Win-Win: A Road Map for Strategic Head Start Participation in New Funding Opportunities
How Head Start can partner with childhood care and education agencies to benefit California’s preschoolers and their families

Ben Allen, Ph.D.¹
Consultant and Policy Advisor, Uplifting, LLC

¹ The views expressed in this paper represent those held by Region 9 Head Start Association.
Acknowledgements

The publication of this policy paper involved several individuals and organizations. The Region 9 Head Start Association Executive Committee; members of the Region 9 Head Start Association Public Policy Committee chaired by Damon Carson, Neighborhood House Association; and Region 9 Head Start Association Board of Directors for their support and input.

Thank you to Head Start California; Susan Muenchow, Principal Researcher, American Institutes for Research; Peggy Pizzo, Director, Early Learning Project, Stanford Graduate School of Education; Camilla Rand, Director, Contra Costa County Employment and Human Services Department; Rick Mockler, Principal, Early Intel; and Michele Stillwell-Parvensky, Vice President of Advocacy and Policy, Kidango; for their review and feedback of an earlier draft of this paper to improve its organization, content, and accuracy. Peter Huffaker with CCR Analytics merits our gratitude for providing the Map 1 depicting the location and names of Head Start grantees throughout the Golden State. In addition, we thank Beth Meloy, Senior Researcher and Policy Analyst, Learning Policy Institute, for supplying and granting us permission to use Figure 1, the visually informative graphic depicting the interaction of early childhood programs and funding streams at the federal, state, local, and provider levels. In appreciation to Hal Silliman, Communications and Marketing Consultant support on editing and distribution.

Our sincere thanks to Dr. Ben Allen, Consultant and Policy Advisor, Uplifting, LLC for authoring this paper.

April 2019

Region 9 Head Start Association
1225 8th Street, Suite 342
Sacramento, CA

916-259-0971
www.region9hsa.org

Edward Condon
econdon@region9hsa.org
# Table of Contents

**Executive Summary** ........................................................................................................... 5

**Introduction** ......................................................................................................................... 7

**New Opportunities for California** ...................................................................................... 7

Governor Gavin Newsom’s 2019-2020 Budget Proposal ......................................................... 7

AB 123, an Act Relating to Early Childhood Education .......................................................... 8

AB 124, an Act Relating to Preschool Facilities Bond Act of 2020 ........................................... 9

**California’s Federal Preschool Development Grant Birth to Five (PDG B-5) Initial Grant Award** .... 9

PDG B-5 Purposes .......................................................................................................................... 9

PDG B-5 Initiatives of Immediate Interest to the Head Start Community .................................. 10

Develop Robust Statewide Needs Assessment Capacity .............................................................. 10

Create a Detailed and Innovative Birth through Five Strategic Plan ......................................... 11

**Head Start Programs Provide High Quality Early Childhood Services and Programming for California’s Highest Needs Preschoolers and Their Families** ......................................................... 11

**Head Start Program Model** .................................................................................................. 11

Funding and Enrollment .............................................................................................................. 13

Head Start Eligibility ................................................................................................................... 13

Head Start’s Federal-to-Local Administrative Structure ............................................................. 14

Head Start Partnerships with Service Providers in California’s Early Childhood System .......... 16

**Evidence Base for the Head Start** ....................................................................................... 18

Favorable Child Outcomes ......................................................................................................... 18

Head Start and Elementary School Years .................................................................................. 18

Middle and High School Years .................................................................................................. 19

Favorable Adult Outcomes ......................................................................................................... 20

Parents/Guardians of Head Start-Enrolled Children .................................................................... 20

Head Start-Enrolled Children .................................................................................................... 20

Return on Investment (ROI) ........................................................................................................ 20

Improved Head Start Program Quality ...................................................................................... 21

Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007 .......................................................... 21

Classroom Teacher Qualifications ............................................................................................ 22

Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS®) ..................................................................... 22

Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised ................................................................. 24

**Opportunities in California Early Childhood Care and Education System** ........................... 24

Access and Quality ..................................................................................................................... 25

Age .............................................................................................................................................. 25

Location .................................................................................................................................... 27

Quality ...................................................................................................................................... 27

Differing Early Childhood Education Program Requirements .................................................... 27

Limited Quality Improvement Systems ....................................................................................... 27

Facilities ..................................................................................................................................... 27

National ..................................................................................................................................... 27
Region 9 Head Start Association

California ........................................................................................................................................28

Mutually Beneficial Opportunities for Head Start Programs and State and Local Early Childhood Care and Education Agencies to Work Together for the Benefit of California’s Highest Needs Preschoolers and Their Families ...............................................................................................29

Legislative Proposals to Expand Early Childhood Care and Education Opportunities ................................29

PDG B-5 Opportunities to Improve California’s Early Childhood System for California’s High Needs and Disadvantaged Children ........................................................................................................30

Data from Statewide Needs Assessment Will Inform Future Expansion of Services ..............................30

Detailed and Innovative Birth through Five Strategic Plan Will Guide Future Expansion and Quality Improvement Activities ..................................................................................................................31

Policy Recommendations ................................................................................................................32

References ........................................................................................................................................41
Executive Summary

In 2019, a new governor’s administration, previous state budget surpluses, and a federal grant of $10.6 million are giving rise to momentum to extend preschool to as many children as possible in California and to improve the state’s aging facilities or build new ones to create spaces that incorporate modern learning concepts into the classroom environment. Several billion dollars of new funding are under consideration by the California State Legislature for early childhood education from Gov. Newsom’s proposed budget for 2019-2020, AB 123 and AB 124 introduced by Assemblyman Kevin McCarty, and a $10.6 million federal Preschool Development Birth through Five (PDG B-5) Initial Grant Award.

The Head Start Program is a school readiness program designed to address the needs of the whole-child, family, and community and serves preschool-aged children (three-, four-, and five-year-olds not age-eligible for kindergarten) and their primarily income-eligible families. In California, Head Start programs served 86,070 Head Start-eligible preschool-aged children in 77,973 federally-funded Head Start slots during the 2017-2018 program year. Head Start programs supported these at risk children and their families on their path to success.

The policy paper applies a statewide systems-level lens to examine how Head Start programs can strategically participate with State and local organizations in these emerging early childhood care and education opportunities by:

- Describing the new California policy initiatives for preschool-age young children and their families;
- Sharing how Head Start programs provide high quality early childhood care and education services for California’s highest needs preschoolers and their Families;
- Taking a snapshot of opportunities and needs in California’s early childhood care and education landscape;
- Explaining how mutually beneficial opportunities for Head Start programs and state and Local early childhood care and education agencies can be best realized by working together and leveraging federal, state, and local investments for the benefit of California’s highest needs preschoolers and their families; and
- Offering recommendations for policy development purposes about how the community-based Head Start programs can potentially participate in new California policy initiatives by partnering with the state, school districts, counties, home providers, and philanthropy to help preschool children and families be successful in their lives.

By supplying this systems-level information for two California audiences: the Head Start community and the entire early childhood care and education system, this policy paper will achieve two purposes:

- First, the paper is a call to action for the Head Start community at the local- and state-levels to discuss, develop, and implement strategies for effective engagement with their State and local partners in the development and implementation of legislative and PDG B-5 initiatives. It’s an imperative that representatives of community-based Head Start programs participate in state legislative and federal initiatives and partner with the myriad of agencies, home providers, and philanthropy to ensure the maximizing of efforts to make preschool-age children and their families be successful in their lives.
Region 9 Head Start Association

- Second, State and local early childhood care and education agencies and providers will acquire a deeper understanding about Head Start and hopefully recognize mutually beneficial opportunities at the state- and local-levels to:
  - Expand access to State Preschool and General Child Programs by partnering with Head Start programs;
  - Improve the workforce in the Head Start, State Preschool, and Transitional Kindergarten Programs;
  - Construct and retrofitting early learning facilities;
  - Work together to PDG B-5 activities to inform future collaboration among programs and expansion of services by
    - Developing a robust Statewide Needs Assessment Capacity and
    - Creating a detailed and innovative Birth through Five Strategic Plan.

For policy proposal development purposes, we offer policy recommendations for how representatives of community-based Head Start agencies can potentially participate in legislative and PDG B-5 initiatives and partner with the state, school districts, counties, home providers, and philanthropy to help preschool-age children and their families be successful in their lives. Depending on the timing of the public release of this paper, our recommendations may also inform the proceedings and recommendations contained in the forthcoming final report of the California Assembly Blue Ribbon Commission on Early Childhood Education (2019).

