AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

Analysis of Options for Funding Universal Preschool in Sonoma County

Updated Report

Emily Weinberg
Susan Muenchow
Karen Manship
Kathleen Jones

APRIL 2016

Analysis of Options for Funding Universal Preschool in Sonoma County

Updated Report

April 2016

Emily Weinberg
Susan Muenchow
Karen Manship
Kathleen Jones

2800 Campus Drive, Suite 200
San Mateo, CA 94403
650-843-9100

www.air.org

5920_04/16

Contents

Purpose and Background

The purpose of this report, as prepared by American Institutes for Research (AIR), is to help Sonoma County develop a plan "to make universal preschool a reality" as recommended in *A Portrait of Sonoma County* (Burd-Sharps & Lewis, 2014). In line with *Strategies to Reduce Poverty in Sonoma County* (Blue Sky Consulting Group, 2014), this report also offers guidance on how to phase in access to quality preschool, beginning in the areas of highest unmet need. This document is intended to replace an earlier version of the report submitted in October 2015; this April 2016 version provides different and more refined phase-in scenarios based on new information and assumptions.

Specifically, this report will do the following:

- Describe the key features, including funding levels, phase-in plans, and finance mechanisms, of 12 city and other regional preschool initiatives being implemented across the United States.
- Analyze potential funding options.
- Provide two estimates for the per-child cost of providing full-day (i.e., eight hours), full-year (12 months) preschool in Sonoma County: one based on the current expenditures for programs meeting the minimum standards for Title 5 State Preschool or Head Start in California, and one with an increase in compensation to a living wage intended to help recruit and retain qualified staff.
- Present eight options for phasing in universal access to quality preschool in the county across a five- to 10-year period, beginning in the areas of highest need and the least access to preschool.
- Make recommendations for funding and phasing in access to quality preschool for all children in Sonoma County.

Research findings highlight the benefits of expanding access to high-quality preschool, especially for children who are disadvantaged, to improve the long-term outcomes for children and their families. For children at risk of falling behind in school, quality early learning and care programs can help improve their readiness for school and school success, with better attendance, higher test scores, and reduced grade-level retention (Karoly & Bigelow, 2005; Reynolds, Temple, & Ou, 2007). Other lasting benefits include higher rates of high school completion, greater likelihood of attending college, and higher lifetime earnings (Reynolds & Ou, 2011). By reducing grade retention, the use of special education and welfare, and involvement in crime, these quality programs can save between $4 and $17 for every dollar invested (Reynolds et al., 2007; Schweinhart et al., 2005). Of particular interest, given the demographics of California and Sonoma County in particular, is that high-quality preschool programs have been found to benefit children from Latino backgrounds whose mothers have little education, have low incomes, and are linguistically isolated (Karoly, Ghosh-Dastidar, Zellman, Perlman, & Fernyhough, 2008).

Although the benefits of preschool are less dramatic for children from more advantaged backgrounds, attending a quality program is associated with higher achievement in elementary school for children from all income groups (Gormley & Phillips, 2005). The educational benefits

of quality programs for preschool-aged children who are not disadvantaged are substantial, perhaps 75 percent as large as those for children from low-income families (Pianta, Barnett, Burchinal, & Thornburg, 2009). An important caveat, however, is that only quality programs have been found to produce improved child outcomes, and no evidence exists that preschool programs of average quality lead to the same results (Barnett, 2008). Moreover, shortfalls in the quality of early learning and care programs have been found to affect children in all income groups in California (Karoly et al., 2008).

As noted in other recent reports on Sonoma County, critical gaps currently exist in the availability of high-quality preschool, particularly in low-income and less populated areas of the county. According to *A Portrait of Sonoma County* (Burd-Sharps & Lewis, 2014), only about 50 percent of Sonoma County's three- and four-year-old children are enrolled in preschool; among Latinos, the rate falls to 39 percent. From 2009 to 2013, state budget cuts led to a loss of 600 state-subsidized slots and the closure of many preschool classrooms in Sonoma County; although opportunities now exist to restore these slots thanks to a Preschool Facilities Grant Fund created by the Board of Supervisors and First 5 Sonoma County (County of Sonoma, 2015), districts and community preschool providers are finding it difficult to fund and develop the new classrooms to house the services for children who are subsidy eligible (Nilsson Consulting, 2014).

Even middle-income families have difficulty affording center-based preschools, with the average cost per child estimated at one third of the median annual income in the county (Burd-Sharps & Lewis, 2014). Moreover, given that the quality of service is fundamental to achieving the potential benefits of preschool, it is important to offer sufficient compensation to attract and retain qualified preschool personnel. According to the State of California Employment Development Department (2015), the median hourly wage for child care personnel in the Santa Rosa-Petaluma metro area is just $12.97, but the median hourly wage for a Santa Rosa elementary schoolteacher is $29 (Salary.com, 2015).

Building on Sonoma County's interest in universal preschool, and the body of work already conducted in the county supporting it, this report provides a plan to expand access to preschool and to raise the quality of service to a level sufficient to achieve the promised benefits of preschool.

Findings From Other Preschool Initiatives Implemented Across the United States: Summary of Key Features

We examined 12 city and other regional preschool initiatives being implemented across the United States. Of these, nine are working toward eventually providing universal access: Boston, Massachusetts; Denver, Colorado; Los Angeles, California; New York City, New York; San Antonio, Texas; San Francisco, California; Seattle, Washington; Washington, D.C. (the District of Columbia); and West Sacramento, California. Of the remaining three initiatives, two—Elk Grove Unified School District (California) and the Chicago Child-Parent Centers (CPCs; Illinois)—have aimed to provide access to preschool to children in certain Title I school catchment areas but do not bill themselves as universal preschool programs. The other initiative—Salt Lake (Utah)—is targeted to a low-income, disadvantaged population of children.

In the sections that follow, we summarize the key features across the preschool initiatives that were examined: primary funding mechanisms, other sources of funding for enrolled children, funding levels, expenditure per child, implementation status, the number of children served, target population, hours and days of operation, family fees, types of providers or provisions for facilities, administering entity, phase-in plan, teacher qualifications, other quality measures, provision for professional development, and political leadership.

Primary Funding Mechanisms

The primary funding mechanism for most of the preschool initiatives is a tax or a set-aside. For example, the primary funding mechanism in Denver and San Antonio is a dedicated sales tax, and Seattle's primary funding mechanism is a property tax levy. San Francisco's primary funding mechanism is a set-aside in the city budget, called the Public Education Enrichment Fund (PEEF; San Francisco Public Schools, 2015), which is financed by a portion of the local property tax. Washington, D.C., and Boston have similar primary funding mechanisms in that both cities use a combination of district and city funds as their primary funding mechanisms. Other primary funding sources for the preschool initiatives include First 5 California (e.g., Power of Preschool grants) and, in the case of New York City, a recent state grant.

We chose to include Elk Grove because of its Title I–funded preschool program. Salt Lake also was included in our analysis because its Pay for Success bond provides preschool services to a select group of children. CPCs were included because they are an example of an initiative that uses both Title I and Pay for Success as sources of funding for their preschool initiative. Table 1 briefly describes the primary funding mechanisms for each initiative.

Table 1. Primary Funding Mechanisms for Preschool Initiatives

Preschool Initiative	Primary Funding Mechanism
Boston: Boston Public Schools (BPS) Early Education; Boston K1DS (ending in November 2015 and being replaced by the Massachusetts Preschool Expansion Grant [PEG])	BPS: city and district budget, including Title I funds Boston K1DS: no primary mechanism (see later discussion) PEG: a federal grant
Chicago: CPCs	Historically, funding is primarily from Title I, with a recent expansion paid for by a 2012 Investing in Innovation (i3) grant from the U.S. Department of Education.
Denver: Denver Preschool Program (DPP)	Dedicated sales tax of 0.15% (was 0.12% in 2014)
Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool	Title I
Los Angeles: Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP)	First 5 California
New York City: Prekindergarten for All	State grant to the city
Salt Lake: School Readiness	Pay for Success bond financed by Goldman Sachs and J. B. Pritzker, backed by the state of Utah
San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA	Dedicated sales tax of 0.125%
San Francisco: Preschool for All (PFA)	PEEF: A set-aside in the city budget initially funded by 3% reserved from the local property tax. First passed in 2004 (Proposition H), expanded and extended in 2014 (Proposition C), with an increase in the portion reserved from the property tax from 3% to 4%.
Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program	Four-year property tax levy
Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program	Public and charter school classrooms are primarily funded by the District of Columbia Public Schools, using the district's per-child funding formula. Community-based organizations (CBOs) are funded by the city's general fund. No tax or other funding stream is specifically dedicated to preschool, so the money must be appropriated by the city every year. The Prekindergarten Acceleration and Clarification Emergency Amendment Act of 2010, which was passed by the city council, requires the mayor to fund CBOs at the levels specified by the 2008 act.
West Sacramento: UP4WS	First 5 California

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); City of West Sacramento (n.d.a); Connors (2014); Dardick & Perez (2014); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Human Capital Research Collaborative (2014b); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014a); Samuels & Ash (2014); SPUR (2004); SPUR (2014); Stewart (2013); United Way of Salt Lake (2014); Watson (2010).

Other Sources of Funding for Children Enrolled in the Preschool Initiatives

Across the preschool initiatives, a variety of other funding sources also provide funds to support the preschool initiatives. For example, the primary funding mechanism in Seattle is a property tax levy, but parent fees and Head Start and state Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP) grants are also used to support the program. West Sacramento is primarily

funded by First 5 California, but additional support comes from First 5 Yolo, private donations, federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, a portion of a 0.5 percent city sales tax, district funds, and in-kind donations from the city. San Antonio's primary funding mechanism is a dedicated sales tax of 0.125 percent, but additional support comes from state and local matching funds, the federal Child and Adult Care Food Program, local donors, and parent fees. However, Denver's primary funding mechanism is the only source of funding for the tuition subsidies it provides. Table 2 briefly describes the other sources of funding for children enrolled in each initiative.

Table 2. Other Sources of Funding for Children Enrolled in Preschool Initiatives

Preschool Initiative	Other Sources of Funding
Boston: Boston K1DS; PEG	Boston K1DS: a combination of city and district money, Race to the Top grant funds, and foundation grants PEG: foundation grants, Head Start, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families vouchers, and other government subsidies
Chicago: CPCs	Pay for Success bond funded by Goldman Sachs, Northern Trust, and the Pritzker Family Foundation
Denver: DPP	DPP receives all its revenue for the preschool initiative from the sales tax. Providers may receive funding from other sources, such as state and federal subsidies and parent fees.
Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool	Individual classrooms are funded by Head Start, Title 5 State Preschool, and Title I. Teachers can and do teach in classrooms funded by different streams, but classrooms are kept segregated by funding source.
Los Angeles: LAUP	Parent fees, Race to the Top grant funds, Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) block grants, and private donations. Also, many of the participating programs receive grants from Head Start, Title 5 State Preschool, and other state and federally funded programs.
New York City: Prekindergarten for All	Additional funds from local sources and other state grants
Salt Lake: School Readiness	Providers included in the Pay for Success bond also serve other children through Title I and parent fees. However, these other sources of funding (e.g., Title I and parent fees) are not used to fund children in the Pay for Success program.
San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA	Although 85% of the funds come from the sales tax, additional funding sources include state and local matching funds for a small portion of the children served, a Child and Adult Care Food Program grant, local donors, and parent fees.
San Francisco: Preschool for All (PFA)	Received about $10 million total in First 5 California funds from 2005 through 2015. Developer impact fees and federal CDBG funds are used for facilities.
Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program	Parent fees for four-year-old children living above 300% of the federal poverty level (three-year-old children living above 300% of the federal poverty level are not eligible for the program); also leverages Head Start money and state ECEAP grants.
Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program	Public schools also receive Head Start funding and funding for children with special needs.

Preschool Initiative	Other Sources of Funding
West Sacramento: UP4WS	First 5 Yolo, private donations, CDBG funds, a portion of a 0.5% city sales tax, district funds, and in-kind donations from the city. First 5 California funding will no longer available after 2015, so the current model is not sustainable. Currently searching for alternative funding sources. Developer impact fees are used for facilities.

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Barnett, Carolan, Squires, Clarke Brown, & Horowitz (2015); Boston Public Schools (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); City of West Sacramento (n.d.a); City of West Sacramento Engineering Department (2015); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014a); Yolo Elections Office (n.d.a, n.d.b).

Funding Levels

Across the preschool initiatives, the level of funding varies widely depending on the sources of revenue, with the amount of funding sought influenced by the size of the population to be served, the quality of the program, the number of hours and days of service, and the proportion of the total expenditure for preschool that the initiative aims to finance.

In general, the programs with the most stable funding levels have a dedicated funding mechanism for preschool (e.g., sales tax, property tax, or set-aside from a general fund). Federal Title I funds and other district funds can be a major source of revenue, as in Chicago, Boston, and Elk Grove, which require school board action every year. But even those programs with a dedicated funding mechanism rely on other sources of revenue. In the largest initiatives (e.g., New York City; Washington, D.C.; and Boston), local and state policies often work together, resulting in state action that provides funds for local initiatives or requiring localities to make good on the funding levels for preschool they have promised.

As might be expected, of the 12 initiatives we examined, New York City has the highest funding level and provides services to the most children, with 53,000 preschool slots for four-year-old children in 2015 financed primarily by $300 million in the city's education budget coming from a recent state appropriation for universal preschool. This special allocation from the state was awarded in a compromise between the state and the city after the New York City mayor's efforts to raise the income tax to finance universal preschool were unsuccessful.

The District of Columbia's preschool initiative has the next highest funding level, with more than $191 million from sources including a set-aside in the city budget spent on more than 12,000 preschool children, representing 86 percent of the three- and four-year-old children in the city. City council legislation requires the mayor to fund the preschool at the level intended.

San Francisco's PFA has one of the more stable funding sources for preschool. As of 2014, it generated $27 million per year and served approximately 4,000 children. First enacted in 2004, Proposition H created PEEF, from which one third is reserved for universal preschool. The initiative was reauthorized in 2014, extended for 25 years, and expanded from a 3 percent set-aside of local property taxes to a 4 percent set-aside.

The funding level sought for an initiative also varies depending on the quality requirements and intensity of the program. For example, the fourth highest funding level for the preschool

initiatives examined for this study is in San Antonio, where the sales tax increase generates $31 million per year. The program currently aims to provide high-quality care to only 2,000 children in four centers, representing about 10 percent of the four-year-old children in the city. Although some expansion is underway, plans for major growth await a future election.

Initiatives that require lead teachers in a preschool classroom to have a bachelor's degree (i.e., San Antonio, Seattle, District of Columbia, Boston, New York City, Elk Grove, and Chicago) or fund full-day preschool services (i.e., San Antonio, Seattle, District of Columbia, Boston, and New York City) tend to have higher funding levels. In addition, for some initiatives, the funding level covers the full cost of the program (i.e., San Antonio, Boston, Elk Grove, and Salt Lake), whereas the funding level covers only a portion of the cost of preschool for most children enrolled in other initiatives. Other sources of funding, such as parent fees, and other public programs, such as Head Start and state-funded preschool, are used to make up the difference (i.e., Denver, Los Angeles, Seattle, and San Francisco). Table 3 briefly describes the funding level for each initiative.

Table 3. Funding Level for Preschool Initiatives

Preschool Initiative	Funding Level
Boston: BPS Early Education; PEG	BPS: $24 million per year PEG: $14 million across four years
Chicago: CPCs	Primarily funded through Title I, with an additional $17 million across four years from a Pay for Success bond
Denver: DPP	$13 million per year from a sales tax increase (forecast to increase to $19 million)
Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool	$1.3 million annually in Title I funds
Los Angeles: LAUP	$48.6 million from First 5 LA, $1.5 million in donations, and approximately $25 million from other sources in fiscal year (FY) 2014
New York City: Prekindergarten for All	$300 million state grant in 2014 to fund full-day preschools; additional funds to expand half-day programs to full-day programs
Salt Lake: School Readiness	Initial investment of $1 million for the first year and $3 million per year for the remainder of the five-year period (Not all of the $3 million is designated for this Pay for Success bond; some funds are designated for grants to improve preschool quality at other providers around the state, in hopes of attracting future Pay for Success funding.)
San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA	$31 million per year for eight years from a sales tax increase, plus state and local matching funds of $3 million per year. State funding covers less than 25% of the costs for eligible children. Funds from the sales tax cover professional development and facilities costs, which San Antonio does not include in its per child expenditure.
San Francisco: PFA	$27.2 million annually from PEEF
Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program	$58 million across four years from a property tax increase

Preschool Initiative	Funding Level
Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program	The total prekindergarten spending by the district in FY 2014 was $191,016,442, according to National Institute for Early Education Research report but may not include funds for CBOs.
West Sacramento: UP4WS	For FY 2015: $913,000 from First 5 California, $100,000 from the city (dedicated sales tax), $100,000 from First 5 Yolo; $1.3 million each from the district and the county; CDBG funds; and grants from corporations and nonprofit organizations

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Barnett et al. (2015); City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); Connors (2014); Dardick & Perez (2014); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Human Capital Research Collaborative (2014b); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014a); Samuels & Ash (2014); SPUR (2014); Stewart (2013).

Preschool Initiative Expenditures per Child

Preschool initiative expenditures per child vary across the preschool initiatives depending on the quality requirements and the intensity of the program. For example, San Antonio, Seattle, the District of Columbia, and Boston all fund a full-day (at least six-hour) program with relatively high-quality standards or requirements, and their expenditures per child per year range from $13,000 to $15,372. In contrast, although it has relatively high-quality standards, Elk Grove supports only a partial-day program, and the expenditure per child per year is $6,500. Salt Lake's program has the lowest expenditure per child per year because it provides a partial-day, school-year program; in addition, its teachers are considered hourly employees, so the expenditure per child does not include benefits for the personnel.

The per-child expenditure for four initiatives (San Antonio, Boston, Elk Grove, and Salt Lake) covers the full cost of the program. For example, in San Antonio, the preschool initiative expenditure per child of $14,500 covers the cost of the program, but professional development funds are not considered part of the per child costs, even though the main funding mechanism (e.g., sales tax) funds professional development. In Boston, the preschool initiative expenditure per child is $10,000–$15,000 per year depending on whether overhead is included, and this covers the full cost of the program. In Elk Grove, Title I funds the full cost per child per year for a half-day program. The Salt Lake Pay for Success bond covers the full cost of the program for the children participating in the bond-supported program.

In contrast to initiatives that provide the full cost of the program, the expenditures per child in Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle provide a fraction of the full cost of providing either a full- or half-day program. For example, Denver provides up to $680 per month per child to participating providers based on a number of factors, including family income, the quality rating of the providers, and the receipt of other government subsidies. In Denver, the monthly per child expenditure does not cover the full cost of providing full-day preschool for any children. In Los Angeles, the proportion of the full cost covered by LAUP depends primarily on the level of support the program receives from other sources of publicly funded early care and education, such as Head Start, Title 5 State Preschool, and state and federally subsidized child care. Table 4 briefly describes the expenditures per child for each initiative.

Table 4. Expenditure per Child for Preschool Initiatives

Preschool Initiative	Expenditure per Child
Boston: BPS Early Education; PEG	BPS: $10,000–$15,000 per year per child in FY 2015, depending on whether overhead is included PEG: $8,000–$16,000 per year per child, depending on whether the child is receiving a government subsidy
Chicago: CPCs	Information not available
Denver: DPP	$29–$680 per month for full-day programs, depending on family income and provider quality (FY 2016); expenditures are prorated for half- and extended-day programs. Providers vary in terms of the number of months that they provide preschool. Thus, annual per child expenditures could range from $290 to $6,800 for a 10-month program or $348–$8,160 for a 12-month program. During the 2014–15 school year, the average tuition credit was $303 per month for a student attending a full-day program, or approximately $3,030 for a 10-month program.
Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool	$6,500 per year from Title I funds in FY 2016
Los Angeles: LAUP	$96–$495 per month, depending on ZIP code of residence and whether the child is receiving a government subsidy (FY 2014). Los Angeles provides only school-year programs, so the annual per child expenditures for a 10-month program could be approximately $960–$4,950.
New York City: Prekindergarten for All	Funds a full-day school-year program at no cost to families; unable to confirm a per child expenditure
Salt Lake: School Readiness	$1,550 per year for four-year-old children, approximately $900 per year for three-year-old children in 2015
San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA	$14,500 per year for FY 2014–FY 2021 (does not include facilities or professional development costs)
San Francisco: PFA	PFA reimburses from $4,950 to $6,000 per year per four-year-old child in FY 2016, based on lead teacher qualifications. In settings where child care subsidies support eligible child enrollment, PFA reimbursements are deducted from the applicable subsidy earnings (such as Alternative Payment Program vouchers, California Department of Education, or Head Start) for that child's enrollment. In these cases, PFA does not fund the child's enrollment; rather, PFA funds an "enhancement" to the program, supplementing the subsidy.
Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program	Approximately $13,000 per year for FY 2016–FY 2020
Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program	$15,372 per year in 2014
West Sacramento: UP4WS	Information not available

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Barnett et al. (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Human Capital Research Collaborative (2014b); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014a); New York City Office of the Mayor (2014).

Implementation Status

The preschool initiatives are at varying stages of implementation. For example, in fall 2015, Seattle was just preparing to launch the first year of its program. In contrast, Denver, Elk Grove, Los Angeles, San Francisco, the District of Columbia, and West Sacramento are all fully implemented to the extent that their funding levels will support. Other initiatives are still working to expand access, such as Boston and San Antonio, and Chicago is attempting both to restore services that were lost in the past decade and to expand. Table 5 briefly describes the implementation status of each initiative.

Table 5. Implementation Status of Preschool Initiatives

Preschool Initiative	Implementation Status
Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS	BPS: fully implemented K1DS: ending its three-year run in November 2015 PEG: preparing a request for proposal for partner organizations and will launch in fall 2015. The city of Boston is considering expansion through a mixed delivery system to provide universal access.
Chicago: CPCs	Began in 1967, reached its peak with 25 centers and 1,500 children (prekindergarten–Grade 3) in the 1980s, but cut back to 10 centers serving 670 preschool children by 2009. The 2012 grant allowed the district to reopen six centers and expand others. The Pay for Success initiative will allow another expansion to begin in 2015, adding six classrooms for 374 four-year-old children, increasing to 2,000 children in four years.
Denver: DPP	The school-year program is fully implemented with 5,000 children served (about 54% of all eligible children) as of 2013. The 2014 increase allowed additional funding to go toward summer programs.
Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool	Fully implemented as of 2007
Los Angeles: LAUP	Fully implemented as of 2014
New York City: Prekindergarten for All	Fully implemented as of the 2015–16 school year; any four-year-old child who wants to participate in prekindergarten will have that opportunity.
Salt Lake: School Readiness	About to begin the third year of a five-year program. Year 1 was the "proof of concept" year, guaranteed by the United Way of Salt Lake and Salt Lake County. Starting in the second year (2014–15), the Pay for Success loan has been guaranteed by the state of Utah.
San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA	About to begin the third year of an eight-year plan
San Francisco: PFA	Fully implemented as of 2014
Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program	Prepared for launch in the 2015–16 school year
Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program	Universal access implemented by 2013–14; focus is now moving to quality improvement.
West Sacramento: UP4WS	Fully implemented as of 2010

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); City of West Sacramento (n.d.a); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified

School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Harris (2012); Human Capital Research Collaborative (2014b); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014a); Nyhan (2013); Samuels & Ash (2014); Seattle Department of Education and Early Learning (2015).

