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OVERVIEW

To meet the expected demand for preschool, most California counties will coordinate planning through the County Offices of Education. Some counties will rely on local public schools to provide the preschool program. But to date, most counties have chosen to build upon the existing child care infrastructure to develop a mixed delivery system of providers from the public and private sector. The benefits of mixed delivery systems are that you can:

- Leverage existing physical facilities thereby avoiding new construction costs or delays in deployment because of construction schedules and slow delivery of portable classrooms.
- Optimize investments already made in publicly funded programs (by adding funding to the base rather than starting from scratch).
- Increase accessibility to preschool for families who need full-day, full-year child care.
- Provide parental choice to the maximum extent reasonable.

Despite the potential of a mixed delivery system, the concept is easier said than done. Governance structures tend to skew program management and organizational culture toward one dominant model. Receiving public funds requires a level of fiscal and program accountability not required of most private providers. Decentralizing contracting processes creates transaction costs that are borne by the taxpayers. In a nutshell, private providers (non-profit and for-profit) operate in the marketplace, schools operate within bureaucracies. The former is organized to be an independent provider of services; the latter hews to the principles of standardization and centralization. Both are capable of upholding the public trust; the bottom line is accepting the responsibility to be accountable to the same fiscal and quality performance standards and comply with their other respective applicable state and local regulations. It will take dedicated effort of all participants to realize the potential of a mixed delivery system because it is always easier to do things “the same old way.”

This section provide a brief review of models for a mixed delivery system, and covers the topics of local and state governance, provider types (center, homes, schools), and managing multiple funding streams that must ultimately track that unduplicated units of service were provided to a single child over the course of the day.

Relevant Preschool California Principles:

Programs Will Match Families’ Needs
Families will have access to quality programs with settings, locations, hours and participatory opportunities that meet their needs and preferences and support their aspirations for their children. Programs will be linked to community resources supporting the healthy development of children and families. Part-day preschool will meet the needs of working families by being integrated with full-day care as seamlessly as possible.
SAMPLE APPROACHES

Mixed Delivery of Providers
Almost all California counties that have initiated a new preschool system have decided to build upon a mixed delivery system of providers, including family child care, if they meet certain quality criteria. (See list of innovative approaches to family childcare below.) Los Angeles County and Merced County have experimented with a Family Child Care Network type model called a “Hub” where as other counties have engaged with family child care providers directly. States such as Georgia, New Jersey, New York, Florida, Illinois and Massachusetts have built upon a mix of public and private centers with limited family child care inclusion. The Oklahoma system operates almost completely through the public school systems.

Innovative Approaches to Including Family Child Care

- **Los Angeles.** LAUP contracts with 67 Family Child Care (FCC) providers through five HUB agencies. These Hubs have served as the central support center for the LAUP FCC providers.

- **Ventura.** Ventura is in contract negotiations to implement the following family child care model. FCCH PFA programs will provide children with 3.5 hours of instruction for 3 days each week for the 12 month prekindergarten year (rather than the school year) to provide the minimum number of 612.5 program hours. Model 1: providers will employ a teacher’s aide to provide supervision of non pre-k children during PFA program hours. During those hours, the PFA qualified provider will present curriculum and activities in keeping with the PFA guidelines below for prek children. The Neighborhood Education Specialist (NES) will spend a minimum of 1.5 hours per week at each Model 1 FCCH providing technical assistance on curriculum and assisting with assessment and monitoring of program quality and child outcomes. Model 2: Will combine three FCCH sites (at least one of which must be a large FCCH) into a single PFA pod. Up to three prekindergarten-age children from each site will come together at the designated PFA pod (the large FCCH with adequate capacity for all 9 children) for PFA programming. The PFA curriculum will be provided by the NES.

- **Santa Clara.** PFA Demonstration project will be developed at four school sites. One large, licensed family child care home will be identified to serve 12 children, which will serve as a feeder to the Family Early Learning Center. The children in the family child care home will be invited to visit the center once a month to participate in group socialization. Parents served by the family child care home will be invited to monthly parent meetings.

- **Merced.** Merced County will pursue three approaches to including family child care in the delivery of PFA and thereby address the need of families for full-day services: 1) a Family Child Care Network Model, 2) a Circuit Teacher Model, or 3) a Wraparound Model. In addition, in order to participate in PFA, some children in rural areas of Merced County may need transportation to preschool sites. Especially for the 30 percent of the children who live in poverty, families may be unable to transport the children except by using public transportation, which may not be available. Therefore, the inclusion of El Nido school district is especially critical to demonstrate a rural alternative that leverages the involvement of Head Start and other providers.
Linkages to Full-Day, Full-Year

One of the most challenging issues in establishing a publicly funded preschool system is how to make a part-day program a viable option for all families, including those with two working parents, or those headed by a single working parent, by providing connections to full-day, full-year services when needed. One approach is to embed the preschool program in an existing full-day program, using the preschool funding stream to improve the quality of at least the part-day portion of the day. Another is to provide linkages to other early care and education providers for wraparound services. Yet another approach is to provide the funds necessary to finance a full-day, full-year program.