Our broad policy recommendations are:

- At the state- and local-levels, the Head Start community should participate in the PDG B-5 funded statewide needs assessment data collection and related activities;
- At the state- and local-levels, the Head Start community must be represented in the PDG B-5 Strategic Planning Process;
- Head Start programs should be eligible for and participate in all birth-to-five initiatives that support facilities for government subsidized early childhood care and education;
- Head Start programs should be eligible for and participate in all birth-to-five initiatives that improve workforce compensation for government-subsidized early childhood care and education teachers staff.
- At the statewide- and Head Start program-levels, Head Start must should be participate in data collection initiatives that:
  - Support strategic policy and program planning and
  - Ensure the federal investment in Head Start grantees is fully utilized by leveraging the federal investment with the State's investment in its California Preschool, General Child Care, and other early childhood care and education programs to:
    - Maximize the benefits of the federal, state, and local investments for California’s children and families and
    - Develop a coordinated referral system for ensuring preschool-aged children and their families are placed in the early childhood care and education program that will best meet their needs.
Introduction
The dawn of 2019 brings forth new early childhood policy initiatives from the California Administration and State Legislature for the benefit of young children and families in the Golden State. This policy paper provides a statewide systems-level lens by describing the new California policy initiatives for preschool-age young children and their families, painting a portrait of California’s early childhood landscape, and offering recommendations for policy development purposes about how the community-based Head Start agencies can potentially participate in these initiatives and partner with the state, school districts, counties, home providers, and philanthropy to help preschool children and families be successful in their lives.2

By supplying this systems-level information for two California audiences: the Head Start community and the entire early childhood care and education system, this policy paper will achieve two purposes. First, the paper is a call to action for the Head Start community at the local- and state-levels to discuss, develop, and implement strategies for effective engagement with their State and local early childhood care and education entities in the development and implementation of legislative and PDG B-5 initiatives. Second, State and local partners will acquire a deeper understanding about the Head Start Program and its role in the early childhood care and education system, and it is hoped that these State and local organizations will find mutually beneficially opportunities to partner with Head Start at the state- and local-levels in the legislative and PDG B-5 initiatives.

The policy brief should generate cross-sector dialogue among all early childhood stakeholders—including Head Start, child care, pre-K, home visiting, child care resource and referral agencies, First Five county commissions, and state and federal departments—about how to leverage and blend federal, state, and local funding streams to yield the highest return on investment for all preschool-aged children and families in California.

New Opportunities for California
New opportunities for preschool-age include Gov. Gavin Newsom’s proposed budget for 2019-2020, AB 123 and AB 124 introduced by Kevin McCarty, and a $10.6 million federal Preschool Development Birth through Five (PDG B-5) Initial Grant Award. These policies should benefit California’s highest at-risk children.

Governor Gavin Newsom’s 2019-2020 Budget Proposal
On Jan. 10, 2019 Gov. Newsom released his 2019-2020 “California For All” State Budget. The Governor proposed a $1.7 billion increase for early childhood education in his budget to:

1. **Expand access and build capacity** for full-day kindergarten by providing funds to construct new or retrofit existing facilities for full-day kindergarten programs.
2. **Move closer toward implementing** universal preschool by increasing full-day, full-year access to State Preschool to all eligible low-income four-year-olds to fund a total of 200,000 slots by 2021-

---

2 Unless otherwise noted, Head Start programs in this paper refer to Head Start, American Indian/Alaskan Native Head Start, and Migrant Seasonal Head Start programs that serve Head Start-eligible preschool-aged children.
2022 and by providing additional slots to not-for-profit providers because local education agencies have limited capacity.

3. **Ensure four-year-old children** can access a full-day, full-year state preschool program by eliminating the existing requirement that families with four-year-olds provide proof of parent employment or enrollment in higher education to access the full-day program.

4. **Develop a long-term plan** to provide universal preschool in California that:
   a. Would consist of strategies to address facility capacity, to ensure a trained workforce is available, and to identify revenue options to support universal access, and
   b. May propose modifications to the Transitional Kindergarten program to address the overlap between the transitional kindergarten program and universal preschool.

5. **Increase the quality and availability** of child care by:
   a. Expanding subsidized child care facilities in the state.
   b. Investing in the education of the child care workforce to improve the quality of care and move child care professionals along the early education/child care professional continuum.
   c. Allocating one-time funds to the California State University for supporting child care infrastructure for students on college campuses.

6. **Developing a long-term strategic plan** for a better well-aligned, financed, and comprehensive child care system in the state (Office of Governor Newsom 2019).

**AB 123, an Act Relating to Early Childhood Education**

Assemblyman Kevin McCarty (D-Sacramento) introduced AB 123, an act relating to early childhood education. At a cost of $1.5 billion per year, the bill would expand access to and increase the quality of preschool services. The bill calls for investing $1 billion to add nearly 70,000 additional State Preschool slots- which would bring the total number of children served through California State Preschool, Head Start or Transitional Kindergarten to approximately 270,000 four-year-olds and 105,000 three-year-olds. Of 70,000 additional California State Preschool spaces, approximately half would be for four-year-olds in low-income neighborhoods and half would be for three-year-olds in poverty (Kidango 2019).

The bill would enhance program quality by spending:
- **$310 million** to increase the standard reimbursement rate for the California State Preschool Program by 23 percent in the 2019-2020 budget year to support higher teacher qualifications and compensation.
- **$190 million** for Transitional Kindergarten enhancement, primarily to add an instructional aide to bring the adult-student ratio down to 12:1 (Kidango 2019).

The quality standards of both the California State Preschool Program and Transitional Kindergarten would be also be enhanced by:
- **Requiring** over an eight-year period that all lead teachers in the California State Preschool Program must have a bachelor’s degree and any additional requirements as established by the Commission of Teacher Credentialing.
- **Requiring** all Transitional Kindergarten teachers to obtain a Preschool through grade 3 Teaching credential or certificate and instructional aides to have an associate’s degree with 23 units of
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early childhood education or alternative certification as established by the Commission on Teaching Credentialing (AB No. 123 2018).

These quality enhancements would impact more than 200,000 children in California State Preschool or Transitional Kindergarten (Kidango 2019).

**AB 124, an Act Relating to Preschool Facilities Bond Act of 2020**

If enacted by California lawmakers and subsequently approved by the voters in a 2020 statewide general election referendum, AB 124, the Preschool Facilities Bond Act of 2010, would authorize the sale of $500 million in bonds to finance a preschool facility grant program. The proceeds from the sale of the bonds would be deposited in the Preschool Facilities Bond Act of 2020 Fund. The Legislature would be able to appropriate monies from the bond fund to the Superintendent of Public Instruction to provide grants to local educational agencies or contracting agencies that receive funding for a state preschool program (AB No. 124 2018). According to AB 124, the grants must be used “...for the renovation, repair, or improvement of an existing building to make the building suitable for licensure for preschool services, and for the purchase of new re-locatable preschool facilities.”

**California’s Federal Preschool Development Grant Birth to Five (PDG B-5) Initial Grant Award**

In December 2018, the Office of Child Care, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services awarded a $10.62 million PDG B-5 initial grant award to the California Department of Education. California has three million children younger than five years old, half of whom come from income-eligible families. California is one of 46 states awarded PDG B-5 grants. In late summer or early fall of 2019, the federal government is expected to issue a new Funding Opportunity Announcement for PDG B-5 Renewal Grants (California Department of Education 2019).

Eligible states will be able to apply for a smaller number of larger PDG B-5 Renewal Grants for Years Two to Four to expand upon Year One activities and implement new activities, including the opportunity for the state to award sub-grants to programs in a mixed-delivery system for the benefit of income eligible and disadvantaged children (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2018a). The PDG B-5 grants are targeted to improve the experiences and outcomes of these children population.

**PDG B-5 Purposes**

The PDG B-5 has three purposes:

1. **To help states develop** and implement a strategic plan for:
   - Facilitating statewide collaboration and coordination among existing early childhood care and education programs in a mixed-delivery system designed to help low-income and disadvantaged children be prepared to enter kindergarten.
   - Improving the transitions of children from low-income and disadvantaged families from early childhood care and education programs in the mixed-delivery system into elementary school through:
     a) Boosting the school readiness for children from low-income and at-risk families.
b) Increasing the efficiency of spending of existing federal, state, local, and non-governmental resources by aligning and strengthening the delivery of existing programs.

c) Developing recommendations to improve the allocation of existing resources with the aim of enhancing the overall participation by children in federal, state, and local early childhood care and education programs within the mixed-delivery system.

d) Enhancing coordination of the service delivery models and funding streams in the state’s mixed-delivery system.

e) Increasing parental knowledge and choice about existing programs.

f) Maintaining availability of services while upgrading program quality (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2018a).

2. **To embolden partnerships** among Head Start providers, state and local governments, Indian tribes and tribal organizations, private entities (including faith- and community-based entities), and local educational agencies with the aim to improving coordination, program quality, and delivery of services (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2018a).

3. **To maximize parental choices** about which early childhood care and education programs to enroll their children within the state’s mixed-delivery system (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2018a).

Overall, the PDG B-5 grants will support states in their efforts to analyze the current landscape of their early childhood education mixed-delivery system and implement changes to the system that will:

- **Maximize** the availability of high-quality early childhood care and education program options for low-income and at-risk families.
- **Improve** the quality of early childhood care and education programs.
- **Simplify** administrative infrastructure.
- **Increase** efficiencies of state-level early childhood care and education funding streams (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2018a).

**PDG B-5 Initiatives of Immediate Interest to the Head Start Community**

Of the multitude of California’s PDG B-5 initiatives, two should be considered for immediate action by the Head Start community:

- **Developing** a robust Statewide Needs Assessment Capacity.
- **Creating** a detailed and Birth through Five Strategic Plan (California Department of Education 2019).

**Develop Robust Statewide Needs Assessment Capacity**

The American Institutes of Research (AIR) will upgrade their birth-through-five Early Learning Needs Assessment Tool to collect data to determine gaps and needs in subsidized early childhood care and education mixed delivery system. The needs assessment survey will collect information at the zip code-level regarding enrollment, facilities, licensing, and other topics.
By August 2019, AIR must complete a statewide needs assessment to improve the state’s ability to direct services to most in need populations. The data collected from the needs assessment will be integrated into existing systems and Local Planning Council (LPC) contracts to sustain consistent, expanded needs assessment capacity after the PDG B-5 funding ends (California Department of Education 2019).