Target Population and Number Children Served

The majority of the preschool initiatives target services to four-year-old children. For example, Denver, San Antonio, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and New York City all primarily target their four-year-old populations. However, in addition to providing preschool for four-year-old children, Seattle will provide preschool for three-year-old children who are at 300 percent of federal poverty level and below. In San Francisco, the reauthorization of PEEF includes a goal of serving all children in San Francisco less than 6 years old while still giving priority to four-year-old children. West Sacramento has broadened the goal of its initiative to provide services for children birth to 5 years old but focused first on providing universal access to four-year-old children. Given the projected loss of First 5 California funds to support services, the extent of the expansion in West Sacramento is unclear. The District of Columbia, Salt Lake, and Elk Grove all provide preschool to three- and four-year-old children.

The preschool initiatives also differ in the extent to which they serve all children in the locality or, put another way, in the percentage of theoretically eligible children they serve. New York City is unusual because it aimed from the outset to make preschool available to all four-year-old children in the city, regardless of family income. Most of the preschool initiatives, however, have started out by expanding or improving preschool in low-performing school neighborhoods. In Denver, the program is now fully implemented and serves 54 percent of its four-year-old children, yet the city estimates that a majority of its funds still go to children who are disadvantaged. San Francisco, also fully implemented, set a goal of serving 65 percent of its four-year-old children. Of the children enrolled in San Francisco's PFA, more than 70 percent are enrolled in a program that is subsidized by the state or federal government (e.g., Head Start, Title 5 State Preschool). Boston estimates that its BPS program serves about one half of the four-year-old children in the city.

Salt Lake does not have a goal of serving children beyond those with high needs, and, in that sense, it does not really fit our definition of a universal preschool program. San Antonio has so far limited funds to children who are disadvantaged. CPCs, by virtue of their location within Title 1 school boundaries, primarily serve low-income families.

Of course, some of the variation in the number of children or the percentage of eligible population served is explained by the program's implementation status. Some initiatives chose to start small and gradually expand to serve their target populations. Seattle, for example, will serve about 270 children during the first year (2015–16) of its preschool program, with plans to expand to 2,000 by 2018–19. San Antonio will serve about 3,700 children by 2017, still a relatively small percentage of the four-year-old children in the city (18.5 percent of approximately 20,000 four-year-old children). Table 6 briefly describes the target population and the number of children served for each initiative.

Table 6. Target Population and Number of Children Served of Preschool Initiatives

Preschool Initiative	Target Population	Number of Children Served
Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS	Four-year-old children living in Boston, with some slots available to three-year-old children with special needs BPS: open to all regardless of income PEG: 200% of the federal poverty level	BPS: 2,400 in 2014, which is about one half the four-year-old population K1DS: 400 children PEG: 300–400 children
Chicago: CPCs	Children ages 3 through Grade 3 living within Title I school boundaries of the Chicago Public Schools	The goal is 2,000 slots for three- and four-year-old children, starting with 374 four-year-old children in 2015.
Denver: DPP	Four-year-old children living in Denver	About 5,000 in 2015 (54% of the four-year-old population)
Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool	Three- and four-year-old children living within Title I school boundaries of the Elk Grove district, with priority to older children	In the 2015–16 school year, 200 children in 10 classrooms at eight school sites
Los Angeles: LAUP	Four-year-old children who are residents of Los Angeles County	11,000 in 2014
New York City: Prekindergarten for All	Four-year-old children living in the five boroughs	53,000 four-year-olds in full-day programs, 2014–15 school year
Salt Lake: School Readiness	Three- and four-year-old children who are eligible for free and reduced lunch; Granite School District also considers additional risk factors (e.g., parents with less than a high school education).	Six hundred in 2013–14, 750 per year in 2014–16, 1,000 per year from 2016 to the end of the grant period. (Granite School District serves approximately 3,000 children overall in its preschool programs, and the director of the program estimates that the district serves about 50% of the three- to four-year-old population in district boundaries.)
San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA	Four-year-old children living in San Antonio, with universal access as goal but currently limited to four high-needs areas	Seven hundred in 2013–14 and 1,500 in 2014–15; plans to ramp up to 3,700 per year by 2017.
San Francisco: PFA	Four-year-old children living in San Francisco; universal access with a special focus on low-income neighborhoods	4,000 (in 2014–15)
Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program	Three- and four-year-old children living in Seattle; open to all four-year-old children and to three-year-old children at 300% of the federal poverty level and below; targets neighborhoods with low-performing schools.	About 270 in 2015–16, ramping up to 2,000 by 2018–19

Preschool Initiative	Target Population	Number of Children Served
Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program	Three- and four-year-old children living in the District of Columbia	A total of 12,426 in 2013–14 (86% of all three- and four-year-old children in the District of Columbia); the district has the capacity to serve 95% of the preschool-age population.
West Sacramento: UP4WS	Access to affordable preschool for all four-year-olds. Eventual goal of offering access to all children 0–5 years old living in West Sacramento, with subsidies to children from low-income families.	Approximately 160 infants and toddlers and 200 three-year-old children in 2015; unable to determine the total number of four-year-old children served because enrollment in partner programs is not tracked. However, according to the city, access to affordable preschool for all four-year-old children is now in place.

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Boston Public Schools (n.d., 2015); City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); City of West Sacramento (n.d.a); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014a); New York City Office of the Mayor (2014); Office of the State Superintendent of Education (n.d.); Seattle Department of Education and Early Learning (2015).

Hours and Days of Operation

Among the preschool initiatives, three main categories of preschool exist in terms of hours of operation: (1) half-day programs that operate up to four hours per day; (2) full-day programs that operate up to 6.5 hours per day (the typical school day); and (3) full-day programs that operate eight to 10 hours per day, which is more similar to the schedules of working parents. Half-day programs are usually operated in two sessions: morning and afternoon. Some of the initiatives examined offer exclusively half- or full-day (defined as up to 6.5 hours) preschool, whereas others provide parents with the option of either half- or full-day preschool. The initiatives that either offer up to 6.5 hours or require it from their providers are San Antonio, Seattle, the District of Columbia, Boston, and New York City. The initiatives offering only half-day programs are Los Angeles, Salt Lake, Elk Grove, and Chicago. Denver, West Sacramento, and San Francisco support both half-day and full-day (defined as up to 6.5 hours) programs at varying levels. None of the initiatives we studied defined a full day as eight or more hours, although San Antonio is notable for providing free extended care services both before and after hours to those families who need it.

Most of the initiatives examined operate or fund preschool only during the school year, although a few, such as Denver, provide some funding for programs that operate during the summer. Most of the programs profiled offer preschool classes five days per week. Salt Lake is an exception, with classes provided four days per week to four-year-old children and two days per week for three-year-old children. Table 7 briefly describes the hours and days of operation for each initiative.

Table 7. Hours and Days of Operation of Preschool Initiatives

Preschool Initiative	Hours and Days of Operation
Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS (PEG)	BPS: school day (six hours), school year only K1DS/PEG: full day (10 hours), year round
Chicago: CPCs	Half day, school year
Denver: DPP	Full-day and partial-day programs; varies depending on providers; expanded to summer programs in June 2015
Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool	Partial-day, school-year programs; morning, afternoon, and twilight sessions
Los Angeles: LAUP	Half-day, school-year programs, with morning and afternoon sessions; exact hours depend on the providers.
New York City: Prekindergarten for All	Full-day (six hours and 20 minutes) programs, five days per week, school year
Salt Lake: School Readiness	Half-day, school-year program: four days per week for four-year-old children and two days per week for three-year-old children; morning and afternoon sessions
San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA	Full-day program (8 a.m.–3 p.m.) with extended care hours (7:15 a.m.–6 p.m.) from late August through early June; no summer program
San Francisco: PFA	Offers half- and full-day programs; exact schedule and child care options, including summer hours, depend on the provider.
Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program	Full-day program, six hours per day, five days per week; school-year and year-round programs
Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program	Full-day (6.5 hours), school-year programs, five days per week
West Sacramento: UP4WS	Partial-day and full-day, school-year and full-year programs, some with extra child care hours

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Boston Public Schools (n.d., 2015); City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); City of West Sacramento (n.d.a); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014b); New York City Office of the Mayor (2014); Office of the State Superintendent of Education (n.d.).

Family Fees

Of the 12 preschool initiatives profiled, 50 percent charge fees to at least some parents who participate, and 50 percent do not charge any fees. In Salt Lake, parents whose children are eligible to participate in the Pay for Success program are not charged fees, although there may be fee-paying children in the same classrooms. All programs that charge fees apply a sliding scale based on income, and most are free to children meeting defined eligibility guidelines, such as living at a certain percentage of the federal poverty level or eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch. Typically, parent fees are paid directly to the preschool provider, whether that is the initiative itself (San Antonio) or a partner provider (e.g., Denver, San Francisco, and Los Angeles). Table 7 briefly describes the family fees for each initiative.

Table 8. Family Fees for Preschool Initiatives

Preschool Initiative	Family Fees
Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS	None
Chicago: CPCs	None
Denver: DPP	Sliding scale based on income and quality level of preschool chosen (higher quality preschools receive larger subsidy)
Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool	None
Los Angeles: LAUP	None for children receiving a government subsidy; parent investment fee for others, based on ZIP code (waivers granted for eligible parents)
New York City: Prekindergarten for All	None
Salt Lake: School Readiness	None for children covered by the Pay for Success bond. Families that do not qualify for participation through Title I can pay the full fee of $1,550 (for the four-year-old program) if slots are available in the district. Families also pay full fees if they live outside the district or are not eligible for the Pay for Success funding.
San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA	Free to children who meet Texas eligibility requirements (e.g., eligible for free or reduced-price lunch) and live in participating districts; sliding scale tuition to children chosen by lottery, including qualifying children living outside participating districts
San Francisco: PFA	No fee for half-day programs; full-day programs are discounted, usually at approximately 25%. Parents who can afford to pay are encouraged to donate their credit back to the preschool program to serve as a scholarship fund. Note: Programs are directly reimbursed per eligible enrollment.
Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program	Free to children from families at 300% of the federal poverty level, sliding scale for all others
Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program	None
West Sacramento: UP4WS	Sliding scale based on income for city-run programs

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Boston Public Schools (2015); City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014b); New York City Office of the Mayor (2014); Office of the State Superintendent of Education (n.d.).

Providers or Facilities

The preschool initiatives we examined fall into two broad categories: mixed delivery systems and single provider systems. In a mixed-delivery system, preschool services are delivered by different types of providers, such as public schools, private schools, for-profit schools, community nonprofit centers, faith-based organizations, charter schools, or family child care homes. In a single provider system, all providers are of the same type or there is only one provider as in a district.

Of the preschool initiatives we profiled, only BPS Early Education, Elk Grove Unified School District, and CPCs operate on a single provider system, in each case a public district, although Boston is moving toward a mixed-delivery model. The remaining nine initiatives operate on some level of mixed delivery or, in the case of San Antonio, will be launching its mixed delivery component in the 2016–17 school year. Not every initiative is open to all types of partner providers. For example, some initiatives do not currently partner with family child care providers (including Seattle, the District of Columbia, and New York City). In almost all cases, partner providers are required to go through a competitive application process and meet certain quality standards (see Table 9 for more details). Two of these mixed delivery preschool initiatives (San Antonio and West Sacramento) operate their own preschool classrooms and fund (or plan soon to fund) partner providers.

Table 9. Providers or Facilities for Preschool Initiatives

Preschool Initiative	Providers/Facilities
Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS (PEG)	BPS: Currently public schools only, although looking at expanding to a mixed delivery system K1DS/PEG: Community providers chosen through a competitive process
Chicago: CPCs	Selected Chicago Public Schools Title I schools
Denver: DPP	Two hundred fifty partner preschools, including public, private, community, and faith-based organizations
Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool	Elk Grove Unified School District Title I schools
Los Angeles: LAUP	Public, private, community, charter, and home-based providers
New York City: Prekindergarten for All	District schools and community providers provide services. Participating community providers are referred to as New York City Early Education Centers, which are selected through a competitive application process. District schools offer classes at both regular elementary schools and at prekindergarten centers that exclusively serve preschool children.
Salt Lake: School Readiness	Six programs, operated by Granite School District (Salt Lake City), Park City School District, a nonprofit community organization (YMCA), two for-profits organizations (Smart Kids & Lit'l Scholars), and one charter school (Guadalupe). Most children (624 in 2015–16) are served by Granite School District.
San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA	Currently four model centers built and operated by Pre-K 4 SA; will expand to qualified public and private providers starting in 2016.
San Francisco: PFA	Qualified public, private, and family providers receive grants based on the number of qualifying children served and based on the availability of funding; priority funding for underserved neighborhoods.
Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program	Public and private providers; schools and providers apply for eligibility. CBOs are selected though a competitive process, and public schools may contract directly without competing.
Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program	District of Columbia Public Schools, charter schools, and CBOs

Preschool Initiative	Providers/Facilities
West Sacramento: UP4WS	Two centers operated by the city; partner providers, including the district and CBOs, operate other centers.

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Boston Public Schools (n.d., 2015); City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Human Capital Research Collaborative (2014b); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014b); Office of the State Superintendent of Education (n.d.).

Administering Entity

Preschool initiatives can be administered through various types of agencies, such as a district, an office or agency within the local government (typically a local district or local education agency), or an independent nonprofit organization. The initiatives in our study are split almost evenly among these different types of agencies. Boston, Elk Grove, and Chicago are initiatives operated by a district. Seattle, West Sacramento, the District of Columbia, and New York City are initiatives administered by a city agency. Denver, San Antonio, and Los Angeles are initiatives administered by a nonprofit organization. Until recently, San Francisco's initiative has been administered by First 5 San Francisco, but it is being transferred to a city government office. The Salt Lake initiative is different from the others because no single, overarching administrator manages the initiative. Six providers operate their programs independently; the United Way of Salt Lake, a nonprofit organization, facilitates communication between the programs, the investors, and the backing agency.

Except for the public districts and two other initiatives (West Sacramento and San Antonio), the administering agency does not operate any preschool classrooms. Instead, this agency is typically responsible for distributing funds and managing quality initiatives. Table 10 briefly describes the administering entity for each initiative.

Table 10. Administering Entity for Preschool Initiatives

Preschool Initiative	Who Administers
Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS	BPS
Chicago: CPCs	Chicago Public Schools
Denver: DPP	DPP, an independent nonprofit organization under contract to the city
Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool	Elk Grove Unified School District
Los Angeles: LAUP	LAUP is an independent nonprofit created by First 5 Los Angeles.
New York City: Prekindergarten for All	New York City Department of Education
Salt Lake: School Readiness	United Way of Salt Lake is the intermediary for the Pay for Success bond. Individual providers operate the programs.
San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA	Pre-K 4 SA is nonprofit organization legally separate from the city but works closely with the mayor's office.
San Francisco: PFA	Initially First 5 San Francisco, transitioning to the city-run Office of Early Care and Education

Preschool Initiative	Who Administers
Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program	Department of Education and Early Learning, City of Seattle
Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program	Division of Early Learning, part of the Office of the State Superintendent of Education
West Sacramento: UP4WS	Early Learning Services Division, City of West Sacramento

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Boston Public Schools (n.d., 2015); City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); City of West Sacramento (n.d.a); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014a); Office of the State Superintendent of Education (n.d.).

Phase-In Plan

The length of the phase-in plans for the preschool initiatives varies widely. Some initiatives (e.g., San Francisco) phased in gradually during a 10-year period. Other initiatives (e.g., Denver, New York City) attempted to serve their target populations during the first year of implementation. Interestingly, most of the initiative directors we interviewed, including those who had attempted a rapid implementation, advised a gradual phase-in to allow time for quality improvement and obtaining sufficient facilities. Table 11 briefly describes the phase-in plans for each initiative.

Table 11. Phase-In Plans for Preschool Initiatives

Preschool Initiative	Phase-In Plan
Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS	BPS: In 2005, the city of Boston provided 700 free preschool slots, mostly in inclusive classrooms. By 2010, 85% of the elementary schools had at least one preschool classroom, with more than 2,000 slots for four-year-old children. As of 2015, 95% of the elementary schools have a preschool classroom, with 2,400 slots available. Currently cannot expand further because of space and budget limitations. PEG: Starting with 15–20 classrooms in fall 2015, depending on possible foundation funding. May expand further if the city decides to fund a mixed delivery program to increase slots in BPS.
Chicago: CPCs	Information not available
Denver: DPP	None; open to all Denver four-year-old children at the start of operations.
Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool	Started as a twilight program in conjunction with adult education programs in six schools. As the adult education program was phased out, preschool moved into more classrooms during the day. In the 2015–16 school year, the district will have 10 Title I–funded classrooms in eight schools. All of these schools also have other preschool classrooms funded by Head Start or Title 5 State Preschool.
Los Angeles: LAUP	In 2002, adopted a goal of universal preschool for four-year-old children by 2014. Received a Power of Preschool grant in 2006 and started by targeting areas of greatest need by ZIP code. In 2007, created 4,034 new slots and 4,360 upgraded slots.
New York City: Prekindergarten for All	During the 2014–15 school year, expanded existing slots from half day to full day, added new slots, and improved the quality of existing full-day slots.

Preschool Initiative	Phase-In Plan
Salt Lake: School Readiness	United Way of Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County backed the loan for the proof of concept year in the first year of the program, with 600 children. Starting with the second year of the program, the state of Utah is guaranteeing the loan, and the program expanded to 750 children. The program will serve 750 children in the third year and expand to serve 1,000 children in the final years of the grant period.
San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA	Started with two city-run centers in 2013–14, added two more in 2014–15, and will add a limited number of public and private providers starting in 2016–17. Full implementation is expected in 2017–18.
San Francisco: PFA	Initially targeted low-income and high-need neighborhoods and became citywide in 2008. City funding was meant to phase in across a five-year period but was not fully funded or fully implemented until 2014. Additional funds from the 2014 renewal and increase of the set-aside from the General Fund for preschool and other educational purposes will be phased in across the next few years.
Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program	Starting with 14–15 classrooms in 2015–16, expanding to 39 in 2016–17, 70 in 2017–18, and 100 in 2018–19, with 2,000 children served in the last year. At that time, the program will be evaluated for renewal.
Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program	The 2008 Act outlined three goals: expand preschool programs by 2,000 slots, improve the quality of existing programs, and place well-qualified and well-paid teachers in every prekindergarten classroom by FY 2014. Work began in 2008, and quality improvement is ongoing.
West Sacramento: UP4WS	Program implemented with a grant from First 5 California in 2005. The first class was 135 children. By 2010, the city had the capacity to provide access to high-quality preschool to all four-year-old children in the city.

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Boston Public Schools (n.d.); City of San Antonio (2015); City of Seattle (2015c); City of West Sacramento (n.d.a); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); New York City Office of the Mayor (2014).

Teacher Qualifications, Other Quality Measures, and Provision for Professional Development and Tuition Reimbursement for Personnel

Requirements for quality measures (e.g., teacher qualifications, adult-to-child ratios, the use of an evidence-based curricula, evaluations based on classroom assessment tools, and standardized child assessment measures) vary across the preschool initiatives. Six initiatives (Seattle, District of Columbia, Boston, New York City, Elk Grove, and Chicago) require teachers to have bachelor's degrees. Other initiatives, such as Denver, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, have less rigorous teacher qualification requirements but provide higher reimbursements to programs that meet higher QRIS levels and include a requirement for teachers at the highest level to have bachelor's degrees. Denver, Los Angeles, and Seattle all use their state or local QRIS as the framework for quality, and providers must meet a specific QRIS rating level to participate and provide preschool through the initiative. Almost all the initiatives have requirements for ratios and total class sizes, but these varied, with some using Head Start standards for ratios and others using Title 5 State Preschool or state licensing standards that tend not to require as protective ratios.

The preschool initiatives also vary in the degree to which they provide professional development or tuition reimbursement to encourage teachers to obtain more education. San Antonio, Boston, and Salt Lake offer the most in terms of professional development. These three initiatives provide regular coaching and professional development. San Antonio also offers tuition credits to preschool teachers taking courses leading toward degrees.

Finally, many of the preschool initiatives require that programs receive an independent assessment of quality using the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS) or the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS). Scores on these assessments are factored into the overall quality rating of the program in Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle, with the assessment also used as a foundation for professional development.

Table 12 briefly describes teacher qualifications, other quality measures, and provision for professional development or tuition reimbursement as an incentive for professional development for each initiative.

Table 12. Teacher Qualifications, Other Quality Measures, and Provision for Professional Development and Tuition Reimbursement for Preschool Initiatives

Preschool Initiative	Teacher Qualifications	Other Quality Measures	Provision for Professional Development or Tuition Reimbursement
Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS	BPS: Teachers must meet same requirements as K–12 teachers (bachelor's degree and credential with plans to receive a master's degree within five years). K1DS: Teachers must have a bachelor's degree in early childhood education.	BPS: Working toward National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) accreditation for all district-operated classrooms (currently 30 are accredited). Staff-to-child ratio of 2:22, negotiated by union contract because teachers have master's degrees. K1DS/PEG: Must be licensed by the state and either NAEYC accredited or working toward accreditation; staff-to-child ratio of 2:20. All programs: Must use standard curriculum, OWL and Building Blocks, which is aligned with BPS kindergarten curriculum. Teacher coaching and observations. Required to allow time for professional development.	Professional development opportunities offered through the public school system and paid for by PEG. BPS also offers extensive curriculum training and coaching, with one coach per every 10 classrooms.
Chicago: CPCs	Each center has one head teacher with certification and a bachelor's degree or higher. Classroom teachers also must be certified with a bachelor's degree. Assistants have an associate's degree, 60 hours in early childhood education, or a Child Development Associate credential.	Class size limited to 17 with at least two teaching staff. Curriculum is aligned with the associated elementary school program. Parent engagement standards include at least 2.5 hours per week of participation.	Provides coaching and at least two professional development sessions per year.

