists that provides guidelines to child care providers on how a business plan and functional plan are developed, there are no specific criteria for evaluating a child care provider’s application. Much reliance is placed on staff's personal knowledge and subjective assessment. Without a clear decision model that defines qualification thresholds, decisions to approve or decline applications may lack transparency and consistency. In addition, staff’s decisions are not always comprehensively reviewed and confirmed by a senior official. There is also no evidence that child care providers whose applications have been declined receive written notification from the Program Manager formally advising them of the basis of the decision made.</td>
<td>That, unsuccessful service provider applicants be provided with a written notification, signed by the Program Manager, outlining the reasons why the application was declined.</td>
<td>Agreed. A form letter has been created. It was ready for implementation October, 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBSERVATION OF EXISTING SYSTEM</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION FOR STRENGTHENING SYSTEM</td>
<td>MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Segregation of Duties</strong> Responsibilities assigned to Subsidy Eligibility Workers (SEW) do not provide for an adequate separation of incompatible duties. SEW’s perform duties that include intake screening, income testing, case management, the authorization of invoice adjustments and approval of payments to child care providers. In addition, except for the approval of invoice adjustments, work performed by SEW’s generally does not receive peer or supervisory review. The Business Process Review carried out by management in 2007 identified the separation of pre-screening, intake, case management and invoice approval processes as a major impediment to efficiency, teamwork and good customer service. While the need to pursue greater efficiencies and customer service is acknowledged, it is also vital to ensure that streamlined processes are designed to prevent and detect errors and irregularities in a timely manner.</td>
<td>That consideration be given to re-assigning responsibilities for reviewing/approving child care providers’ invoices and adjustments to a member of staff not directly involved with child placement and case management.</td>
<td>Agreed. The program does not have the capacity at the present time. This recommendation will be integrated into the new business processes forthcoming as a result of the BPR recommendations. Implementation of this recommendation Q.2 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBSERVATION OF EXISTING SYSTEM</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION FOR STRENGTHENING SYSTEM</td>
<td>MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>Subsidy Overpayments</strong>&lt;br&gt;Occasionally, parents continue to receive child care fee subsidies when they are no longer eligible. Usually such overpayments arise from the failure of the recipient to notify the Child Care Subsidy Program Office of a change in family income or other information impacting eligibility. When detected, such cases are referred to the Ontario Works (OW) Recovery Office which assumes responsibility for recovering the funds. As at July, 2008, there were 92 cases of overpayments totalling approximately $52,000.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;A review of a sample of such cases indicated that overpayments are not adequately tracked in the OCCMS system. Amounts recorded as owing in OCCMS differ from amounts noted in the Recovery Office’s records (SDMT system), mostly as a result of repayments made by the clients. Three of the ten overpayments in the sample were not even noted in the SDMT system of the Recovery Office. There does not appear to be any communication between SEW’s and the Recovery Office regarding amounts recovered, possibly leading to inaccurate balances owing.</td>
<td>That the Child Care Subsidy Program Office obtain repayment information from the OW Recovery Office on a regular basis. The balances owing should be updated accordingly in OCCMS.</td>
<td>Agreed. The existing process is time consuming for staff. Although all policies and procedures are currently being updated as part of the Business Process Review, further consultation is required with Finance and Administration, Ontario Works Overpayment Recovery, other municipalities etc. in order to develop a more efficient process. This task will be identified as part of the Child Care System’s 2009 work plan with an estimated completion time in Q.3 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>OBSERVATION OF EXISTING SYSTEM</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION FOR STRENGTHENING SYSTEM</td>
<td>MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Appeal Process</td>
<td>That unsuccessful fee subsidy applicants be provided with a letter outlining the basis of subsidization ineligibility as well as the process for appeals.</td>
<td>Agreed. An OCCMS form letter advising all unsuccessful fee subsidy applicants of their ineligibility including the process for appeals has been created. Implementation October, 2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clients that have been interviewed and have been assessed to be ineligible for a fee subsidy do not receive written notification from the City advising them of the basis of the decision.

