

# Cross System Collaboration:



Sponsored by:  
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services  
Administration for Children and Families



OFFICE OF HEAD START

## A Fresh Look at Working Together:

*Increasing Access to  
Quality Early Learning –  
State Examples*

This document was prepared under contract #23337001T with the Department of Health and Human Services. The views expressed in the document are those of the contractor. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services is intended or should be inferred.

## INTRODUCTION

**Y**oung children develop in the context of their families, other caregivers, and communities. To promote healthy growth and development from birth to school age, successful early care and education programs must address the diverse needs of children, families, and communities. This typically requires partnership across multiple service systems, especially to meet the needs of children who face risks to their development. Effective collaboration draws on the strengths of partnering programs in the community to promote a seamless system of high-quality early care and education services for children birth to age 5, linkages to necessary health and social services, and partnerships with families. New alliances always require relationship building. Often potential partners have to be willing to move out of their comfort zones to come to agreement.

New approaches to collaboration among early care and education systems are receiving attention from stakeholders at the Federal, State, and community levels. For example, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the Department of Education (ED) have been exploring collaboration issues by convening internal and public meetings across early childhood agencies and program administrators. Most States and Territories now have Governor-appointed State Early Childhood Advisory Councils (ECACs) that are engaged in implementing multi-year plans to promote coordination and collaboration of early care and education policy and services for children from birth to the age of school entry. At the same time, tight State budgets mean a focus on promoting efficiency. Local leaders are seeking innovative and sustainable solutions to meet the diverse needs of the children and families in their communities.

In April 2011, the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) in HHS, in collaboration with ED, convened a day-long meeting of State and local leaders entitled “Working Together: Increasing Access to Quality Early Learning Opportunities” to identify new strategies to overcome collaboration challenges. Head Start State Collaboration directors, Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) administrators, and early childhood specialists in State education agencies attended. The agenda focused on two topics: leveraging multiple funding streams and joining forces to increase quality of services to children and families, especially for those with low incomes. Participants heard from Federal staff from HHS and ED, listened to presenters engaged in State- and community-level collaborations, and participated in facilitated discussion groups. Speakers from **the District of Columbia, Minnesota, New York City, and West Virginia** provided details on their efforts and experiences. Throughout the day, presenters and participants were encouraged to “think outside the box” to identify creative solutions to old problems.

The Office of Child Care (OCC) requested this report to capture the spirit and themes that emerged from this meeting and participant discussions. *One of the overarching findings was that the two topics of the meeting, funding and quality, could not be separated easily from each other.* Based on information shared at the meeting and further research by the author, emerging topics being discussed by States and communities seeking to build collaborative services include:

1. Aligning quality across programs using the highest standards and putting funding together creatively to minimize complexities for parents, providers, and teachers.
2. Ensuring that eligibility and payment rules allow for creative collaboration that improves quality and continuity.
3. Developing a continuum of comprehensive services taking into account the whole family and linked to where children are.
4. Expanding and building 0–5 expertise and ownership among stakeholders.
5. Working across sectors to continually improve the quality of both the collaboration and the services delivered.

By no means are these ideas and examples shared in this report meant to be exhaustive; many other approaches exist in States and communities. The report concludes by describing some additional ideas meeting participants suggested for moving forward in collaboration and next steps in progress at the Federal level.

*The themes and examples included here are based on analysis of the meeting proceedings and further research conducted by the author and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Federal Government.*

## COLLABORATION TOPICS THAT EMERGED FROM MEETING DISCUSSIONS

### States and communities are aligning quality across programs using the highest standards and putting funding together creatively to minimize complexities for parents, providers, and teachers.

At the State and local levels, early care and education leaders are working together to first articulate what they want to provide for children and families first, and making the funding work “on the back end.” This may mean creative combinations of funding sources, or rethinking the incentives embedded in a particular source. As they plan these efforts, State and local leaders often need help to gain clarity on Federal rules so they can take advantage of flexibility allowed for State and local decision making. Careful consideration of allowable use of funds and cost allocation strategies is necessary.

#### EMERGING STRATEGIES INCLUDE:

**Developing a brand name that can be used across all participating early care and education programs and providers.** Encouraging programs and the individuals serving in them to focus on the similarities and strengths of each partner is fundamental to collaboration. Some leaders have developed cross-program branding or naming of an initiative that can break down assumptions that may come from calling a program “child care” versus “Head Start” versus “prekindergarten.” For example:

- Several State prekindergarten initiatives deliver services in schools, community-based child care, and/or Head Start (HS) programs. All participating providers may use the same program name to market or describe their services. For example, **Georgia** Pre-K and More at Four in **North Carolina**.

## FEDERALLY FUNDED EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS

At the “Working Together” meeting, speakers and participants addressed issues in collaborating across State initiatives and the following Federal early care and education programs:

- **Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF):** A block grant to States, Territories, and Tribes to assist low-income families who are receiving and transitioning from temporary public assistance in obtaining child care so that they are able to attend training/ education or work. A portion of funds are available to States to improve the quality of child care
- **Early Head Start/Head Start (EHS/HS):** A national program that promotes school readiness by enhancing the social and cognitive development of children through the provision of educational, health, nutritional, social, and other services to enrolled children and families. Grants are provided directly to local programs.
- **Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program:** As authorized by the Affordable Care Act of 2010, this new funding provides grants to States and Territories to (1) strengthen and improve maternal and child health programs, (2) improve service coordination for at-risk communities, and (3) identify and provide comprehensive home visiting services to families who reside in at-risk communities.
- **Parts B and C of the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA):** Part B provides grants to States and Territories to make special education and related services available to preschool age children with disabilities. Part C provides grants to States and Territories to assist in maintaining and implementing coordinated programs of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- **Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA):** Financial assistance to local education authorities and schools with high numbers or high percentages of children living in poverty to help ensure that all children meet challenging State academic standards. Schools may use funds for early childhood services.

- **New York City** recently released the first request for proposals for EarlyLearn NYC. Services will be delivered in a cross-section of the city’s early care and education settings—including child care centers and family child care homes, HS, and schools. The intention is that all services operate under the name EarlyLearn NYC.

**Layering funds to add together desired program features, rather than parts of the day of service.** Some State and community initiatives are thinking about putting together funds like a layer cake, but the layers are aspects of the program necessary to meet a higher standard rather than hours in a child’s day. For example:

- The **Massachusetts** Department of Early Education and Care provided support to the Lowell Public School District in Massachusetts to pay for qualified early education and family support staff to work with a public school teacher in the provision of full day/full year high quality prekindergarten services in the Murkland Elementary school. The base payment for the children’s slots comes from contracts provided by Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care, which administers the CCDF subsidy program. In addition, a local Head Start agency provided services for the prekindergarten program.

