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Welcome and Introductions

1. Call to Order and Comments by the Chair

Chair Terry Ogawa opened the meeting of the Policy Roundtable for Child Care and Development (Roundtable) at 10:06 a.m. with self-introductions.

2. Approval of January 9, 2019 Minutes

Upon a motion by Nellie Ríos-Parra and seconded by Dawn Kurtz, the minutes for the January 9, 2019 were approved. Kalene Gilbert abstained.

Public Policy

3. Policy Report and Discussion
Michele Sartell provided a high level presentation of the Governor’s budget proposals for early care and education. Governor Newsom has proposed a cradle to career agenda that encompasses education as well as other services to improve child and family well being. Michele referenced a handout in the meeting materials titled, Governor Introduces Proposed Budget – FY 2019-20 Early Care and Education Items. The Governor’s proposals for early care and education address achieving universal preschool, expanding state preschool slots, building the infrastructure planning (facility development and workforce capacity), providing a cost-of-living adjustment, adjusting funding for CalWORKS Stages 2 and 3 Child Care based on anticipated caseloads, and developing a cradle to career data system. Additional proposed investments address paid family leave, home visitation, and developmental screenings.

While the Governor’s proposed investments in early care and education are historic, his budget overlooks the significant gap in services available for babies and toddlers of low-income working families. In Los Angeles County, only six percent of 51 percent of eligible babies and toddlers of low-income, working families are served by state subsidized programs. Furthermore, the Governor does not address the reimbursement rates for subsidized services that continue to lag behind the cost of operating programs that meet higher quality standards as set forth by the quality rating and improvement system being implemented across the state.

Michele mentioned that on February 5th the Board of Supervisors passed a motion directing the Chief Executive Officer to send a five-signature letter to the Governor and the County’s State legislative delegation expressing the Board’s support for the Governor’s proposals for funding early care and education programs and encouraging additional investments in infant and toddler care and other related services that increase access to high quality early care and education programs. Hopefully, the motion provides the means necessary to the Roundtable and Child Care Planning Committee also weigh in on the Governor’s proposals in particular as hearings come up.

Michele added that the Early Childhood Education Coalition has sent letters to Senator Holly Mitchell, Chair of the Senate Budget Committee and Assembly Member Phil Ting, Chair of the Assembly Budget Committee. The letter was included in the meeting packets.
Michele briefly summarized trailer bills addressing early care and education services. Trailer bill language specific to the Emergency Child Care Bridge Program for Foster Children proposes waiving fees associated with the registry for providers who are serving children funded under the program. In addition, advocacy efforts are underway to increase funding that would provide additional vouchers for more children, and increase the number of navigators and trauma informed trainings available for early educators. Terry Ogawa asked Jennifer Hottenroth of the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) to provide an update on the program at a future meeting.

Michele next referenced the Child Care and Early Learning Trailer Bill, which addresses three items as follows: 1) Requires the development of recommendations for future investments in the State system of child care and early learning; 2) Allocates $245 million in infrastructure grants for the construction of new or retrofitting of exiting child care and preschool facilities, including those that operate as a child care center or a family child care home; and 3) Allocates $245 million for competitive workforce development grants to expand the number of qualified child care and early learning professionals. The Joint Committee on Legislation is closely monitoring this trailer bill.

Michele concluded her presentation by sharing the matrix of legislation, which was included in the meeting handouts. There are several early care and education bills, and others related to the field; she encouraged Roundtable members to let her know of any bills not in the matrix for potential inclusion.

**Ongoing Efforts**

4. **Update on Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation Project**

Kalene Gilbert of the Department of Mental Health (DMH) thanked the Roundtable for their contributions to the progress that has been made to date on the project. She mentioned that her office has transitioned from the children's division to the prevention division with the goal engaging directly with communities to increase protective factors and reduce risk factors associated with trauma with a focus on education.

Early childhood mental health consultation (ECMHC) in early childhood settings is a problem solving and capacity-building intervention implemented within a collaborative relationship between a professional consultant with early childhood mental health expertise and one or more individuals with other areas of expertise, primarily child care center staff. ECMHC aims to build the capacity (improve the ability) of staff, families, programs, and systems to prevent, identify, treat and reduce the impact of behavioral challenges, trauma and mental health concerns among children and their families.

DMH’s Prevention Administration Services has proposed a pilot project to implement ECMHC with existing Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) providers experienced in the practice to deliver:

- Classroom level consultation to build the skills of early care and education staff to address challenging behaviors
- Workforce development to enhance staff understanding of social-emotional development as well as address staff wellness

5. **Update on Director Selection Process**

Dr. Robert Gilchick reported that over 100 applications for the director position have been received by Human Resources. Applicants meeting the minimum qualifications for a Health Program Manager I were added to a list of potential candidates. Dr. Debbie Allen and Dr.
Gilchick have been interviewing candidates with the intent of identifying persons with both a balance of management skills and expertise in early care and education. Applications are still being accepted. Roundtable members suggested a number of strategies to increase the pool of candidates including advertising the position with other counties, developing a more attractive job bulletin and conducting targeted outreach.