New Jersey’s Abbott preschool program operates 10 hours a day, five days per week. According to the NIEER 2005 State Preschool Yearbook (p. 104), revenue to make possible the full day program come from combining Department of Human Service funds with Department of Education funds. At least 180 days must include the 6-hour education day plus four hours of wrap-around service. Some districts choose to provide 10 hours of service for more than 180 days.

In Georgia and Oklahoma, the only states that have had universal preschool programs for some time, the trend is toward greater use of full-day programs. Georgia now provides 6.5 hours of preschool per day to more than 70,000 four-year-olds. In Oklahoma, where districts have a choice of full-day or part-day programs, enrollment in state-funded full-day programs has grown 82 percent since 2002 (NIEER, Can More Full-Day Pre-K Address the Readiness Gap?, Preschool Matters, May/June 2006 Volume 4, No. 4, p. 3).

Multiple Funding Streams

Multiple funding streams have been a sticky issue for most California counties hoping to build from existing public investments. They have had to work closely with the California Department of Education to ensure that programs already receiving funds for providing one kind of child care or preschool service do not have their base funding supplanted by the new preschool funding. Thus in some counties, such as Los Angeles, LAUP requires that its funding be used for quality enhancements such as staff development, materials and equipment, and not be used to support the base services already funded by the state. Similar fiscal accountability issues have been addressed by Head Start agencies that run concurrent federal and state programs in the same facilities or classrooms. In some cases, the children must be separated, but in all circumstances the Head Start funds must track to the eligible child and not be spread among a class of children. As services expand, but funding is inadequate to meet quality requirements and standards, as children may need both preschool and full-day care, as more than one program needs to be housed in a single facility, the issues of managing and accounting for multiple funding streams will need tending. The only true antidote to the problem of managing and negotiating case by case solutions is ample dedicated funding for a universal system.

Governance

California counties that have launched preschool programs in the past 5 years are using varied governance structures. In Ventura, San Diego, and San Mateo, the County Office of Education administers the program with funds from the state, county, and/or local First 5 and other municipal and private sources. These funds are awarded to local school districts to operate programs and the school district may contract with private providers and also operate in local schools. In Yolo County, the First 5
commission directly administers the program, and in San Francisco and Los Angeles, a new public non-profit agency was formed to manage the Universal Preschool program. The precedent set by the language of the failed ballot initiative (Preschool for All – Proposition 82) and the California Master Plan for School Readiness, called for the County Offices/Departments of Education to act as fiscal agent and administrator of the preschool programs. A carve-out or exception was granted to Los Angeles and San Francisco Counties because an administrative infrastructure had already been established. As more counties explore local options for developing systems, the County Offices have demonstrated initiative in wanting to support local school districts in expanding preschool and in getting preschool growth stimulated in areas of highest need.

Governance in other states is within the Department of Education except in three instances. The Georgia preschool program is a mixed delivery system administered by the Office of School Readiness, established by the governor ten years ago. Massachusetts has a state level, Department of Early Education and Care, created to coordinate funding streams dedicated to the education and care, specifically a future universal preschool program. It currently funds local councils created for the specific purpose of distributing funding to local communities. The new Voluntary Prekindergarten Program in Florida is a mixed delivery system administered through the Office of Early Learning located in the Agency for Workforce Innovation, with linkages to the state Department of Education. In New York, the Department of Education administers the program, but the state has set aside 20% for private providers to participate in the program, with the balance going to school districts. Illinois funds local community collaborations that in turn fund and provide oversight to a mixed delivery system.

BASIC ISSUES

Some of the issues that your county will need to address regarding its delivery system are listed below:

1. Challenges of Mixed Delivery System:
   a. How to increase compensation for teachers working with 4-year-olds and not with other age groups in a typical mixed age child care program.
   b. Variations in program standards (e.g., currently the State Preschool and General Child Care programs have 1:8 staff child ratio, Title 22 has 1:12 and others may be proposed).
   c. Variations in compensation between public and private and across providers and school districts.
   d. Computing enhancement rates when State Preschool base rates vary, even within a county.
   e. Potentially higher cost of serving children in family child care and in small center.
   f. Perception that participation in a publicly funded pre-school system will mean loss of control, loss of unique identity, and an increase in paperwork as an independent provider.
   g. Marketing participation in Preschool for All to private providers generally.
   h. Standardized rates.
Delivery System

2. Challenges of Linkages to Full-Day, Full-Year
   a. Financing from other sources to cover the costs of the non-preschool-program funded hours in full-day, full-year programs
   b. Transportation to and from half-day programs for working parents.
   c. Developing staffing patterns and compensation schedules that are feasible for a full-day program in both center-based and family child care settings with a part-day preschool program or funding stream.