In addition, the applicants do not receive a letter outlining the process for appealing the decision. Rather, communication is done verbally at the time of the application interview. The Day Nurseries Act requires the Consolidated Municipal Service Manager to advise unsuccessful applicants about the appeal process. Without a written communication to the applicant, it is difficult to demonstrate that the City is in compliance with this requirement. This issue was previously raised in a review carried out by the Province for 2005.
7. **Grandparenting Provisions**

Section 66.7 of the Day Care Nurseries Act (the Act) has provisions which ensure that those parents who were recipients of fee subsidies before the introduction of the income test on January 1, 2007 will not be financially prejudiced since the inception of the new testing. Through its grandparenting provisions, parents continue to contribute the lower rates until the child enters grade 1 (i.e. six years old).

However, if a parent's adjusted income increases by 20% or more in a year over the adjusted income as determined in the first year the parent applied for assistance under the needs testing, grandparenting will not apply from the current year onward and the parent will pay for child care in the amount determined by the formula for the income test.

In a sample of ten clients who were subsidy recipients prior to the January 1, 2007 inception of income testing, Internal Audit found two recipients for whom the 20% income increase regulation should have applied, thus eliminating the grandparenting coverage. These clients should have been contributing at the higher rate determined by the income testing methodology prescribed in the Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>OBSERVATION OF EXISTING SYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION FOR STRENGTHENING SYSTEM</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grandparenting Provisions</strong></td>
<td>That the 20% increase in income rule as stipulated in the grandparenting provision of the Act be applied to all appropriate subsidy recipients. Changes in the required contributions as a result of these calculations should be implemented immediately.</td>
<td>Agreed. City of Hamilton staff received information of this change in a policy directive from the Province on December 21, 2006 with an implementation date of January 1, 2007. The Province identified 2007 as a transitional year which included ongoing questions and answers from municipalities and the Province. Interpretation of this policy change was complex and the Province fully anticipated inconsistencies in application during the transition year. Clarification of this policy was reviewed with all staff during the October team meeting with the expectation that this policy be followed immediately as the situation arises (i.e. when a client reports significant changes and/or during the client's annual review).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following items were noted during the course of the audit. Although they do not present internal control deficiencies, they are indicated in this Addendum so management is aware of the issues and risks and can address them appropriately.

1. **Frequency of Per Diem Reviews**

   Per diem rates paid to child care providers are reviewed at the request of the provider and upon receipt of the provider’s budget. Therefore, providers who submit updated budgets on a regular basis are paid per diem rates that estimate their current operating costs. There are several providers whose rates were noted to be significantly lower than the average because the rates were last reviewed in the year 2000. As the providers have not submitted operating budgets and financial statements in eight years, the determination of whether the per diem rates reflect the providers’ actual cost of care could not be ascertained. It is also unclear whether the procedure for rate reviews is communicated to child care providers.

   Uniform per diem rates paid to private home day care providers were last set in 2005 and have not been adjusted for inflation.

   **It is recommended:**
   That, for the purpose of comparing actual expenditures to budget, child care providers be required to submit operating budgets on an annual basis, regardless of whether a rate review is being requested.

   **Management Response:**
   Agreed. However, the program does not have capacity at the present time to implement this recommendation. As a result of the BPR process, the recommendation will be integrated into the new business processes, provided there are sufficient resources to do so. It is important to note that all service providers were notified of the rate review in 2005. Upon further investigation, it was noted that some OCCMS fields were not updated to reflect actual rate reviews for some centres.

   That management consider the best means of communicating with child care providers regarding the procedure for applying for rate reviews.

   **Management Response:**
   Agreed. Numerous mechanisms are already in place regarding ongoing communication with all child care providers. The development of an ‘Access to Service’ component of the new program delivery model is one of the activities currently underway as part of the Business Process Review. One of the new service model’s goals is to increase communication and access to our services.
2. **OCCMS Access Security**

Passwords to access OCCMS, the software used for the administration of child care fee subsidies, have not been changed in several years. OCCMS is not programmed to periodically prompt users for password changes. Also, the child care unit does not maintain a log that tracks the frequency of password changes.