- The **Minnesota** Departments of Human Services and Education collaborated to develop clear policies and resources to encourage and support county staff and local programs in putting a full-day CCDF subsidy and Federal Early Head Start/Head Start (EHS/HS) funding together for eligible children under State rules.<sup>1</sup> The goal is to layer funds to promote full-day models that support continuity of care and integrated services. Children are enrolled in both programs. Child care funds are used primarily for core child care services, and EHS/HS funds are used for service enhancements.<sup>2</sup>

**Using quality rating and improvement systems (QRIS) linked to funding to incentivize early care and education programs to provide care that meets the same quality standards to children in low-income families.** Linking CCDF subsidy payment levels to the quality standards articulated in a State QRIS or other quality standards can help more children in families with low income gain access to higher quality child care. Recent OCC guidance clarified that CCDF agencies may require some providers to meet high-quality standards in order to receive subsidy payments, as long as parents have an opportunity to choose from the full range of care categories and types of providers.<sup>3</sup> QRIS design can be based on a crosswalk of standards across the child care and early education field to move all participating programs toward higher program standards and teacher qualifications. For example:

- **North Carolina's** rated licensing system allows licensed programs to voluntarily reach higher quality standards to receive a star rating of 2–5 (one star means compliance with licensing). The State Division of Child Development pays participating providers more per child eligible for CCDF subsidy according to the level of rating they have. There is an online calculator to help providers plan their budgets. State child care subsidy system data indicate that 61% of 3- to 5-year-old children and 58% of infants and toddlers receiving subsidy are in centers or homes that have earned four or five stars.<sup>4</sup>
- **Maine** received a data capacity grant from ACF in 2002 to conduct research and link administrative data sets to plan for a statewide QRIS. After an exhaustive crosswalk process, a group of Maine stakeholders decided that every QRIS program standard should be linked to an existing standards framework (e.g., Federal Head Start Program Performance Standards [HSPPS], National Association for the Education of Young Children [NAEYC], National Association for Family Child Care [NAFCC], National Afterschool Association [NAA]).<sup>5</sup>

**Developing tools to describe potential models and help with cost allocation.** In successful collaborations, partners ensure that funds are spent appropriately and effectively. Some States have taken steps to help educate State- and county-level staff as well as potential local programs on how best to partner or put together multiple funding sources. Well-developed resources can alleviate perceived and real barriers by making the partnership and cost-allocation processes more understandable. For example:

- **Minnesota** State administrators worked with Federal staff at OCC and OHS as they developed resources to promote local partnership, outline potential models, and provide guidance on developing a budget. Guidance includes descriptions of example program partnership models and sample budget agreements, written policy guidance for counties and agencies to use in authorizing care for families who are enrolled in both programs, and materials to explain how State CCDF subsidy program payments interact when a child receiving subsidy attends. State CCDF agency and Head Start State Collaboration staff co-hosted videoconferences and webinars to disseminate information to EHS/HS grantees and to counties and agencies administering CCAP to explain payment policies and procedures.<sup>6</sup>

- The **Iowa** Head Start State Collaboration office and local directors developed a presentation on how to braid and blend HS services and State preschool services. The presentation included different levels of collaboration between HS and the State prekindergarten program that could be used to combine the prekindergarten program into HS settings. They spoke at regional, statewide, and local meetings to encourage more HS partnerships and provide a how-to guide to help implementation.<sup>7</sup>

**Promoting equity in salaries for similarly qualified teachers across early care and education settings.**

Low wages are a concern throughout the early care and education field and pose a barrier to building seamless services from birth to age 5. Disparities in pay between partnering agencies doing similar work with similar qualifications and in similar settings add tensions to collaboration efforts, as do disparities in teacher salaries that are based on the ages of the children they serve. Some participants in the “Working Together” meeting said that collaboration among local programs can be stymied by this longstanding issue. Some States and communities are explicitly addressing this barrier in different ways. For example:

- **New Jersey’s** Abbott preschools and **North Carolina’s** More at Four prekindergarten programs are both delivered in schools, child care, and HS programs. In New Jersey, salary levels for teachers are determined by education level and are based on each school district’s salary guide. North Carolina sets the salary level across the State.
- A few States provide ongoing salary supplements or stipends based on education level directly to members of the early care and education workforce. For example, **Oklahoma’s** REWARD program provides up to \$1,500 a year to directors, teachers, and family child care providers depending on their education and whether they maintain employment for 6 months at the same facility. The facility must service children and families in the child care subsidy program. **Montana’s** Infant Toddler Certified Caregiver Stipend Program provides a \$500 bonus to child care and EHS teachers who complete Montana’s Certified Infant Toddler Course, based on principles of the Program for Infant Toddler Care (PITC) in WestEd. To promote continuity of care for infants and toddlers, the State initiative requires that program participants be employed continuously with the same licensed/registered facility for the 18-month stipend period to receive the full stipend.
- A handful of States are building in indicators on compensation (salary and/or benefits) into the levels of a QRIS. **Kentucky’s** STARS for KIDS NOW has a four-level system. At the third star level providers must give staff a minimum of 6 paid days of leave per year, increasing to 11 days after 1 year of employment. At the fourth star level, providers who offer to cover half of the cost of health insurance for full-time staff are eligible to receive an annual enhancement award.<sup>8</sup> An analysis of State QRIS rules found that 11 States require participating providers to use salary scales matched to education and experience level, although just two specify guidelines for what salary levels should be.<sup>9</sup>

**States and localities are ensuring that eligibility and payment rules allow for creative collaboration that improves quality and continuity.**

Early care and education programs and funding streams may have different requirements for how families qualify and programs are paid, but some States and communities have decided “not to let policy get in the way of collaboration.” Reviewing available funding sources to find areas of flexibility to promote continuity of care despite changes in family situations can be a first step. Another approach is to find new ways to finance gaps in continuity or quality that would otherwise occur.

## EMERGING STRATEGIES INCLUDE:

**Using allowable CCDF flexibility to promote continuity and quality of care and collaboration with EHS/HS and schools.** OCC has clarified that States may set CCDF subsidy eligibility and redetermination policies to encourage longer duration of care for children within certain parameters.<sup>10</sup> In addition, Federal law does not prohibit using CCDF with other Federal funds to care for the same child as long as eligibility conditions are met by the family. For example:

- The **Minnesota** School Readiness Connections pilot used a portion of CCDF subsidy dollars to create special agreements with 14 center and family child care providers to meet increased quality standards in exchange for higher provider payment rates than they would otherwise receive through a voucher/certificate. Participating providers had at least 25% of their children receiving subsidy. The providers could charge up to 25% more than the typical CCDF subsidy payment rate allowed in their counties. (Outside this program, the maximum increase a provider could qualify for was 15% above rate for higher teacher qualifications or accreditation. On average, State subsidy payment rates are well below the 75th percentile of market rate.) Other provisions required to encourage continuity of care included: children were required to attend care for at least 25 hours a week; unscheduled child absent days did not count against provider payments; and authorized hours of child care did not automatically vary according to parent work schedules (as long as children attended at least 25 hours a week). In exchange, providers implemented quality enhancements such as implementing the Work Sampling Assessment system, developing stronger family partnerships, increasing capacity to provide families with health and social service referrals, and improving staff education levels.<sup>11</sup>
- **Illinois** has a separate CCDF subsidy application process for children being served in a program collaborating with early care and education programs with longer eligibility periods than under the State CCDF subsidy program. The Child Care Collaboration program does not provide additional funding, but it allows for flexibility on some key policies to ease collaboration. The Collaboration program rules allow for annual redetermination of family eligibility (although families must report change in income during that period), a 90-day grace period for job loss, and indefinite eligibility for families receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funding who have included participation of the child or family in a collaborative program as part of their TANF “responsibility and service plan.”<sup>12</sup> The Head Start State Collaboration office supports a Web site with additional information on collaboration models.<sup>13</sup>
- **Twenty-two States** now extend the period of time families may qualify for CCDF child care subsidy to 12 months.<sup>14</sup> This can make it easier for child care providers to partner with programs that allow children to stay in the program for a year or until they age out. States attach different requirements on families to report changes that could impact eligibility during that period, although some do not change the terms of the subsidy until the 12 months are up. Some States have extended eligibility during period of job loss to help families during economic downturn.<sup>15</sup>