3. Challenges of Multiple Funding Streams:
   a. Meshing the existing state-contracted State Preschool Program with an apportionment model (same issue with other state- and federally contracted programs).
   b. Supplementing and not supplanting existing program funds.

4. Challenges of Governance:
   a. Coordinating between public and private providers.

TOOLS AND TEMPLATES

- Matrix from First 5 California Preschool for All Toolkit (Table 2-2: Existing Publicly Funded Early Care and Education Programs and Table 2-3), AIR, available on First 5 California website, http://www.ccfc.ca.gov/PFA.htm.

- Example of Braided Funding Streams from Elk Grove from First 5 California Preschool for All Toolkit (Figure 5-1 and Table 5-2 and Table 5-3), AIR, available on First 5 California website, http://www.ccfc.ca.gov/PFA.htm.

- Sample staffing pattern embedding part-day preschool in a full-day program in First 5 California Preschool for All Toolkit (Appendix 4-4.: Staffing Pattern for Upgraded Child Care Program (Title 5) to include Preschool for All), AIR, available on First 5 California website, http://www.ccfc.ca.gov/PFA.htm.

- Child Development Attendance and Fiscal Reporting and Reimbursement Procedures PowerPoint (California Department of Education)

- Matrix of Child Care and Development Programs and Key Variables(draft-- California Department of Education)

- Family Child Care Hub Model (forthcoming)

- Models of Multiple Funding Streams and Governance(forthcoming)
OTHER RESOURCES

Below is a list of other resources that may be helpful as you plan your delivery system:

**Blending and Braiding Funds To Support Early Care and Education Initiatives**
http://www.financeproject.org/Publications/FP%20Blending%20Funds%201_24.pdf

This strategy brief highlights the successes and lessons learned in blending early childhood funding streams. It is important to note that blending funds is just one of a number of financing strategies that can be used to support the development of early care and education initiatives. Other strategies, such as developing new resources, are also critical and are addressed in other publications. The purpose of this brief is to present financing strategies that state and local policymakers, community leaders, and program coordinators can employ to align, coordinate, and integrate discrete, categorical funding streams. When used effectively, these strategies can help reduce duplication, increase the efficient use of resources, reduce the administrative burden of multiple categorical programs, and fund early childhood supports and services that are more integrated and coordinated.

**A Full-Day, Full-Year Early Care and Education Partnerships: Recommendations of the Collaborative Partners Work Group**

This report presents recommendations of the Collaborative Partners Work Group. Members of the group, which consisted of local Head Start, California Department of Education (CDE), and federal Region IX administrators, share their suggested programmatic and fiscal practices with programs in furthering collaborative arrangements and partnerships.

**Making Dollars Follow Sense: Financing Early Childhood Mental Health Services to Promote Healthy Social and Emotional Development in Young Children (Aug 2002)**
http://www.nccp.org/media/pew02d-sum.pdf

Drawing on lessons from six case studies, this policy paper highlights the most innovative approaches states and communities are currently using to finance early childhood mental health services and explores what else might be done to mix, match, and leverage all available resources. The case studies are based on interviews with policy and program leaders in the states of Florida, Indiana, Ohio, and Vermont, as well as two metropolitan areas—San Francisco and Cuyahoga County, Ohio (where Cleveland is located).

**Side By Side Comparison**

This document provides a comparison of specific components of the CDE’s Coordinated Compliance Review, as revised in 2002 to incorporate Desired Results for Children and Families, and the federal Head Start program compliance monitoring process, known as PRISM (Program Review Instrument for Systems Monitoring). It is intended as a resource for co-funded programs to prepare for CDE and federal monitoring visits.
Community-based child care providers play a crucial role in the development of any high-quality pre-k system. As seen from the above environmental scan, many states deliver pre-k through a “mixed delivery” system, which offers parents a variety of choices: faith-based centers, Head Start programs, for- and nonprofit child care centers, as well as public schools.

Preschool for All is a movement of business leaders, K-12 educators, parents, labor, law enforcement, faith-based institutions, seniors, community leaders, early care and education providers, and child advocates seeking to establish a voluntary and publicly funded part-day preschool for all 4 year olds in California. These Supplemental Principles for Faith Based Programs are designed to affect the implementation and inclusion of faith-based programs in all Preschool for All programs developed in California.