Create a Detailed and Innovative Birth through Five Strategic Plan

Based on the needs assessment findings, California will develop a detailed and innovative strategic plan that will provide guidance to policymakers to increase access to services for children and families with high needs. The Governor’s State Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care will play a pivotal role in digesting the findings from the needs assessment and using them to craft the statewide strategic plan.

Working in concert with the Governor’s State Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care, WestEd will consult with a wide range of stakeholders and synthesize existing plans into a single, unified strategic plan for the mixed-delivery system. The aim is to increase access of children with high needs to high-quality services (California Department of Education 2019).

Head Start Programs Provide High Quality Early Childhood Services and Programming for California’s Highest Needs Preschoolers and Their Families

Head Start Program Model

Throughout our nation, Head Start provides high-quality and two-generational comprehensive early learning services to more than 1 million children from birth to age five and their primarily income-eligible families annually (U.S. Department of Human Services 2016b). The Head Start program is a school readiness program serving preschool-aged children (three-, four-, and five-year-olds not age-eligible for kindergarten) and their primarily income-eligible families. Head Start supplies a comprehensive range of education, health, nutrition, and family support services to Head Start-enrolled children and their families. Through their participation in Head Start, parents/guardians of Head Start-enrolled children have opportunities to become more financially responsible and pursue new employment and educational opportunities.

Head Start programs implement with fidelity evidence-based curriculum and developmental assessments aligned with the Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework: Ages Birth to Five, to support the learning by children and families in five domains:

- Approaches to learning
- Cognitive development (e.g., math and science)
- Language and literacy

The Early Head Start program serves pregnant women and infants and toddlers under age three; therefore, discussion about the Early Head Start program is not included in this report. Like Head Start, Early Head Start has a federal-to-local administrative structure, has similar enrollment eligibility requirements, and has a two-generational program design by providing comprehensive child development and family support services to infants and toddlers, pregnant women, and their families.
• Social and emotional functioning
• Physical skills

Head Start programs are experienced in administering screening tools with young children and their families to identify potential developmental delays and concerns. Within 45 calendar days of when the child first attends a Head Start program or when the child first receives a home visit for the Head Start home-based program option, a Head Start program must complete or obtain a current developmental screening to identify concerns regarding a child’s developmental, behavioral, motor, language, social, cognitive, and emotional skills. This must be performed in collaboration with the child’s parent and with the consent of the child’s parent. Through this screening process, developmental concerns may be identified, and action can be taken to begin addressing them appropriately. Identified developmental and behavioral concerns may be trauma-induced resulting from a child’s exposure with Adverse Childhood Experiences.

If the Head Start program identifies a possible developmental concern for the child, the Head Start program will refer the child to a Local Educational Agency for a formal evaluation to assess the child’s eligibility for services under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). If the evaluation determines the child is eligible for special education services under IDEA, the program must ensure the individual needs of children eligible for services under IDEA are met, and the Head Start program must collaborate with the local agency responsible for implementing IDEA, the family, and other service partners to ensure services for a child with disabilities will be planned and delivered through their Individualized Education Program. Behavioral support and mental health services may be provided to the child and family as appropriate.

The Head Start Program promotes parental and family engagement in their children’s and their own learning. Parents and families are encouraged to support their children’s learning, cultivate their knowledge of child development and parenting skills, advance their own education, and increase their economic self-sufficiency (Sabol and Chase-Lansdale 2015).

Head Start teachers and staff use the second edition of the *Head Start Parent, Family, and Community Engagement (PFCE)* as a “research-based organizational guide” to assist them with supplying the required parent, family, and community engagement practices, programming, and services for the benefit of children and families (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2018c).

Each Head Start program must follow intake and family assessment procedures to identify family strengths and needs related to the family engagement outcomes as described in the *Head Start Parent, Family, and Community Engagement Framework*. The outcomes include family well-being, parent-child relationships, families as lifelong educators, families as learners, family engagement in transitions, family connections to peers and the local community, and families as advocates and leaders (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2018c).

The purpose of Head Start is to prepare children from primarily income-eligible families for kindergarten. Consequently, Head Start promotes planning and activities to help transition Head Start graduates and their families into kindergarten.
Funding and Enrollment


Head Start Eligibility

The federal Head Start eligibility requirements reflect the commitment of Head Start and Early Head Start programs to serve the highest needs children and families. A pregnant woman is eligible for the Early Head Start Program or a child is eligible for Head Start or Early Head Start under the criteria:

- **Family’s income** is equal to or below 100 percent of the federal poverty level: $25,750 for a family of four living in the contiguous 48 states and the District of Columbia during 2019 (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2019f).
- **Family is eligible** for Temporary Assistance to Needy Families or Supplemental Security Income.
- **Child is homeless**, as defined in the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act,
- **Child is in foster care.**

If a family is not eligible for Head Start or Early Head Start under one of the above four criterion, a program may enroll a child who would benefit from services irrespective of the family’s income along as these children consist of 10 percent or less of a program’s enrollment (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016a). Many the children who fall into this eligibility category are identified as having disabilities. At least 10 percent of each Head Start grantee’s total actual child enrollment must consist of children with disabilities who are determined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to be eligible for special education and related services or early intervention services by state or local agency providing services under Part B or Part C of IDEA (Head Start Act, as amended 2007).

During 2017-2018 program year, Head Start programs in California served 10,831 preschool-age children who had an Individualized Education Program (IEP) because they were determined by the local educational agencies to receive special education and related services under Part B of IDEA. Of the 10,831 children, 3,558 children (33 percent) were determined by local educational agencies eligible to receive special education and related services while they were enrolled in Head Start (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2019a).

---

4 The 86,070 figure represents Head Start-eligible preschool-aged children who were served by Head Start, American Indian/Alaskan Native Head Start, and Migrant Seasonal Head Start programs during the 2017-2018 program year. The figure excludes children from birth through age two served by Migrant and Seasonal Head Start programs and Early Head Start programs. Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration of Children and Families, Office of Head Start. (2019a). *Office of Head Start – Program Information Report (PIR), Summary Report – 2018 – State Level.* Washington, DC. The difference between 86,070 children served and 77,973 federally funded Head Start slots is due to enrollment turnover when families move out of the service area and families in the service area enroll their children in Head Start during the program year.
In addition, a Head Start or Early Head Start program is allowed to have up to 35 percent of its child enrollment consisting of children from families with incomes between 100 percent ($25,750) and 130 percent ($33,475) of the federal poverty levels if the program meets two conditions:

- **The program creates** and implements an outreach plan in the community and enrollment policies and procedures to ensure the program meets the needs of eligible pregnant women, children, and children with disabilities, prior to the program serving pregnant women or children who do not meet the above criteria; and
- **Establishes criteria** that ensure pregnant women and children eligible under the above criteria are served first (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016a).

**Head Start’s Federal-to-Local Administrative Structure**

Head Start programs are operated as federal-to-local organizations. Local community-based organizations receive federal grants from the federal Office of Head Start to administer Head Start programs. Community-based organizations who receive their federal Head Start grant directly from the Office of Head Start are called Head Start grantees. Each Head Start grantee receives 80 percent of its funding from its federal Head Start grant and must raise the remaining 20 percent from non-federal funding sources, such as private, local, municipal, county, and/or state funding sources. Often, Head Start grantees will delegate some or all of the delivery of Head Start services to another community-based organization, called a Head Start delegate agency.

During the 2017-2018 program year, 149 community-based organizations in California were either a grantee or delegate agency. Table 1 describes the types, frequencies, and percentages of the 149 community-based organizations providing Head Start services to preschool-aged children.

**Table 1: Types, Frequencies, and Percentages of Community-Based Organizations Providing Head Start Services to Preschool-Aged Children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private/Public Non-Profit (Non-CAA) (e.g., mental health, early childhood education/child development, or multi-purpose human service organizations)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Educational Agencies (e.g., unified school districts or county offices of education)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Action Agency</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Government or Consortium (American Indian/Alaska Native) percent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Agency (Non-CAA) (e.g., cities or county governments )</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Public For-Profit (e.g., for-profit hospitals)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each Head Start program operates in a geographic service area. Each Head Start program conducts a community needs assessment to inform its programming and services. Drawing upon the findings of their respective community needs assessments and taking into consideration available annual funding, each program must choose to operate one or more of the four program options: center-based, home-
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based, family child care, or an approved locally-designed option that differs from the three other program options.

During the 2017-2018 program year, Head Start programs received federal Head Start funds to provide 77,973 slots. Of 77,973 slots, 71,459 were center-based program slots consisting of 40,309 part-day and 31,150 full-day slots (see Table 2). Head Start programs with part-day slots frequently participate in the California Preschool Program to receive part-day pre-K slots in order to layer funding streams to provide a full-day of high quality early childhood services to Head Start-enrolled and non-Head Start-enrolled children and their families.

Program options enable a Head Start program tailor its services and programming to best meet the needs of young children and their families in their local service areas (Head Start California 2019; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016a). Given each Head Start program’s extensive knowledge of the local communities in its service area, Head Start programs have much to offer when County Local Planning Councils convene to making planning and funding decisions.