**Tapping non-Federal funding sources to fill eligibility or quality gaps for children and families.** In some cases, a State or community might develop a “workaround” for restrictions on current Federal funding sources to increase seamlessness of services or raise quality. States and communities might seek private sector partners in the business or foundation community or restructure how taxes are collected or used to meet their priorities. State and local leaders can also encourage creative approaches to leveraging existing dollars to minimize overhead costs. These approaches may foster some flexibility in use of funds, although adherence to standards and reporting requirements is still necessary to clarify how Federal dollars are being put together with other sources. For example:

- Fairfax County, **Virginia**, uses county revenue to help families extend their eligibility for child care subsidy when their income exceeds State limit for CCDF. The Northern Virginia county has a higher than average cost of living than much of the State, so families in the county have trouble paying for child care well above the typical family income limit in the rest of the State. County funds are used to make up the difference between the State income limit and 275% of the FPL. Another creative strategy employed by the Fairfax County Office for Children (OFC)—which both is a Federal EHS grantee and administers county CCDF subsidy services—allows the delivery of EHS in family child care homes. The OFC layers EHS, CCDF, and county dollars to pay for different components that together provide full-day, full-year care meeting Federal HSPPS.
- The city of Madison, **Wisconsin**, uses municipal property tax revenue for a voluntary accreditation program for early care and education programs including infant through school-age childcare, preschools, and EHS/HS. A family child care system is funded to accredit family child care providers. Accreditation involves professional observation, feedback, and consultation with providers to meet quality child care practices and maintain city standards. A child care assistance program is available to help families ineligible for CCDF child care subsidy. Eligible families must use Madison accredited child care. The city also provides funding to community nonprofits to increase access to quality child care for low-income families, train child care staff, and provide family support resources.

**Facilitating cost-sharing strategies across multiple providers to address key functions such as intake, eligibility determination, professional development, and administration.** Raising standards for quality and operations practices also can raise the cost of providing early care and education services. Changes in the economy may mean more parents unable to pay for or send their children to early care and education programs. Some participants in the “Working Together” meeting voiced concerns that small programs and family child care homes may not be able to manage increasing costs and maintain quality. Some State- and community-level initiatives might help programs work together across sectors to share overhead costs and strengthen services.

#### **EMERGING STRATEGIES INCLUDE:**

- The Children’s Home in Chattanooga, **Tennessee**, is an independent, nonprofit agency that contracts to provide management and oversight for 10 participating early care and education sites, including sites in private child care, public schools, and Federal EHS/HS grantees.<sup>16</sup> By sharing the costs of administration, billing parents and funders, staff support and technical assistance, technology, and quality control, the participating programs have been able to raise quality standards, wages, and benefits, as well as extend developmental screening services to all children.<sup>17</sup> Following on the success of this model, a Nashville shared services initiative—Early Learning Connections—was funded under an agreement with the Tennessee Department of Human Service— to create a replicable business model for the early learning community. The state made \$1.3 million available for the multi-year project. The Nashville network consists of 12 high quality centers (each has earned the highest rating in the Tennessee Star-Quality Rating Program) that serve over 1500 children from vulnerable populations whose fees are subsidized through various entities that including child care subsidies, EHS/HS, pre-kindergarten, United Way, private donations/grants and other funding sources. The centers are exploring common administrative functions that can be shared in a hub model, group purchasing to lower expenses as well as using technology to streamline operations. In addition, the centers are looking for ways to work with their funders to streamline administrative functions, such as data reporting.<sup>18</sup>

- SharedSourcePA is a partnership of the Pennsylvania Association for the Education of Young Children (PennAEYC), the Delaware Valley Association for the Education of Young Children (DVAEYC), the Pittsburgh Area Association for the Education of Young Children (PAEYC), and Public Health Management Corporation (PHMC). The alliance promotes shared learning, efficient use of resources, and quality improvement through Web-based resources designed to save child care providers time and money. Examples include: buying discounted food and supplies, providing access to templates on handbooks and forms needed to manage services, and providing access to training resources. In addition, PHMC has developed software to assist in program management and data collection that could be used to provide information efficiently to the State QRIS and licensing systems and thus reduce costs for programs.<sup>19</sup> Pennsylvania OCDEL supports this innovative shared services approach and is examining how it could make reporting licensing, subsidy, and quality data easier for providers.<sup>20</sup>

## States and localities are developing a continuum of services that can respond to individual needs of children and families and can be linked to diverse care settings.

Early care and education are increasingly seen as better promoting early optimal childhood development by addressing child health and creating partnerships with families. Goals for early learning are more difficult to meet without the ability to connect children and families who face multiple risks to comprehensive services, such as necessary health, mental health, social services, and economic security supports. Many of the children currently receiving child care funded through CCDF subsidies or State prekindergarten programs could benefit from the family and community partnership approach built into the Federal HSPPS. Some States and communities are looking for ways to broaden access to comprehensive services in a variety of ways.

### EMERGING STRATEGIES INCLUDE:

**Expanding access to comprehensive services required by EHS/HS to children in integrated care settings.** Federal EHS/HS grantees must partner with families to help them reach their goals for strengthening their families and promote their children's development. Grantees are mandated to provide developmental screenings within 45 days of enrollment and follow up to help families access referrals and treatment,<sup>21</sup> but other early care and education settings serving low-income children may not have standards, staff, or resources to do so. Different models exist in States and communities to link similar levels of comprehensive supports to other early care and education settings. For example:

- A new Federal Early Head Start for Family Child Care Demonstration Project is under way in 22 communities to design, implement, and evaluate a replicable framework that supports a partnership between EHS and family child care. EHS grantees and child care partners in each site are at different stages of development; some are building understanding of the model and others are trying to expand upon existing initiatives. In **Vermont** the Head Start State Collaboration office and CCDF administrator are helping to convene State-level meetings with a broad range of stakeholders that include administrators of the State QRIS and local children's integrated services, as well as the family child care association and networks. These meetings are being used to introduce the model, identify potential barriers, and create strategies to overcome those barriers.

## FEDERAL EARLY HEAD START FOR FAMILY CHILD CARE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

The purpose of the Early Head Start for Family Child Care Project is to design, implement, and evaluate a replicable framework that supports a partnership between EHS and family child care. The project goals are:

- Higher quality care for low-income children in family child care homes
- Coordinated comprehensive services for families
- Support to increase capacity for family child care providers
- Strong partnerships that support coordinated service delivery in communities.

Grants have been awarded to 22 ARRA-funded EHS grantees in 17 States. Demonstration sites are partnering with family child care in rural, urban, and suburban settings. Each grantee has a child care partnership coordinator to support development and implementation of a work plan. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., will conduct the project evaluation.

For additional information contact Kate Sanders at 202 857-2641 or [ksanders@zerotothree.org](mailto:ksanders@zerotothree.org).

