

Reasons for Decision:

Order #AP1920-0293

On <date removed>, the appellant filed an appeal of the Director's calculation of her child care subsidy. The decision was communicated by letter dated <date removed>.

At the hearing the department indicated it received the appellant's application and documents which verified their income. The calculations for the appellant's subsidy was completed using this information. The appellant had confirmed with the department that the amount of income on the documentation was correct.

In their appeal the appellant asserted they had received a greater subsidy amount in the past with an income level that was the same as that used in their current subsidy calculation. After reviewing the file for the appellant, going back to <year removed>, it was determined they had not received an income at the same level as they do currently. Rather, they had previously been receiving EIA benefits in the past, which meant their income was not used as part of the subsidy calculation. The department added that in its review of the appellant's file it was determined that it had made an error in the calculation of their subsidy, resulting in their personal contribution amount being lower than it should be.

The appellant told the Board that in <year removed> her income had been <amount removed> per hour and they only had to pay <amount removed> as their personal contribution for child care and the rest was subsidized. The appellant personal contribution then increased to approximately <amount removed> when they made an hourly wage of <amount removed> per hour in subsequent years. The appellant believes the computer program used to calculate their child care subsidy made an error as the personal contribution amount should be lower as their hourly pay rate is lower. The additional money they now have to spend on child care was all they previously had to spend on items such as clothing and other personal effects.

In response to a question from the Board the appellant stated they did not dispute the income amounts used for the calculation. The appellant explained they did not know that they could as this was their first time having to go through this process.

In response to questions from the Board the department stated the appellant only receives subsidy for her child care in the summer months as their child is in care all day. For the remainder of the year the appellant's child is in school and their personal contribution level covers the cost of the child care.

The Board asked the appellant why they believe the department made a mistake in their subsidy calculation. In response the appellant stated they felt the mistake was

made due to the department using a computer to perform the calculation. The appellant did not know how their personal contribution amount could go up so high with their child maintenance going from <amount removed> to <amount removed> semi-monthly. The appellant provided this information to the department when it performed the calculation. The appellant indicated that they do not have the time to perform all the calculations to show the error, however they assert something is wrong with their calculation.

The Board asked the appellant if they had spoken to the department about any errors they may have made. The appellant told the Board they did, however each time they do so the department provides them with the same information about their hourly wage and their semi-monthly pay.

The appellant told the Board they felt they did not understand what they were explaining. The appellant indicated that they had done some calculations with respect to their child care subsidy on multiple calculators. When doing so one of the calculators made a mistake. The appellant believes that there is something wrong with the computer system used by the department as they have never had this high a personal contribution in the past.

The Board asked the department if they looked into the possibility a mistake was made with the appellant's subsidy calculation. In response the department told the Board that when it looked into the appellant's file they had been receiving EIA previously, meaning their income was not factored into the calculation during that time period. The department had explained to the appellant that while their hourly pay rate is approximately the same, the subsidy amount depended on whether or not they was receiving EIA as well as the amount of hours worked. The department's acting manager also looked over the calculations used for the appellant's subsidy and confirmed they were done correctly. The department does not factor rent or other household expenses into their calculations.

In response to questions from the Board the appellant indicated their periods of employment did not last long. The appellant is currently working in a temporary job.

After careful consideration of the written and verbal evidence submitted to it, the Board has determined the Department assessed the appellant's application correctly based on the information it had before it, in accordance with the legislation and regulations. The Board confirmed the Director's decision calculating the child care subsidy.

DISCLAIMER

These are electronic copies of the Reasons for Decision issued by the Social Services Appeal Board. These written reasons have been edited to protect the personal information of individuals by removing personal identifiers.