Preschool Initiative	Teacher Qualifications	Other Quality Measures	Provision for Professional Development or Tuition Reimbursement
Denver: DPP	No single requirement exists, although teacher qualifications are taken into account by the Colorado Shines QRIS, and programs must have a Level 3 QRIS rating or be taking specific measures to reach that rating to participate in the initiative.	Programs are evaluated and rated by Colorado Shines, NAEYC, or the National Association of Family Child Care. Programs must have a Level 3 Colorado Shines QRIS rating or be taking specific measures to reach that rating. Teacher qualifications, adult-to-child ratios, classroom size, curriculum, and other quality measures are considered as part of the rating process.	Each program receives a quality improvement plan from DPP. Depending on need, DPP invests in coaching, tuition, or other professional development activities.
Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool	Credentialed teachers with a bachelor's degree and 12 hours of early childhood education; newly hired assistants are required to have 48 college units or an associate's degree. Five teachers without bachelor's degrees were grandfathered into the system.	Individual classrooms meet standards for their specific funding source: Head Start classrooms meet Head Start standards, and Title 5 State Preschool classrooms meet state standards. Title I classrooms meet state licensing requirements, with a classroom size of 20 and a staff-to-child ratio of 1:10.	Professional development opportunities are provided through Race to the Top funds.
Los Angeles: LAUP	The lead teacher must hold a Child Development Teacher permit,[a] and assistants must have a Child Development Assistant permit. For QRIS Level 4 programs, lead teachers must have an associate's degree in early childhood education or a related field; for QRIS Level 5 programs, lead teachers must have a bachelor's degree.	Staff-to-child ratio of 1:8, with at least one adult qualifying as a lead teacher. NAEYC-accredited programs with at least a five-star rating may operate at 1:20. The maximum class size is 24. Programs must follow one of eight approved curricula or follow the Montessori or Reggio Emilia approach. Quality certification through QRIS is required, and higher rated programs receive higher reimbursements.	Program support specialists offer training opportunities and facilitate learning communities for teachers.

Preschool Initiative	Teacher Qualifications	Other Quality Measures	Provision for Professional Development or Tuition Reimbursement
New York City: Prekindergarten for All	All teachers must have a bachelor's degree and either early childhood certification or be on track to get it within three years. No grace period exists after the three years are passed.	All programs are evaluated using ECERS and CLASS evaluations. Class sizes and ratios are based on Department of Health regulations. The curriculum must meet New York State Common Core requirements for preschool, and programs must meet requirements for parent engagement. All programs must be licensed and receive regular safety inspections.	Professional development and trainings offered by the New York City Department of Education throughout the school year, as well as on-site support at both the classroom and the program levels. Past partnership with City University of New York (CUNY) helps teachers become certified. CUNY'S Early Childhood Professional Development Institute advises teachers and provides professional development resources.
Salt Lake: School Readiness	Lead teachers must have at least a Child Development Associate credential or an associate's degree in early childhood education or a related field. Many lead teachers have bachelor's degrees. Assistant teachers often have Child Development Associate credentials, but only a high school diploma is required.	Adult-to-child ratio of 1:10 is required. The We Can! Early Childhood Curriculum is an evidence-based curriculum. Special education consultants, speech-language pathologists, and other service providers provide additional support.	Teachers receive monthly evidence-based professional development and coaching. No monetary support is provided for teachers to attain bachelor's degrees, but the program provides release time and other in-kind support for teachers working on their degrees.
San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA	Teachers must be certified in early childhood education. Most have bachelor's degrees; some have master's degrees. Assistants must have Child Development Associate credential or an associate's degree. All are required to have at least three years of early childhood teaching experience (most have much more).	Classroom ratio of 2:20, with eight floating assistants. Unable to confirm additional quality measures.	Offers coaching and tuition credits. Holds free on-site training sessions that also are open to preschool teachers throughout the state of Texas.

Preschool Initiative	Teacher Qualifications	Other Quality Measures	Provision for Professional Development or Tuition Reimbursement
San Francisco: PFA	The minimum qualifications for a lead teacher include a California Child Development Permit at the teacher level (24 units of early childhood education and child development including core courses plus 16 general education units); the second teacher must be at least an associate teacher, and the third teacher must be at least an assistant teacher. Each site also must have a program director with a bachelor's degree or a site director with a California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Site Supervisor Permit for agencies operating multiple sites. Program or site directors must have 24 early childhood education and child development units (including core) plus six units of administration and two units of adult supervision. Family child care programs are exempt from the program director qualifications but must meet the lead teacher qualifications.	All preschool classrooms must have a minimum score of 4.50 on ECERS or the Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale (FCCERS) and must maintain a score of 4.00 across the entire facility. Curriculum documentation also must be provided. Classroom size of no more than 24, staff-to-child ratio of 1:8 (or 1:10 for Head Start or Title 5 State Preschool).	Professional development supports are developed by citywide trend data from CLASS/ECERS, and cohorts are formed as professional learning communities (project, dual language, science, and curriculum). Sites may choose from a menu of options and must commit to setting aside funding from their PFA budget for release time of staff (one session per month). Also provides on-site coaching. Every participating program must have a quality improvement plan that is linked to their professional development and the PFA budget.

Preschool Initiative	Teacher Qualifications	Other Quality Measures	Provision for Professional Development or Tuition Reimbursement
Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program	Lead teachers: Bachelor's degree in early childhood education or a bachelor's degree and a Washington State teaching certificate with a P–3 endorsement. Assistant teachers: Associate's degree in early childhood education or two years of coursework in early childhood education meeting Washington State Core Competencies for Early Care and Educational Professionals. Teachers have four years to meet these requirements. Tuition support is provided.	All programs must have a QRIS rating of at least 3. A six-hour day is required. The maximum class size is 20, with a 1:10 adult-to-child ratio. Programs must offer one of two approved curriculums (High Scope or Creative), and curriculum training is required.	Tuition assistance is available. High Scope and Creative curriculum training is offered at no cost to providers, along with other professional development opportunities and on-site coaching.
Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program	Must have bachelor's degree or (for nonpublic schools) an associate's degree with plans to get a bachelor's degree by September 2017. Assistant teachers must have associate's degree, 48 credits, or a paraprofessional credential. A Child Development Associate credential is acceptable only for nonpublic schools. Charter schools do not have specific teacher requirements.	Classroom sizes no larger than 20 for four-year-old children and 16 for three-year-old children. Staff-to-child ratio of 2:16 for three-year-old children and 2:20 for four-year-old children. Mixed-age classrooms follow the standards for three-year-olds. Participating CBO programs must be nationally accredited. All programs operated by public schools or CBOs use a curriculum aligned with the District of Columbia Public Schools early learning standards and perform required developmental screenings. Charter schools are not bound by these requirements, but they undergo regular reviews by the District of Columbia Public School Charter Board.	Offers free and low-cost training sessions, including free Child Development Associate credential trainings with books and other materials included. The University of the District of Columbia also offers a scholarship fund, initially funded by the Initiative, which covers the cost of classes and books for teachers seeking certification or advanced degrees.

Preschool Initiative	Teacher Qualifications	Other Quality Measures	Provision for Professional Development or Tuition Reimbursement
West Sacramento: UP4WS	Master teachers or program directors (i.e., site directors) will possess (or be in the process of obtaining) bachelor's degrees in early childhood education and child development. Assistant teachers will possess associate's degrees with 24 core early childhood education units. Any teaching staff not meeting the above requirements must follow a written plan to satisfy them by 2015.	All programs must receive passing scores on ECERS, FCCERS, or the Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scale, as determined by the city of West Sacramento, and must complete CLASS evaluations. Teacher-to-child ratio of 2:20 or 3:24 at preschools (lower for toddlers and infants). Programs that exceed minimum requirements receive higher reimbursements.	None specifically, but partner organizations often use funds from UP4WS for professional development purposes.

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Barnett et al. (2015); Boston Public Schools (n.d., 2015); City of Seattle (2015c); City of West Sacramento (n.d.b); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Human Capital Research Collaborative (2014a); Los Angeles Universal Preschool (2014b).

[a]The Child Development Permit is a document that authorizes service in the care, development, and instruction of children in a child care and development program. It verifies that the individual has fulfilled the requirements established by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing for assisting, teaching, or supervising in a child development program in the state of California. A provider must have a permit to be eligible for child care and development teaching or administrative positions funded by California Department of Education's Child Development Division.

Political Leadership

Almost every initiative we studied had a local politician or other leader who took on preschool as a cause. In several cases, a city mayor or other elected official acted as an advocate for the preschool program. For example, Mayors John Hickenlooper and Michael Hancock of Denver, Julián Castro of San Antonio, Ed Murray of Seattle, and Christopher Cabaldon of West Sacramento, as well as City Council President Tim Burgess of Seattle and County Supervisor Tom Ammiano of San Francisco, were particularly instrumental in helping pass ballot initiatives relating to preschool programs in their cities. Mayors also have influenced the creation of preschool initiatives in other ways, such as Bill de Blasio of New York City encouraging the state legislature to drastically increase funding for the state's universal preschool program or Mayors Tom Menino and Martin Walsh working with the local district to expand preschool opportunities in Boston (Table 13).

Community organizers and education advocates also provide key leadership in many localities. Particularly potent is the combination of advocacy with elected leaders, as in Salt Lake City, where the local United Way and local education leaders worked together to convince the state to back Pay for Success initiatives, or in Washington, D.C., where then-Council Chair Vincent Gray joined with advocacy groups to help pass the 2008 city council measure that funded universal preschool in that city.

Table 13. Political Leadership for Preschool Initiatives

Preschool Initiative	Political Leadership
Boston: BPS Early Education; Boston K1DS	Former Mayor Thomas Menino and current Mayor Martin Walsh
Chicago: CPCs	Original CPCs: former CPS Superintendent Lorraine Sullivan Pay for Success expansion: Mayor Rahm Emanuel
Denver: DPP	Former Mayor John Hickenlooper (now governor of Colorado; initial program) and current Mayor Michael Hancock (2014 expansion)
Elk Grove: Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool	Elizabeth Pinkerton, long-time district teacher and administrator, and Dave Gordon, district superintendent from 1995 to 2004
Los Angeles: LAUP	LAUP board and leadership team
New York City: Prekindergarten for All	Mayor Bill de Blasio
Salt Lake: School Readiness	United Way of Salt Lake, Voices for Utah Children, Salt Lake County Mayor Ben McAdams, State Representative Greg Hughes
San Antonio: Pre-K 4 SA	Mayor Julián Castro, local business leaders
San Francisco: (PFA	Community organizers, former County supervisor Tom Ammiano
Seattle: Seattle Preschool Program	City Council President Tim Burgess and Mayor Ed Murray
Washington, D.C.: Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program	Former District of Columbia Council Chair Vincent Gray (later mayor), current Mayor Muriel Bowser, and various community organizations and nonprofit organizations

Preschool Initiative	Political Leadership
West Sacramento: UP4WS	Mayor Christopher Cabaldon

Note. Information included in this table was either provided during interviews or adapted from Boston Public Schools (2015); City of Seattle (2015b); City of West Sacramento (n.d.a); Connors (2014); Dardick & Perez (2014); Denver Preschool Program (n.d.); Elk Grove Unified School District (2015); First 5 San Francisco (n.d.); Goldsmith (2008); Haskins (2014); New York City Office of the Mayor (2014); United Way of Salt Lake (2014); U.S. Conference of Mayors (2014a, 2014b); Watson (2010).

Analysis of Potential Funding Sources

Both benefits and challenges are associated with the various funding sources for financing universal preschool. The following sections briefly review the attributes of the primary funding mechanisms used by the preschool initiatives we studied, including sales taxes, property taxes, set-asides from city budgets, Pay for Success bonds, and Title I. We also discuss business involvement in direct funding as well as advocacy for publicly funded early care and education initiatives.

Sales Tax

Denver, San Antonio, and West Sacramento fund their preschool programs—at least in part—through a voter-approved, dedicated sales tax. According to the stakeholders interviewed, Denver successfully imposed a sales tax in 2006, after two prior efforts failed, by undertaking an extensive public education campaign that promoted the value of preschool to its citizens. The initial 2006 measure in Denver passed narrowly, winning 50.6 percent of the vote (50 percent was required for the measure to pass; Murray, 2014). A renewal and expansion of the preschool measure in 2014 won by a much more comfortable margin, garnering 55 percent of the vote (Robles, 2014).

San Antonio's tax passed in 2012 with 53 percent of the vote (Baugh & Cesar, 2012). West Sacramento's sales tax was a general sales tax, and only some of the revenues are dedicated to preschool services (City of West Sacramento, 2006). The tax passed with 64.5 percent of the vote (Yolo Elections Office, n.d.a), and the advisory measure connected to it passed with 82.3 percent of the vote (Yolo Elections Office, n.d.b).

California has a complicated tax structure, with strict rules about how taxes may be raised. Taxes are levied at the state, county, and city levels, and cities may impose additional taxes. Currently, counties and cities may impose additional sales taxes of up to 2 percent (Roberts, 2015). However, if both county and city taxes are imposed, the revenue is collected only once, with the city collecting its percentage on purchases made within city limits, and the county collecting its percentage on purchases made in the county but outside city limits (Institute for Local Government, 2008).

In California, sales taxes may be raised only by ballot measure. Government agencies may impose two types of taxes: general taxes and special taxes. General taxes are imposed to raise general-purpose revenue, which may be used toward any legal purpose. To be considered a general tax, no restrictions may be placed on the use of the revenue. *A general tax increase must be approved by a simple majority of the affected voters.* Special taxes are imposed to raise money for a specific purpose and can be used only toward the specified purpose. *A special tax must be approved by a two-thirds majority of the affected voters* (Institute for Local Government, 2008). In 1996, California voters passed Proposition 218, which gives local voters broad authority to file suit and challenge local taxes and fees (Legislative Analyst's Office, 1996).

Because a general tax requires a simple majority of the vote, it is typically considered the easier way to pass a tax measure. However, general taxes are more likely to be challenged in the courts, especially if they are written in such a way that they could be confused with a special tax. With a

general tax, voters have no guarantee that the additional funding would be used for any specific purpose. In contrast, a special tax is typically considered more difficult to pass than a general tax because it requires a two-thirds majority, but with this type of tax, the voters are assured that the funds will be used for a specific purpose.

Although Sonoma County historically votes to support education and other government initiatives, according to the stakeholders interviewed, two recent tax increase measures failed on the ballot. Measure M, which was on the November 2014 ballot, was a 0.125 percent sales tax that would have provided support for the county library system. The measure faced no organized opposition, but it still failed to pass because it required a two-thirds majority for passage (Ballotpedia, 2014). The other recent tax increase failure was Measure A on the June 2015 ballot. In part because of the failure of Measure M, the supporters of Measure A wrote it as a general tax. Measure A was a general sales tax that, if approved, would have authorized the county to levy an additional sales tax of 0.25 percent, increasing the county's sales tax rate from 8.25 percent to 8.5 percent. County officials estimated the tax would have raised $20 million per year in additional revenue. The plan for the revenue involved 44 percent going to the county and the remainder going to cities within the county. County officials indicated that with approval of the measure, the county would have had the funds needed to repair and maintain the county's 12,383 miles of roads. The specific purposes listed in the ballot questions, however, also included transit services and public safety. Opponents critiqued Measure A because of its general purpose, arguing that because the county sold the sales tax as a way to repair the roads, it should have fully restricted its purpose to roads. Opponents also argued that there was no guarantee that the county would have used Measure A tax revenue for roads and might have diverted the revenue to pay off debt from the county's public pensions (Ballotpedia, 2015; Gullixson, 2015; Hart, 2015). The measure was soundly rejected, gaining only 37.3 percent of the vote (Ballotpedia, 2015). Had the measure passed, local taxpayer associations were planning to challenge it in court, based on their belief that it was really a special tax, not a general tax, and should have required a two-thirds majority (Kennedy, 2015).

In part because of the failure of Measure A and the previous failure of Measure M, the local stakeholders we interviewed expressed concerns about the prospects of a voter-supported tax increase winning on the ballot in Sonoma County. However, these same stakeholders also reported that they believed that tax money is the only stable, sustainable way to pay for expanded preschool, without increased funding from the state or federal government. In addition, the stakeholders involved in other preschool initiatives, including Denver, San Antonio, and San Francisco, agreed that a sales tax increase was a sustainable way of funding preschool expansion. While stakeholders in these local initiatives noted that one disadvantage of a sales tax increase is that revenue decreases when the economy is in a down cycle, they also noted that officials can factor possible economic downturns into the tax percentage increase to ensure a more stable revenue stream.

Property Tax

Another type of local tax that has been used to fund preschool initiatives is a property tax. Property taxes are assessed on owners of real property, including both residential and commercial properties. In California, general property taxes are limited to 1 percent, although increases can be assessed for specific purposes. Similar to sales taxes used for specific purposes,

in California, such increases must be approved by two thirds of the voters (Institute for Local Government, 2013). Seattle is funding its universal preschool program primarily through a property tax increase. According to the stakeholders interviewed, the city has a history of using the Families and Education Levy for education-related purposes (City of Seattle, 2015a). The tax increase passed in 2014 with 67 percent of the vote (Beekman, 2014).

Set-Asides

A set-aside is another way that some preschool initiatives have been funded. A set-aside, also known as an earmark, is a commitment from a local government to use money from its general fund for a specific purpose. A set-aside can be a specified amount, a percentage of revenue, or a combination of both. Some advantages of set-asides include their predictability from year to year and their ability to get citizens involved in the voting process. The disadvantages include a lack of flexibility as circumstances change or during a budget crisis (SPUR, 2008). San Francisco and Washington, D.C. largely fund their universal preschool programs through set-asides, according to the stakeholders interviewed for both initiatives. San Francisco's set-aside was created by the passage of Measure H in 2004, passing with more than 70 percent of the vote. San Francisco's set-aside from the general fund is actually financed by a 4 percent (initially 3 percent) set-aside from property tax revenues but did not increase the property tax itself.

Although sales taxes and property taxes have been successful through ballot measures for preschool initiatives in other states, the battle is likely to be greater for any local tax initiative to win in California because of the two-thirds majority requirement. The two places in California that have reached that level of support are San Francisco, which has a long history of supporting similar efforts, and West Sacramento, where only a very small portion of the tax increase goes toward providing preschool services. In San Francisco, the measure was part of a PEEF (Public Education Enrichment Fund) for educating older children, which may have increased its chances of passage.

Pay for Success

The benefits and challenges associated with other funding mechanisms, such as Pay for Success bonds, abound. The following briefly reviews Pay for Success and its history as well as its use as a funding source for the Salt Lake School Readiness initiative and CPCs.

Known in Australia and the United Kingdom as social impact bonds, Pay for Success is a new funding model that partners government and other nonprofit agencies with private investment firms. The investors pay for social intervention programs or improvements up front, and the government agency returns the money with interest after the programs begin to provide savings in other areas. The funds are repaid only if the savings are realized, based on specific metrics and outcomes agreed on in advance. The first social impact bond was issued in September 2010 by Social Impact UK, and the model has gained great interest in the United States during the last few years (Government of the United Kingdom, 2013; Nonprofit Finance Fund, 2013).

Within the last few years, several Pay for Success initiatives have launched in the United States; five have been funded as of February 2015. Two of these initiatives (Chicago and Salt Lake City/Park City, Utah) are targeted to funding preschool education for children from low-income

families (Golden & Nagendra, 2015). Preschool education is an area of interest to Pay for Success funders, in part because of a report from the National Bureau of Economic Research (Heckman, Moon, Pinto, Savelyev, & Yavetz, 2009) showing a 7 percent to 10 percent return on investment from the High/Scope Perry Preschool Program, which targeted African-American youth who were disadvantaged.

Because private investors bear the lion's share of the risk, Pay for Success initiatives are attractive. Supporters of the model suggest that shifting the financial risk onto private investors provides room for government agencies to experiment with new and different approaches (Hoback, 2015). However, the model also has its critics. In its study on a proposed Pay for Success initiative to fund prisoner reentry programs, the Maryland Department of Legislative Services (2013) found that such a program, on its own, was unlikely to pay back enough dividends to cover the costs of administering the initiative, much less reward investors. Hoback (2015) cited Susan Brown, public policy director of the Minnesota Council on Nonprofits, who expressed concerns about the time and expense of evaluating the programs to determine whether the metrics are being met. Other issues raised include the difficulty of quantifying outcomes and the risk of services being compromised by the incentive to hit specific targets (McHugh, Sinclair, Roy, Huckfield, & Donaldson, 2013). A similar project in the United Kingdom was shown to have decreased the quality of the services provided by a reentry organization called Pathways to Work, when they shaped their policies to suit the terms of their contract with the investor rather than the needs of their clients (Hudson, Phillips, Ray, Vegeris, & Davidson, 2010). Others, such as Congressman Ross Hunter, see the interest rates charged by these private investors as too high compared with traditional government-backed bonds (he cites a difference of 9 percent to 11 percent compared with rates as low as 4 percent; Hoback, 2015).

Using Pay for Success, Salt Lake has finished its second year of a program, called School Readiness, to expand preschool access for three- and four-year-old children from low-income families. Because School Readiness is the first attempt in the United States to fund early childhood education on the Pay for Success model, the project has attracted national attention. It will likely be considered a test case as to whether the Pay for Success scheme is a feasible way to fund early childhood education programs (Lu, 2014; Meehan, 2013).

The impetus for using the Pay for Success model in Salt Lake was based on a study by Voices for Utah Children (2011), which followed a cohort of children who attended high-quality Title I preschools in Salt Lake City's Granite School District. The study showed that these children used special education services at a much lower rate, resulting in reduced costs for the district. According to the stakeholders interviewed, because the preschool program provided such a well-delineated return on investment, early childhood leaders in the city felt it would make an excellent candidate for a Pay for Success bond. Goldman Sachs and philanthropic investor J. B. Pritzker fronted the funds for the initial investment (Meehan, 2013). Initially, the state was unwilling to pass a bill that would provide backing funds for the loan. United Way of Salt Lake and Salt Lake County set up the initial contracts and put up backing funds ($1 million from the United Way and $350,000 from the county) for the first year of the program, referred to as a "proof of concept" year. This provided an example framework for the state, and the state came onboard, setting aside the backing funding by passing HB 96 in 2014. HB 96 created the School Readiness Board, which guarantees the Salt Lake Pay for Success project and offered competitive grants to other preschool programs wanting to improve their quality standards in hopes of attracting future Pay for Success

funding. The bill appropriated $3 million for the grants and to back or guarantee the remaining years of the School Readiness Pay for Success grant (Utah State Legislature, 2014). The Early Intervention Research Unit of Utah State University will measure the outcomes. If the agreed-on outcomes are not reached, the loan will not be repaid (United Way of Salt Lake, 2014).

The Salt Lake Pay for Success grant pays the full cost of a $1,550 per child, three-hour preschool program for approximately 750 children from low-income families currently and will expand to 1,000 children during the final two years of the grant. The Salt Lake stakeholders interviewed reported that the intent of this particular Pay for Success bond was not to serve every child from a low-income family in Salt Lake. Instead, they are taking the opportunity to reach out to low-income families and educate them on the importance of preschool and work with the Utah State Legislature to expand preschool opportunities throughout the state. The director of preschool services for Granite School District, one of the providers for the Pay for Success grant, estimated that the district's preschool program serves approximately 3,000 children, of which approximately 624 receive preschool services through the Pay for Success grant. In addition, she estimated that the district's preschool program serves only 50 percent of the eligible population in the district.