- The **District of Columbia** Public School system (DCPS) has leveraged local funding and Federal grant funding to offer HS comprehensive services to all preschool and prekindergarten children in Title 1 elementary schools in the city. The revised cost allocation plan reflects the major investment in local funding that covers the costs of classroom teachers, 90% of instructional aides, all special subject and resource teachers, social workers, psychologists, a nurse, and maintenance and administrative personnel in schools that provide direct services to children. DCPS school officials worked closely with Region 3 and national HS staff to develop the School Wide Model plan. Using the principle “be true to intent, not tradition,” the city layers existing prekindergarten funding with HS to ensure integrated classrooms that are required to meet the higher of Federal HSPPS and State prekindergarten standards rather than separately run classrooms in the same school. The DCPS was able to open 45 new classrooms in the 2010–2011 school year.

**Putting comprehensive health and social service standards and supports into QRIS and ensuring access for children receiving child care subsidy.** State-managed CCDF subsidy programs and licensing rules do not require the level of comprehensive services required by and funded in Federal EHS/HS. Subsidy rates are determined using market rate surveys of the cost of child care, which typically does not include the costs of family support workers. Federal CCDF guidance recommends that States set payment rates at the 75th percentile of current market rates. Some States are providing separate grants or incentives to bring a more comprehensive approach to child care settings serving children in child care, especially those serving families receiving CCDF subsidies. For example:

- **Pennsylvania** provides grants to center-based programs through Keystone Babies to give infants and toddlers receiving CCDF subsidy assistance access to three- or four-star- level programs in Keystone STARS (the State QRIS). (That access initiative is funded with ARRA funds, and as such is scheduled to end September 30, 2011.) Program standards for the QRIS were modeled after Federal HSPPS, offering supportive resources to families.<sup>22</sup> Similar to the Federal standards, Keystone Stars has a “partnerships with family and community” category. To earn four stars, centers and family child care homes must have policies demonstrating engagement and partnership with parents in program planning and decision making.<sup>23</sup>

- Several States have layered requirements similar to EHS/HS comprehensive service provisions into the levels of the State QRIS. **Delaware** is one of few States that have policies to address inclusion of children with disabilities embedded in the QRIS. Delaware QRIS standards require two-star programs to have written inclusion policies that are shared with families, and they require four-star programs to involve families in planning to meet the needs of their child, including individual education plans/individualized family service plans (IEPs/IFSPs).<sup>24</sup> **Idaho** has incorporated the Strengthening Families approach into the voluntary IdahoSTARS QRIS for centers and family child care homes. Completion of a Strengthening Families Action Plan after a self-assessment process earns providers a point toward achieving a Tier Four rating.<sup>25</sup> **Ohio’s** QRIS requires programs to screen children for developmental delays within 60 days of enrollment and refer them to appropriate necessary follow-up services within 90 days.

## States and localities are expanding and building 0–5 expertise and ownership among stakeholders.

Early care and education collaborations may be more successful if they are built on trusting relationships, common understanding of what children and families need to thrive, and shared ownership of the initiative. Often early care and education agencies and programs operate on parallel paths without meaningfully engaging with each other to pursue their shared goals for children and families. States and communities are finding ways to make these connections by intentionally expanding the 0–5 knowledge base and in some cases sharing the responsibility for promoting positive child development.

### EMERGING STATE AND COMMUNITY STRATEGIES INCLUDE:

**Sharing resources across systems to build a cadre of experts with similar knowledge and skills across multiple disciplines.** Most early care and education State and community stakeholders are interested in increasing the qualifications and skills of the workforce to promote better outcomes for children. However, professional development, consultation, and technical assistance resources are often dedicated to specific sectors of the early care and education field. Some States and communities are finding ways to forge connections to build cross-system expertise and move toward more coordinated quality enhancement activities. For example:

- **Region 1 (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont)** child care and EHS/HS State leaders have worked together to develop Training Modules and Core Knowledge and Competencies (CKC) as resources to improve the skills of early childhood consultants in diverse care settings for infants and toddlers. Multidisciplinary teams from each State—including child care, EHS/HS, health, mental health, early intervention, and family support experts—have been part of a “train-the-trainers” strategy to roll out the Training Modules. The CKC are available to all States for consultants working in infant/toddler settings to be used across systems and sectors in early care and education. In addition, some States have used them to educate higher education faculty, improve online course offerings, and develop community-level teams with infant/toddler expertise.<sup>26</sup>
- In **Virginia**, a group of State leaders called “the Alignment Project” worked together to develop key sets of standards to form the backbone of the State professional development system. Representatives from the State CCDF administration in the Department of Social Services, the Head Start State Collaboration office, the Department of Education, the Head Start State Association, and agencies and organizations representing child mental health and disabilities issues worked together to develop Virginia’s Milestones of Child Development early learning guidelines for children birth to age 5, Competencies for Early Childhood Professionals, and a career lattice leading from State-sponsored noncredit classes to higher education. Collaboration with the State community college system has led to a common course catalog and offerings across the State. This collaborative approach continued when the EHS/HS State-based technical assistance specialist alerted State leaders that Federal EHS grantees were having trouble meeting a national requirement that EHS teachers have at least a CDA by September 2010.<sup>27</sup> A jointly developed letter asked OHS to approve the State infant/toddler credential as sufficient to meet the Federal requirement. OHS granted that request.<sup>28</sup>

**Intentionally requiring joint decision making and oversight across sectors for communities or programs to receive funding.** Programs and providers may need strong incentives to work together. States and communities can provide clear mandates for collaboration to ensure shared decision making and resources by tying those requirements to funding. For example:

- The **Nebraska** Early Childhood Education Endowment is a public-private investment protected by the State's constitution that established grant funds available to public school districts and cooperatives of school districts to implement high-quality programs serving at-risk children from birth to age 3. The grant programs, known as Sixpence programs, may offer a home visiting model, center-based model, or a combination and requires local planning partnerships with programs such as EHS, child care, or other community-based organizations.
- The **West Virginia** legislature passed legislation in 2002 requiring that within 10 years all 3- and 4-year-olds with an IEP to address special needs must have access to voluntary State prekindergarten. The law explicitly states that at least 50% of classrooms must be delivered in partnership with community-based organizations like child care or HS; 70% now meet that requirement. Each county must have an early childhood team—with representation from local boards of education, HS, and local child care agencies—that determines the location of classrooms and responsibilities for sharing resources to meet required standards for service delivery.<sup>29</sup>

**Keeping new and existing partners engaged and informed across systems.** Barriers to collaboration can occur because stakeholders don't have full information about other early care and education systems or are new to working with children from birth to age 5. Some States and communities are finding ways to address those knowledge deficits and better engage their partners. For example:

- The **District of Columbia** school-wide HS expansion in Title I schools needed principals to fully embrace responsibility for implementing the federal Head Start Program Performance Standards and the more comprehensive approach to family and community partnerships required. To address this, principals received orientation up front. Early Childhood Education Instructional Specialists went to new participating classrooms weekly, often doing the observation and walk through together with the principals to share information and educate them. This resulted in increased buy-in and enthusiasm in many cases.
- The **West Virginia** voluntary prekindergarten program is delivered in schools, child care, and HS. Regardless of location, buy-in of the local program administrators was necessary to make the model work. The State provided elementary school stakeholders with training on early childhood development and education. All locations must adhere to the same standards and use the same curriculum.