Table 2: California Head Start Program Options by Federally Funded Head Start Slots during the 2017-2018 Program Year (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2019a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Options</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>Subsets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Center-based program</strong></td>
<td>71,459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center-based program - 5 days per week:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-day enrollment</td>
<td>30,305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of 30,305, the number available as full-working-day enrollment</td>
<td>12,533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of 12,533, the number available for full-calendar-year</td>
<td>3,542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-day enrollment</td>
<td>22,724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of 22,724, the number in double sessions</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center-based program - 4 days per week:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-day enrollment</td>
<td>845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-day enrollment</td>
<td>17,585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of 17,585, the number in double sessions</td>
<td>13,682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home-based program</strong></td>
<td>3,574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of center-based and home-based program</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family child care program</strong></td>
<td>2,733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of 2,733, the number available as full-working-day enrollment</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of 1,992, the number available for full-calendar-year</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locally designed option that differs from the above program options</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>77,973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To review California’s Head Start grantees and number of children served go to - https://www.region9hsa.org/californias-head-start-agencies/

Head Start Partnerships with Service Providers in California’s Early Childhood System

In February 2019, the federal Office of Head Start leadership from the federal Region IX Administration for Children and Families (ACF) Office in San Francisco communicated to Head Start program directors a regional priority for Head Start programs to develop, track, and monitor their partnerships with:

- **Early childhood programs** in private and public settings for the delivery of services to children and families.
• **Public schools** for the promotion of successful child and family transitions from Head Start to transitional kindergarten or kindergarten (Region IX Office of Head Start 2019).\(^5\)

This priority reinforced the existing requirements in the Head Start Act and the Head Start Program Performance Standards for Head Start programs to effectively provide Head Start services to young children and their families by coordinating and collaborating effectively with other public or private early childhood education and development programs.\(^6\) The federal Head Start Program Performance Standards (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016a, 44-45) require Head Start programs “...to establish collaborative relationships and partnerships with community organizations such as establishing joint agreements, procedures, or contracts and arranging for onsite delivery of services as appropriate, to facilitate access to community services that are responsive to children’s and families’ needs and family partnership goals, and community needs and resources, as determined by the community assessment.” Head Start programs “...must establish necessary collaborative relationships and partnerships, with community organizations...”

Community organizations may include public schools providing Title I services, local educational agencies providing special education services under Section 619/Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, schools providing kindergarten, transitional kindergarten, state-funded pre-kindergarten programs, such California State Preschool, child care programs, such as General Child Care, health care providers, dentists, mental health professionals, substance abuse treatment providers, family preservation and support services, child protective services, libraries, museums, agencies administering the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program, nutrition assistance programs, workforce development and training programs, adult or family literacy, higher education institutions, housing assistance agencies to support for children and families experiencing homelessness; and domestic violence prevention and support providers (Head Start Act, as amended; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016a, 44-45).

As depicted in Table 3, Head Start programs had formal agreements with child care partners to provide child care subsidy assistance and services (1,054), LEAs to coordinate services for Head Start-enrolled children with disabilities (805), LEAs to coordinate the transitioning of Head Start participants and their families into kindergarten (731), and Part C of the IDEA agencies to coordinate services for Early Head Start-enrolled children with disabilities (443). Head Start programs had 506 collaboration and resource sharing agreements with public school pre-kindergarten programs to provide California Preschool Program services to Head Start-enrolled and non-Head Start enrolled children. In addition, Head Start programs had 151 formal collaboration agreements with agencies to facilitate the provision of appropriate child welfare services for children and teenage parents needing them (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2019a).

---

\(^5\) The ACF Region 9 administrative area covers Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, American Samoa, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Republic of Palau, and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

\(^6\) Head Start Act, as amended.
Table 3: Number of Head Start Partnerships with Service Providers during the 2017-2018 Program Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Agreements with Child Care Partners during the program year</td>
<td>1,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Agreements with Local Educational Agencies to Coordinate Services for Children with Disabilities</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Agreements with Local Educational Agencies to Coordinate Transition Services</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Collaboration and Resource Sharing Agreements with Public School Pre-Kindergarten Programs in Which the Program Is Currently Participating</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Agreements with Part C Agencies to Coordinate Services for Children with Disabilities</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Collaboration Agreements with Child Welfare Agencies in Which the Program Is Currently Participating</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to supplying Head Start services to Head Start-enrolled children and their families, Head Start grantees are experienced providers of child care and state-funded pre-kindergarten education services to Head Start-enrolled and non-Head Start-enrolled children and their families. For example, 60 percent of Head Start grantees have contracts with the California Department of Education to provide California State Preschool services (Head Start California 2019). During the 2017-2018 program year, Head Start programs received child care subsidies to serve 9,001 Head Start-enrolled children (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2019).7

Evidence Base for the Head Start
The section examines the evidence base for the Head Start Program by summarizing its multi-generational benefits for children and adults. The evidence base relies on the findings of large- and small-scale evaluations of Head Start.

Favorable Child Outcomes
Head Start programs generate favorable child outcomes during the children's Head Start and elementary school years and middle school and high school.

Head Start and Elementary School Years
During their Head Start and elementary school years, children who attended Head Start were more likely than children participating in the comparison groups to experience increased outcomes on pre-reading, pre-writing, vocabulary, and literacy skills; decreased need for special education services, increased access to dental care, higher immunization rates, and improved health outcomes. The findings from the random assignment national Head Start Impact Study showed small-to-moderate, statistically significant, favorable impacts for three- and four-year-old children enrolled in Head Start on pre-reading, pre-writing, vocabulary, and parent reports of children’s literacy skills (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2010). Meanwhile, Head Start decreases the need for children to receive special education services in elementary schools (Barnett 2002; Deming 2009).

7 This figure may include children from birth through age two enrolled in a Migrant Seasonal Head Start program.
The Head Start Impact Study found that children enrolled in Head Start received significantly more dental care than the children in the control group (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2010). Children attending Head Start have increased access to dental care and have higher immunization rates than non-Head Start children do (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2005; Currie and Thomas, 1995). Upon their entry to kindergarten, children who participated Head Start were more likely to receive dental check-ups than those who did not (Lee et al. 2013). Analyzing publicly available data from the random assignment Head Start Impact Study, Zhai, Brooks-Gunn, and Waldfogel (2014) found that Head Start participants demonstrated more favorable impacts on cognitive and parent-reported behavioral development measures during the Head Start, kindergarten, and first grade years than children in parental care and relative/non-relative care.

The University of California, Los Angeles/Johnson & Johnson Health Care Institute provided comprehensive health literacy training to Head Start staff who in turn educated Head Start families about health literacy. As a result, children of more than 9,000 Head Start families at 55 sites were less absent on 29 percent fewer school days and the families made 58 percent less emergency room visits to address their children’s health needs. Meanwhile, parents experienced a 42 percent reduction in lost work days (Teutsch et al. 2016).

Children participating in center-based Head Start programs were more likely to receive health consultations and screenings than children participating in other center-based early childhood programs were. More than 90 percent of Head Start centers screened for child health problems compared with 65 percent of non-Head Start centers. (Gupta et al., 2009). Head Start’s health screening and prevention services significantly reduced child mortality rates of children ages five to nine years old (Ludwig and Miller 2007). Head Start children are less likely to be obese (Frisvold 2006; Carneiro and Ginja 2014) and more likely to be immunized (Currie and Thomas 1995). Compared with children who did not receive Head Start, Head Start participants were two times more likely per week to engage in healthy eating habits (Lee et al. 2013).

### Middle and High School Years

During their middle and high school years, children who attended Head Start were more likely than children participating in the comparison groups to experience a range of favorable educational, health, mental health, and societal outcomes. During their middle school year, Head Start participants in the CAP Tulsa Head Start program in Oklahoma had higher eighth grade achievement test scores in mathematics than children in the comparison group (Phillips et al. 2016; Meloy et al. 2019). In middle school, Head Start participants were less likely to be chronically absent (Phillips et al. 2016) and were less likely to repeat a grade by eighth grade (Phillips et al. 2016; Deming 2009).

In terms of health, Head Start participants were seven percentage points less likely to be in poor health (Deming 2009) and were less likely to experience chronic conditions requiring the use of medical equipment, such as an air filter, breathing mask, catheter, crutches, helmet, special shoes, or wheelchair (Carneiro and Ginja 2014). For male children at ages 12 and 13, prior participation in the Head Start program reduced the incidence of behavioral problems, health problems and obesity. As adolescents, prior Head Start participants experienced improved mental health with lower rates of depression, and they were less obese (Carneiro and Ginja 2014). Head Start participants are more likely to graduate from high school (Bauer and Schanzenbach 2016; Deming 2009; Ludwig and Miller 2007).
Favorable Adult Outcomes
Because of Head Start’s two generational design, participation in Head Start generates favorable adult outcomes for two sets of Head Start participants. Parents/guardians of Head Start-enrolled children and Head Start-enrolled children realize a range of positive adult outcomes.

Parents/Guardians of Head Start-Enrolled Children
Parents/guardians of Head Start-enrolled children have opportunities through their participation in Head Start with their children to increase their assets and financial literacy and pursue and realize educational and employment opportunities in the workforce. During the 2017-2018 program year, 7,639 families learned how to build assets by opening savings and checking accounts and receiving financial literacy training and debt counseling. In the same year, 3,445 families had a parent/guardian who completed high school or was awarded a GED and 1,042 families had a parent/guardian who earned an associate degree. Meanwhile, 653 families had at least one parent/guardian who graduated with a baccalaureate or graduate degree. By the end of the 2017-2018 program year, 1,551 families consisted of one or more parent/guardian who completed a job training program, professional certificate, or license. During the 2017-2018 program year, 6,831 families that received job training services.