The CPC program in Chicago also is using Pay for Success to expand its program for three- and four-year-old children. The program was founded in 1967 by a former superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools, Lorraine Sullivan, and was designed to provide preschool to children from low-income families not already being served by Head Start. It is known for being the first preschool program to be funded with federal Title I dollars, as well as for the Chicago Longitudinal Study, which tracks students to show the long-term impact of attending a high-quality preschool (University of Minnesota, 2015). The program runs from age 3 through third grade, with three- and four-year-old children attending half-day preschool at a center co-located with an elementary school. The program also requires parent participation, both at home and in the classroom. However, because of budget cuts, school closures, and declining enrollment, the program had been slowly losing seats (Harris, 2012), down from a high of 25 centers and 1,500 three-year-old children through third graders served per year in the 1980s to only 10 centers with 670 preschool slots in 2009 (Nyhan, 2013). In 2011, the city was part of a consortium that received an i3 grant to expand the CPC model to more cities, primarily in the Midwest. Chicago's portion of the $15 million five-year grant provided services to 1,200 children at 15 sites starting in fall 2012 (Human Capital Research Collaborative, 2011). To build on this expansion, in October 2014, Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel announced a $17 million social impact bond that would fund an additional 2,600 CPC slots across three years (Connors, 2014). Goldman Sachs and Northern Trust are the primary funders. The program is administered by the Chicago Public Schools and will be evaluated by a consortium of three local nonprofit groups (Dardick & Perez, 2014). The new slots will be opened in six schools, including two existing CPC locations, three locations added in the 2012 expansion, and one entirely new location. Capital construction costs will be funded by the city and the state of Illinois, not the social impact bond (Human Capital Research Collaborative, 2014b).

As with Salt Lake, the Chicago CPC Pay for Success grant is already garnering national interest, but it also has its critics. Rick Cohen (2014) pointed out that the CPC program already has a proven record of success (a 20-year longitudinal study from a team from the University of Rochester showed more than $7 returned per dollar invested; see Reynolds, Temple, White, Ou, & Robertson, 2011) and suggests that the city would be better served by paying for the program

up front rather than giving the money back to investors later on. Other fiscal evaluations suggest that the cost of administering the bond may outweigh the savings to the city (Sanchez, 2014).

Overall, the Pay for Success model in the United States may have limits as a primary or long-term funding source for a large-scale preschool initiative. First, Pay for Success requires an initial private investor willing to assume the risk of funding the initiative without guarantee of repayment. In addition, it is important to note that Salt Lake uses Pay for Success funding to pay for a very small percentage of the four-year-old population, and in Chicago, the Pay for Success bond is not the primary source of funding. However, it will be important to keep an eye on the Salt Lake and Chicago "experiments" to see if Pay for Success does expand to support a larger scale initiative. At a minimum, the Pay for Success model may play an important role in raising public awareness of the importance of early education, thereby contributing to increased support for more stable public funding for preschool.

Federal Title I

One of the oldest sources of public funding for preschool initiatives is federal Title I funds, which are used in Chicago and Elk Grove. In 2014–15, the Elk Grove Unified School District designated approximately 8.5 percent of its Title I funds to provide preschool services in Title I–eligible schools. The provision of Title I funds allowed the Elk Grove district to serve children just above the income eligibility limits for other publicly subsidized programs and provide compensation to preschool teachers equivalent to that of K–12 personnel.

The advantages of using Title I funds for preschool include the flexibility of the funding source; in schools with schoolwide Title I programs, the funds can be used for any child, regardless of family income, attending a Title I school, to improve the quality of service and compensation for personnel and extend the hours or days of service.

The primary disadvantage of Title I as a funding source for preschool, unless federal Title I funds are increased overall, is that the federal government has provided these funds to schools to support students in all grades, from prekindergarten to Grade 12. In 2006–07, less than 1 percent (approximately 0.6 percent) of California's Title I funds were allocated for preschool (Karoly, Reardon, & Cho, 2007), compared with 3 percent nationally (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). During the recent Great Recession, it is likely that even schools that had been using Title I for preschool-age children faced pressure to use the funds to fill deficits in services for older children. That said, Title I remains an important part of preschool finance in CPCs, perhaps the most thoroughly evaluated preschool program showing one of the highest returns on investment. Using Title I funds to support preschool in combination with another funding mechanism, as in Chicago, may be a workable approach.

Partnerships with Local Businesses

Another potential approach for obtaining support for preschool is to develop partnerships with local businesses. Business support might be direct, as in the provision of on-site programs for preschool-age children or infants and toddlers or the provision of employee benefits to pay for preschool or child care, or indirect, by engaging business support for a preschool initiative supported by public funds. For example, chambers of commerce provided key support for

preschool initiatives in Denver (Goldsmith, 2008) and San Antonio (Baugh & Cesar, 2012), by not only endorsing the measures but also helping to craft them, with representatives serving on working groups and task forces from the early stages of the process.

Many chamber of commerce organizations encourage their members to provide support for their employees' child care needs. The Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce is one local leader in this area. Through its WHEEL Plus program, and in partnership with First 5 Sonoma County, the Chamber promotes the importance of early childhood education to its members, and they sponsor an annual tour of high-quality child care facilities, according to the vice president of public policy for the Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce. The Santa Rosa Chamber worked with local businesses to apply for a grant from First 5 Sonoma County, which would have provided support for companies to provide on-site child care. The proposal was not funded, but according to the stakeholders interviewed, the Chamber continues to be interested in supporting efforts to expand child care programs in the county.

Sonoma County stakeholders who were interviewed identified a lack of employers large enough to provide a sustainable population of children of the right age to make it cost effective to hire staff at the ratios required for child care licensure as the key barrier to employers providing on-site child care for their employees. One potential solution suggested was finding ways to encourage employers located near each other, such as in an office park, to work together to fund a child care center.

One large Sonoma County employer, Graton Resort & Casino in Rohnert Park, proposed to offer on-site child care to its employees (Mason, 2008), but this does not seem to have become a reality. However, many casinos host or provide on-site child care facilities for their employees. Two Las Vegas casinos—the Venetian and Texas Station—opened the first such facilities in 2000. The centers were owned and operated by Children's Choice Learning Centers, a for-profit company (purchased by Bright Horizons in 2013) that paid for the centers' construction and operation. The casinos donated the land, and the Venetian subsidized parent fees at 20 percent below market rates (Strow, 2000). Some states, such as Massachusetts, have passed laws authorizing municipalities to require casinos to build child care centers (Timmins, 2013).

Another potential employer to target for providing child care to its employees is Kaiser Permanente. Many hospitals provide on-site or subsidized child care to their employees. Large hospitals with on-site employee child care centers include Stanford Hospital and Florida Hospital Waterman (Galt, 2013), as well as Rex Hospital at the University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill and Riverside Methodist Hospital in Columbus, Ohio (Fields, Rodak, Roney, & Tawoda, 2012).

Although it seems unlikely that businesses will be a primary operator of preschools, there may be opportunities for Sonoma County to work with the business community to expand access to preschool, and having business support for a locally funded preschool initiative could well be invaluable in garnering larger community support for such an initiative.

Cost Estimates and Phase-In Plans

Cost per Child for Universal Preschool

To determine the funds necessary to support universal preschool in Sonoma County, it is first important to determine the expenditure per child necessary for such an initiative. Based on direction from Sonoma County Department of Health Services, Health Policy, Planning and Evaluation staff, the goal was to estimate the cost of a full-day, full-year program that would serve three- and four-year-old children to meet the objective of promoting school readiness while also operating on a schedule that would meet the needs of working parents.

To estimate the current per-child cost of such a program serving three- and four-year-old children in Sonoma County, we began by reviewing the budgets and staffing patterns for a sample of the county's preschool programs, including Head Start and Title 5 State Preschool, the two publicly funded programs whose standards are generally thought to represent the minimum level of quality necessary to promote improved early learning and increase child outcomes (Karoly & Bigelow, 2005). The standards for these two programs also relate to California's five-level Race to the Top QRIS framework. Although Sonoma County was not one of the original 16 counties piloting the framework, having such a framework may help the county qualify for the new California State Preschool Block Grants. Federal Head Start Performance Standards roughly translate to a Level 4 rating on the QRIS framework, whereas Title 5 State Preschool standards translate approximately to a QRIS Level 3 rating. As we saw in the descriptions of the 12 preschool initiatives, several initiatives, such as those in Denver, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, currently use QRIS Level 3 ratings as one of the entry-level requirements for receiving preschool initiative funding.

Staffing patterns and adult-to-child ratios in preschool classrooms were similar, although not identical across the programs in Sonoma County that we studied. For example, whereas Title 5 State Preschool allows a group size of 24 with a staff-to-child ratio of 1:8 for preschool children, the maximum group size in Head Start is 20 for four-year-olds with 17 for three-year-olds, with staff-to-child ratios for the two age groups of 1:10 and 1:8.5, respectively. Taking these differences into account, we assumed a group size of 20 children with at least two adults—two teachers—all day, plus 1.8 full-time equivalent teaching assistants (i.e., the teaching assistants are present most of the day but typically not in the early morning or late afternoon when fewer children are in full-day programs). These specifications—a group size of 20 and 1:10 adult-to-child ratio—also conform to Tier 3 and 4 requirements in California's emerging QRIS system.

Although per-child costs were similar across these Sonoma-based programs we studied, centers allocated nonteaching staff resources differently. For example, following federal requirements, the Head Start program hired a family outreach worker to work with families and promote family engagement. Whereas this feature was lacking in other preschool programs we studied, some had a facilities specialist and a fiscal specialist, positions that might exist for the overall administration of Head Start across the county but not in an individual center.

As indicated above, based on direction from Sonoma County staff and local stakeholders, we assumed a full-day (eight-hour), full-year (12-month) program. It is important to note that although the budgets we developed defined "full day, full year" in this manner, this is not the

definition we later found to be used in most of the local preschool initiatives (outside of Sonoma county) that we examined (described previously in the report), which typically define a full day as up to the school day length of 6.5 hours and operate on a school-year (10-month) versus 12-month basis. This difference in definition is important as the longer number of hours and days of preschool services proposed in Sonoma substantially increases the cost.

Based on the standards and assumptions outlined previously, we found that the cost of a full-day, full-year preschool program using current salaries for staff in Sonoma County would be $11,590 per child. Of these costs, approximately 44 percent are for instructional staff salaries, 11 percent for other staff salaries, 18 percent for staff benefits, and 27 percent for nonpersonnel costs. Further details of the costs included in the per child cost estimate are noted in Appendix C.

Based on direction from Sonoma County, raising the wages of the staff across the board to a living wage was the main approach for improving quality, with the intent of retaining as well as recruiting future qualified employees.

We estimated the cost per child if wages are increased to a living wage by setting $15 per hour as the minimum wage. For the lowest paid employee, a teacher assistant, this represented an increase of 15.74 percent; therefore, all teaching staff were given this same percentage raise in the living wage budgets. Nonteaching administrative staff (e.g., fiscal specialists, family outreach workers, and facilities specialists) are already paid a living wage. In developing the living wage budgets, because teachers are given notable raises and because it seemed important to recognize the roles the nonteaching staff play in establishing a quality program, we provided an increase for them as well. However, because the nonteaching staff as a group were already earning more than $15 per hour, we selected a 5 percent raise instead of 15.74 percent. This process resulted in a per-child cost of $13,143.

The per-child cost if wages were raised to living wages—$13,143—breaks out by budget category in approximately the same manner as the current salaries cost per child, given that nonpersonnel costs and benefits are estimated as a percentage of salaries. Further details of the costs included in the per child cost estimate are noted in Appendix C.

At first glance, the estimated costs per child of a preschool initiative in Sonoma County—$11,590 if staff were paid current salaries, $13,143 if salaries were raised to the living wage—seem to be in the upper half of the 12 initiatives we studied. The per-child estimated expenditure at living wage salaries in Sonoma would be about the same as the per-child cost in Seattle, although still lower than that in Boston, San Antonio, or Washington, D.C. However, it is important to note that the Sonoma program would offer eight hours and 12 months of service, whereas most of the other initiatives, including those in Seattle, San Antonio, and Washington, D.C., operate on a school-day, school-year calendar, and some of the programs, as in Elk Grove and LAUP, support only part-day services at a per-child cost of about half that estimated for the full-day program in Sonoma. Thus, a significant portion of the estimated per-child cost in Sonoma would actually go toward the provision of what would be considered extended-day, extended-year services in some of the other local preschool initiatives we examined (outside of Sonoma county and described previously in the report).

Although the total estimated per-child cost for the Sonoma program may seem substantial compared with existing State Preschool reimbursement rates, the portion of the expenditure available to finance a level of quality sufficient to promote school readiness is less than that of many of the other initiatives we studied, such as in Boston, San Antonio, and Washington, D.C. For example, the per-child expenditure in those cities is higher largely because of the level of teacher compensation. Our review found that offering compensation for lead teachers that was close to that of elementary school teachers with similar qualifications was a key factor in retaining qualified preschool teachers. Although increasing wages may help retain personnel, $15 per hour is still a long way from the median wage for an elementary school teacher in Santa Rosa (the Sonoma county seat) ($29 per hour; Salary.com, 2015), and this disparity may make retaining highly qualified staff difficult. Salary increases may have to be greater to attract and retain teachers who are more qualified. Also, for the purposes of further increasing program quality, the county may wish to consider the cost of implementing other quality elements, such as classroom assessments, professional development, coaching and mentors, a research-based curriculum, and more robust support for family engagement.

Various factors could increase or decrease the per-child cost of preschool. Major factors that might increase the cost are raising the compensation for lead teachers who have bachelor's degrees to be commensurate or closer to those of K–12 teachers, hiring a staff person to address family engagement, introducing a new evidence-based curriculum, offering teachers tuition reimbursement to obtain additional training, and conducting assessments of classroom quality to guide program improvement. The major factor that would decrease the cost of the program would be to offer services fewer hours a day and for fewer months a year (e.g., six hours per day and 10 months per year) as in most of the preschool initiatives we examined. Based on AIR's previous research, a program operating six hours a day for 175 days per year costs one third less than a program that operates 250 days per year and nine hours per day (Lam & Muenchow, 2009). Thus, reducing hours per day and days per year might yield sufficient savings to help Sonoma County provide some of the quality elements found in other preschool initiatives without raising the expenditure per child beyond that found for a living wage in this report.

Cost of Upgrading the Quality of Existing Subsidized Slots

For a mixed-delivery system for preschool as envisioned by the Sonoma stakeholders we interviewed, it is important to take into account not only the cost of creating new preschool slots to serve additional children but also the cost of upgrading the quality of existing subsidized slots (such as State Preschool and CalWORKS slots) expected to participate in the program. The purpose of the upgrade is to help the program reach quality standards (such as for teacher salaries, teacher–child ratios, curricula, and professional development) established for Sonoma's countywide program. Building on the existing number of publicly subsidized preschool slots captures some of the public dollars already invested in these programs, reduces the number of new facilities that need to be created, makes use of the existing labor force, and helps to create a delivery system that meets the needs of diverse families. Including these other publicly subsidized programs also creates an opportunity to create a more unified system and to simplify family entrance to the programs.

However, it is important to provide a level playing field where all participating providers who meet the same standards of quality receive the same payment or reimbursement for the same

number of hours of service. Currently, many of the existing subsidized programs, most notably State Preschool, receive only about 60 percent ($9,025 in 2014–15) of the proposed reimbursement at the living wage ($13,143) for the universal preschool program in Sonoma County.

We estimate the initial cost to upgrade the subsidized slots at current salaries is $2,565 per child in the first year. We derived this number by subtracting the 2014–15 State Preschool Reimbursement Rate ($9,025) from AIR's estimate of the real cost of preschool in Sonoma County ($11,590) at current salaries. We estimate that it will increase each year as the real cost of preschool increases 3 percent per year, a standard cost-of-living adjustment.

With staff compensation raised to the living wage, we estimate that the cost to upgrade existing subsidized slots is $4,118 per child in the first year. We derived this number by subtracting the 2014–15 State Preschool Reimbursement Rate ($9,025) from AIR's estimate of the real cost of preschool in Sonoma County at living wage salaries ($13,143). The upgrade will be part of the ongoing operational expense; hence, we estimate that it will also increase each year as the real cost of preschool increases 3 percent each year, a standard cost-of-living adjustment.

For the purposes of this estimate, we assume that the cost to upgrade existing subsidized programs such as Head Start, the Alternative Payment Program, and CalWORKS is on average the same as the cost for upgrading State Preschool. Based on our experience in other counties estimating the cost of upgrading programs, it may require somewhat less to upgrade Head Start, because it is typically better funded than State Preschool. However, some of the Head Start funds are spent on comprehensive health and other services beyond the scope of the proposed universal preschool program. Hence, the actual Head Start funds available for educational purposes are often not much greater than that for State Preschool. Similarly, some child care centers associated with CalWORKS appear to receive higher reimbursements than State Preschool, but the CalWORKS programs may also provide more hours and days of service. Hence, for planning purposes, we thought it best to apply the average upgrade rate to all subsidized slots to ensure that adequate resources are available.

Phase-In Plan Scenarios for Universal Preschool

Below we show the estimated total cost and phase-in plans for eight scenarios.

Table 14 summarizes provides the following information for each scenario:

- Population of children
- Number of children currently enrolled in publicly supported slots
- Unmet Need (Number of new or newly publicly supported slots needed)
- Length of phase-in
- Total cost in final year—current salaries
- Total cost in final year—living wage salaries

Tables 15 through 30 present the individual scenarios as follows:

1. Serving all four-year-olds in the high-priority census tracts (Tables 15 and 16)
2. Serving all four-year-olds in the high-priority ZIP codes (Tables 17 and 18)
3. Serving three and four-year-olds below 300 percent of the federal poverty level (FPL) at 85 percent participation rate in the high-priority census tracts (Tables 19 and 20)
4. Serving three and four-year-olds below 300 percent FPL at 85 percent participation rate in the high-priority ZIP codes (Tables 21 and 22)
5. Serving three and four-year-olds below 300 percent FPL at 70 percent participation rate in the high-priority census tracts (Tables 23 and 24)
6. Serving three and four-year-olds below 300 percent FPL at 70 percent participation rate in the high-priority ZIP codes (Tables 25 and 26)
7. Serving all three- and four-year-olds countywide at 70 percent participation rate (Tables 27 and 28)
8. Serving all three- and four-year-olds countywide at 70 percent participation rate; children below 300 percent FPL would receive free preschool and those above would receive discounted tuition (Tables 29 and 30)

The length of the phase-in period for each scenario depends on the number of new slots needed. For all scenarios in which more than 1,000 new slots are needed, we used a 10-year phase-in; for all scenarios in which fewer than 1,000 new slots are needed, we used a five-year phase-in.

Defining unmet need is one of the most challenging aspects of developing scenarios for phasing in universal preschool. On the one hand, a plan utilizing a mixed-delivery system would most likely build on the existing supply of both private pay and publicly subsidized providers. In many of the local preschool initiatives we studied, existing preschool providers, both public and private, were invited to submit applications to participate in the new local initiative. Building on the private as well as public supply reduces costs for construction of new facilities and offers families a wider selection of programs. However, one of the purposes of a universal preschool initiative is to help families currently struggling to pay for preschool. Expecting some families to pay the full price for a program that others receive for free seems unrealistic if not inconsistent with the concept of universal preschool. In the mixed-delivery initiatives we studied, such as Denver, San Francisco, and Seattle, all of the children attending participating private centers receive discounted or free tuition.

Thus, in estimating the expense of a universal preschool program, it is important to include the expense of both the new slots to be created and of existing private-pay slots that will now receive full or partial public support. In the following scenarios, therefore, we determined that the safest way to estimate unmet need—the number of new slots that will need to be created and the number of existing private-pay slots that will now receive public support—was to subtract only existing subsidized slots (Head Start, Title 5, CalWORKS Stages 2 and 3, and Alternative Payment programs) from the target population to be funded for each scenario. In this way, we allow for the possibility that the private-pay slots will become part of the new universal preschool system, but we account for the cost of providing public funding for them. We also

consider the cost of upgrading the existing subsidized slots to the quality standards described previously. Each table therefore presents the estimated total cost of creating the new slots and providing public support to existing private-pay slots in the target population of children, and of upgrading the existing subsidized slots to the level of the proposed Sonoma program.

The last scenario (Tables 29 and 30) uses the same approach but with one important difference: In this scenario we assume, after a 70 percent participation rate, that preschool will be free to three- and four-year-olds below 300 FPL while offering discounted—as opposed to free—tuition to the more than 3,000 children estimated to be above that income level countywide and likely participants in the program. Because developing a specific sliding fee scale was beyond the scope of this project, we estimated that, on average, the children above 300 percent of FPL would receive a tuition credit valued at 25 percent of the real cost. In practice, children closest to 300 percent of FPL would receive a larger discount and children far above that level would receive much less. This approach reduces the countywide estimated cost in the final year of the phase-in, at 70 percent participation, at current salaries, from approximately $104 million to $69.5 million.

Finally, as outlined in the list of scenarios above, we estimated the cost of serving children in different geographic areas and different income levels at several different participation rates. Based on our review of the 12 locally initiated preschool initiatives conducted for this Sonoma project, the level of participation depends largely on the design of the program—whether it is free, the hours of service, transportation, and the quality. In neighborhoods where participation in existing preschool programs is especially low, such as in Latino neighborhoods in Sonoma County, the level of outreach to encourage participation may be important. In Washington, D.C., where preschool is free to all three- and four-year-olds, 86 percent of the children participate in publicly subsidized preschool. In Denver, Colorado, where all four-year-olds are eligible, but where only the lowest income families receive free preschool and the remainder pay a portion of the cost based on a sliding fee scale, 54 percent participate. Some of the scenarios below in high-need areas in Sonoma County assume a 100 percent participation rate; the remainder assume between 70 percent and 85 percent participation.

Table 14. Summary of Total Costs for Last Year Of Phase-In for Each Scenario (Current Salaries and Increasing Salaries to a Living Wage) Calculating Unmet Need by Subtracting Only Existing Subsidized Preschool Slots (Head Start, Title 5, CalWORKS, and Alternative Payment Program), Including Upgrading Existing Subsidized Slots in the Total Costs

Phase-In Scenario	Population of Children	Existing Subsidized Slots ONLY	Number of Resulting New Slots Needed (Unmet Need)	Length of Phase-in	Current Salaries Total Cost in Final Year	Living Wage Total Cost in Final Year
1. All four-year-olds in the high-priority census tracts	1,280	395	885	5 years	$13,131,591	$15,369,941

Phase-In Scenario	Population of Children	Existing Subsidized Slots ONLY	Number of Resulting New Slots Needed (Unmet Need)	Length of Phase-in	Current Salaries Total Cost in Final Year	Living Wage Total Cost in Final Year
2. All four-year-olds in the high-priority ZIP codes	5,302	1,270	4,032	10 years	$68,713,520	$79,461,921
3. Three- and four-year-olds below 300% FPL at 85% participation rate in the high-priority census tracts	1,172 (85% of 1,379)	283	889	5 years	$12,733,626	$14,783,116
4. Three- and four-year-olds below 300% FPL at 85% participation rate in the high-priority ZIP codes	5,575 (85% of 6,558)	2,013	3,562	10 years	$65,660,627	$76,804,339
5. Three- and four-year-olds below 300% FPL at 70% participation rate in the high-priority census tracts	965 (70% of 1,379)	283	682	5 years	$10,033,495	$11,721,001
6. Three- and four-year-olds below 300% FPL at 70% participation rate in the high-priority ZIP codes	4,591 (70% of 6,558)	2,013	2,578	10 years	$50,780,871	$59,929,783
7. All three- and four-year-olds countywide at 70% participation rate	8,091 (70% of 11,558)	2,013	6,078	10 years	$104,182,375	$120,584,735

Phase-In Scenario	Population of Children	Existing Subsidized Slots ONLY	Number of Resulting New Slots Needed (Unmet Need)	Length of Phase-in	Current Salaries Total Cost in Final Year	Living Wage Total Cost in Final Year
8. All three- and four-year-olds countywide at 70% participation rate, free for children below 300% FPL, and a 25% tuition credit for all children at or above 300% FPL	8,091 (70% of 11,558)	2,013	3,021 (below 300% FPL) 3,057 (at or above 300% FPL)	10 years	$69,507,175	$81,260,933

The notes for each scenario provide the data sources for determining the target population and the children already served. Data on the number of existing subsidized slots in each scenario were obtained from AIR's Early Learning Needs Assessment Tool (ELNAT), which includes Head Start enrollment by ZIP code from an AIR survey of Head Start grantees and state-subsidized enrollment by ZIP codes from the California Department of Education's 801A reports, or from data on the number of place-based subsidized slots and alternative payment vouchers from the Child Care Planning Council Report Supplement, 2015, for the high-priority census tracts. The number of children was estimated using American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data.