## **States and localities are working across sectors to continually improve both the quality of the collaboration and services delivered.**

Making significant changes to the way programs and services have been delivered for years can take time. Supporting all partners to maintain new standards of quality and services may require rethinking existing technical assistance, data collection, monitoring, and assessment systems that function separately. However, quality measurement tools that work for one care setting or age group may not be appropriate for another. A collaboration strategy recommended repeatedly at the "Working Together" meeting was to continually assess and document how a new approach worked, and not be afraid to tweak aspects of the effort as lessons are learned. Speakers noted that this was true both for the quality of the collaboration/integration of systems as well as for the early childhood development services being delivered.

## EMERGING STATE AND COMMUNITY STRATEGIES INCLUDE:

**Sharing monitoring and assessment processes, tools, and data.** All entities in the early care and education field must use monitoring and assessment tools and data in a useful and responsible manner to ensure continual program improvement. Child care monitoring typically has been conducted by State child care licensing systems that vary greatly in their standards and frequency. QRIS systems may have additional monitoring and/or assessment requirements. EHS/HS grantees are reviewed by Federal teams every 3 years and in most States must be licensed as well. State birth-to-3 and State prekindergarten programs often have separate monitoring and assessment systems, although 10 States require all State-funded prekindergarten programs to be licensed regardless of location. Of the 41 States with State-funded prekindergarten programs, 25 exempt public school sites from licensing.<sup>30</sup> HS programs that accept State prekindergarten or CCDF funding must also meet Federal HSPPS. Among the few State birth-to-3 or State-funded prekindergarten initiatives that adopt Federal HSPPS, some collaborate with Federal review teams.<sup>31</sup> Local partners in collaborations may become overwhelmed by multiple sets of monitoring and assessment processes. Some States and communities are building collaborative approaches to address this growing concern. For example:

- The **Pennsylvania** Office of Child Development and Learning (OCDEL) developed tools to assist EHS/HS programs in demonstrating they had achieved State QRIS standards. The State developed a Worksheet to identify activities required of federally funded EHS/HS programs that satisfy the QRIS standards. OCDEL is currently reviewing how to improve on this tool and the requirements for Head Start participation in Keystone STARS to streamline the process and further leverage federally required activities such as on-site review and reporting.
- **Arkansas'** Better Beginnings QRIS has specific reciprocity processes to make it easier for EHS/HS and other nationally accredited programs to participate in the state rating systems by submitting program and assessment information gathered for federal purposes to the state.
- In **Georgia**, where EHS/HS programs are not required to have a child care license, members of the State licensing staff provide workshops designed to help HS programs that want to become licensed. Georgia prekindergarten consultants have been trained on the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) observational tool for assessing teacher-child interactions, which is also required for monitoring Federal HS grantees. The State and HS systems are investigating how to coordinate their activities so that classrooms that participate in both systems are not observed redundantly.<sup>32</sup>

**Improving State data systems to collect and analyze data across multiple types of programs to inform ongoing program improvement and State policy.** There is a growing understanding that continual improvement of an early care and education system requires a unified data system that facilitates understanding the needs of all children and families, targeting services to those most in need, coordinating services, and measuring impact. First and foremost, data system experts recommend that State leaders determine what questions they need to answer before designing an integrated system. As part of this effort, the Early Childhood Data Collaborative (ECDC) working group of the DQC has defined 10 Fundamentals of Coordinated Early Care and Education Systems to help States integrate data collected by systems serving children birth through age 5. Some approaches include:

- The **Pennsylvania** Early Learning Network integrates child-level assessment information with information about the child's background, the structure of the program, and information about the teachers and aides who work in the program, to improve quality and provide feedback for young children participating in programs funded through OCDEL. The network includes: the State prekindergarten program; programs receiving State-funded HS supplemental funding;

child care centers with three- and four-star ratings in the QRIS, family child care homes with four-star ratings; and programs and services funded under Part C and Part B, Section 619 of IDEA. OCDEL chose the Work Sampling System for preschool-aged children and the Ounce Scale for infants and toddlers. Children receive a unique identifier that is linked to the K–12 unique identifier, allowing for long-term follow-up for the children participating in these programs. The next phases will bring in home visiting programs sponsored by the State, such as the Nurse Family Partnership program.<sup>33</sup> The data system will generate reports designed to meet the needs of a variety of constituencies, including: parents, to better understand their child’s development; providers and teachers, to access program and child-level data; administrators, to inform technical assistance decisions; and policymakers, to track statewide aggregate data trends.<sup>34</sup>

- **South Carolina** used support from the OPRE to build child care and early education research capacity and create a system of linked data sets on children birth to 6 with child-, family-, and provider-level data, including subsidy, licensing, QRIS, SNAP, and TANF data. Using cutting-edge technology, the data system has a unique identifier at both the child and provider levels.<sup>35</sup> The goal is to understand how quality improvement efforts are working in early care and education programs being utilized by low-income working parents. The State has been able to use the data already to inform targeted use of ARRA dollars for those child care and early education providers most struggling with meeting licensing health and safety regulations.<sup>36</sup>

**Supporting, reviewing, and revising collaboration procedures over time.** Collaboration can be a labor-intensive process for which outside facilitation and technical assistance can be very helpful to move beyond longstanding divisiveness among stakeholders. Some “Working Together” participants were interested in how the process of building collaboration itself could be supported and how a State or community could weigh the success of systemic change. Tools to assist leaders in this process are emerging.<sup>37</sup> Some examples of State strategies include:

- **Wisconsin’s** State Department of Public Instruction provides support, along with private funders, to fund “community collaboration coaches” trained to facilitate agreements between schools and community-based providers to deliver Wisconsin 4K. The State school funding formula provides local school districts with the option of offering prekindergarten services for 4-year-olds. They may do so in collaboration with existing child care and HS programs. The coaches work with the community stakeholders representing business, schools, child care, HS, parents, recreation, and parent education to explore the issues and develop community-based approaches to 4K.<sup>38</sup>
- **West Virginia’s** legislature established the prekindergarten program in 2002, but the West Virginia Board of Education (WVBE) has revisited and revised rules governing operation of the program multiple times since then to strengthen the quality of the program and collaborative process. In 2008, for example, the WVBE changed the funding calculations for prekindergarten to ensure that children in various settings were funded equally and equitably, regardless of type of collaboration or setting.<sup>39</sup>

### Ongoing Challenges

Many innovative approaches to increasing collaboration and coordination of early care and education programs and services have emerged in recent years, although challenges remain. Participants in the “Working Together” meeting spent time in small groups discussing the most common and persistent challenges they see in moving forward and suggesting solutions. Some questions that emerged from those discussions include:

- **How can collaboration requirements be embedded in all Federal early care and education programs?** Some participants wanted more explicit prioritization of and requirements for collaboration—from Federal agencies through any level of operations involved with a funding stream, including regional, State, local education authorities, and individual programs. One idea was to strengthen the role of Head Start State Collaboration directors who are spearheading collaborative efforts in many States.
- **What strategies might work to encourage further education and human services collaboration at all levels?** Participants were excited about new Federal agency activities to work across ED and HHS. Some participants suggested ideas that might help them develop better alliances with education in States and communities, for example, addressing the fact that ED and HHS divide the States into different Federal regions for the purpose of providing guidance to State and local administrators. Another concern was how to balance a tension between local control in public school systems and consistent quality program standards for early care and education settings. The fact that public schools are often exempt from child care licensing rules is troublesome to some. At the same time, the great variation in the strength of quality standards in State licensing regulations made some participants ask for Federal guidance to set more national standards.
- **Are there ways for Federal agencies to help States and communities align monitoring and assessment requirements?** Some participants found it difficult to envision ways to comply with the different content and intensity of monitoring and assessment required in Federal and State initiatives. Some noted that several of the speakers mentioned working closely with Federal regional staff in designing their initiatives, and thought this type of help might be necessary for them to feel confident about being innovative with Federal dollars.
- **How could more flexible Federal resources and technical assistance be made available to work across sectors to promote quality of services?** Some participants were interested to learn more about new technical assistance centers and plans in HHS and wanted to know whether collaboration would be part of their agendas. In addition, some wanted more flexibility in aligning and using professional development resources designated for the different Federal programs.
- **Could Federal guidance be developed to assist programs concerned about cost allocation when putting together Federal funding sources?** Some participants noted that they had found resources developed under a defunct OCC and OHS initiative—the Quality in Linking Together (QUILT) project—very useful, and wondered if they could be updated to reflect current issues in collaboration, for example, collaboration that works toward seamless services from birth to 5, and that spans across a broader range of programs than just EHS/HS and child care.