Head Start programs contribute to the development of the early childhood education workforce by using their federal Head Start training and technical assistance funds to enable parents of Head Start-enrolled children to acquire the skills and education to work as teachers and staff in Head Start programs. Of 18,739 Head Start teachers and staff in California, 4,149 (22 percent) were current or former Head Start or Early Head Start parents (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2019a).

Head Start-Enrolled Children
As adults, children who participated in Head Start were more likely than children participating in the comparison groups to attend college, earn higher education degrees, smoke cigarettes less, and be productive and law-abiding citizens.

Parents of three-year-olds enrolled in Head Start increased their educational attainment more than parents of children in the control group (Sabol and Chase-Lansdale 2015). Head Start participants have higher college attendance rates (Bauer and Schanzenbach 2016; Deming 2009; Ludwig and Miller 2007). Head Start participants are more likely to earn an associate’s degree, a baccalaureate degree, license, or certificate (Bauer and Schanzenbach 2016). Head Start children are 19 to 25 percent less likely to smoke as an adult (Anderson et al. 2009). Instead of being idle and breaking laws as young adults, Head Start participants are seven percentage points more likely to be enrolled in school and working and reporting income (Deming 2009) and are less likely to participate in criminal activity at ages 20-21 (Carneiro and Ginja 2014).

Return on Investment (ROI)
Rigorous research reveals that society reaps a ROI of at least $7 for every $1 invested in Head Start. Based upon their rigorous analysis of Head Start impact data, Ludwig and Phillips (2007) conclude, “These impact estimates taken at face value would suggest that Head Start as it operated in the 1960s through the 1980s generated benefits in excess of program costs, with a benefit-cost ratio that might be
at least as large as the 7-to-1 figure often cited for model early childhood programs such as Perry Preschool." In comparison with other model, highest-quality early childhood programs that have generated high ROIs, Deming (2009) calculated that Head Start provides 80 percent of the benefits of these programs at 60 percent of the cost. Head Start is operated more efficiently than these model early childhood programs. More recently, Dr. James Heckman, a Nobel laureate economist, and his colleagues, calculated that a prototypical high quality birth-to-five program serving disadvantaged children, similar in design with Head Start, can yield a 13 percent per year return on investment with a corresponding ratio of $7.30 in benefits for every $1.00 invested in the program (Heckman 2017; Garcia et al. 2019).

**Improved Head Start Program Quality**

During the past 12 years, the quality of Head Start programs has improved across the country and in California. The enactment of the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, promulgation of the federal Head Start Program Performance Standards in 2016, the transformation of the federal Head Start Monitoring System from a compliance-to-performance based system (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016b), ongoing support of the Head Start Training and Technical Assistance system, and the agility and commitment of Head Start practitioners to continuous quality improvement have ensured that Head Start programs are high quality.

**Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007**

The *Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007* contributed to the improved quality of Head Start programs by requiring:

- **Head Start programs** use a research-based early childhood curriculum aligned with the Head Start Child Outcomes Framework\(^8\) and, as appropriate, state early learning standards.

- **At least 50 percent** of Head Start teachers nationwide in center-based Head Start programs possess by September 30, 2013:
  - A baccalaureate or advanced degree in early childhood education; or
  - A baccalaureate or advanced degree and coursework equivalent to a major relating to early childhood education, with experience teaching preschool-age children.

- **Office of Head Start** in its monitoring reviews of Head Start programs to use a valid and reliable research-based observational instrument for assessing classroom quality, including the multiple dimensions of teacher-child interactions that are linked to positive child outcomes and later achievement.

- **Major revisions to the** Head Start Program Performance Standards through subsequent regulation that would ensure Head Start programs:
  - Follow scientifically-based and developmentally appropriate education performance standards regarding school readiness based on the *Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework: Ages Birth to Five*.
  - Meet the stricter state or local requirements when state or local licensing requirements are more stringent than the Head Start Program’s teacher-child ratios and group size requisites.

---

\(^8\) Head Start Child Outcomes Framework became the *Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework: Ages Birth to Five*. 
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- **Development and implementation** by regulation of a transparent, reliable, and valid system for designation renewal that would determine whether a Head Start agency is delivering a high-quality and comprehensive Head Start program. The Office of Head Start uses its Head Start Designation Renewal System (DRS) to determine whether each Head Start grantee is delivering a high-quality Head Start program, which called for the establishment of a “designation renewal system.” When DRS began in December 2011, 535 grantees (34 percent) of 1,574 active Head Start grantees were required to re-compete for their grant or engage in tribal government consultation. Of 1,574 Head Start grantees, 1,421 were non-tribal grantees. Of 1,421 non-tribal Head Start grantees, 453 (32 percent) were required to re-compete for their grants. In California, 13 of 84 (15 percent) of non-tribal Head Start grantees were required to re-compete in open competition to retain their federal grants (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016d).

*Classroom Teacher Qualifications*

One contributor to a quality early childhood program is requiring classroom teachers to have a baccalaureate degree (National Research Council 2000; Bueno, Darling-Hammond, and Gonzales 2010). For this reason, The Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007 mandated at least 50 percent of Head Start teachers nationwide in center-based programs possess no later than September 30, 2013 either: 1) a baccalaureate or advanced degree in early childhood education; or 2) a baccalaureate or advanced degree and coursework equivalent to a major relating to early childhood education, with experience teaching preschool-age children.

**Table 4: Increase in the Proportions of Head Start Classroom Teachers Nationwide and in California Possessing a Baccalaureate or Advanced Degree from the 2011-2012 to 2017-2018 Program Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nationwide</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Years</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Years</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nationally, the percentage of Head Start classroom teachers having a baccalaureate degree or higher jumped by 10 percent from 61 percent in 2012 to 71 percent in 2018 (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2019b and 2019c). In California, there was a larger increase during the same period. Head Start classroom teachers possessing a baccalaureate degree or higher soared by 18 percent from 48 percent in 2012 to 66 percent in 2018 (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2019d and 2019e).

*Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS®)*

Shortly after the enactment of the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, the Office of Head Start adopted the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) as its valid and reliable research-

---

9 A Head Start grantee is a community-based organization that has been awarded a federal Head Start grant by the Office of Head Start to operate a Head Start program.
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based observational instrument for assessing classroom quality in its monitoring reviews of Head Start programs. Many Head Start programs also began having certified CLASS assessors come into their programs to observe teacher-child interactions in their classrooms for the purpose of improving teaching and learning.

In 2011, the Office of Head Start decided to use CLASS scores—collected during CLASS reviews of Head Start grantees—as one of the quality benchmarks in the DRS to determine whether a Head Start grantee must re-compete for its grant in open competition. Using a seven-point scale, trained CLASS observers rate CLASS dimensions of Head Start or other preschool classrooms, taking into consideration the frequency and quality of teacher-child interactions. Scores of one to two indicate a low quality of teacher-child interactions. Scores of three to five mean classrooms demonstrate a mix of effective and ineffective or no interactions, while scores of six to seven mean that trained observer consistently views effective teacher-child interactions (National Center on Early Childhood Development, Teaching, and Learning 2016).

During FFY’s 2012 through 2015, 1,370 Head Start grantees nationwide, 78 Head Start grantees in the Region 9 States of Arizona, California, Hawaii, and Nevada, and 78 Head Start grantees in California were assessed during their CLASS monitoring reviews (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016c). Head Start grantees California, the Region 9 States, and the United States had Emotional Support and Classroom Organization domain scores in the high range, and had Instructional Support scores in the low to middle range (see Table 5). 10

### Table 5: Average CLASS® Domain Scores Aggregated across FFYs 2012-2015 for the United States and California (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016c).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Region 9 States</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Numbers of Head Start Grantees Assessed</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Organization:</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support:</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanwhile, the 2006 and 2014 cohorts of the Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES) showed an increase of 0.5 points in the average CLASS Instructional Support scores from 1.9 to 2.4 (Aikens et al. 2016). The Office of Research, Planning, and Evaluation in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services oversees the cohorts of its FACES. By sampling nationally representative samples of three- to four-year-old children entering Head Start for the first time during the fall of their program year, their families, Head Start teachers, classrooms, centers, and programs, cohorts of FACES collect descriptive information about the characteristics, experiences and outcomes of Head Start children and families and about the characteristics of the Head Start programs that serve them. Each FACES cohort draws a sample of from Head Start programs and centers from across the 50 states and the District of Columbia (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016d).

10 Prior large scale evaluations of CLASS indicated that mean preschool classroom scores are lower in the Instructional Support domain than in the Emotional Support and Classroom Organization domains (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016c).
Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised

While CLASS measures the quality of instructional and social emotional aspects of the classroom environment, the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R) is a global measure of the structural features of the classroom quality (Moiduddin et al. 2017). Two factors of the ECERS-R are the Provisions for Learning and Teaching and Interactions. Comparing the scores of the two factors from the FACES 2006 to FACES 2014 cohorts, the average score for ECERS-R Provisions for Learning increased by 0.8 points from 3.6 to 4.4 and average score for the ECERS-R Teaching and Interactions increased by 1.1 points from 4.0 to 5.1 (Aikens et al. 2016).11

Opportunities and Needs in California’s Early Childhood Care and Education System

Currently, California’s early childhood care and education system consists of a multitude of programs for preschool-aged children that are funded by one or more sources with different standards, accountability, monitoring, and eligibility requirements. California invests $5.4 billion a year in early childhood care and education programs, drawing upon state and federal funding streams, including the state’s General Fund, revenues raised by taxing cigarettes, federal Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP), and Title IV-E (PDG B-5 Grant document 2018).