The first table in each pair represents the total cost at current staff salaries and the second shows the total cost if staff salaries were to be increased to a living wage, as described above.

Four-Year-Olds in High-Priority Census Tracts

Table 15. All Four-Year-Olds in the High-Priority Census Tracts at Current Salaries

Total number of children	1,280				
Total number of slots to add (unmet need)	885				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New or newly publicly funded slots	40	120	200	240	285
Continuing slots created in prior years		40	160	360	600
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$11,590	$11,937	$12,295	$12,664	$13,044
Number of existing subsidized slots	395	395	395	395	395
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$2,565	$2,912	$3,270	$3,639	$4,019
Total cost each year	$1,476,569	$3,060,278	$5,718,098	$9,035,992	$13,131,591

Note. The total number of children (four-year-olds) was calculated by taking one third of "children 2 to under 5" category, Tables 10–14, Child Care Planning Council Report Supplement, 2015. Unmet need was calculated by subtracting all existing subsidized slots identified in the "Number of place-Based subsidized spaces" and "Number of children with Alternative Payment vouchers" table rows from the Child Care Planning Council Report Supplement tables for each high-priority census tract.

Table 16. All Four-Year-Olds in the High-Priority Census Tracts at Living Wage

Total number of children	1,280				
Total number of slots to add (unmet need)	885				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New or newly publicly funded slots	40	120	200	240	285
Continuing slots created in prior years		40	160	360	600
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$13,143	$13,538	$13,944	$14,362	$14,793
Number of existing subsidized slots	395	395	395	395	395
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$4,118	$4,513	$4,919	$5,337	$5,768
Total cost each year	$2,152,431	$3,948,454	$6,962,585	$10,725,281	$15,369,941

Note. The total number of children (four-year-olds) was calculated by taking one third of "children 2 to under 5" category, Tables 10–14, Child Care Planning Council Report Supplement, 2015. Unmet need was calculated by subtracting all existing subsidized slots identified in the "Number of place-based subsidized spaces" and "Number of children with Alternative Payment vouchers" table rows from the Child Care Planning Council Report Supplement tables for each high-priority census tract.

Four-Year-Olds in High-Priority ZIP Codes

Table 17. All Four-Year-Olds in the High-Priority ZIP Codes at Current Salaries

Total number of children	5,302				
Total number of slots to add (unmet need)	4,032				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New or newly publicly funded slots	80	120	200	300	400
Continuing slots created in prior years		80	200	400	700
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$11,590	$11,937	$12,295	$12,664	$13,044
Number of existing subsidized slots	1,270	1,270	1,270	1,270	1,270
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$2,565	$2,912	$3,270	$3,639	$4,019
Total cost each year	$4,184,110	$6,085,952	$9,071,448	$13,486,701	$19,452,800
	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
New or newly publicly funded slots	460	500	580	660	732
Continuing slots created in prior years	1,100	1,560	2,060	2,640	3,300
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$13,435	$13,839	$14,254	$14,681	$15,122
Number of existing subsidized slots	1,270	1,270	1,270	1,270	1,270
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$4,410	$4,814	$5,229	$5,656	$6,097
Total cost each year	$26,560,538	$34,620,456	$44,270,043	$55,631,632	$68,713,520

Note. The total number of children (four-year-olds) was calculated by using three-year averages from the 2012 American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data, disaggregated by ZIP based on Missouri Census Data Center ZIP code to (Public Use Microdata Area [PUMA]) allocation factors, for all ZIP codes associated with Sonoma County's highest-need elementary schools. Unmet need was calculated by subtracting total enrollment for three- and four-year-olds in all subsidized programs (Head Start, Title 5, CalWORKS, and Alternative Payment programs) in each of these ZIP codes, with Head Start enrollment from AIR's survey of Head Start grantees and state-supported enrollment from the California Department of Education 801A enrollment reports as of October 2012, as contained in AIR's Early Learning Needs Assessment Tool (ELNAT).

Table 18. All Four-Year-Olds in the High-Priority ZIP Codes at Living Wage

Total number of children	5,302				
Total number of slots to add (unmet need)	4,032				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New or newly publicly funded slots	80	120	200	300	400
Continuing slots created in prior years		80	200	400	700
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$13,143	$13,538	$13,944	$14,362	$14,793
Number of existing subsidized slots	1,270	1,270	1,270	1,270	1,270
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$4,118	$4,513	$4,919	$5,337	$5,768
Total cost each year	$6,281,615	$8,438,419	$11,824,156	$16,831,323	$23,597,245
	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
New or newly publicly funded slots	460	500	580	660	732
Continuing slots created in prior years	1,100	1,560	2,060	2,640	3,300
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$15,237	$15,694	$16,165	$16,649	$17,149
Number of existing subsidized slots	1,270	1,270	1,270	1,270	1,270
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$6,212	$6,669	$7,140	$7,624	$8,124
Total cost each year	$31,657,855	$40,798,297	$51,741,520	$64,626,258	$79,461,921

Note. The total number of children (four-year-olds) was calculated by using three-year averages from the 2012 American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data, disaggregated by ZIP based on Missouri Census Data Center ZIP code to (Public Use Microdata Area [PUMA]) allocation factors, for all ZIP codes associated with Sonoma County's highest-need elementary schools. Unmet need was calculated by subtracting total enrollment for three- and four-year-olds in all subsidized programs (Head Start, Title 5, CalWORKS, and Alternative Payment programs) in each of these ZIP codes, with Head Start enrollment from AIR's survey of Head Start grantees and state-supported enrollment from the California Department of Education 801A enrollment reports as of October 2012, as contained in AIR's Early Learning Needs Assessment Tool (ELNAT).

Three- and Four-Year-Olds Below 300 Percent of the Federal Poverty Level in High-Priority Census Tracts, at 85 Percent Participation Rate

Table 19. Three- and Four-Year-Olds Below 300 Percent FPL at 85 Percent Participation Rate in the High-Priority Census Tracts at Current Salaries

Total number of children	1,172				
Total number of slots to add (unmet need)	889				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New or newly publicly funded slots	80	120	200	240	249
Continuing slots created in prior years		80	200	400	640
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$11,590	$11,937	$12,295	$12,664	$13,044
Number of existing subsidized slots	283	283	283	283	283
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$2,565	$2,912	$3,270	$3,639	$4,019
Total cost each year	$1,652,923	$3,211,598	$5,843,634	$9,134,971	$12,733,626

Note. To estimate the total number of children (three- and four-year-olds) below 300 percent FPL in the high-priority census tracts, we used the Child Care Planning Council 2015 report supplement reports of "children from low-income families" (under 70 percent state median income) and "children in families earning just over the eligibility limit," which together provide the total number of children in families earning $75,000. Because 300 percent FPL for a family of four is $71,550, we multiplied this total by 90 percent to approximate the number of children in the high-priority census tracts below $71,500, or 300 percent of poverty. We then multiplied this population estimate of the number of children below 300 percent FPL by 85 percent, the assumed participation rate. To calculate unmet need, we used data on the number of children enrolled in subsidized slots, with Head Start enrollment obtained from AIR's survey of Head Start grantees and state-supported enrollment from the 801A reports from the California Department of Education and in all licensed care, for the ZIP code(s) associated with each census tract to estimate the percentage of overall slots that are subsidized. We then applied these percentages to total child care supply in each census tract to estimate the number of subsidized slots and subtracted these from total population.

Table 20. Three- and Four-Year-Olds Below 300 Percent FPL at 85 Percent Participation Rate in the High-Priority Census Tracts at Living Wage

Total number of children	1,172				
Total number of slots to add (unmet need)	889				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New or newly publicly funded slots	80	120	200	240	249
Continuing slots created in prior years		80	200	400	640
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$13,143	$13,538	$13,944	$14,362	$14,793
Number of existing subsidized slots	283	283	283	283	283
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$4,118	$4,513	$4,919	$5,337	$5,768
Total cost each year	$2,216,919	$3,984,552	$6,969,442	$10,702,019	$14,783,116

Note. To estimate the total number of children (three and four-year-olds) below 300 percent FPL in the high-priority census tracts, we used the Child Care Planning Council 2015 report supplement reports of "children from low-income families" (under 70 percent state median income) and "children in families earning just over the eligibility limit," which together provide the total number of children in families earning $75,000. Because 300 percent FPL for a family of four is $71,550, we multiplied this total by 90 percent to approximate the number of children in the high-priority census tracts below $71,500, or 300 percent of poverty. We then multiplied this population estimate of the number of children below 300 percent FPL by 85 percent, the assumed participation rate. To calculate unmet need, we used data on the number of children enrolled in subsidized slots, with Head Start enrollment obtained from AIR's survey of Head Start grantees and state-supported enrollment from the 801A reports from the California Department of Education and in all licensed care, for the ZIP code(s) associated with each census tract to estimate the percentage of overall slots that are subsidized. We then applied these percentages to total child care supply in each census tract to estimate the number of subsidized slots and subtracted these from total population.

Three- and Four-Year-Olds Below 300 Percent of the Federal Poverty Level in High-Priority ZIP Codes, at 85 Percent Participation Rate

Table 21. Three- and Four-Year-Olds Below 300 Percent FPL at 85 Percent Participation Rate in the High-Priority ZIP Codes at Current Salaries

Total number of children	5,575				
Total number of slots to add (unmet need)	3,562				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New or newly publicly funded slots	80	120	200	240	300
Continuing slots created in prior years		80	200	400	640
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$11,590	$11,937	$12,295	$12,664	$13,044
Number of existing subsidized slots	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$2,565	$2,912	$3,270	$3,639	$4,019
Total cost each year	$5,889,520	$8,022,573	$11,246,217	$15,146,910	$20,038,452
	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
New or newly publicly funded slots	360	400	500	600	762
Continuing slots created in prior years	940	1,300	1,700	2,200	2,800
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$13,435	$13,839	$14,254	$14,681	$15,122
Number of existing subsidized slots	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$4,410	$4,814	$5,229	$5,656	$6,097
Total cost each year	$26,000,265	$32,839,574	$41,475,490	$52,052,415	$65,660,627

Note. The total number of children (three- and four-year-olds) below 300 percent FPL in high-priority ZIP codes was calculated by using three-year averages from the 2012 American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data, disaggregated by ZIP based on Missouri Census Data Center ZIP code to (Public Use Microdata Area (PUMA)) allocation factors, for all ZIP codes associated with Sonoma County's highest-need elementary schools. This total was multiplied by 85 percent, the assumed participation rate. Unmet need was calculated by subtracting total enrollment for three- and four-year-olds in all subsidized programs (Head Start, Title 5, CalWORKS, and Alternative Payment programs) in each of these ZIP codes, with Head Start enrollment from AIR's survey of Head Start grantees, and state-supported enrollment from the California Department of Education 801A enrollment reports as of October 2012, as contained in AIR's ELNAT.

Table 22. Three- and Four-Year-Olds Below 300 percent FPL at 85 percent Participation Rate in the High-Priority ZIP Codes at Living Wage

Total number of children	5,575				
Total number of slots to add (unmet need)	3,562				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New or newly publicly funded slots	80	120	200	240	300
Continuing slots created in prior years		80	200	400	640
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$13,143	$13,538	$13,944	$14,362	$14,793
Number of existing subsidized slots	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$4,118	$4,513	$4,919	$5,337	$5,768
Total cost each year	$9,020,240	$11,439,252	15,095,062	$19,518,687	$25,065,996
	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
New or newly publicly funded slots	360	400	500	600	762
Continuing slots created in prior years	940	1,300	1,700	2,200	2,800
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$15,237	$15,694	$16,165	$16,649	$17,149
Number of existing subsidized slots	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$6,212	$6,669	$7,140	$7,624	$8,124
Total cost each year	$31,827,057	$39,583,253	$49,376,911	$61,371,793	$76,804,339

Note. The total number of children (three- and four-year-olds) below 300 percent FPL in high-priority ZIP codes was calculated by using three-year averages from the 2012 American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data, disaggregated by ZIP based on Missouri Census Data Center ZIP code to (Public Use Microdata Area [PUMA]) allocation factors, for all ZIP codes associated with Sonoma County's highest-need elementary schools. This total was multiplied by 85 percent, the assumed participation rate. Unmet need was calculated by subtracting total enrollment for three- and four-year-olds in all subsidized programs (Head Start, Title 5, CalWORKS, and Alternative Payment programs) in each of these ZIP codes, with Head Start enrollment from AIR's survey of Head Start grantees, and state-supported enrollment from the California Department of Education 801A enrollment reports as of October 2012, as contained in AIR's ELNAT.

Three- and Four-Year-Olds Below 300 Percent of the Federal Poverty Level in High-Priority Census Tracts, at 70 Percent Participation Rate

Table 23. Three- and Four-Year-Olds Below 300 Percent FPL at 70 Percent Participation Rate in the High-Priority Census Tracts at Current Salaries

Total number of children	965				
Total number of slots to add (unmet need)	682				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New or newly publicly funded slots	40	80	120	200	242
Continuing slots created in prior years		40	120	240	440
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$11,590	$11,937	$12,295	$12,664	$13,044
Number of existing subsidized slots	283	283	283	283	283
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$2,565	$2,912	$3,270	$3,639	$4,019
Total cost each year	$1,189,342	$2,256,621	$3,876,382	$6,602,133	$10,033,495

Note. To estimate the total number of children (three- and four-year-olds) below 300 percent FPL in the high-priority census tracts, we used the Child Care Planning Council 2015 report supplement reports of "children from low-income families" (under 70 percent state median income) and "children in families earning just over the eligibility limit," which together provide the total number of children in families earning $75,000. Because 300 percent FPL for a family of four is $71,550, we multiplied this total by 90 percent to approximate the number of children in the high-priority census tracts below $71,500, or 300 percent of poverty. We then multiplied this population estimate of the number of children below 300 percent FPL by 70 percent, the assumed participation rate. To calculate unmet need, we used data on the number of children enrolled in subsidized slots, with Head Start enrollment obtained from AIR's survey of Head Start grantees and state-supported enrollment from the 801A reports from the California Department of Education and in all licensed care, for the ZIP code(s) associated with each census tract to estimate the percentage of overall slots that are subsidized. We then applied these percentages to total child care supply in each census tract to estimate the number of subsidized slots and subtracted these from total population.

Table 24. Three- and Four-Year-Olds Below 300 Percent FPL at 70 Percent Participation Rate in the High-Priority Census Tracts at Living Wage

Total number of children	965				
Total number of slots to add (unmet need)	682				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New or newly publicly funded slots	40	80	120	200	242
Continuing slots created in prior years		40	120	240	440
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$13,143	$13,538	$13,944	$14,362	$14,793
Number of existing subsidized slots	283	283	283	283	283
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$4,118	$4,513	$4,919	$5,337	$5,768
Total cost each year	$1,691,189	$2,901,550	$4,738,457	$7,829,626	$11,721,001

Note. To estimate the total number of children (three- and four-year-olds) below 300 percent FPL in the high-priority census tracts, we used the Child Care Planning Council 2015 report supplement reports of "children from low-income families" (under 70 percent state median income) and "children in families earning just over the eligibility limit," which together provide the total number of children in families earning $75,000. Because 300 percent FPL for a family of four is $71,550, we multiplied this total by 90 percent to approximate the number of children in the high-priority census tracts below $71,500, or 300 percent of poverty. We then multiplied this population estimate of the number of children below 300 percent FPL by 70 percent, the assumed participation rate. To calculate unmet need, we used data on the number of children enrolled in subsidized slots, with Head Start enrollment obtained from AIR's survey of Head Start grantees and state-supported enrollment from the 801A reports from the California Department of Education and in all licensed care, for the ZIP code(s) associated with each census tract to estimate the percentage of overall slots that are subsidized. We then applied these percentages to total child care supply in each census tract to estimate the number of subsidized slots and subtracted these from total population.

Three- and Four-Year-Olds Below 300 Percent of the Federal Poverty Level in High-Priority ZIP Codes, at 70 Percent Participation Rate

Table 25. Three- and Four-Year-Olds Below 300 Percent FPL at 70 Percent Participation Rate in the High-Priority ZIP Codes at Current Salaries

Total number of children	4,591				
Total number of slots to add (unmet need)	2,578				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New or newly publicly funded slots	80	120	140	180	220
Continuing slots created in prior years		80	200	340	520
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$11,590	$11,937	$12,295	$12,664	$13,044
Number of existing subsidized slots	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$2,565	$2,912	$3,270	$3,639	$4,019
Total cost each year	$5,889,520	$8,022,573	$10,508,497	$13,627,207	$17,429,630
	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
New or newly publicly funded slots	300	320	380	420	418
Continuing slots created in prior years	740	1,040	1,360	1,740	2,160
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$13,435	$13,839	$14,254	$14,681	$15,122
Number of existing subsidized slots	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$4,410	$4,814	$5,229	$5,656	$6,097
Total cost each year	$22,507,051	$28,134,484	$34,918,809	$42,656,406	$50,780,871

Note. The total number of children (three- and four-year-olds) below 300 percent FPL in high-priority ZIP codes was calculated by using three-year averages from the 2012 American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data, disaggregated by ZIP based on Missouri Census Data Center ZIP code to (Public Use Microdata Area [PUMA]) allocation factors, for all ZIP codes associated with Sonoma County's highest-need elementary schools. This total was multiplied by 70 percent, the assumed participation rate. Unmet need was calculated by subtracting total enrollment for three- and four-year-olds in all subsidized programs (Head Start, Title 5, CalWORKS, and Alternative Payment programs) in each of these ZIP codes, with Head Start enrollment from AIR's survey of Head Start grantees and state-supported enrollment from the California Department of Education 801A enrollment reports as of October 2012, as contained in AIR's Early Learning Needs Assessment Tool (ELNAT).

Table 26. Three- and Four-Year-Olds Below 300 Percent FPL at 70 Percent Participation Rate in the High-Priority ZIP Codes at Living Wage

Total number of children	4,591				
Total number of slots to add (unmet need)	2,578				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New or newly publicly funded slots	80	120	140	180	220
Continuing slots created in prior years		80	200	340	520
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$13,143	$13,538	$13,944	$14,362	$14,793
Number of existing subsidized slots	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$4,118	$4,513	$4,919	$5,337	$5,768
Total cost each year	$9,020,240	$11,439,252	$14,258,443	$17,795,251	$22,107,431
	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
New or newly publicly funded slots	300	320	380	420	418
Continuing slots created in prior years	740	1,040	1,360	1,740	2,160
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$15,237	$15,694	$16,165	$16,649	$17,149
Number of existing subsidized slots	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$6,212	$6,669	$7,140	$7,624	$8,124
Total cost each year	$27,865,538	$34,247,392	$41,941,233	$50,716,142	$59,929,783

Note. The total number of children (three- and four-year-olds) below 300 percent FPL in high-priority ZIP codes was calculated by using three-year averages from the 2012 American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data, disaggregated by ZIP based on Missouri Census Data Center ZIP code to (Public Use Microdata Area [PUMA]) allocation factors, for all ZIP codes associated with Sonoma County's highest-need elementary schools. This total was multiplied by 70 percent, the assumed participation rate. Unmet need was calculated by subtracting total enrollment for three- and four-year-olds in all subsidized programs (Head Start, Title 5, CalWORKS, and Alternative Payment programs) in each of these ZIP codes, with Head Start enrollment from AIR's survey of Head Start grantees and state-supported enrollment from the California Department of Education 801A enrollment reports as of October 2012, as contained in AIR's Early Learning Needs Assessment Tool (ELNAT).

Three- and Four-Year-Olds Countywide at 70 Percent Participation Rate

Table 27. All Three- and Four-Year-Olds Countywide at 70 Percent Participation Rate at Current Salaries

Total number of children	8,091				
Total number of slots to add (unmet need)	6,078				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New or newly publicly funded slots	80	100	140	200	400
Continuing slots created in prior years		80	180	320	520
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$11,590	$11,937	$12,295	$12,664	$13,044
Number of existing subsidized slots	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$2,565	$2,912	$3,270	$3,639	$4,019
Total cost each year	$6,089,553	$8,010,981	10,517,676	$13,911,064	$20,091,061
	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
New or newly publicly funded slots	600	800	1,000	1,200	1,558
Continuing slots created in prior years	920	1,520	2,320	3,320	4,520
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$13,435	$13,839	$14,254	$14,681	$15,122
Number of existing subsidized slots	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$4,410	$4,814	$5,229	$5,656	$6,097
Total cost each year	$29,300,075	$41,794,897	$57,847,420	$77,745,380	$104,182,375

Note. The total number of children (three- and four-year-olds) was calculated by using three-year averages from 2013 American Community Survey data; this figure was multiplied by 70 percent, the assumed participation rate. Unmet need was calculated by subtracting total enrollment for three- and four-year-olds in all subsidized programs (Head Start, Title 5, CalWORKS, and Alternative Payment programs) in the county, with Head Start enrollment from AIR's survey of Head Start grantees and state-supported enrollment from the California Department of Education 801A enrollment reports as of October 2012, as contained in AIR's ELNAT.