## Conclusion

OCC, OHS, and ED will continue to explore and promote opportunities for collaboration at the Federal, State, and community levels. Federal activities that could further address some of the issues raised in the “Working Together” meeting are currently under way or in development. For example:

- **Partnerships with States in Learning Laboratories (L<sup>2</sup>).** A December 2010 meeting of State prekindergarten directors, child care administrators, and Head Start State Collaboration directors highlighted the need for increased collaboration and coordination at the Federal and State levels to better support local programs. In response to this need, the ACF’s Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary and Inter-Departmental Liaison for Early Childhood Development, OHS, and OCC will partner together on the L<sup>2</sup>. The purpose of the L<sup>2</sup> is to collaborate with States to investigate opportunities to better align key aspects of Federal and State early childhood systems, including standards, licensing, and QRIS. The expectation of the L<sup>2</sup> is to learn from States and grantees how to better support local programs in order to reduce burden and provide quality early childhood programs through collaboration and cooperation. Two Learning Laboratories will begin in July 2011: L<sup>2</sup> on Monitoring, which will include North Carolina and Oregon, and L<sup>2</sup> on School Readiness, which will include Maryland and Colorado. States asked to participate were selected based on location, program operations, and grantees.
- **Collaboration across national technical assistance centers.** The OCC Pathways and Partnership Workplan recognized that CCDF is used by States to build an infrastructure for child care quality that spans a wide variety of child care, HS, prekindergarten, and afterschool programs. OCC and OHS have redesigned their new OHS national technical assistance centers with consideration of opportunities to collaborate. OCC will make awards for a redesigned Child Care Technical Assistance Network (CCTAN) by September 30, 2011. Some efforts to collaborate across these centers have already begun. For example, the National Center on Child Care Professional Development Systems and Workforce Initiative will be jointly funded by OCC and OHS.

The information and ideas gathered at the “Working Together: Increasing Access to Quality Early Learning Opportunities” meeting will help inform Federal-level activities to promote collaboration across the early care and education system.

*This report was prepared for the Office of Child Care by Rachel Schumacher.*

## STATE- AND COMMUNITY-LEVEL CONTACTS FOR INCLUDED EXAMPLES

Aligning quality across programs using the highest standards and putting funding together creatively to minimize complexities for parents and providers.

Strategy	State/Approach	Contact
Developing a brand name that can be used across all participating early care and education programs and providers.	Georgia – Georgia Pre-K program	Susan Adams Acting Assistant Commissioner for Pre-K Bright from the Start: Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning susan.adams@dec.al.ga.gov
	New York City – Early Learn NYC	Shari Gruber Director, Policy and Procedure New York City Administration for Children’s Services 212-361-6939 grubers@acs.nyc.gov
	North Carolina – More at Four prekindergarten program	Deborah J. Cassidy Director, Division of Child Development and Early Education North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services 919-662-4499 Deb.Cassidy@dhhs.nc.gov
Layering funds to add together desired program features, rather than parts of the day of service.	Massachusetts – Collaboration with Lowell Public School District	Sherri Killins, Ed.D Commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care 617-988-6612 sherri.killins@massmail.state.ma.us
	Minnesota – Tools and support to layer CCDF subsidy and EHS/HS	Laurie Possin, Policy Specialist Child Care Assistance Program Minnesota Department of Human Services 651- 431-4044 laurie.j.possin@state.mn.us
Using quality rating and improvement systems (QRIS) linked to funding to incentivize early care and education programs to provide care meeting the same quality standards to children in low-income families.	North Carolina – Rated licensing system and increased access to highly rated programs for children receiving subsidy	Deborah J. Cassidy Director, Division of Child Development and Early Education North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services 919-662-4499 Deb.Cassidy@dhhs.nc.gov
	Maine – QRIS	Patti Woolley, Director Early Childhood Division Maine Department of Health and Human Services 207-624-7909 Patti.Woolley@maine.gov

Strategy	State/Approach	Contact
Developing tools to describe potential models and help with cost allocation.	Minnesota – Tools to promote EHS/HS and CCDF layering	Laurie Possin Policy Specialist, Child Care Assistance Program Minnesota Department of Human Services 651-431-4044 laurie.j.possin@state.mn.us
	Iowa – Models to encourage State prekindergarten and HS partnerships	Tom Rendon, Director Head Start State Collaboration Office Iowa Even Start State Coordinator Iowa Department of Education Tom.rendon@iowa.gov
Promoting equity in salaries for similarly qualified teachers across early care and education settings.	New Jersey – Abbott District preschools set salary levels across child care, Head Start, and school settings	Ellen Wolock Director, Office of Preschool Education Division of Early Childhood Education New Jersey Department of Education 609-777-2074 ellen.wolock@doe.state.nj.us
	North Carolina – More at Four program sets salary levels across child care, Head Start, and school settings	Deborah J. Cassidy Director, Division of Child Development and Early Education North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services 919-662-4499 Deb.Cassidy@dhhs.nc.gov
	Oklahoma – REWARD program	Lu Ann Faulkner-Schneider Coordinator Professional Development and Quality Initiatives Oklahoma Department of Human Services Child Care Services 800-347-2276 Luann.Faulkner@okdhs.org
	Montana – Infant Toddler Certified Caregiver Stipend Program	Jamie Palagi, Chief Early Childhood Services Bureau Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services jpalagi@mt.gov
	Kentucky – STARS for KIDS NOW QRIS addresses benefits for child care teachers	Marybeth Jackson, Director Department for Community Based Services Division of Child Care Kentucky Cabinet for Health and Family Services 502-564-2524 Marybeth.Jackson@ky.gov

