

## **Coordination among CCDF, Head Start, and Pre-Kindergarten Programs**

### **Description**

This session explored how coordination among early childhood programs such as the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), Head Start, and state-sponsored pre-kindergarten programs may be improving program quality and child outcomes. The discussion continued exploration of gaps revealed in last year's meeting and began to formulate strategies for more focused and cross-cutting research.

### **Facilitator**

Sara Vecchiotti, Child Care Bureau

### **Discussants**

- Ajay Chaudry, New York City Administration for Children's Services
- Rick Brandon, University of Washington, Human Services Policy Center
- Diane Schilder, Education Development Center

### **Scribes**

- Nancy Crowell, Georgetown University
- Rosemary Kendall, National Child Care Information Center

### **Issues**

- Intersection between CCDF and other programs
- Findings from the Ohio Child Care/Head Start Partnership, data collection issues, and coordination of systems that are changing with the new Early Learning Initiative and other initiatives
- Head Start as an "economically segregated" program from which non-Head Start children also benefit through Head Start/Child Care partnerships
- The role of family, friend and neighbor care in coordination efforts
- How coordination activities impact on infant, toddler, and after-school care
- How state administrators use research on coordination to inform their policy decisions
- How to set up an early care and education system which reaches children across a wide income eligibility threshold

### **Handouts in the Session Folder**

- Coordination Among CCDF, Head Start and PreKindergarten Programs

### **Discussion Notes**

#### Summary of issues raised and discussed by panel members and participants

- Blending of funds provides an opportunity
- Children and families receive benefits
- Teachers receive more support in partnerships
- Age and economic segregation are issues
- Salaries issues are an important workforce issue

#### Summary of running discussion

- Intersection between CCDF and other programs
- Findings from the Ohio child care and Head Start partnership, data collection issues, and coordination of systems that are changing with the new Early Learning Initiative and other initiatives
- The role of family, friend and neighbor care in coordination efforts
- How coordination activities impact on infant, toddler, and after-school care
- How state administrators use research on coordination to inform their policy decisions

#### Ajay Chaudry

Coordination Among CCDF, Head Start, and Pre-Kindergarten Programs — Rethinking Child Care: An Integrated Plan for Early Childhood Development in New York City

1. Early Childhood Care and Education Services in New York City:
  - Head Start

CCPRC Annual Meeting  
Concurrent Breakout, Session 17  
Wednesday, April 26, 11:00 a.m.

- Administration for Children's Services (ACS) contracted care (group and family child care)
- ACS vouchers
- Human Resources Administration (HRA) vouchers for welfare-to-work/TANF population
- Department of Education universal pre kindergarten (UPK)

2. By age:

- Infant/Toddler
- 4 year olds –10 times more likely to get services from city (UPK, Head Start) compared to a one-year old
- Integration– opportunity to distribute services according to need and equitably to serve children of different ages

3. Service coverage:

- Young children below poverty line in New York City – 29%
- NYC rate for children eligible for subsidized early childhood development services (below 200 % of the FPL) – 42.2%
- Percentage of low-income population currently served by subsidized early childhood programs – 30%
- Additional service coverage provided by UPK – approximately 50,000 four-year-olds

4. Integration Objectives:

- Fluidity – seamless service delivery
- Unified system – one front door
- Serve the most vulnerable
- Reliable, flexible, coordinated

5. Strategies for intra-agency coordination (e.g., Head Start, family child care):

- Develop cost-sharing allocation models for children served across programs
- Merge TANF and low-income child care programs
- Share intake, enrollment and contract data across agencies
- Unify contracts
- Coordinate assessment, audit, performance and quality measures

6. Indicators of progress:

- No breaks in care
- Integration of TANF and low-income child care
- Equal access to voucher system
- Less pay disparity in pre kindergarten, Head Start, child care, unions, different models of service
- Families receiving child care and Head Start services receive information and referrals to both programs

7. Information systems:

- Reliable
- Flexible
- Coordinated

Rick Brandon

Cost of Head Start and early care and education (ECE) in Ohio (2 community agencies, 6 centers, mix Head Start and child care, urban and rural, high quality + Ohio partners)

1. Mutual Learning: Head Start and Human Services Policy Center

CCPRC Annual Meeting  
Concurrent Breakout, Session 17  
Wednesday, April 26, 11:00 a.m.

- Community Head Start agencies learn what their true costs per child are, and how rural/urban costs compare
  - HSPC learns about range of costs and components
2. Key issues:
- Cost and revenues per child
  - Staff qualifications and pay
  - Ratios
  - Professional development
  - Non-personnel costs
3. Revenues:
- Multiple sources and blended funding (Head Start finding)
  - Actual costs per child were intermediate between high Head Start and low CCDF payment levels
4. Wide variation in staff education levels
5. Wide variation in hourly wages
6. Child/adult ratios:
- Part time during the day, during the week and staff adjustments
  - Difference with urban (consistent and carefully managed) and rural (not so)
  - Need to look at pattern during the day
7. Non-teaching costs:
- Vary widely – some done at community agency level
  - Professional development costs (especially compared to public schools and to other states)
  - Hard to get good data

- Benefit from partnership with Head Start (curriculum, services, nutrition); Head Start moves away from being fully economically segregated program
8. Non-Head Start children:
- Benefit from partnership with Head Start (curriculum, services, nutrition)
  - Head Start moves away from being fully economically segregated program
9. Comparison of costs:
- Total costs per child were about half way between higher revenues per child from Head Start and lower revenues per child from CCDF subsidies – agencies effectively blended funds and provided service at the average combined revenue level.
  - 35 vs. 45 hours a week in care has implications for Head Start.

Diane Schilder

Ohio Partnerships between Head Start and Child Care

1. Differences in observed quality between partnering and non-partnering providers
2. Varying levels of partnership activity:
  - Duration
  - Number of partnership children
  - Services from partners (funds, professional development, other services)
3. Curriculum support:
  - Many teacher-developed
  - Head Start more likely to have curriculum
4. Partnering services:
  - More likely to provide screenings, referrals, range of services

5. Good communication with partners:
  - Partnerships with better stated goals had better results
6. Well defined goals and high levels of communication:
  - Predict benefits of partnership
  - Improve ELLCO and ERS scores
7. Having a partnership is related to improvements in ELLCO and ECERS-R scores
8. Data on child outcomes:
  - Will be collecting
  - Will complete observation of family child care homes

#### Questions and Comments

1. What about Early Head Start?

It has a huge role to play. There are few resources. NYC is looking for Head Start waivers (now limited to 8% of Head Start budget), wants to age down Head Start.
2. What about the issue of age segregation?

Families are being separated and there is economic segregation. Middle-income children are left out. Policies shouldn't promote it (see Gary Henry, Georgia UPK studies)
3. Salary is a workforce issue.

#### End of Session

*Breakout session notes are brief summaries of issues, findings and ideas discussed by participants and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Child Care Bureau or other members of the Child Care Policy Research Consortium.*