Table 28. All Three- and Four-Year-Olds Countywide at 70 Percent Participation Rate at Living Wage

Total number of children	8,091				
Total number of slots to add (unmet need)	6,078				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New or newly publicly funded slots	80	100	140	200	400
Continuing slots created in prior years		80	180	320	520
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$13,143	$13,538	$13,944	$14,362	$14,793
Number of existing subsidized slots	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$4,118	$4,513	$4,919	$5,337	$5,768
Total cost each year	$9,341,462	$11,520,479	$14,363,225	$18,211,534	$25,220,030
	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
New or newly publicly funded slots	600	800	1,000	1,200	1,558
Continuing slots created in prior years	920	1,520	2,320	3,320	4,520
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$15,237	$15,694	$16,165	$16,649	$17,149
Number of existing subsidized slots	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$6,212	$6,669	$7,140	$7,624	$8,124
Total cost each year	$35,663,617	$49,833,511	$68,038,055	$90,603,562	$120,584,735

Note. The total number of children (three- and four-year-olds) was calculated by using three-year averages from 2013 American Community Survey data; this figure was multiplied by 70 percent, the assumed participation rate. Unmet need was calculated by subtracting total enrollment for three- and four-year-olds in all subsidized programs (Head Start, Title 5, CalWORKS, and Alternative Payment programs) in the county, with Head Start enrollment from AIR's survey of Head Start grantees and state-supported enrollment from the California Department of Education 801A enrollment reports as of October 2012, as contained in AIR's ELNAT.

Three- and Four-Year-Olds Countywide at 70 Percent Participation Rate, Free for Children Below 300 Percent FPL, and a 25 Percent Tuition Credit for Children at or Above 300 Percent FPL

Table 29. All Three- and Four-Year-Olds Countywide at 70 Percent Participation Rate, Free for Children Below 300 Percent FPL, and a 25 Percent Tuition Credit for Children at or Above 300 Percent FPL at Current Salaries

Total number of children	8,091				
Total number of slots to add or partially public support (unmet need)	6,078				
Total number of slots to add for children below 300% FPL at full cost	3,021				
Total number of slots for children at or above 300% FPL to receive tuition credit	3,057				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New or newly partially public supported slots	80	100	140	200	260
Continuing slots created in prior years		80	180	320	520
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$11,590	$11,937	$12,295	$12,664	$13,044
Number of existing subsidized slots	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$2,565	$2,912	$3,270	$3,639	$4,019
25% of cost for each child at or above 300% FPL	$8,857,006	$9,122,716	$9,396,397	$9,678,289	$9,968,638
Total cost each year	$14,946,559	$17,133,697	$19,914,074	$23,589,353	$28,233,523
	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
New or newly partially publicly supported slots	300	380	420	500	641
Continuing slots created in prior years	780	1,080	1,460	1,880	2,380
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$13,435	$13,839	$14,254	$14,681	$15,122
Number of existing subsidized slots	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$4,410	$4,814	$5,229	$5,656	$6,097
25% of cost for each child at or above 300% FPL	$10,267,697	$10,575,728	$10,893,000	$11,219,790	$11,556,384
Total cost each year	$33,656,180	$40,469,515	$48,215,156	$57,547,262	$69,507,175

Note. The total number of children (three- and four-year-olds) was calculated by using three-year averages from 2013 American Community Survey data; this figure was multiplied by 70 percent, the assumed participation rate. Unmet need was calculated by subtracting total enrollment for three- and four-year-olds in all subsidized programs (Head Start, Title 5, CalWORKS, and Alternative Payment programs) in the county, with Head Start enrollment from AIR's survey of Head Start grantees and state-supported enrollment from the California Department of Education 801A enrollment reports as of October 2012, as contained in AIR's ELNAT.

Table 30. All Three- and Four-Year-Olds Countywide at 70 Percent Participation Rate, Free for Children Below 300 Percent FPL, and a 25 Percent Tuition Credit for Children at or Above 300 Percent FPL at Living Wage

Total number of children	8,091				
Total number of slots to add or partially publicly support (unmet need)	6,078				
Total number of slots to add for children below 300% FPL at full cost	3,021				
Total number of slots to add for children at or above 300% FPL to receive tuition credit	3,057				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New or newly publicly supported slots	80	100	140	200	260
Continuing slots created in prior years		80	180	320	520
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$13,143	$13,538	$13,944	$14,362	$14,793
Number of existing subsidized slots	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$4,118	$4,513	$4,919	$5,337	$5,768
25% of cost for each child at or above 300% FPL	$10,044,387	$10,345,719	$10,656,091	$10,975,773	$11,305,047
Total cost each year	$19,385,850	$21,866,198	$25,019,315	$29,187,308	$34,454,081
	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
New or newly publicly supported slots	300	380	420	500	641
Continuing slots created in prior years	780	1,080	1,460	1,880	2,380
Cost per child (increasing 3% per year)	$15,237	$15,694	$16,165	$16,649	$17,149
Number of existing subsidized slots	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013
Cost per child to upgrade existing subsidized slots to desired quality (increasing 3% per year)	$6,212	$6,669	$7,140	$7,624	$8,124
25% of cost for each child at or above 300% FPL	$11,644,198	$11,993,524	$12,353,330	$12,723,929	$13,105,647
Total cost each year	$40,603,706	$48,330,446	$57,114,477	$67,697,959	$81,260,933

Note. The total number of children (three- and four-year-olds) was calculated by using three-year averages from 2013 American Community Survey data; this figure was multiplied by 70 percent, the assumed participation rate. Unmet need was calculated by subtracting total enrollment for three- and four-year-olds in all subsidized programs (Head Start, Title 5, CalWORKS, and Alternative Payment programs) in the county, with Head Start enrollment from AIR's survey of Head Start grantees and state-supported enrollment from the California Department of Education 801A enrollment reports as of October 2012, as contained in AIR's ELNAT.

Cost Estimate and Phase-In Plan for Expanding Access to Home Visiting Programs for Children Ages 0–3 Years

In addition to expanding to universal preschool, Sonoma County also has expressed an interest in expanding evidence-based home visiting services such as the Nurse-Family Partnership (N-FP) to families beginning at pregnancy to age 2. With its focus on both mother and baby, N-FP takes a two-generation approach to reduce potential risk factors and enhance protective factors that

result in well-documented improvements in pregnancy and child health outcomes, as well as economic self-sufficiency for the whole family (Nurse-Family Partnership, 2011).

Health Policy, Planning, and Evaluation staff from the Sonoma County Department of Health Services provided us with the current cost per child of home visiting services through the N-FP model, which is approximately $6,536 per family per year. Currently, the county is only able to enroll approximately 11.25 percent of eligible families (first-time pregnant women who are eligible for Medi-Cal or WIC), which is an active caseload of 240 families in a given year, served by a team of eight nurses.

The county's goal, however, is to serve up to 25 percent of eligible families. Given the nurse-to-families ratios to which N-FP staff must adhere, the most feasible way to reach, or nearly reach, this goal is to double the team of nurses. This will allow the program to serve a caseload of 480 families—or an estimated 22.5 percent of the eligible population—simultaneously. Because the program provides services beginning at pregnancy until the child's second birthday, most families participate for more than one year. However, there is also some attrition in participation. Accounting for both of these factors, enrolling 180 new families per year (double the current 90 families typically enrolled in a year) would yield an average caseload of 480 families at any one time. The cost to serve these new families (180 new enrollees per year, for a total annual caseload of 480 families) is estimated at approximately $3.1 million, an increase of about $1.6 million over current costs if implemented immediately. Given the current 35 percent federal match, approximately $2 million of this cost is expected to fall on Sonoma County. It is estimated that scaling up N-FP over five years (assuming a 3 percent annual increase) would cost $3.5 million in the final year to serve 480 families.

Recommendations for Funding and Phasing in Universal Preschool in Sonoma County

By examining the 12 preschool initiatives, interviewing Sonoma County stakeholders, conducting cost analyses, and reviewing the pros and cons of various funding options, AIR offers the following 10 recommendations for financing and phasing in universal access to quality preschool in Sonoma County.

What Is the Ultimate Goal?

1. Clearly define the county's ultimate goal as providing access to quality preschool for all three- and four-year-old children in the county.

Defining *universal* or *providing access to all* is important. As will be discussed in this section, providing access to all does not necessarily mean making preschool free to all. However, a universal preschool initiative typically aims to allow all children regardless of family income to participate. Some research indicates that children who are disadvantaged do better when enrolled in preschool programs with peers from a variety of social and economic backgrounds (Schechter & Bye, 2007). Thus, even though most universal preschool initiatives start by expanding and enhancing services in low-income neighborhoods, they typically offer preschool services to all children, regardless of family income, who live in those neighborhoods.

As emphasized throughout this report, it also is important to stress that the goal is to increase access to a level of preschool quality that can be expected to enhance child outcomes. In some of the preschool initiatives that we analyzed, such as San Francisco, a majority of the initiative funds are used to enhance the quality of services partially funded by other public sources, not to fund the entire per child cost.

In addition, it is wise to set a goal for serving both three- and four-year-old children, even if the initial focus is on four-year-olds. Research indicates that two years of preschool lead to better results than one year, especially for disadvantaged children, although the impact of the second year may be less than the first (Yoshikawa et al., 2013). A two-year focus also provides flexibility for shifting any new local funds that become available to support three-year-old children if a federal or state measure at some point makes funds available to serve all four-year-old children. Stakeholders in Seattle specifically noted that Sonoma County should be aware of what is happening at the state and federal levels. They indicated that one reason not to start out "too big, too fast" is that then you can build a system that responds to increased funding from state and federal sources. During the last decade, multiple efforts have been made at the state level and, in recent years, at the federal level, to expand access to preschool. The lack of success to date of these efforts in obtaining sufficient funds even to serve all four-year-olds from economically disadvantaged backgrounds underscores the interest in and need for local initiatives. Local initiatives should be sufficiently flexible to incorporate and invest any new state and federal dollars that eventually become available.

Finally, it may be important to focus on the word *preschool*. Clearly, preschool is not the only form of early care and education that can make a case for public support. A strong evidence base

exists for other programs, such as home visiting and high-quality care for infants and toddlers. However, efforts to obtain public support for one initiative for a broad array of services may be less apt to succeed than a more narrowly defined program. In Denver, two efforts to mount a ballot initiative for a broad array of services, which included home visiting and other forms of child care as well as preschool, failed with less than 30 percent support. In response to these disappointing results, advocates conducted polling and learned that the broad range of services confused voters. However, the voters understood and resonated with the concept of preschool. When the initiative was reframed to focus on preschool, it passed. Thus, as Sonoma County considers a possible preschool initiative, it will be important to make sure that the wording and the scope of the initiative make sense to the public asked to support the effort.

Free Versus Sliding-Scale Support

2. Plan to provide free preschool to families below 300 percent of the federal poverty level and on a sliding scale to families above that income level.

Determining exactly how much financial assistance a universal preschool initiative can provide and for which children depends, of course, on the type and level of revenue that is available. If a universal preschool measure is supported as part of public school funding, as in Boston, it might indeed be free to all. But many of the preschool initiatives we examined in some way provide more financial help to children from lower income families and significantly less support for children from higher income families.

Seattle, now launching its first year of implementation, will make preschool free to children from families below 300 percent of the federal poverty level in 2015, or $72,750 for a family of four, and the program will offer a sliding fee schedule for children from higher income families. Denver, which began implementing its universal preschool initiative in 2007, offers preschool tuition credits to families, with the credit ranging from $14 to $662 per month—depending on family income, the level of service chosen (half day, full day, or extended day), and the quality rating of the provider—toward the full cost of the program. By limiting the level of credit given to higher income families, Denver is able to provide some assistance to 54 percent (5,000) of the four-year-olds in the city at a cost of approximately $13 million.

AIR's recommendation to provide free services in Sonoma County up to the Seattle level of 300 percent of the federal poverty level is based partly on the proportion of family income that paying for the full cost of preschool would absorb. Paying the full $13,414 we estimate is necessary to pay for full-day, full-year preschool for even one child would require 18 percent of the income of a family of four at 300 percent of the federal poverty level, and 36 percent for two preschool-age children. Families up to that income level may indeed have difficulty paying for a quality preschool program.

Making full-day, full-year preschool free to all three and four year olds in families below 300 percent of the federal poverty level and on a sliding fee scale to families above that level would cost about $69.5 million in the final year of phase-in at current salaries, or $81 million if salaries were increased to a living wage.

If the revenue for universal preschool is not sufficient to provide services free to all children up to 300 percent of the federal poverty level countywide, then the county might consider doing so in high-priority census tracts where the level of need is the greatest. The county might also consider offering free services to those up to 70 percent of the state median income, the current income limit for eligibility for Title 5 State Preschool, or even 185 percent of the federal poverty level, which is the maximum income for eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch. This would make services free to a family of four with an income of up to $44,863.

Alternatively, the county might decide to provide free preschool to children from families up to 300 percent of the federal poverty level but to reduce the cost by supporting a school day, school year (six hours, 10 months) rather than a full-day, full-year (eight to 10 hours, 12 months) service. This option could significantly reduce the cost of the initiative. As in San Francisco, families might still choose a full day of service, but the cost of the extended day would have to be supported by other public or private sources, or by the family itself.

Determining the proportion of children who will be eligible for free preschool services, of course, has implications for the sliding fee scale and how generous the county can be in helping families with somewhat higher incomes afford quality preschool. Based on the 12 preschool initiatives we examined, the level of support provided to families regardless of family income varies greatly. In Seattle, families pay from 0 percent to 95 percent of the tuition cost of preschool. Families living at or below 300 percent of federal poverty level pay no fees, whereas families at or above 760 percent of the federal poverty level pay 95 percent of the tuition. In contrast, preschool initiatives in Boston, the District of Columbia, and New York City do not implement a sliding scale and actually make preschool free to all regardless of family income.

Leverage Existing Revenue Sources

3. Maximize leverage of existing state and federal revenue sources: Title 5 State Preschool, Head Start, Transitional Kindergarten, and Title I.

To expand access to quality preschool, Sonoma County would do well to ensure that it is obtaining all the existing state and federal revenue for preschool for which it is eligible.

As California attempts to restore Title 5 State Preschool slots that were cut during the Great Recession, the Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County has applied for an additional 48 full-day restored slots, and North Bay Children's Center has applied for 24 full-day restored slots. In addition, because of the loss of facilities or the need to renovate them, the county and First 5 Sonoma County created a grant fund of $655,000 to help address these facilities issues, which had placed a total of 144 existing Head Start slots and 98 Title 5 State Preschool slots at risk (Collier, 2015; Hansen, 2015).

Going forward, it will be important for the county to watch for any new Title 5 State Preschool slots for which it may apply and follow the progress of AB 47 and next year's state budget. If implemented and funded, AB 47 in its August 2015 form calls on the state to make Title 5 State Preschool available to all eligible four-year-old children, which, at 70 percent of the state median income, would mean all four-year-old children living in families with incomes up to approximately $53,974 for a family of four, per the 2011–2013 American Community Survey

(U.S. Census Bureau, 2014). If such an initiative were enacted, Sonoma County might gain up to 1,151 new state-funded preschool slots.[1] However, the state measure would address only the unmet need for four-year-old children. It would not provide support to many lower middle-income families having difficulty paying for child care. This state measure also would probably cover only about two thirds of the real cost of a full day of preschool estimated in this report, even for preschools paying teachers less than a living wage. Finally, Governor Brown has not signed similar measures in the past.

Equally important is to ensure that Sonoma County maximizes its use of Transitional Kindergarten funds. Recent trailer language in the state budget bill now allows districts to enroll four-year-old children in transitional kindergarten, with the caveat that districts will not receive state average daily attendance funding until these children turn five years old later in the school year. However, some districts, such as the Los Angeles Unified School District, have chosen to serve more four-year-old children in Transitional Kindergarten rather than in State Preschool because per-pupil funding for elementary school (which varies under the new local control funding formula depending on the district's specific demographics) is typically substantially higher than the per-child reimbursement rates for Title 5 State Preschool programs. Children in transitional kindergarten also are taught by a well-trained, credentialed teacher who aligns instruction with the kindergarten curriculum, factors that may support better academic outcomes for children later. The possibility that the state might further expand access to transitional kindergarten highlights the wisdom of crafting a local initiative which would support three-year-olds if more state funding becomes available for four-year-olds.

Finally, Sonoma County might convene superintendents of Title I schools to discuss the possibility of their investing federal Title I funds in preschool. As seen in Elk Grove and in Chicago, Title I funds can be spent on preschool for any child, regardless of income, attending a Title I school, and can provide the funds necessary to support a schoolwide initiative that makes preschool free to all in the school. The funds are flexible and can be spent to increase teacher salaries and other quality improvements. According to our research, no school district in Sonoma County currently invests Title I funds in preschool. However, it should be noted that in FY 2006–07, California only spent a statewide total of $12.6 million in Title I funds on preschool programs (Karoly et al., 2007). The main obstacle to obtaining Title I funds, as stated above, for preschool is simply the need to provide compensatory services to older children, even though evidence proves that investments in services for younger children are more effective and help reduce the need for compensatory education later on (Heckman et al., 2009).

Need for Additional Revenue

4. Recognize that existing state and federal revenues are not enough—and are unlikely ever to be enough—to fund universal preschool in Sonoma County. Consequently, increased local revenue is needed to make universal preschool a reality.

Based on AIR's cost analysis and phase-in options for universal preschool in Sonoma County, none of the existing state and federal sources would be sufficient to support a countywide

[1] We estimated the number of eligible four-year-old children living at 70 percent of the state median income using AIR's Early Learning Needs Assessment Tool.

initiative. Even the least expensive options (scenarios 1, 3, and 5), limiting access to all four-year-olds in the high-priority census tracts or to three- and four-year-olds below 300 percent of the federal poverty level in the same census tracts, would cost between $10 million and $13 million at current salaries. Even if the Title I schools in these neighborhoods diverted all their Title I funds from other age groups to focus on preschool services, which is highly unlikely, these Title I funds likely would not be enough to fund the entire cost of the initiative. For example, Elk Grove's current Title I preschool program serves only 200 children in a part-day, school-year program that is funded with $1.3 million annually from Title I funds. By using a portion of the district's Title I funds, Elk Grove can serve only a portion of its eligible preschool population. The district uses Head Start funds to serve additional children. Financing a broader initiative of $69 million or more—the cost to serve all children under 300 percent poverty at a 70 percent participation rate incorporating a sliding fee scale—would clearly require much greater revenue than is currently available.

Determining the type of finance mechanism that would work best in Sonoma County is as much a political decision as a research question. Based on our examination of preschool initiatives across the United States, the mechanism might be a sales tax increase, which raises $13 million per year in Denver and $31 million per year in San Antonio. Or it could be a property tax increase, which is expected to raise $58 million over four years in Seattle. Alternatively, it could be a set-aside from the county's general fund, which generates $27.2 million per year for preschool in San Francisco; because the funding for this set-aside actually comes from dedicating 4 percent of the property tax revenue to the fund, it may be seen as an indirect way of using property taxes to finance preschool without actually increasing the tax. Another option could be, as in Washington, D.C., a combination of district funding, Head Start funds, and a set-aside from the city's general fund, which generates $191 million per year. California's requirement for a two-thirds majority to pass either a sales tax dedicated to a specific purpose or a property tax poses a significant hurdle. As suggested later in these recommendations, Sonoma County might be able to surmount this hurdle by mounting a public education campaign as done in Denver after two prior ballot measures failed there. In addition, an additional sales tax might not be enough on its own. For example, Sonoma County's Measure A, the failed transportation measure, was a 0.25 percent sales tax increase that county officials estimated would raise $20 million per year. If the county proposed a similar sales tax measure, then it would likely need to either reduce the hours of service to six versus eight hours of service or provide tuition credits rather than the full cost of preschool for those above 300 percent of the federal poverty level or begin by phasing in the program for only four-year-old children. A set-aside from the county general fund, as in San Francisco, might be worthy of consideration, but no set-aside currently exists for education, and the entire budget allocation from the county for the Department of Health in 2014–15 was $41 million.

We also considered the merits of some newer, more innovative finance mechanisms. In Chicago, although Title I remains the primary financing mechanism for the renowned CPCs, the initiative is now receiving $17 million across a four-year period from a Pay for Success bond to expand services. Similarly, Salt Lake is obtaining nearly $3 million per year from a Pay for Success bond. Both of these bonds were initially financed by private entities, which will eventually obtain the savings generated by the bonds. Hence, the Pay for Success approach requires finding an entity to float the bond and makes a promise to pay back the investor with some percentage of the total cost savings, based on meeting metrics agreed on under the terms of the loan.

Therefore, some of the savings realized by implementing a preschool program would be returned to the investor rather than reinvested in expanding or upgrading the preschool services themselves.

An interesting, smaller-scale finance mechanism that we discovered in the course of our examination of preschool initiatives is in New Orleans, where a portion of golf course fees from a facility near an Educare program (Educare, n.d.), is being reserved to help finance early care and education services. Although the fees are expected to generate only $250,000–$350,000 per year, a small fraction of the center's total operating cost, the buy-in from the golf club members may help increase public and business community awareness and support for this center and perhaps could generate interest in the broader implementation of preschool services. Sonoma County might investigate the possibility of requesting some limited support from golf course fees or wine club memberships, especially where these activities are adjacent to preschool facilities.

It also may be important to rule out some revenue sources as the primary funding mechanism for universal preschool. For many years, First 5 California and local First 5 commissions have provided some of the most significant new funds for improving and expanding preschool services in California. Although First 5 support continues to be the major source of funding for LAUP and West Sacramento's preschool initiative, the decline in Proposition 10 revenues from the tobacco tax limits the amount of new preschool slots that First 5 dollars can support. In addition, the First 5 California preschool grant funding that these two programs currently use as a primary funding source is set to end in 2015. Already, West Sacramento, which relied on First 5 support as its major revenue for universal preschool, is looking for replacement funding.

In summary, most of the leaders of the preschool initiatives we examined, as well as the Sonoma County stakeholders we interviewed, stressed that a dedicated new local funding stream is essential for implementing a successful universal preschool initiative. A sales tax increase would be an effective dedicated funding stream, but it will require a substantial public education campaign to meet the two-thirds voter support requirement. A set-aside from the county general fund, as in San Francisco, also would be effective, but we are unsure whether the current level of revenue collected from the property tax for that fund would be sufficient to cover most of the phase-in options provided in this report. AIR recommends that Sonoma County consider either the sales tax increase or the set-aside from the general fund, but only if these measures are accompanied by a substantial public education campaign. A Pay for Success bond would be an appealing accompaniment to a dedicated public funding stream, but it is best viewed as less than a primary funding mechanism for a countywide universal preschool initiative.

Finding New Revenue for Facilities

5. Adopt a separate funding source or reserve a specific percentage of any new revenue for preschool facilities.

From the outset of our exploration of finance options for universal preschool in Sonoma County, it has been clear that a lack of facilities poses a significant barrier to expanding services. Neither Title 5 State Preschool nor Head Start supplies funds specifically for facilities. Consequently, programs often obtain or rent space in schools for which schools are willing to donate the space at a reduced or little cost during periods of declining enrollment, but then the programs may

reclaim the space when demands for enrolling older children increase. Thus, this year Sonoma County had to request $305,000 from the Board of Supervisors plus $350,000 from First 5 Sonoma simply to create enough facilities to restore slots that were cut during the Great Recession and for which the state of California is now making funds available to restore (Collier, 2015).

As part of the planning for universal preschool, AIR therefore recommends that at least 10 percent of any new revenue source for preschool be reserved for constructing and renovating facilities. If Sonoma County decides to seek and is successful in obtaining a new revenue source dedicated to preschool, then during at least the first two years of program implementation, a much greater proportion of the funds might be invested in facility construction and renovation.