**Ensuring that eligibility and payment rules allow for creative collaboration that improves quality and continuity.**

<b>Strategy</b>	<b>State/Approach</b>	<b>Contact</b>
Using allowable CCDF flexibility to promote continuity and quality of care and collaboration with EHS/HS and schools.	Minnesota – School Readiness Connections Pilot	Cherie Kotilinek, Manager Child Care Assistance Program Minnesota Department of Human Services 651-431-4005 Cherie.Kotilinek@state.mn.us
	Illinois – Child Care Collaboration Program	Gina Ruther, Director Illinois Head Start State Collaboration Office 618-583-2083 gina.ruther@illinois.gov
Tapping non-Federal funding sources to fill eligibility or quality gaps for children and families.	Fairfax, Virginia – County funding used to promote continuity of care and exceed State limits for income eligibility	Anne-Marie D. Twohie, Director Office for Children Fairfax County Department of Family Services 703-324-8103 Anne-Marie.Twohie@fairfaxcounty.gov
	Madison, Wisconsin – City-funded Voluntary Accreditation Program	Madison Child Care Program Community Development Division 608-266-6520 commserv@cityofmadison.com
	Chattanooga, Tennessee – The Children’s Home shared services model	Phil Accord, Executive Director The Children’s Home 423-698-2456 PPASB4@aol.com
	Nashville, Tennessee – Early Learning Connections shared services model	Carolyn Hannon Collaboration Manager Early Learning Connections 615-321-4939 x155 channon@cfmt.org Barbara West Wall, Director Child Care Services Tennessee Department of Human Services 615-313-4770
	Pennsylvania – SharedSource (originated in Philadelphia) and coordination with State for data reporting	Jodi Askins Executive Director Pennsylvania Association for the Education of Young Children 888-272-9267 jaskins@pennaeyc.org Bob Frein, Director Bureau of Subsidized Child Care Bureau of Early Learning Office of Child Development and Early Learning Departments of Education and Public Welfare 717-346-9320 rfrein@state.pa.us

**Developing a continuum of comprehensive services taking into account the whole family and linked to where children are.**

Strategy	State/Approach	Contact
Expanding access to comprehensive services required by EHS/HS to children in integrated care settings.	Vermont – EHS for Family Child Care Demonstration Project site	Kathleen Eaton Paterson Assistant Director and Interim Head Start Collaboration Office Child Development Division Vermont Department of Children and Families kathleen.paterson@ahs.state.vt.us
	District of Columbia – Public school integration of prekindergarten and HS children	Miriam Calderon, Director Early Childhood Education Department of Teaching and Learning District of Columbia Public Schools 202-442-5231 Miriam.calderon@dc.gov
Putting comprehensive health and social service standards and supports into QRIS and ensuring access for children receiving child care subsidy.	Pennsylvania – Keystone Babies and Keys to Quality QRIS	Sue Mitchell Bureau of Early Learning Office of Child Development and Early Learning Departments of Education and Public Welfare 717-346-9320 susmitchel@state.pa.us
	Delaware – QRIS inclusion policies	Kathy Wilson, Education Specialist Professional Development, Workforce and QRIS Early Development and Learning Delaware Department of Education 302-735-4210 kwilson@doe.k12.de.us
	Idaho – IdahoSTARS QRIS integration of Strengthening Families approach	Lorraine Evans Clayton Director, Early Childhood Coordinating Council State Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems Grant claytonl@dhw.idaho.gov Jane Zink IdahoSTARS Quality Rating & Improvement Coordinator Idaho AEYC jzink@idahoaeyc.org
	Ohio – Step up to Quality QRIS and screening requirements	Jamie Gottesman Assistant Bureau Chief Bureau of Child Care & Development Ohio Department of Job and Family Services gottej@odjfs.state.oh.us

## Expanding and building 0–5 expertise and ownership among stakeholders.

Strategy	State/Approach	Contact
Sharing resources across systems to build a cadre of experts with similar knowledge and skills across multiple disciplines	Region 1 (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont) – Training Modules and Core Knowledge and Competencies (CKC) for consultants working with infants and toddlers	Shireen Riley Regional Child Care Program Manager Region 1 Office of Child Care Administration for Children and Families 617-565-1152 shireen.riley@acf.hhs.gov
	Virginia – Alignment Project development of State standards	Ann Janney-Schultz, Manager ECE and Infant/Toddler Specialist Virginia Head Start T/TA Center Ajanney-schultz@icfi.com 540-344-4547
Intentionally requiring joint decision making and oversight across sectors for communities or programs to receive funding.	Nebraska – Early Childhood Education Endowment - Sixpence	Kathleen Feller, Associate Vice President Early Childhood Programs - Sixpence Nebraska Children and Families 402-817-2018 kfeller@nebraskachildren.org
	West Virginia – Voluntary prekindergarten	Traci Dalton, Director Head Start State Collaboration Office West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources Traci.L.Dalton@wv.gov Clayton Burch, Assistant Director Office of School Readiness West Virginia Department of Education 304-558-5325 wburch@access.k12.wv.us
Keeping new and existing partners engaged and informed across systems.	District of Columbia – Engaging elementary school principals in delivering Head Start	Miriam Calderon, Director Early Childhood Education Department of Teaching and Learning District of Columbia Public Schools 202-442-5231 Miriam.calderon@dc.gov
	West Virginia – Voluntary prekindergarten	Traci Dalton, Director Head Start State Collaboration Office West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources Traci.L.Dalton@wv.gov Clayton Burch, Assistant Director Office of School Readiness West Virginia Department of Education 304-558-5325 wburch@access.k12.wv.us

**Working across sectors to continually improve both the quality  
of the collaboration and services delivered.**

<b>Strategy</b>	<b>State/Approach</b>	<b>Contact</b>
Sharing monitoring and assessment processes, tools, and data	Pennsylvania – Keystone STARS QRIS tools for EHS/HS to qualify	Catherine Cormany, Chief Bureau of Early Learning Office of Child Development and Early Learning Departments of Education and Public Welfare 717-346-9320 ccormany@state.pa.us
	Arkansas – reciprocity processes to make it easier for EHS/HS and nationally accredited programs to submit information to qualify for QRIS	Vicki Mathews, QRIS Coordinator Division of Child Care and Early Childhood Education Arkansas Department of Human Services 501-682-4888 Vicki.Mathews@arkansas.gov
	Georgia – Licensing technical assistance for Head Start programs	Janice M. Haker, Director Head Start State Collaboration Bright from the Start Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning 404-651-7425 janice.haker@dec.al.ga.gov
Improving State data systems to collect and analyze data across multiple types of programs to inform ongoing program improvement and State policy.	Pennsylvania – Early Learning Network	Todd Klunk Director Finance Administration and Planning Bureau of Early Learning Office of Child Development and Early Learning Departments of Education and Public Welfare 717-346-9320 tklunk@state.pa.us
	South Carolina – Increasing capacity to analyze child care data and link across systems	Leigh Bolick, Director Division of Child Care Services South Carolina Department of Social Services Leigh.Bolick@dss.sc.gov
Supporting, reviewing, and revising collaboration procedures over time	Wisconsin – Community collaboration coaches	Jill Haglund, Early Childhood Consultant Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction 608-267-9625 Jill.Haglund@dpi.state.wi.us
	West Virginia – Voluntary prekindergarten	Traci Dalton, Director Head Start State Collaboration Office West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources Traci.L.Dalton@wv.gov Clayton Burch, Assistant Director Office of School Readiness West Virginia Department of Education 304-558-5325 wburch@access.k12.wv.us