Of $5.4 billion in funding, these entities administer these amounts:

- \$4.9 billion from the state Department of Education (CDE)
- \$371 million from the state Department of Social Services (CDSS)
- \$100 million from First 5 CA (F5CA)
- \$78 million from the state Department of Developmental Services (CDDS) (PDG B-5 Grant document 2018)

In addition to the $5.4 billion, Head Start and Early Head Start grantees received $1.1 billion in federal funding to provide Early Head Start and Head Start services. Federally recognized tribes received $12 million in federal CCDF funds to provide child care services (PDG B-5 Grant document 2018).

In March 2018, federal lawmakers appropriated a $2.37 billion increase in discretionary FFY 2018 funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG). Drawing upon the $229.7 million increase in its FFY 2018 allocation, California will spend $102 million per year for two years to pay for 11,307 new vouchers to help families with paying for child care and will spend $26.4 million initially to start annual inspections of licensed child care programs, (National Women’s Law Center 2019).

California’s ELC programs serve nearly 526,000 children through 13 direct service programs with nearly 124,000 children through the Early Head Start and Head Start programs, and more than 20,000 children across 84 federally recognized tribes (PDG B-5 Grant document 2018).

---

11 The ECERS-R scores range from 1 to 7. The ECERS-R publisher classifies the average ECERS-R factor scores as follows: 1 or 2 equals inadequate quality, 3 or 4 equals minimal quality, 5 or 6 equals good quality, and 7 equals excellent quality (Aikens et al. 2016).
During the 2018-2019 year, California funded 169,000 California State Preschool slots. The Legislative Analyst’s Office indicated that this figure may count children dually enrolled in California State Preschool and Head Start. Of the total California State Preschool slots, the Legislative Analyst’s Office reported California funded 103,000 part-day and 67,000 California State Preschool slots (Legislative Analyst’s Office 2019). Figure 1 below depicts the interaction of early childhood programs and funding streams at the federal, state, local, and provider levels.

Access and Quality
Access exists by age and location and in the early childhood education system in California.

Age
According to the California Budget & Policy Center, the supply of subsidized child care and preschool falls short of serving 89 percent of eligible children from birth through age 12. In 2017, only 228,100 (11 percent) of 2 million children from birth through age 12 eligible for subsidized child care and preschool care programs in California were enrolled in a program that provided full-day, year-round care (Schumacher 2019). Of 2,351,000 children from birth to age five living in California, nearly 50 percent lived in households with incomes at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty line (Melnick et al. 2018).

During the 2015-2016 year, 963,000 of 2,351,000 children (41 percent) were eligible for federal- and state-subsidized early learning programs, including California State Preschool, Transitional Kindergarten, General Child Care, and Alternative Payment Child Care, Head Start and Early Head Start. Of 963,000 eligible children, only 33 percent were enrolled in these programs, and 67 percent lacked access to these early learning programs (Melnick et al. 2018).

Of 505,000 eligible children from birth to age three, 70,000 (14 percent) were enrolled and 435,000 (86 percent) lacked access due to a lack of supply. Of 458,000 eligible three- and four-year-olds, 248,000 (54 percent) were enrolled and 210,000 (46 percent) were not because of a lack of supply (Melnick et al. 2017). In California, Head Start programs served 86,070 Head Start-eligible preschool-aged children in 77,973 federally funded Head Start slots during the 2017-2018 program year (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2019a).

12 The 228,100 figure represents children enrolled in the full-day California State Preschool Program or in one of the following subsidized child care programs: Alternative Payment Program; CalWORKs Stages One, Two, or Three; Family Child Care Home Network; General Child Care; and the Migrant Child Care and Development Program (Schumacher 2019).

13 The 86,070 figure represents Head Start-eligible preschool-aged children who were served by Head Start, American Indian/Alaskan Native Head Start, and Migrant Seasonal Head Start programs during the 2017-2018 program year. The figure excludes children from birth through age two served by Migrant and Seasonal Head Start programs and Early Head Start programs. Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration of Children and Families, Office of Head Start. (2019a). Office of Head Start – Program Information Report (PIR), Summary Report – 2018 – State Level. Washington, DC. The difference between 86,070 children served and 77,973 federally funded Head Start slots is due to enrollment turnover when families move out of the service area and families in the service area enroll their children in Head Start during the program year.
Figure 1

Many Agencies Control California’s ECE Programs

**Federal**
- U.S. Dept. of Health & Human Services
  - Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Bureau
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care
- Health Resources and Services Organization
- U.S. Dept. of Education
  - Office of Special Education Programs
  - Office of Elementary & Secondary Education

**State**
- CA Dept. of Social Services
- CA Dept. of Education
- CA Dept. of Public Health
- CA Dept. of Dev. Services
- First 5 California

**Local**
- County Welfare Departments
- Alternative Payment Providers
- School Districts
- Special Education Local Plan Areas
- County Departments of Health
- First 5 County Commissions

**Provider**
- Private Service Providers
- Licensed Centers
- Schools
- License-Exempt Homes
- Licensed Family Homes
- Home Visitors

**Programs**
- California State Preschool Program
- Transitional Kindergarten
- Head Start
- Special Education
- General Child Care and Development
- Alternative Payment Program
- Title I Funded Preschool
- Home Visiting

**Note:** This graphic shows the multiple agencies that administer state- and federally funded ECE programs in California. Administrative oversight includes setting regulations, allocating resources, managing contracts, and overseeing program quality, among other responsibilities. Administrators may, but do not always, provide funding. ECE programs (the colored lines shown in the key) may be offered by various kinds of local providers, some of whom offer multiple programs at a given time. Several other organizations, particularly First 5, resource and referral agencies, and QRIS consortia, also provide considerable support to providers and programs, although their role varies by county.


Source: Learning Policy Institute, January 23, 2018
Only 12 percent of children birth to age two attended an early childhood education program in a licensed center or family child care home. Nine percent of subsidy-eligible infants and toddlers attended a licensed early childhood program. Most of these children are in unlicensed settings of varying quality (Manship et al. 2018).

In California, the quality of early childhood programs varies markedly (Manship et al. 2018). Considerable variation in the quality of early childhood education programs exists across counties (Manship et al. 2018). Differing requirements among the California’s publicly-funded programs and California’s Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) contributes to the uneven levels of quality.

The programmatic requirements differ regarding teacher credentials, class size, staff-child ratios, curriculum, and standards (Melnick et al. 2018). California has a large proportion of children in programs with no standards (Stipek 2018). Children from low-income families disproportionally attend child care programs with no standards (Stipek 2018).

License-exempt child care programs are not required to meet standards (Stipek 2018). More than 90 percent of children attending license-exempt care child care programs participate in CalWORKs, a state-funded child care program for children from low-income families (Stipek 2018).

The state’s monitoring of licensed child care programs is limited. Meanwhile, a minority of early childhood programs participate in California’s QRIS. Only 28.7 percent of 12,246 licensed day care and infant centers and 6.8 percent of 29,348 license-exempt programs participated in California’s voluntary QRIS in September 2017 (Stipek 2018). Ratings of programs participating in California’s QRIS are not easily accessible to parents (Stipek 2018). In most state QRISs, financial incentives are provided to encourage programs to participate and to award improvements in the quality ratings of programs (Stipek 2018). California’s QRIS does not provide these financial incentives (Stipek 2018).

During the past five years, national and California organizations have documented the large need for increased public and private investments to maintain, repair, remodel, and construct early learning facilities.

The Bipartisan Policy Center has drawn national attention to the needs for increased private and public investments in high-quality early learning facilities and for implementing policies to support these facilities for all children across the country (Bipartisan Policy Center 2018; Smith and Tracey 2019). In the United States, nearly 130,000 center-based early childhood education programs serve nearly 7 million children, and 1 million in-home providers care for 2.7 million children. According to the Bipartisan Policy Center (2018), many communities lack early learning facilities, and many children receive early
childhood education services in settings that hinder their learning, are unsafe, and may not promote their health development.

Three years ago, the federal Office of Head Start published its report to Congress about Head Start facilities. During FFY 2015 monitoring reviews of Head Start centers in states across the country, including California, the Office of Head Start collected observational data about status of Head Start facilities. The Office of Head Start found that more than half of Head Start centers were constructed before 1990 and more than one-third of centers were built before 1970 (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2015).

Of centers constructed prior to 1990, less than half have been renovated. The mean age of the centers is about 40 years. Although most Head Start centers seem to be functional and sustainable, some buildings were observed to have facility challenges that one would expect in aging and weathered facilities, such as weatherization of buildings and playgrounds and deterioration and structural defects in facilities. The report called for new funding to maintain, repair, and renovate existing centers and to build new centers suitable for supplying Head Start services (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2015).

**California**

Similar to programs providing early childhood education services in communities in other states, many organizations across California recognize the need for public and private investments to maintain and repair existing facilities and to build new ones to accommodate the proposed expansion of state-funded early childhood programs in California.