From our examination of other preschool initiatives, we learned that other programs faced similar challenges as Sonoma County currently faces with regard to facilities for preschool. For example, San Antonio and Seattle dealt with this issue specifically by setting aside money from within their main funding mechanisms for facilities. West Sacramento and San Francisco are examples of programs that used other funding sources outside the primary funding mechanism, such as developer impact fees and CDBG funds, to pay for building and improving facilities.

Developer impact fees are fees typically assessed per unit and levied on new construction projects. They are used to fund off-site capital projects and improvements that are necessary to support the development and the people who will live or work there (Duncan Associates, n.d.). Impact fees are most often associated with infrastructure, such as roads or sewer and water lines, but they also can be used to fund school buildings, improvements, and expansions. For example, San Francisco requires new office and hotel development projects to provide in-house child care facilities or pay a fee to the city's Child Care Capital Fund (City of San Francisco, 2010). West Sacramento also levies a child care impact fee on new development. The city has used funds from this fee to provide capital improvements to its partner providers and build two city-run preschool classrooms. Per the Permit and Resource Management Department (2015), Sonoma County already levies building permit fees that can include fees targeted toward school improvements, depending on where the project is built.

CDBG funds are another type of funding mechanism that can be used for child care facilities. These grants, administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (n.d.), are primarily designated for low-income housing, but they also can be used to fund services that aid in economic support, such as child care facilities. The two main types of CDBG funding are entitlement programs and state programs. Entitlement programs consist of direct funding from the federal government that is available to cities of 200,000 people or more as well as certain urbanized counties. State programs, also known as the Small Cities CDBG program, offer funds to cities and towns that do not qualify as entitlement areas. The city of San Francisco has used CDBG funds to plan and build new preschools through the Low Income Investment Fund. The city of West Sacramento also has used CDBG money to supplement preschool tuition grants through the Small Cities CDBG program, but the restrictions placed on these funds can change, so they cannot always be budgeted for this purpose.

Mount a Public Education Campaign

6. Invest in and mount a public education campaign to build the case for the additional revenue needed.

Critical to the success of attempts to raise taxes to support a preschool initiative in Sonoma County will be the development of a public education campaign. Denver provides a good example of the importance of public awareness campaigns. Denver's history of trying to get a universal preschool program established goes back to the early 2000s, when two attempts at passing an education sales tax failed miserably, garnering less than 30 percent of the vote each time. When John Hickenlooper was elected mayor, he worked to build a coalition to draft a proposal, and the city ran an extensive television education campaign that raised public awareness and most likely led to the successful outcome. Even with the extensive campaign, the November 2006 ballot measure was narrowly approved, by fewer than 2,000 votes. When the initiative went back to the ballot in 2014, asking voters to extend the program until 2026 and raise the tax to 0.15 percent, the city touted the positive results of the program, citing improved third-grade standardized test scores from children who had been preschool students in the first few years of the program. Voters approved the 2014 measure with 55 percent of the vote.

In our interviews with San Francisco stakeholders and Jolene Smith of First 5 Santa Clara, the interviewees stressed the importance of conducting polling to determine the needs and the type of education campaign required. These interviewees also indicated that the timing of the ballot initiative also could contribute to its success or failure. For example, if the measure is on a ballot at a time when there will most likely be low voter turnout, the likelihood of the measure passing is small. If the measure is on a ballot at a time when there will likely be other measures for voters to consider, the result also could be detrimental.

These interviewees also reported that the wording of the ballot initiative could impact the outcome at the polls. For example, in Denver, according to the stakeholders interviewed, the first two ballot measures failed because they were too broad, and the voters were unclear as to what they were voting for. The first two measures in Denver were worded as birth to age 5 initiatives and included child care, home visiting, and some health components.

Stakeholders across almost all the preschool initiatives also reported on the importance of building partnerships as part of the planning process. In particular, stakeholders in Salt Lake, Denver, San Francisco, Seattle, San Antonio, and Boston all noted working with districts and community child care and advocacy groups. San Antonio and Denver also specifically included representatives from the business community in the coalitions that developed the plans for their programs.

Based on the experience of these other preschool initiatives, it will be important for Sonoma County to strengthen its coalition of support for universal preschool. Assembling district superintendents as well as local chambers of commerce would be helpful. As discussed earlier in this report, most of the successful preschool initiatives have had a mayor, a school superintendent, or other key local champion.

Evidence-Based Framework

7. Establish an evidence-based framework for quality programs that will achieve the promised benefits of preschool.

All the preschool initiative leaders we interviewed stressed the importance of establishing a framework for quality likely to achieve the promised benefits of investing in preschool, such as reduced grade repetition, less use of special education and welfare, and higher rates of school attendance and achievement. As one of the directors of Seattle's new preschool program noted, "It's all about the quality."

Most of the preschool initiatives we examined place a premium on enhancing lead teacher requirements for preschool programs, often to a level of education required for K–12 teachers with a level of compensation approaching if not equaling that of K–12 teachers. Other quality elements of some programs include having a master-level teacher provide support to several classrooms, having a robust family engagement component, assessing classrooms and providing coaching to meet the shortfalls identified, and having a research-based curriculum. San Francisco interviewees noted that they had to slow down the implementation of their initiative when they discovered through classroom assessments that many of the participating programs required significant improvement.

That said, some of the preschool initiatives, most notably Denver and San Francisco, set less stringent entry-level requirements for preschool providers but provide incentives for the programs to meet higher standards. In Denver, the entry-level requirement is to meet Level 3 of the Colorado Shines QRIS. Denver offers higher reimbursement rates for preschool programs that meet higher standards. Across the years, a higher proportion of participating programs have met the higher requirements, and a greater proportion of families are choosing the higher rated programs.

Given that 16 California counties, including Los Angeles and San Francisco, are already adopting the Race to the Top QRIS, we recommend that Sonoma County consider this system as a framework for its preschool initiative. Although the county is not one of the initial 16 counties in the QRIS, the county might set entry-level requirements for provider participation at Level 3 on the Race to the Top QRIS, with higher reimbursement rates for programs meeting Level 4 or Level 5 standards. Other important quality QRIS components include conducting classroom assessments using ECERS and CLASS and providing coaching or professional development.

Making Connections

8. Attach preschool programs to elementary schools where possible but allow for the participation of community preschool providers.

As noted in *A Portrait of Sonoma County* (Burd-Sharps & Lewis, 2014), attaching preschool programs to elementary schools, such as in El Verano in Sonoma County, is an attractive model for implementing new preschool programs. Doing so helps involve families early on in their children's education outside the home and may lead to their continuing engagement as their children advance

to kindergarten and beyond. Access to support services, such as a school nurse, early intervention, and even transportation and food services, may be greater in a public school setting.

However, it also is wise to allow for the participation of community preschool providers in the initiative. First, some families prefer to have their preschool-age children enrolled in the same settings as their infants and toddlers. Second, some prefer a smaller setting or a program with a specific curriculum. Finally, even when a local initiative is based on or receives strong support from public schools, as in Boston, schools may run out of space to house the programs, and additional services must be sought from community preschool providers.

Program Services

9. Plan for at least a full-day (six hours), school-year program to achieve educational goals, with opportunities to obtain extended-day, extended-year services.

Most of the preschool initiatives we examined provide families the option of at least a six-hour, school-year program (i.e., eight initiatives offer at least a six-hour, school-year program: San Antonio, Seattle, the District of Columbia, Boston, New York, Denver, West Sacramento, and San Francisco). Denver, West Sacramento, and San Francisco support both half-day and full-day programs at varying levels, and families can choose full-day services but the cost of the extended day is supported by other public or private sources or by the family itself.

The reasons for at least a six-hour day include that a partial-day schedule is simply inaccessible for many working families and may pose a barrier to enrollment for some children who would most benefit from the program. Although a longer day of eight to 10 hours may be necessary for many families with preschool-age children, that length of day may be too long for most three- and four-year-old children, and a supplementary extended-day program of a different type is advisable for this age group.

As discussed in the cost estimate section of this report, AIR suggests that Sonoma County consider using the expenditure per child we estimated for an initiative using the living wage to pay preschool personnel but reduce the hours of service covered by the initiative to up to 6.5 hours, thereby freeing up some of the funds to improve the quality of service. Families needing the longer hours of service would still be able to choose this option, with the additional hours covered by parent fees or subsidized child care for eligible children.

Phase in the Program

10. Phase in the preschool initiative across 10 years to ensure program quality and allow time for the construction of facilities, beginning in the areas of highest need.

Most of the preschool initiatives that we examined were phased in gradually; even in cases where the implementation was more rapid, the stakeholders we interviewed recommended phasing in gradually based on experience. For example, in San Francisco, city funding was meant to phase in within five years, but the program was not fully funded or implemented until 2014, which was actually a 10-year time frame. San Francisco interviewees also recommended phasing in gradually based on their experience of conducting a needs assessment and realizing that it would

take more than five years to have enough providers that met the quality standards for the program. In contrast, Denver and New York phased in rather quickly. For example, Denver began the program with 250 providers at full implementation and allowed providers to join provisionally, with improvement plans to increase quality. This is in contrast to San Francisco, where providers were allowed to participate only after they had met the quality standards.

Based on our examination of preschool initiatives across the United States, AIR advises that Sonoma County consider a 10-year phase-in period for the full implementation of its preschool initiative. Hence, the county might begin by implementing the initiative in the census tracts with the most children who are disadvantaged and the greatest unmet need, achieving this objective by Year 5 of the initiative. Meanwhile, the initiative also could support the construction or the renovation of facilities, coaching and other professional development for the staff, and overall upgrading of the quality of service. Full implementation would be at 70 percent participation by Year 10. None of the preschool initiatives we examined is at 100 percent participation. Furthermore, as indicated in many parts of this report, the cost of full implementation may be significantly reduced by several factors: increases in other funding streams, such as Title 5 State Preschool and Transitional Kindergarten, providing less than eight to 10 hours or a full year (12 months) of service, and limiting the contribution of the initiative to higher income families by implementing a sliding fee scale.

Summary

Based on AIR's research on 12 preschool initiatives, a cost analysis, and interviews with area stakeholders, making universal preschool a reality is feasible in Sonoma County. A successful universal preschool initiative in the county would include the following steps:

- Define the goal clearly as "access to quality preschool for all three- and four-year-olds."
- Offer free preschool up to 300 percent of the federal poverty level and on a sliding scale to families above that level.
- Establish a framework for quality.
- Plan for at least a school-day, school-year calendar, with provisions for extended day and year.
- Make the most of existing state and federal funding.
- Obtain a dedicated new funding source for preschool.
- Adopt a separate funding source or reserve a specific percentage of any new revenue source for facilities.
- Attach preschool programs to elementary schools where possible but offer a mixed-delivery system including community-based providers.
- Conduct a public education campaign on the benefits of investing in quality preschool.
- Phase in the preschool initiative across a period of up to 10 years, beginning in the neighborhoods of greatest unmet need.

References

Ballotpedia. (2014). *Sonoma County library sales tax increase, Measure M.* Retrieved from http://ballotpedia.org/Sonoma_County_Library_Sales_Tax_Increase,_Measure_M_%28November_2014%29

Ballotpedia. (2015). *Sonoma County general sales tax, Measure A.* Retrieved from http://ballotpedia.org/Sonoma_County_General_Sales_Tax,_Measure_A_%28June_2015%29

Barnett, W. S. (2008). *Preschool education and its lasting effects: Research and policy implications.* Boulder, CO: University of Colorado, School of Education, Education and the Public Interest Center; Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University, College of Education, Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Education Policy Research Unit. Retrieved from http://nieer.org/resources/research/PreschoolLastingEffects.pdf

Barnett, W. S., Carolan, M. E., Squires, J. H., Clarke Brown, K., & Horowitz, M. (2015). *District of Colombia: The state of preschool 2014: State preschool yearbook.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, National Institute for Early Education Research. Retrieved from http://nieer.org/sites/nieer/files/DC_2014_0.pdf

Baugh, J., & Cesar, M. L. (2012, November 7). Local voters decide to put their money on Pre-K 4 SA. *San Antonio Express News.* Retrieved from http://www.mysanantonio.com/elections/article/Voters-approve-Castro-s-Pre-K-plan-4014635.php

Beekman, D. (2014, November 5). Seattle voters OK preschool measure. *Seattle Times.* Retrieved from http://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/seattle-voters-ok-preschool-measure/

Blue Sky Consulting Group. (2014). *Strategies to reduce poverty in Sonoma County: An analysis of the impact of a living wage and other poverty reduction strategies on Sonoma County.* Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from http://sonoma-county.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=505&meta_id=162878

Boston Public Schools. (n.d.). *Department of Early Childhood.* Retrieved from http://bpsearlychildhood.weebly.com

Boston Public Schools. (2015). *Boston K1DS: High quality pre-K in community-based early education programs.* Retrieved from http://bpsearlychildhood.weebly.com/boston-k1ds.html

Burd-Sharps, S., & Lewis, K. (2014). *A portrait of Sonoma County.* Brooklyn, NY: Measure of America: A Project of the Social Science Research Council. Retrieved from http://ssrc-static.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/05141006/English_Complete_POSC.pdf

City of San Antonio. (2015). *Pre-K San Antonio: About.* Retrieved from http://www.sanantonio.gov/Pre-K4SanAntonio/about.aspx

City of San Francisco. (2010). *Article 4 of the San Francisco Planning Code: Development impact fees and project requirements that authorize the payment of in-lieu fees: Sec. 414, Child-care requirements for office and hotel development projects.* Retrieved from http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/article4developmentimpactfeesandprojectr?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$anc=JD_414

City of Seattle. (2015a). *Department of Education and Early Learning: About the families and education levy.* Retrieved from http://www.seattle.gov/education/about-us/about-the-levy

City of Seattle. (2015b). *Seattle City Council: Seattle preschool program.* Retrieved from http://www.seattle.gov/council/issues/PreschoolforAll/default.html

City of Seattle. (2015c). *The Seattle Preschool Program plan: Demonstration phase 2015–2018.* Retrieved from http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/OFE/AboutTheLevy/EarlyLearning/SPP_ProgramPlan2015-16_Final.pdf

City of West Sacramento Engineering Department. (2015). *General notes & requirements, permit information, fee schedules.* Retrieved from https://www.cityofwestsacramento.org/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=11479

City of West Sacramento. (n.d.a). *History and information.* Retrieved from http://www.cityofwestsacramento.org/city/depts/cmo/up4ws/facts.asp

City of West Sacramento. (n.d.b). *Quality preschool and childcare criteria.* Retrieved from http://www.cityofwestsacramento.org/city/depts/cmo/up4ws/quality.asp

City of West Sacramento. (2006). *Measure K report.* Retrieved from https://www.cityofwestsacramento.org/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=2228

Cohen, R. (2014, October 17). Does "Pay for Success" actually pay off? The ROI of social impact bonds. *Nonprofit Quarterly.* Retrieved from http://nonprofitquarterly.org/2014/10/17/does-pay-for-success-actually-pay-off-the-roi-of-social-impact-bonds/

Collier, M. (2015, June 10). Adjoining counties devise different strategies to expand preschool. *EdSource.* Retrieved from http://edsource.org/2015/adjoining-counties-devise-different-strategies-to-expand-preschool/81223

Connors, K. (2014). Chicago to expand pre-K program with hefty social-impact bond. *Education Week, 34*(10), 7.

County of Sonoma. (2015, May 15). *Sonoma County Board of Supervisors and First 5 Sonoma Fund Preschool Facilities Grant Program* [Press Release]. Retrieved from http://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Board-of-Supervisors/Press-Releases/2015/BOS-and-First-5-Sonoma-Fund-Preschool-Facilities-Grant-Program/

Dardick, H., & Perez, J. (2014, October 7). Emanuel to issue bond money to expand pre-K. *Chicago Tribune.* Retrieved from http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/politics/ct-emanuel-pre-k-bonds-1008-2-20141008-story.html

Denver Preschool Program. (n.d.). *About DPP: FAQs.* Retrieved from http://dpp.org/about-us/faqs

Duncan Associates. (n.d.). *Impact fees—general FAQ.* Retrieved from http://www.impactfees.com/faq/general.php

Educare. (n.d.). *What is Educare?* Retrieved from http://www.educareschools.org/about/pdfs/What-is-Educare.pdf

Elk Grove Unified School District. (2015). *Preschool programs.* Retrieved from http://www.egusd.net/students_parents/faqs/14-15/Preschool.pdf

Fields, R., Rodak, S., Roney, K., & Tawoda, T. (2012, April 2). 100 great places to work in healthcare. *Becker's Hospital Review*. Retrieved from http://www.beckershospitalreview.com/lists/100-great-places-to-work-in-healthcare.html

First 5 San Francisco. (n.d.). *First 5 San Francisco.* Retrieved from http://www.first5sf.org/

Galt, J. (2013, July 24). Childcare for hospital employees: A "must have" that creates an effective workplace. *Global Healthcare.* Retrieved from http://www.healthcareglobal.com/hospitals/603/that-Creates-an-Effective-Workplace

Golden, M., & Nagendra, B. (2015). *Pay for Success in the U.S.: Summaries of financed projects.* Greenville, SC: Institute for Child Success. Retrieved from http://www.instituteforchildsuccess.org/pfs.php

Goldsmith, S. (2008, February 25). Management insights: Denver's John Hickenlooper. *Governing Magazine*. Retrieved from http://www.governing.com/columns/mgmt-insights/Denvers-John-Hickenlooper.html

Gormley, W. T., & Phillips, D. (2005). The effects of universal Pre-K in Oklahoma: Research highlights and policy implications. *Policy Studies Journal, 33*(1), 65–82.

Government of the United Kingdom. (2013). *Knowledge box.* London, UK: Cabinet Office, Centre for Social Impact Bonds. Retrieved from http://data.gov.uk/sib_knowledge_box/knowledge-box

Gullixson, P. (2015, May 17). The five biggest myths about Measure A. *The Press Democrat.* Retrieved from http://www.pressdemocrat.com/opinion/paulgullixson/3942151-181/gullixson-the-five-biggest-myths

Hansen, J. (2015, May 26). Roseland Head Start closure leaves hole in community. *The Press Democrat.* Retrieved from http://www.pressdemocrat.com/news/3983816-181/roseland-head-start-closure-leaves

Harris, R. (2012). *Child-parent centers make a comeback.* Retrieved from http://catalyst-chicago.org/2012/11/child-parent-centers-make-comeback/

Hart, A. (2015, May 9). Sonoma County road tax proposal Measure A in hands of voters. *The Press Democrat.* Retrieved from http://www.pressdemocrat.com/news/3878329-181/sonoma-county-road-tax-proposal

Haskins, K. (2014, July 15). Building on what's working in early education in Boston [Web log post]. Retrieved from https://www.barrfoundation.org/blog/building-on-whats-working-in-early-education-in-boston

Heckman, J. J., Moon, S. H., Pinto, R., Savelyev, P. A., & Yavetz, A. (2009). *The rate of return to the High/Scope Perry Preschool Program* (NBER Working Paper 15471). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/papers/w15471.pdf

Hoback, J. (2015). Private money, public impact. *State Legislators, 41*(5), 26–29.

Hudson, M., Phillips, J., Ray, K., Vegeris, S., & Davidson, R. (2010). *The influence of outcome-based contracting on provider-led pathways to work* (Research Report No. 638). Norwich, UK: Department for Work and Pensions. Retrieved from http://www.psi.org.uk/pdf/2010/rrep638.pdf

Human Capital Research Collaborative. (2011). *Investing in Innovation "i3" grant will expand Child-Parent Centers in the Midwest.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Human Capital Research Collaborative. (2014a). *Midwestern Child Parent Center expansion 2014–2015 program guidelines.* Retrieved from https://humancapitalrc.org/~/media/files/midwestcpc/pdfs/programguidelines92914rev.pdf?la=en

Human Capital Research Collaborative. (2014b). *Chicago's social impact bond for Child-Parent Centers expands a proven school reform model.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Institute for Local Government. (2008). *Understanding the basics of county and city revenues.* Retrieved from http://www.counties.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/understanding_the_basics_of_county_and_city_revenues_ilg.pdf

Karoly, L. A., & Bigelow, J. H. (2005). *The economics of investing in universal preschool education in California.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corp. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG349.pdf

Karoly, L. A., Ghosh-Dastidar, B., Zellman, G. L., Perlman, M., & Fernyhough, L. (2008). Prepared to learn: The nature and quality of early care and education for preschool-age children in California. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR539

Karoly, L. A., Reardon, E., & Cho, M. (2007). *Early care and education in the Golden State: Publicly funded programs serving California's preschool-age children.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corp. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical_reports/2007/RAND_TR538.pdf

Kennedy, R. (2015, May 25). Two views on Measure A: No. *The Press Democrat.* Retrieved from http://www.pressdemocrat.com/opinion/3971418-181/two-views-on-measure-a

Lam, I., & Muenchow, S. (2009). *Financing a full-day, full-year preschool program in California: Strategies and recommendations*. San Mateo, CA: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from http://www.earlylearningsystems.org/files/upload/Full-Day_Preschool052009.doc

Legislative Analyst's Office. (1996). *Understanding Proposition 218.* Retrieved from http://www.lao.ca.gov/1996/120196_prop_218/understanding_prop218_1296.html

Los Angeles Universal Preschool. (2014a). *10 years, 10 reasons to celebrate: 2014 annual report.* Retrieved from http://laup.net/documents/who_we_are/laup_annual_report_2014.pdf

Los Angeles Universal Preschool. (2014b). *Operating guidelines.* Retrieved from http://laup.net/documents/for_providers/operating_guidelines/laup_operating_guidelines_fy_2014_2015.pdf

Lu, A. (2014). Results-based financing for preschool catching on. *Pew Charitable Trusts: Stateline.* Retrieved from http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/blogs/stateline/2014/03/21/resultsbased-financing-for-preschool-catching-on

Maryland Department of Legislative Services. (2013). *Evaluating social impact bonds as a new reentry financing mechanism: A case study on reentry programming in Maryland.* Annapolis, MD: Maryland Department of Legislative Services, Office of Policy Analysis. Retrieved from http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/Pubs/BudgetFiscal/2013-Evaluating-Social-Impact-Bonds.pdf

Mason, C. (2008, January 17). Graton tribe's plan described as both dream, nightmare. *The Press Democrat.* Retrieved from http://www.pressdemocrat.com/csp/mediapool/sites/PressDemocrat/News/story.csp?cid=2170832&sid=555&fid=181

McHugh, N., Sinclair, S., Roy, M., Huckfield, L., & Donaldson, C. (2013). Social impact bonds: A wolf in sheep's clothing? *Journal of Poverty & Social Justice, 21*(3), 247–257.