In addition, the system does not have a pre-set password configuration that enhances password security. For example, the password structure could be designed to be alpha numeric, with a minimum number of characters and a mandatory combination of upper and lower case characters.

While the ultimate responsibility for OCCMS rests with the Province of Ontario, the City, along with other extensive users, should lobby the Province for security and utility enhancements to the system.

*It is recommended:*
*That staff in the Social Development and Early Childhood Services Division of the Community Services Department continue to lobby the Province for an enhancement to OCCMS’ access security.*

**Management Response:**
*Agreed. A request was submitted to the OCCMS user group on September 24, 2004. To date, this request has not been approved. We will continue to lobby the user group for this enhancement. In November, 2008, a policy for the local system administrator to manually reset the passwords on a quarterly basis will be implemented.*
3. **Wait List Management Strategy**

Due to the demand for fee subsidies outweighing the available funding, a wait list was implemented in June, 2008. The Wait List Management Strategy categorizes child care fee subsidy applicants into 3 major priorities based on a mix of reason for service and income criteria. As of August 2008, over 460 applicants had been placed on the waiting list. Placement of children from the waiting list is on a first-come-first-served basis whenever spaces become available. However, the Wait List Management Strategy does not provide details regarding the determination of availability of child care spaces and subsequent placement.

*It is recommended:*

That management establish written procedures for placements from the waiting list, including a metric for determining availability of child care spaces in order to trigger active placements from the waiting list.

*Management Response:*

Agreed. The Wait List Management Strategy is separate from this process as it is the policy for determining the ranking of children on the wait list which is a modified first come first served basis. The Wait List Management Strategy is used to determine the order children will be removed from the wait list, not when they will be removed from the wait list.

The process used to determine the availability of child care spaces is part of routine caseload/budget management and is based on the analysis of the fee subsidy budget to the existing and projected year end expenditures. This calculation is carried out on a monthly basis by Management and takes into account a range of influencing factors. Program policies and procedures are currently being updated as part of the Business Process Review with the specific section on removing children from the wait list to be completed by December, 2008.
4. **Filing**
While electronic client files in OCCMS are considered primary storage, much of the clients’ hard copy documentation (Notice of Assessments, Parent Agreements) are still stored as paper files. There does not appear to be an efficient system of maintaining paper files as several files selected for testing could not be easily located and some could not be found at all. Terminated and active clients’ files are filed together with no indexing to distinguish active files from those that are inactive.

Files contain personal application information. Loss of this information increases the risk of unauthorized use. The lack of a good filing system can have an impact on the efficiency of the operations.

*It is recommended:*
*That a filing system be developed to ensure efficient management of clients’ paper files and prevent loss of valuable information.*