## NOTES:

1. Personal communication with Cherie Kotilinek, CCDF Administrator, Minnesota Department of Human Services, June 2011.
2. Minnesota Department of Human Services, Child Care Assistance Program Integrated Full-Day Head Start Services. (2009). *Payment application guidelines*. Minneapolis, MN: Author.
3. Administration for Children and Families, Office for Child Care. (n.d.). *Policy interpretation question (PIQ)*. Retrieved from: <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/occ/law/guidance/current/piq2011-01/piq2011-01.htm>.
4. Personal communication with Anna Carter, Division of Child Development and Early Education, North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services, July 14, 2011.
5. Dean, A., & Woolley, P. (2010, August). *Maine's approach to QRIS*. Presentation at Early Childhood 2010: Innovation for the Next Generation, Washington, DC.
6. Possin, L. (2010, November). *Effective child care and Early Head Start collaborations that promote high quality comprehensive care: Minnesota perspective* (Webinar presentation). Washington, DC: National Infant & Toddler Child Care Initiative & Early Head Start National Resource Center.
7. Personal communication with Tom Rendon, Iowa Head Start State Collaboration Director, June 2011.
8. Personal communication with Marybeth Jackson, July 2011. See Kentucky Department of Education, STARS for KIDS NOW (Quality Rating System), retrieved from <http://www.education.ky.gov>.
9. Austin, L. J. E., Whitebook, M., Connors, M., & Darrah, R. (2011). Staff preparation, reward, and support: *Are quality rating and improvement systems addressing all of the key ingredients necessary for change?* Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California at Berkeley.
10. See Administration for Children and Families, Office for Child Care. (n.d.). *Policy interpretation question ACYF-PIQ-CC-99-02*. Retrieved from: <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ccb/law/guidance/current/pq9902/pq9902.htm>.
11. Personal communication with Cherie Kotilinek, CCDF administrator, Minnesota Department of Human Services, June 13, 2011.
12. Personal communication with Gina Ruther, Head Start State Collaboration Director, Illinois Department of Human Services, June 14, 2011.
13. See the Illinois Early Childhood Collaboration Web page (n.d.) <http://ilearlychildhoodcollab.org/>.
14. National Child Care Information and Technical Assistance Center. (n.d.). *CCDF eligibility policies*. Retrieved from: [http://nccic.acf.hhs.gov/poptopics/eligibility\\_policies.pdf](http://nccic.acf.hhs.gov/poptopics/eligibility_policies.pdf).
15. Ewen, D., & Matthews, H. (2010). *Adopting 12-month subsidy eligibility: Impacts on children, families, and state child care programs*. Center for Law and Social Policy. Retrieved from: <http://www.clasp.org/admin/site/publications/files/12montheligibility.pdf>.
16. The Laura & David Merage Foundation. (n.d.). *The Children's Home profile*. Retrieved from: <http://www.earlylearningventures.org/Shared-Services/Shared-Services-Toolkit/Approaches.aspx>.
17. Stoney, L. (2009). *Shared services: A new business model to support scale and sustainability in early care and education*. Retrieved from: <http://www.earlylearningventures.org>.
18. Personal communication with Carolyn Hannon, July 15, 2011.

19. Personal communication with Jodi Askins, July 11, 2011.
20. The Laura & David Merage Foundation (n.d.). *Delaware Valley Association for the Education of Young Children & Public Health Management Corporation Shared Source profile*. Retrieved from: <http://www.earlylearningventures.org/Shared-Services/Shared-Services-Toolkit/Approaches.aspx>.
21. See Head Start Program Performance Standards, 45 CFR 1304.20.
22. Pennsylvania Keys to Professional Development. (n.d.). *Pennsylvania early learning keys to quality. Other early childhood programs*. Retrieved from: [http://www.pakeys.org/pages/get.aspx?page=Programs\\_Other](http://www.pakeys.org/pages/get.aspx?page=Programs_Other).
23. Pennsylvania Keys to Professional Development. (n.d.). *Keystone Stars: Continuous quality improvement for learning programs. Center performance standards for FY 2010–2011*. Retrieved from: <http://www.pakeys.org/docs/2010-2011%20Keystone%20STARS%20Performance%20Standards%20for%20Centers.pdf>.  
Pennsylvania Keys to Professional Development. (n.d.). *Keystone Stars: Continuous quality improvement for learning programs. Family child care home performance standards for FY 2010–2011*. Retrieved from: <http://www.pakeys.org/docs/2010-2011%20Keystone%20STARS%20Performance%20Standards%20for%20Family%20Child%20Care%20Homes.pdf>.
24. Lesko, J., & Winton, P. (2010, August). *Quality and inclusion*. Presentation at Early Childhood 2010: Innovation for the Next Generation, Washington, DC. Note that the Delaware QRIS is currently under review and specific provisions described here may change.
25. Sherman, R. (2010). *Idaho and Strengthening Families*. Presentation at Early Childhood 2010: Innovation for the Next Generation, Washington, DC. Retrieved from: <http://www.earlychildhood2010.org/NRCFiles/File/Idaho-strengthening-families.pdf>
26. See National Infant and Toddler Child Care Initiative (2011). *A Guide to effective consultation with settings serving infants, toddlers, and their families: Core knowledge, competencies, and dispositions*. [http://nitcci.nccic.acf.hhs.gov/resources/Effective\\_Guide\\_to\\_Consultation.pdf](http://nitcci.nccic.acf.hhs.gov/resources/Effective_Guide_to_Consultation.pdf).
27. See *Qualifications for Early Head Start Infant and Toddler Center-based staff*, ACF–IM–HS–10–06. Retrieved from: [http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ohs/policy/im2010/acfimhs\\_10\\_06.html](http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ohs/policy/im2010/acfimhs_10_06.html).
28. Janney –Schultz, A. (2011, June). *Virginia early childhood credentials*. Presentation for National Infant & Toddler Initiative webinar for Region 3 early care and education professionals.
29. *Building intentionality in a collaborative design and implementation for West Virginia universal pre-K*. (2011, April). Presentation at Working Together meeting, Washington, DC.
30. National Child Care Information and Technical Assistance Center & National Association for Regulatory Administration. (n.d.). *The 2008 child care licensing study*. Retrieved from <http://naralicensing.org/displaycommon.cfm?an=1&subarticlenbr=205>
31. Schumacher, R., & DiLauro, E. (2008). *Building on the promise: State initiatives to expand access to Early Head Start for young children and their families*. Center for Law and Social Policy & ZERO TO THREE. Retrieved from: [http://www.clasp.org/resources\\_and\\_publications/publication?id=0424&list=publications](http://www.clasp.org/resources_and_publications/publication?id=0424&list=publications).
32. Personal communication with Janice M. Haker, Head Start Collaboration Director, Georgia Bright from the Start, June 14, 2011.
33. Stedron, J. (2010). *A look at Pennsylvania's early childhood data system*. National Conference of State Legislatures and the Data Quality Campaign. Retrieved from: <http://www.ncsl.org/portals/1/documents/Educ/PAEarlyChild-Stedron.pdf>.
34. Ibid.

35. Personal communication with L. Bolick, South Carolina Department of Social Services, October 29, 2010.
36. Bolick, L. (2010). *South Carolina's Child Care Data Bridge project*. Presentation at Early Childhood 2010: Innovations for the Next Generation, Washington, DC.
37. See the Build Initiative Web page *Evaluation of systems change*, <http://www.buildinitiative.org/content/evaluation-systems-change>, and the Early Childhood Systems Working Group materials, <http://www.buildinitiative.org/content/early-childhood-systems-working-group-ecswg>.
38. Wisconsin Early Childhood Collaborating Partners. (n.d.). *Community approaches to 4K*. Retrieved from: <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/4k-community-approaches-about.php>.
39. *Building intentionality in a collaborative design and implementation for West Virginia universal pre-K*. (2011, April). Presentation at Working Together meeting, Washington, DC.