In fact, California’s early childhood education infrastructure has only the capacity to serve less than 25 percent of the nearly three million children under age six (Howell 2019). The need for high-quality early learning facilities in California exceeds the available resources to finance the repair, maintenance, and construction of high-quality early learning facilities (Low Income Investment Fund 2016, 7). According to the Children’s Investment Fund and LIIF, new funding for facilities is needed in three areas: repairing and maintaining existing facilities; making capital improvements and renovating existing facilities; building new facilities. (Low Income Investment Fund 2016, 7).

The Low-Income Investment Fund reported the lack of child care facilities meant that $74 million in state child care operating subsidies were unspent from 2004 to 2007. If facilities had been available, an additional 60,000 low-income children could have received early childhood education services (Low Income Investment Fund 2016, 5).

Private child care providers often cannot afford to lease, purchase, or build quality facilities. Instead, they frequently depend on the generosity of churches, public schools, and landlord to charge them below market rents for space or provide them with free space (Low Income Investment Fund 2016, 6).

Santa Clara County provides a recent snapshot of early learning facility needs and issues. In a survey of 86 licensed, center-based providers and representatives from 28 school districts in Santa Clara County, 76 percent of preschool providers indicated that their facilities needed moderate-to-extensive improvements and 25 percent of providers serving preschool-aged children plan to serve more
preschoolers (Santa Clara County Office of Education 2018, 5-6). The survey asked the respondents about the obstacles they face in opening, maintaining, enhancing, or expanding facilities. The top five provider responses to the question were:

- **Shortage of space** (35 percent)
- **Issues locating** a site (33 percent)
- **Scarcity** of local or state funding (25 percent)
- **Issues obtaining** a license (20 percent),
- **Local restrictions** regarding zoning or land use (20 percent) (Santa Clara County Office of Education 2018, 5-6)

**Mutually Beneficial Opportunities for Head Start Programs and State and Local Early Childhood Care and Education Agencies to Work Together for the Benefit of California’s Highest Needs Preschoolers and Their Families**

California’s early childhood care and education system has opportunities and needs that can best addressed by leveraging current federal and state investments in early childhood care and education programs with the potential new investments under consideration by the California State Legislature and with ensuring all stakeholders participate in the activities funded by the PDG B-5 grant. By working together for the benefit of California’s highest needs preschoolers and their families, Head Start and state and local early childhood care and education agencies have mutually beneficial opportunities to influence the drafting and enactment of legislation and the implementation and outcomes of PDG B-5 projects.

**Legislative Proposals to Expand Early Childhood Care and Education Opportunities**

Both Gov. Newsom and Rep. McCarty have made legislative proposals to increase the supply of early childhood care and education opportunities for preschool-age children. Gov. Newsom proposed expanding full-day, full-year access to State Preschool for 200,000 four-year-olds by 2021-2022 and increasing the quality and availability of child care. Rep. McCarty introduced legislation to expand the supply and quality of State Preschool and Transitional Kindergarten Programs by enhancing their quality standards and adding nearly 70,000 new State Preschool slots to be served through State Preschool, Head Start, or Transitional Kindergarten. He introduced a bill calling for investing new funds to retrofit existing facilities and construct new ones to accommodate the potential increased supply of state-subsidized State Preschool and Transitional Kindergarten services.

As experienced providers of high-quality preschool programs to preschool-aged children from income-eligible families, Head Start programs in California are well-positioned to support the potential expansion and implementation of high-quality preschool and child care services. As the map above shows, Head Start grantees are located throughout California and provide high-quality early childhood care and education services. Taking into consideration their local community needs assessment findings and available federal Head Start funding, Head Start grantees provide services in urban, suburban, and rural communities and ethnically and racially diverse populations in these communities.
The Head Start grant design is based on a community assessment, instead of funded enrollment model. Head Start frequently has more of an institutional presence in communities while in some cases State Preschool contracts are moved around periodically.

Many Head Start programs currently partner with the California Department of Education and local providers of State Preschool and General Child Care services to leverage their federal Head Start grant funds by layering them with state preschool and child care funds to provide a full-day duration of high-quality early childhood care and education services. In many of Head Start’s partnerships with State Preschool providers, Head Start grantees layer their federal part-day Head Start program option funds with part-day State Preschool funds to provide:

- **Full-day** of high-quality preschool services.
- **Comprehensive** health, nutrition, and family support services

Through Head Start partnerships with the General Child Care Program, many Head Start programs leverage their full-day, full-year federal Head Start grant funds with child care reimbursement rates to provide before-and-after child care services to provide full-working day, full-year services.

Head Start practitioners are skilled in building high-quality early childhood care and education programs. With their expertise, they can collaborate with the state and their local partners to ensure that the expansion of preschool and child care services for potentially hundreds of thousands of preschool-age children are of high quality. Depending on the community, Head Start programs will be able to provide facilities and/or capacity to accommodate the increased supply early childhood care and education services that potentially would be increased by the legislative proposal under consideration by California lawmakers.

**PDG B-5 Opportunities to Improve California’s Early Childhood System for California’s High Needs and Disadvantaged Children**

The participation of Head Start representatives from geographically, ethnically, racially, and linguistically diverse communities throughout the Golden State should be encouraged in the development and implementation of a robust statewide needs assessment and innovative birth through five strategic plan—both funded by the PDG B-5. Head Start participation in both initiatives will provide mutually beneficial opportunities for the state, the Head Start community, and other stakeholders.

**Data from Statewide Needs Assessment Will Inform Future Expansion of Services**

The development and implementation of a robust statewide needs assessment will provide an opportunity for the state, the Head Start community, and other stakeholders to collect mutually beneficial data, including zip code-level data on enrollment, facilities, licensing, and children dually enrolled in Head Start and California State Preschool programs and Head Start and California General Child Care programs. The collection of accurate dual enrollment data by the State and its early childhood care and education partners would be markedly simplified and strengthened by requiring unique identifiers for children enrolled in publicly supported programs, including Head Start. In several States, such as Florida, Pennsylvania, and Vermont, Head Start programs and relevant State agencies have begun using unique identifiers for children enrolled in Head Start and other publicly funded early childhood programs. The use of unique identifiers for Head Start-enrolled children is consistent with...
§1302.53(b)(3) in the Head Start Program Performance Standards regarding the integration and sharing of relevant Head Start data with State education data systems to track the educational performance of Head Start graduates as they progress through the kindergarten through grade 12. In the Head Start Program Performance Standards (2106a), §1302.53(b)(3) reads, “A program, with the exception of American Indian and Alaska Native programs unless they would like to and to the extent practicable, should integrate and share relevant data with state education data systems, to the extent practicable, if the program can receive similar support and benefits as other participating early childhood programs.”

The statewide needs assessment data will provide useful information for future planning of expanding early childhood care and education programs in the state. Head Start programs already collect community-level data through their community needs assessments and their partnerships with child care providers and local education agencies. With extensive knowledge of their local communities, Head Start representatives have a chance to influence the questions posed in the statewide needs assessment.

**Detailed and Innovative Birth through Five Strategic Plan Will Guide Future Expansion and Quality Improvement Activities**

Based on the needs assessment findings, information contained in existing state and local plans, and by engagement with stakeholders, California will create a single, unified, detailed and innovative strategic plan. This plan will likely provide guidance to policymakers and Head Start and other early learning practitioners about how to implement future quality improvement strategies and how and where to increase access to early childhood care and education services for children and families with high needs.

The strategic plan will likely inform how early childhood care and education programs, such as Head Start, will provide high-quality services to children with high needs within California’s mixed-delivery system. Head Start community-based agencies have a sophisticated knowledge and expertise about how to braid federal and state funding streams to provide high-quality services. By bringing this knowledge and expertise to table, Head Start representatives can influence the content of the strategic plan.
Policy Recommendations
For policy proposal development purposes, we offer policy recommendations for how representatives of community-based Head Start agencies can potentially participate in and influence the outcomes of legislative and PDG B-5 initiatives and partner with the state, school districts, counties, home providers, and philanthropy to help preschool-age children and their families be successful in their lives. Our hope and request is that this paper will generate discussion within the Head Start community.

In addition to the policy recommendations provided below, we call for more specific recommendations from the Head Start community about how elements of Head Start Program Model should be incorporated into legislative proposals and PDG B-5 discussed in this paper. The elements include the Head Start Program Model’s two-generational approach, foci on the development the whole child, family, and community, provision of inclusive comprehensive services including behavioral support and mental health services, promotion of parent and family engagement, implementation of evidence-based curriculum and developmental assessments with fidelity, commitment to continuous improvement, supportive professional development system, and emphasis on coaching and mentoring to support classroom teachers and staff.

These more specific recommendations from Head Start community members should be shared with the Region 9 Head Start Association and California Head Start. We defer to California Head Start’s legislative and policy agenda as most reflective of Head Start needs in California.

Our broad policy recommendations are:

- At the state- and local-levels, the Head Start community should participate in the PDG B-5 funded statewide needs assessment data collection and related activities;
- At the state- and local-levels, the Head Start community must be represented in the PDG B-5 Strategic Planning Process;
- Head Start programs should be eligible for and participate in all birth-to-five initiatives that support facilities for government subsidized early childhood care and education;
- Head Start programs should be eligible for and participate in all birth-to-five initiatives that improve workforce compensation for government-subsidized early childhood care and education teachers staff.
- At the statewide- and Head Start program-levels, Head Start must should be participate in data collection initiatives that:
  - Support strategic policy and program planning and
  - Ensure the federal investment in Head Start grantees is fully utilized by leveraging the federal investment with the State’s investment in its California Preschool, General Child Care, and other early childhood care and education programs to:
    - Maximize the benefits of the federal, state, and local investments for California’s children and families and
    - Develop a coordinated referral system for ensuring preschool-aged children and their families are placed in the early childhood care and education program that will best meet their needs.
Within these broad policy recommendations, we offer specific policy recommendations in Tables 6-9 below.