*Management Response:*
*Agreed. Improvements have been implemented since the audit including the separation of terminated files from active files. Staff now use hard copy sign out cards in order to keep track of all files.*
## Ministry of Children and Youth – City of Hamilton Program Review
### 2008 Child Care Fee and Wage Subsidy
#### ACTION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>SITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR COMPLETION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fee Subsidy:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide applicant with letter confirming eligibility/ineligibility for subsidy, applicant’s responsibilities if subsidy is approved and the appeal process. Copy of letter to be placed on file.</td>
<td>Agreed. At present, all fee subsidy applicants complete and sign a Parental Agreement and Authorization for payment when eligibility has been approved. When applicants are no longer eligible, applicants are verbally informed as well as the child care program their child/ren attends and a case note is written into OCCMS. The City of Hamilton is currently updating its business processes to streamline above. Letters are presently being ‘tested’ which will include all information in the recommendation.</td>
<td>The ‘job aide’ to support staff with this transition is currently being finalized. The letters will be introduced for all new applications June 1, 2009 and will be introduced during the annual update for current active applicants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information relevant to ongoing eligibility or circumstances which resulted in changes to amount of subsidy to be noted in Ontario Child Care Management System (OCCMS) note section.</td>
<td>Agreed. As part of the updated business processes for fee subsidy, OCCMS case note standards have been developed and implemented.</td>
<td>Complete and ongoing OCCMS case note standards were introduced during Q1 2009 and continue to be monitored and amended as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish standards for file structure.</td>
<td>Agreed. The City of Hamilton has finalized documentation standards relating to fee subsidy eligibility.</td>
<td>Complete implemented Q2 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wage Subsidy:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CMSM request audited financial statements (including a third party purpose report) from all centres receiving wage subsidy funding in excess of $20,000.</td>
<td>Agreed. The program does not have the capacity to monitor at the present time. This recommendation will be integrated into the new business processes forthcoming as a result of the Business Process Review (BPR) Child Care Services is currently undertaking.</td>
<td>In the design and implementation phase of the BPR. Implementation for the monitoring of operator reporting requirements will occur in Q4, 2009.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Service Delivery Model Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Service Improvement</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Care Service Teams</strong></td>
<td>• Geographically based teams to deliver fee subsidy eligibility and ongoing case management (alignment with Best Start community based Service Provider Teams that service Ontario Early Years Neighbourhood Hubs) • Consolidation of pre-screen, intake and case management functions to reduce the points of contact for new applicants, improving customer service • Staff have equal responsibility for all duties, and workload is evenly distributed • Consistent staff coverage of all areas of the City during peak periods, vacations and absences • Re-assignment of the review and approval of child care service providers’ invoices and adjustments in response to internal audit recommendations regarding separation of duties</td>
<td>• Calls returned in 2 business days • Mail processed within 10 days • Client files updated annually per legislative requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Service Co-ordination</strong></td>
<td>• Increased capacity to address the 186% increase in special needs children being serviced • Consistent coverage of all areas of the City during peak periods, vacations and absences</td>
<td>• Referrals reviewed in 1 business day • Meetings to plan for Special needs children attended bi-weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Planning, Funding and Support</strong></td>
<td>• Review and approval of child care service providers’ invoices and adjustments in response to internal audit recommendations regarding separation of duties • Service Provider contractual obligations are met per the established reporting requirements. • Independent reviews for contract approvals, and payment processing as per the internal audit recommendations • Continuous development and documentation of policies, procedures, and business processes as required by the Ministry of Children and Youth Services • Training coordination internally for staff and externally for operators • Internal file audits and external operator audits as required by the Ministry of Children and Youth Services</td>
<td>• Invoices reconciled by the 15th of the month • Service Provider budgets reviewed annually • Invoices have second signature • 1 Random invoice audit /year /operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Service</strong></td>
<td>• Fee Subsidy information developed for the web including a self screening process: • Increased email access for applicants, and service providers, by creating Email addresses for child care service teams, systems services coordinators, systems support • Consolidated first point of contact for child care services • Automated call distribution for increased access to information as well as simplified incoming call distribution • Records retention and file management consolidated and improved as recommended by the internal audit</td>
<td>• Email inquiries responded to in 2 business days • Terminated files purged weekly • Mail sorted and distributed daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Function**
  - Income Test eligibility
  - Liaise with Neighbourhood Service Provider Team Members
  - Case Management

- **Service Improvement**
  - Geographically based teams to deliver fee subsidy eligibility and ongoing case management (alignment with Best Start community based Service Provider Teams that service Ontario Early Years Neighbourhood Hubs)
  - Consolidation of pre-screen, intake and case management functions to reduce the points of contact for new applicants, improving customer service
  - Staff have equal responsibility for all duties, and workload is evenly distributed
  - Consistent staff coverage of all areas of the City during peak periods, vacations and absences
  - Re-assignment of the review and approval of child care service providers’ invoices and adjustments in response to internal audit recommendations regarding separation of duties

- **Key Performance Indicators**
  - Calls returned in 2 business days
  - Mail processed within 10 days
  - Client files updated annually per legislative requirements

- **Special Service Co-ordination**
  - Therapeutic & Special Needs referrals
  - Community groups related to specialized supports
  - Preschool Universal(PSU) Child Care

- **System Planning, Funding and Support**
  - Child Care Service Management Plan
  - Contract Admin
  - Ministry Reporting
  - Service Provider Funding

- **Access to Service**
  - Information Development & Knowledge Transfer
  - New Self-Screening Process:
    - Web
    - Phone
    - Paper
  - Admin Support