Meehan, S. (2013, August 16). Pre-K program attracts investors out for returns. *Education Week.* Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2013/08/07/37preschool_ep.h32.html

Murray, J. (2014, August 11). Denver City Council signs off on ballot measure to hike preschool tax. *Denver Post.* Retrieved from http://www.denverpost.com/news/ci_26317331/denver-city-council-vote-preschool-tax-increase-ballot

New York City Office of the Mayor. (2014). *Ready to launch: New York City's implementation plan for free, high-quality, full-day universal pre-kindergarten.* Retrieved from http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/home/downloads/pdf/reports/2014/Ready-to-Launch-NYCs-Implementation-Plan-for-Free-High-Quality-Full-Day-Universal-Pre-Kindergarten.pdf

Nilsson Consulting. (2014). *Sonoma County Child Care Planning Needs Assessment Update 2014*. Santa Rosa, CA: Child Care Planning Council of Sonoma County. Retrieved from https://www.scoe.org/files/needs-assessment-update-2014.pdf

Nonprofit Finance Fund. (2013). *Pay for Success learning hub.* Retrieved from http://payforsuccess.org/

Nurse-Family Partnership. (2011). *Communities: A community healthcare program that delivers positive change.* Denver, CO: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nursefamilypartnership.org/communities

Nyhan, P. (2013, December 9). i3 grant tests the potential & reach of one of the country's oldest PreK-3rd programs. *EdCentral.* Retrieved from http://www.edcentral.org/i3-grant-tests-potential-reach-one-countrys-oldest-prek-3rd-programs/

Office of the State Superintendent of Education. (n.d.). *Early learning.* Retrieved from http://osse.dc.gov/service/early-learning

Permit and Resource Management Department. (2015). *Building permit fees.* Retrieved from http://www.sonoma-county.org/prmd/fees/building.htm

Pianta, R. C., Barnett, W. S., Burchinal, M., & Thornburg, K. R. (2009). The effects of preschool education: What we know, how public policy is or is not aligned with the evidence base, and what we need to know. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 10*(2), 49–88.

Reynolds, A. J., & Ou, S. (2011). Paths of effects from preschool to adult well-being: A confirmatory analysis of the Child-Parent Center Program. *Child Development, 82*(2), 555–582.

Reynolds, A. J., Temple, J. A., & Ou, S. (2007). *Impacts and implications of the Child-Parent Center preschool program*. Paper presented at the National Invitational Conference of the Early Childhood Research Collaborative on Critical Issues in Cost-Effectiveness in Children's First Decade, Minneapolis, MN.

Reynolds, A. J., Temple, J. A., White, B. A., Ou, S. R., & Robertson, D. L. (2011). Age-26 cost-benefit analysis of the Child-Parent Center early education program. *Child Development, 82*(1), 379–404. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01563.x/pdf

Roberts, D. (2015). *Bill raising sales tax cap passes CA Assembly.* Retrieved from http://calwatchdog.com/2015/05/29/bill-raising-sales-tax-cap-passes-ca-assembly/

Robles, Y. (2014, November 5). Preschool program will continue to fund tuition for Denver 4-year-old children. *The Denver Post.* Retrieved from http://www.denverpost.com/news/ci_26871578/preschool-program-will-continue-to-fund-tuition-for-denver-4yearolds

Salary.com. (2015). *Teacher, elementary school, Santa Rosa, CA.* Retrieved from http://swz.salary.com/SalaryWizard/Teacher-Elementary-School-Hourly-Salary-Details-Santa%20Rosa-CA.aspx

Samuels, C. A., & Ash, K. (2014, April 7). N.Y.C. hustles to make use of pre-K windfall. *Education Week.* Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2014/04/07/28newyork.h33.html

San Francisco Public Schools. (2015). *Public Education Enrichment Fund (PEEF).* Retrieved from http://www.sfusd.edu/en/about-sfusd/voter-initiatives/public-education-enrichment-fund.html

Sanchez, M. (2014). *For the record: Paying for preschool with social impact bonds.* Chicago, IL: Catalyst Chicago. Retrieved from http://catalyst-chicago.org/2014/11/record-paying-preschool-social-impact-bonds/

Schechter, C., & Bye, B. (2007). Preliminary evidence for the impact of mixed-income preschools on low-income children's language growth. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *22*(1), 137–146.

Schweinhart, L. J., Montie, J., Xiang, Z., Barnett, W. S., Belfield, C. R., & Nores, M. (2005). *Lifetime effects: The High/Scope Perry Preschool study through age 40* (Monographs of the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 14). Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press.

Seattle Department of Education and Early Learning. (2015). *Seattle preschool program.* Retrieved from http://www.seattle.gov/education/child-care-and-preschool/seattle-preschool-program

SPUR. (2004, March 1). *Proposition H—public education fund.* Retrieved from http://www.spur.org/publications/voter-guide/2004-03-01/proposition-h-public-education-fund

SPUR. (2008). *Setting aside differences: Should the city budget be decided at the polls?* Retrieved from http://www.spur.org/publications/spur-report/2008-01-16/setting-aside-differences

SPUR. (2014). *San Francisco Voter Guide, November 2014.* Retrieved from http://www.spur.org/sites/default/files/publications_pdfs/SPUR_Voter_Guide_November_2014_print.pdf#page=7

State of California Employment Development Department. (2015). *Occupation profile: childcare workers.* Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/cgi/databrowsing/occExplorerQSDetails.asp?searchCriteria=child+care&careerID=&menuChoice=&geogArea=0604000097&soccode=399011&search=Explore+Occupation

Stewart, K. (2013, June 15). Utah public preschool push gets $7 million from private investors. *Salt Lake Tribune.* Retrieved from http://www.sltrib.com/strib/news/56457077-78/preschool-education-program-united.html.csp

Strow, D. (2000, April 27). Venetian, Station Casinos tout employee child-care centers. *Las Vegas Sun.* Retrieved from http://lasvegassun.com/news/2000/apr/27/venetian-station-casinos-tout-employee-child-care-/

Timmons, A. (2013, May 5). In Massachusetts, casinos provide jobs, taxes, child care and skating rinks. *Concord Monitor.* Retrieved from http://www.concordmonitor.com/news/localstate/6016287-95/in-massachusetts-casinos-provide-jobs-taxes-child-care-and-skating-rinks

United Way of Salt Lake. (2014). *Pay for Success.* Retrieved from http://www.uw.org/our-work/cradle-to-kindergarten/pay-for-success.html

University of Minnesota. (2015). *Chicago longitudinal study.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute of Child Development. Retrieved from http://www.cehd.umn.edu/icd/research/cls/default.html

U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). *State median income.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/income/data/statemedian/index.html

U.S. Conference of Mayors. (2014a). *Denver Preschool Program*. Retrieved from http://usmayors.org/educationalexcellence/userfiles/Denver,%20CO%201.pdf

U.S. Conference of Mayors. (2014b). *Universal preschool for West Sacramento (UP4WS).* Retrieved from http://usmayors.org/educationalexcellence/userfiles/west%20sacramento,%20ca.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2014). *Improving basic programs operated by local educational agencies (Title I, Part A).* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/index.html

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (n.d.). *Community Development Block Grant Program—CDBG.* Retrieved from http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/comm_planning/communitydevelopment/programs

Utah State Legislature. (2014). *Utah School Readiness initiative* (H.B. 96). Retrieved from http://le.utah.gov/~2014/bills/static/HB0096.html

Voices for Utah Children. (2011). *A sustainable financing model: High quality preschool for at-risk children.* Retrieved from http://www.uw.org/site-migration-archive/our-work/research-reports/a-sustainable-financing-model-for-high-quality-preschool-evidence-from-the-granite-school-district-in-utah-updated-10-26-11.pdf

Watson, B. H. (2010). *A case study of the pre-K for all campaign: How pre-K for all became the law of the land in Washington, DC.* New York, NY: Foundation for Child Development. Retrieved from http://fcd-us.org/sites/default/files/Pre-K%20for%20All%20DC%20Case%20Study.pdf

Yolo Elections Office. (n.d.a). *West Sacramento 1/2c sales tax.* Retrieved from http://www.yoloelections.org/election-returns/archives/20021105/wsac_k

Yolo Elections Office. (n.d.b). *West Sacramento Advisory Measure J, fund streets, parks repair.* Retrieved from http://www.yoloelections.org/election-returns/archives/20021105/wsac_j

Yoshikawa, H., Weiland, C., Brooks-Gunn, J., Burchinal, M., Espinosa, L., Gormley, W., Zaslow, M. (2013). *Investing in our future: The evidence base on preschool education.* New York, NY: Foundation for Child Development and Ann Arbor, MI: Society for Research in Child Development.

Appendix A. Methodology

Our methodology included four main activities:

- An examination of 12 preschool initiatives being implemented across the United States
- Interviews with Sonoma County stakeholders
- Interviews and a literature review related to facilities and funding mechanisms
- The development of cost estimates and phase-in plans

The 12 preschool initiatives examined are in Denver, Colorado; San Antonio, Texas; Seattle, Washington; Elk Grove, California; West Sacramento, California; Salt Lake County, Utah; San Francisco, California; Washington, D.C.; Boston, Massachusetts; Los Angeles, California; New York City, New York; and Chicago, Illinois. Our examination of these initiatives included a thorough review of the initiative websites and documentation provided on these websites, such as provider applications, evaluation reports, white papers, fact sheets, and other programmatic documentation. In addition, we conducted at least one in-depth interview with key informants for the following initiatives: Denver, San Antonio, Seattle, Elk Grove, West Sacramento, Salt Lake County, and San Francisco. We conducted brief telephone conversations as well as e-mail correspondence to confirm information included in this report for Boston, New York City, and the District of Columbia. We were able to confirm information by means of e-mail alone for Los Angeles. The information included in this report for Chicago is based solely on our review of the CPC website and accompanying documentation. In addition, for the Educare model, we reviewed the Educare website and accompanying documentation and conducted interviews with two representatives from areas implementing the Educare model: Jolene Smith, chief executive officer of First 5 Santa Clara, and Jermaine Smith, the development director for Educare New Orleans.

We conducted interviews with a few Sonoma County stakeholders to help provide context and budget information for the development of our cost estimates and phase-in plans as well as information on the local context for making our recommendations on the funding options. We conducted interviews with the following Sonoma County stakeholders: Melanie Dodson and Jim Walters from the Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County; Lisa Grocott, the director Head Start/Early Head Start for the Sonoma County Community Action Partnership; Susan Gilmore, the founder and executive director of the North Bay Children's Center; and Kelly Bass Seibel, the vice president of public policy for the Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce.

To provide detailed information on potential sources of funding for universal preschool, including facilities, we reviewed documents and websites related to funding mechanisms being used by the 12 preschool initiatives as well as the Educare centers in Santa Clara and New Orleans. In addition, we interviewed Mary Garvey and Megan Golden from the Institute for Child Success about their work related to Pay for Success bonds. We interviewed Candace Wong, the director of California Child Development Programs for the San Francisco office of the Low Income Investment Fund, about the fund's work related to improving and building child care facilities. We also interviewed Jolene Smith about the funding mechanism for the Santa

Clara Educare facilities as well as the funding mechanisms for the Educare model program in Santa Clara.

We developed two cost estimates for the purpose of this report. One cost estimate assumes current salaries, and the other increases salaries to a living wage. For both cost estimates, we collected budget information from three different programs that included Head Start, Title 5 State Preschool, and one private community-based provider.

We developed eight scenarios for meeting the unmet need for preschool in Sonoma County. These scenarios include the cost to serve different segments of the three- and four-year-old population (e.g., all children in high-priority areas) at both current salaries and living wages. To develop these scenarios, we used two tools that our team had already developed for this type of work: (1) the Early Learning Needs Assessment Tool, which brings together data from multiple sources to identify the areas of highest need in the county, and (2) the Cost Estimator Tool, a user-friendly tool to assess the cost of phasing in access to preschool. We supplemented the information in these tools with American Community Survey data at the ZIP code level for population estimates where necessary. We also used information from the Sonoma County Child Care Planning Council's supplement to the 2014 Child Care Needs Assessment to estimate the number of preschool slots needed in high-priority census tracts.

Appendix B. Interviews Conducted

The interviewees are listed alphabetically by last name.

- **Ailish Brady,** senior advisor in the Division of Early Childhood Education at the New York City Department of Education
- **Margaret Brodkin,** chief executive officer of Margaret Brodkin and Associates and founder of Funding the Next Generation
- **Kathy Bruck,** chief executive officer for Pre-K 4 SA
- **Claudia Charter,** program specialist for the Elk Grove Unified School District
- **Melanie Dodson,** executive director for the Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County
- **Chris Ellis,** partnership director for Early Learning Outcomes at the United Way of Salt Lake
- **Mary C. Garvey,** associate director of Pay for Success financing at the Institute for Child Success
- **Susan Gilmore,** founder and executive director of the North Bay Children's Center
- **Megan Golden,** senior fellow at the Institute for Child Success
- **Lisa Grocott,** director of Head Start for the Sonoma County Community Action Partnership
- **Elizabeth Groginsky,** assistant superintendent of early learning for the Office of the State Superintendent of Education in the District of Columbia
- **Nancy Herota,** director of the School Readiness Department in the Sacramento County Office of Education (previously with the Elk Grove Unified School District)
- **Justine Jimenez,** early learning program director for the City of West Sacramento
- **Erica Johnson,** project manager of the Seattle Preschool Program
- **Laurel Kloomok,** executive director of First 5 San Francisco
- **Jennifer Landrum,** president and chief executive officer of DPP
- **Freddy Martinez,** fiscal administrator for Pre-K 4 SA
- **Lauren Meyer,** director of program assessment in the Division of Early Childhood Education at the New York City Department of Education
- **Holly Miller,** director of the Department of Education and Early Learning of the City of Seattle
- **Sophia Pappas,** chief executive officer in the Division of Early Childhood Education at the New York City Department of Education
- **Carol Richardson,** assistant city manager for the City of West Sacramento

- **Jason Sachs,** director of early childhood for BPS
- **Kelly Bass Seibel,** vice president of public policy for the Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce
- **Jolene Smith,** chief executive officer of First 5 Santa Clara
- **Jermaine Smith,** development director for Educare New Orleans
- **Brenda Van Gorder,** director of preschool services for Granite School District in Salt Lake City
- **Jim Walters,** facilities director for the Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County
- **Candace Wong,** director of California Child Development Programs for the Low Income Investment Fund Child Care Facilities Fund

Appendix C. Detailed Budgets for Preschool per Child Cost Estimates

Table C1. Detailed Budget for Estimating Per-Child Cost of Preschool at Current Wages

Number of three- and four-year-olds served: 40
Number of classrooms: 2
Number of sessions per day: 1 Full day/full year
Class size: 20

Personnel	FTEs or %	Salary	Total	Source
Site Supervisor (also a Master Teacher)	1	$42,057.00	$42,057.00	Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County
Teacher	1	$34,028.00	$34,028.00	
Associate Teacher	2	$29,910.00	$59,820.00	
Assistants	1.8	$26,906.00	$48,430.80	Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County +5% (staff have received only one 2% COLA increase since 2009)
Cook	0.55	$28,959.00	$15,927.45	
Case Manager (three sites)	0.33	$37,512.72	$12,379.20	
Program Director (12 sites)	0.08	$67,594.80	$5,632.90	
Facilities Director (12 sites)	0.08	$52,830.96	$4,226.48	
Preschool Resource Specialist (12 sites)	0.08	$42,325.92	$3,386.07	
Case Manager/Fiscal Supervisor (1.25 FTE for 12 sites)	0.10	$59,841.60	$6,233.50	
Fiscal Specialist (12 sites)	0.08	$37,128.00	$2,970.24	
Facilities/Maintenance Specialist (12 sites)	0.08	$40,906.32	$3,272.51	
Substitutes			$17,500.00	Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County
Subtotal—Salaries	*7.1875*		*$255,864.14*	
Benefits				
Payroll Taxes and Worker Compensation	16.50%		$42,217.58	
Medical Insurance	15.75%		$40,298.60	Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County—Average %
Subtotal Benefits			*$82,516.19*	
Subtotal Personnel			**$338,380.33**	

Personnel	FTEs or %	Salary	Total	Source
Nonpersonnel Costs	37%		**$125,200.72**	We have assumed 37% here to make up for recent cuts and to cover additional staff training costs to assist programs in making quality improvements.
Total Cost			**$463,581.05**	
Total Cost per Child			**$11,589.53**	

Note. FTE = full-time employee.

Table C2. Detailed Budget for Estimating per Child Cost of Preschool at Living Wage

Number of three- and four-year-olds served: 40
Number of classrooms: 2
Number of sessions per day: 1 Full day/full year
Class size: 20

Staff	FTEs or %	Salary	Total	Living Wage Increases	Source
Site Supervisor (also a Master Teacher)	1	$42,057.00	$42,057.00	$48,676.77	Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County +15.74%
Teacher	1	$34,028.00	$34,028.00	$39,384.01	
Associate Teacher	2	$29,910.00	$59,820.00	$69,235.67	
Assistants	1.8	$26,906.00	$48,430.80	$56,053.81	
Cook	0.55	$28,959.00	$15,927.45	$18,434.43	
Case Manager (three sites)	0.33	$37,512.72	$12,379.20	$12,998.16	Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County +5% (staff have only gotten one 2% COLA increase since 2009) + 5% raise
Program Director (12 sites)	0.08	$67,594.80	$5,632.90	$5,914.55	
Facilities Director (12 sites)	0.08	$52,830.96	$4,226.48	$4,437.80	
Preschool Resource Specialist (12 sites)	0.08	$42,325.92	$3,386.07	$3,555.38	
Case Manager/Fiscal Supervisor (1.25 FTE for 12 sites)	0.10	$59,841.60	$6,233.50	$6,545.18	
Fiscal Specialist (12 sites)	0.08	37,128.00	$2,970.24	$3,118.75	
Facilities/Maintenance Specialist (12 sites)	0.08	40,906.32	$3,272.51	$3,436.13	

Staff	FTEs or %	Salary	Total	Living Wage Increases	Source
Substitutes			$17,500.00	$18,375.00	
Subtotal—Salaries	*7.1875*		*$255,864.14*	*$290,165.62*	
Benefits					
Payroll Taxes and Worker Compensation	16.50%		$42,217.58	$47,877.33	
Medical Insurance	15.75%		$40,298.60	$45,701.09	Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County average %
Subtotal Benefits			*$82,516.19*	*$93,578.41*	
Subtotal Personnel			**338,380.33**	**$383,744.04**	
Nonpersonnel Costs	37%		**125,200.72**	**$141,985.29**	We have assumed 37% here to make up for recent cuts and to cover additional staff training costs to assist programs in making quality improvements.
Total Cost			**463,581.05**	**$525,729.33**	
Total Cost per Child			**$11,589.53**	**$13,143.23**	

Note. FTE = full-time employee. To calculate living wage, we began with the lowest paid staff, teacher assistants, who earn $12.94 per hour in the current budget. To get to $15 per hour, the assumed minimum living wage, these staff would require a 15.74 percent increase. Staff already paid at professional levels were given a 5 percent increase.

Appendix D. Highest Priority Schools and Associated ZIP Codes and High-Risk Priority Areas per *A Portrait of Sonoma County* and Associated Census Tracts

Table D1. First 5 Identified Highest Priority Schools and Associated ZIP Codes

	Highest Priority Schools	ZIP Codes
1	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	95401
2	James Monroe Elementary	95403
3	Luther Burbank Elementary	95401
4	McDowell Elementary	94954
5	Steele Lane Elementary	95403
6	Sheppard Elementary	95407
7	Roseland Elementary	95407
8	Kawana Elementary	95404
9	Helen M. Lehman Elementary	95401
10	Taylor Mountain Elementary	95407
11	Bellevue Elementary	95407
12	Meadow View Elementary	95407
13	Roseland Creek Elementary	95407
14	Brook Hill Elementary	95404
15	John Reed Primary	94928
16	Kid Street Learning Center Charter	95401
17	Robert L. Stevens Elementary	95407
18	Healdsburg Elementary	95448
19	Horicon Elementary	95412
20	El Verano Elementary	95433
21	Albert F. Biella Elementary	95401
22	Sassarini Elementary	95476
23	Cesar Chavez Language Academy	95403
24	Cinnabar Charter	94952
25	Wright Charter	95407
26	Miwok Valley Language Academy Charter	94954
27	Geyserville Elementary	95441
28	Dunbar Elementary	95442
29	Thomas Page Academy	94931
30	Monte Rio Elementary	95462
31	J.X. Wilson Elementary	95401
32	Jefferson Elementary	95425
33	Flowery Elementary	95476

	Highest Priority Schools	ZIP Codes
34	La Tercera Elementary	94954
35	Loma Vista Immersion Academy	94954
36	Morrice Shaefer Charter	95403
37	Guerneville Elementary	95446
38	Cali Calmecac Language Academy	95492
39	Mark West Elementary	95403
40	Binkley Elementary Charter	95405
41	Park Side Elementary	95472
42	Whited Elementary Charter	95405
43	Olivet Elementary Charter	95401
44	Forestville Elementary	95436
45	Jack London Elementary	95403
46	Village Elementary Charter	95405

Table D2. High-Risk Priority Areas per *A Portrait of Sonoma County* and Associated Census Tracts

	Census Tract	Area Name	ZIP Codes
1	East Cloverdale		
	Census Tract 1542.01	East Cloverdale	95425
2	Fetters Springs/Agua Caliente West		
	Census Tract 1503.05	Fetters Springs/Agua Caliente West	95431, 95433
3	Northwest Santa Rosa		
	Census Tract 1530.03	Railroad Square	95401, 95403
	Census Tract 1530.01	Coddingtown	95401, 95403
	Census Tract 1519	Burbank Gardens	95401, 95403
	Census Tract 1529.03	Comstock	95401, 95403
	Census Tract 1520	Downtown Santa Rosa	95401, 95403
	Census Tract 1528.02	Bicentennial Park	95401, 95403
	Census Tract 1530.02	West End	95401, 95403
	Census Tract 1521	West Junior College	95401, 95403
4	Southwest Santa Rosa		
	Census Tract 1531.02	Sheppard	95407
	Census Tract 1531.04	Roseland	95407
	Census Tract 1531.03	Roseland Creek	95407
5	Southeast Santa Rosa		
	Census Tract 1514.01	Kawana Springs	95404
	Census Tract 1514.02	Taylor Mountain	95404

ABOUT AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

Established in 1946, with headquarters in Washington, D.C., American Institutes for Research (AIR) is an independent, nonpartisan, not-for-profit organization that conducts behavioral and social science research and delivers technical assistance both domestically and internationally. As one of the largest behavioral and social science research organizations in the world, AIR is committed to empowering communities and institutions with innovative solutions to the most critical challenges in education, health, workforce, and international development.

LOCATIONS

Domestic

Washington, D.C.

Atlanta, GA

Austin, TX

Baltimore, MD

Cayce, SC

Chapel Hill, NC

Chicago, IL

Columbus, OH

Frederick, MD

Honolulu, HI

Indianapolis, IN

Metairie, LA

Naperville, IL

New York, NY

Rockville, MD

Sacramento, CA

San Mateo, CA

Waltham, MA

International

Egypt

Honduras

Ivory Coast

Kyrgyzstan

Liberia

Tajikistan

Zambia

2800 Campus Drive, Suite 200
San Mateo, CA 94403
650-843-9100

www.air.org

Making Research Relevant

5920_04/16