Table 6: Governor’s Budget Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisions</th>
<th>Actions to Develop Policy Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand access and build capacity for full-day kindergarten by providing funds to construct new or retrofit existing facilities for full-day kindergarten programs</td>
<td>Head Start community conduct an inventory of their facilities to determine the extent to which it can support the expansion of the supply of full-day kindergarten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head Start community should support and provide its expertise in high quality facilities by communicating best practices in facilities to the Newsom Administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move closer toward implementing universal preschool by increasing full-day, full-year access to California State Preschool to all eligible low-income four-year-olds to fund a total of 200,000 slots by 2021-2022 and by providing additional slots to not-for-profit providers because local education agencies have limited capacity.</td>
<td>Head Start community and its state and local partners should support and actively engage with the Newsom Administration and the California State Legislature in the expansion of full-day, full-year preschool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head Start community should conduct an inventory of its capacity to determine the extent to which it can support the expansion of the supply of full-day, full-year access to State Preschool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For appropriate initiatives, the Head Start community should offer its knowledge of braiding/layering funding streams to provide a longer duration of high-equality services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California Department of Education should count each year the numbers of children dually enrolled in Head Start and State Preschool programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure four-year-old children can access a full-day, full-year California State Preschool program by eliminating the existing requirement that families with four-year-olds provide proof of parent employment or enrollment in higher education to access the full-day program</td>
<td>Head Start community should communicate to the Newsom Administration and the California State Legislature its support on this initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a long-term plan to provide universal preschool in California</td>
<td>Head Start community should fully participate in the development of the plan, and Head Start must ensure that it has a seat at all the tables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the quality and availability of child care</td>
<td>Head Start community should support this initiative and communicate to the Newsom Administration and the General Assembly how...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td>Actions to Develop Policy Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start programs can increase the quality and availability of child care.</td>
<td>Each year, the California Department of Education should count the numbers of children dually enrolled in Head Start and General Child Care programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Governor’s Office should prioritize working with Head Start grantees to ensure the federal investment in Head Start grantees is fully utilized by leveraging this federal investment with the State’s investment in its California Preschool, General Child Care, and other early childhood care and education programs to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maximize the benefits of the federal, state, and local investments for California’s children and families and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop a coordinated referral system for ensuring preschool-aged children and their families are placed in the early childhood care and education program that will best meet their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a long-term strategic plan for a more well-aligned, financed, and comprehensive child care system in the state.</td>
<td>Head Start community should fully participate in the development of the long-term strategic plan for a more well-aligned, financed, and comprehensive child care system in the state by ensuring Head Start representatives have a seat at all the tables and work with state and local partners to build a shared vision and plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7: AB 123 Relating to Early Childhood Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisions</th>
<th>Policy Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand access to high-quality universal preschool including the California State Preschool Program, federal Head Start programs, and transitional kindergarten, to all four-year-old children starting in communities that need it most, which would be considered communities that serve all four-year-olds that live within the attendance area of an elementary school where at least 70 percent of pupils qualify for free or reduced-price meals</td>
<td>Head Start community and its state and local partners should support and actively engage with Rep. McCarty, the Newsom Administration, and the General Assembly in the expansion of high-quality universal preschool. California Department of Education should count each year the numbers of four-year-olds dually enrolled in Head Start and State Preschool programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase access to high-quality preschool to all three-year-olds in poverty through the California State Preschool Program or the federal Head Start programs.</td>
<td>Head Start community and its state and local partners should support and actively engage with Rep. McCarty, the Newsom Administration, and the General Assembly to increase access to high-quality preschool to all three-year-olds in poverty. California Department of Education should count each year the numbers of three-year-olds dually enrolled in Head Start and State Preschool programs. County level funding allocations should be created based upon local assessments. Those funds should be allocated to maximize the gaps in services based upon the best information available and commonly understood by stakeholders. The proposed “local needs assessments” language in the bill should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td>Policy Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strengthened to protect the existing federally-funded Head Start slots.</td>
<td>We recommend that the legislation be amended to require the participation in local planning assessments and decision making by the Head Start grantee(s) affected by the assessment(s) and decision(s). With the aim of maximizing the gaps in services based upon the best information available and commonly understood by stakeholders, we recommend that the bill be amended so that decisions about county-level funding allocations must have the approval of the representative from the Head Start grantee(s) that would be affected by those decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the California State Preschool Program and enable local educational agencies to blend the program with transitional kindergarten</td>
<td>Head Start community should support this access and financing initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the standard reimbursement rate by 23 percent in the 2019-2020 budget year to increase teacher salaries to a professional wage</td>
<td>Head Start community should support this initiative particularly providers in low-income communities because higher reimbursement rates help support Head Start partnerships with center-based and family child homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer local educational agencies a supplemental grant of $3,000 per pupil for Transitional Kindergarten, if all of the following standards are met: Classrooms have a credential teacher and an instructional aide; Classrooms have no more than 24 pupils, and one adult per 12 pupils; A full-day program is provided to all pupils; and pupil progress is assessed for purposes of informing instruction and continuous quality improvement</td>
<td>Head Start community should support this quality initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the quality standards of both the California State Preschool Program and Transitional Kindergarten by achieving all of the following: Requiring over an eight-year period all lead teachers in the California State Preschool Program to have a bachelor’s degree and any additional requirements as established by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing; limiting California State Preschool Program classrooms to no more than 24 pupils and two adults in the classroom; and requiring all transitional kindergarten teachers to obtain a Preschool through grade 3 Teaching credential or certificate</td>
<td>Head Start community should support this professional development and workforce initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Head Start community should ask Rep. McCarty how many teachers would be expected to meet this requirement and how much would it cost for the expected number of teachers to reach it.</td>
<td>The Head Start community should survey Head Start grantees to ascertain how many Head Start community needs to support and how much it would cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td>Policy Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and instructional aides to have an associate’s degree with 23 units of early childhood education or alternative certification as established by the Commission on Teaching Credentialing</td>
<td>teachers already meet this proposed requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: AB 124 relating to the Preschool Facilities Bond Act of 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisions</th>
<th>Policy Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If enacted by California lawmakers and subsequently approved by the voters in a 2020 statewide general election referendum, AB 124, the Preschool Facilities Bond Act of 2010, would authorize the sale of $500 million in bonds to finance a preschool facility grant program. The proceeds from the sale of the bonds would be deposited in the Preschool Facilities Bond Act of 2020 Fund. The Legislature would be able to appropriate monies from the bond fund to the Superintendent of Public Instruction to provide grants to local educational agencies or contracting agencies that receive funding for a state preschool program. The grants must be used... “for the renovation, repair, or improvement of an existing building to make the building suitable for licensure for preschool services, and for the purchase of new relocatable preschool facilities.”</td>
<td>We recommend that language be added into AB124 to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Enable</strong> the funds to support the conversion of facilities from serving preschoolers to infants and toddlers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Pay for</strong> “start-up costs” related to expanding access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Require</strong> the Superintendent to also provide grants to non-profit organizations, county offices of education, and Head Start grantees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Head Start community applauds the design of a grant program to avoid community-based early childhood programs from taking on debt, which many are unable to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Head Start community should conduct a survey of its facility needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: California PDG B-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Policy Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California will conduct a statewide birth-through-five needs assessment. The needs assessment survey will collect information at the zip code-level regarding enrollment, facilities, licensing, and other topics. The American Institutes for Research must complete the statewide community needs assessment by July 2019.</td>
<td>Head Start community should participate fully in the community needs assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region 9 Head Start Association should consider providing technical assistance and help all Head Start and Early Head Start grantees collect zip-code level data in their service areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIR should collect data on the number of Head Start-enrolled children who are dually enrolled in California Preschool Program and the number of Head Start-enrolled children who are dually enrolled in General Child Care Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To facilitate the collection dual program enrollment data and track the educational progress of Head Start graduates in the kindergarten through grade 12 system, the Head Start community in concert with the Superintendent of Public Instruction should consider the adoption of unique identifiers for Head Start-enrolled children provided Head Start programs would receive similar support and benefits as other early childhood programs using unique identifiers with their children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the needs assessment findings, California will develop a strategic plan that will provide guidance to policymakers to increase access to services for children and families with high needs. The Governor’s State Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care will play pivotal role in digesting the findings from the needs assessment and using them to craft the statewide strategic plan.</td>
<td>Head Start community should participate fully in the strategic planning process and ensure that it has seats at the various tables throughout the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California Head Start and the California Head Start State Collaboration Office need to be appointed to the Governor’s State Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head Start representative(s) on the Governor’s State Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care should participate fully in the statewide strategic planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The State of California should allocate new funding to the California Head Start Collaboration Office for a project to develop a strategy for leveraging Head Start’s unique capacity for serving the needs of children who are experiencing homelessness, are in foster care,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives</td>
<td>Policy Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have special needs, have had multiple Adverse Childhood Experiences, and have had suffered trauma.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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