Wrap Up

6. Announcements and Public Comments

7. Meeting in Review
   a. Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Stakeholder Event</td>
<td>Terry Ogawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue the Strategic Planning Progress</td>
<td>Richard Cohen &amp; Ellen Cervantes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Follow up Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Pending/Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation</td>
<td>Kalene Gilbert</td>
<td>Updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles to present the updates on the Emergency Child Care Bridge Program for Foster Children</td>
<td>Ellen Cervantes, Cristina Alvarado</td>
<td>Updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue discussions with Cheryl Wold on strengthening and using data from the Portrait of Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Terry Ogawa</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue discussions with the Office of Women and Girls Initiative</td>
<td>Terry Ogawa</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure H – Homeless Initiative: Board of Supervisor’s Child Care Motion</td>
<td>Cristina Alvarado</td>
<td>Updates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Call to Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.
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ABOUT US

Advancement Project California is a next generation, multi-racial civil rights organization working on systems change. California staff in Los Angeles and Sacramento work to expand opportunities in our educational systems, create healthy built environments, build participatory and representative communities, and shift public investments toward equity.

We develop rigorous, evidence-based solutions, innovate technology and tools with coalition partners to advance the field, broker partnerships between community advocates and the halls of power, and build racial and economic equity. With the understanding that education is an essential component in improving the lives and opportunities of all Californians, we work across the state and with a diverse set of stakeholders to improve the early learning and K–12 education systems.

We believe that effective and respectful partnerships are the bedrock of fixing a system responsible for educating California’s children.

INTRODUCTION

Early learning environments are essential for promoting healthy child development. Vibrant colors, sunlight, and natural outdoor environments for playing and exploring are all critical to contributing to a child’s brain function and physical development. However, the majority of families and children in California do not have access to high-quality early learning environments, due to lack of early care and education (ECE) facilities in their neighborhood. Lack of access is particularly acute for low-income communities of color.

Presently, California’s ECE system and infrastructure reflect a California of decades past. Family working trends show that in the 1970s, about 30 percent of mothers with children under age three entered the workforce. Nationally, we now see that close to 60 percent of mothers with children under three enter the workforce. Families need two incomes to meet the demands of rising housing costs and increased costs of living. Unfortunately, there has not been equivalent growth in ECE services, leaving many families in a difficult position. Despite changes in working trends, investments in the California publicly-funded ECE system are just barely at pre-recession funding levels.

Recognizing this, the Golden State’s new gubernatorial administration and legislators have committed more resources to increase availability of high-quality ECE for California’s children. There is much discussion across the state about how best to achieve this goal. Missing from many of these discussions, however, is an analysis of whether the state has sufficient physical facilities to house the babies, toddlers, and preschoolers it aims to serve.
WHY EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION MATTERS

The research is clear: For children to thrive, we must ensure that all children, birth through five, have safe, socially supported, and effective ECE.6

BRAIN DEVELOPMENT AND ATTACHMENT

A child’s first five years are a magical period of learning and development. Neuroscientists show that by age five, 90 percent of a baby’s brain is developed.7 Quality experiences and relationships during these first years are the impetus for positive development and the creation of trillions of neural connections, which have a deep and lasting impact on future development. High-quality ECE helps children form healthy attachments, which provide the basis for cognitive development, physical growth, and health.8

KINDERGARTEN READINESS

Early learning opportunities are essential for preventing educational achievement gaps before they begin to form.9 A report from the Getting Down to Facts II series, “A Portrait of Educational Outcomes in California,” examines K-12 educational outcomes and finds that disparities in educational outcomes are evident long before 3rd grade testing begins, demonstrating that positive experiences before kindergarten are critical to future success.10 Closing the achievement gap requires increasing access to high-quality ECE services in our highest-need communities.

ECE IS A SMART INVESTMENT

Nobel Prize-winning economists find that ECE investments offer substantial financial returns.11 New research documents a 13 percent per year return on investment of high-quality ECE programs for low-income children of color.12 Taxpayers and society at large also benefit from high-quality ECE programs, specifically from the tax revenues of working parents who contribute to the economy—supporting all children on a path to success.13

This report is a comprehensive examination of California’s ECE facilities challenge. Whether California’s high-quality ECE system is universal or targeted, whether the impetus comes from an initiative, the legislature, the governor, or elsewhere, decision-makers will face the same reality: Increased ECE access cannot be offered where there are no spaces to house these programs. This report analyzes where ECE facilities are available, barriers to facility development and improvement, and policy recommendations to ensure that California builds the needed infrastructure for the success of our ECE system.

TABLE 1: FACILITIES IN CALIFORNIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CHILD AGE SERVED (INFANTS AND TODDLERS OR PRESCHOOL-AGE)</th>
<th>MAX CAPACITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Family Child Care Home</td>
<td>A licensed provider’s personal residence where they care for eight or fewer children, for periods of less than 24 hours per day, while the parents or guardians are away.</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Family Child Care Home</td>
<td>A licensed provider’s personal residence where they care for 14 or fewer children, for periods of less than 24 hours per day, while the parents or guardians are away.</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Center</td>
<td>Any child care facility other than a family child care home where children are provided non-medical care and supervision in a group setting for less than 24 hours per day.</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Max varies based on indoor/outdoor square footage available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Kindergarten</td>
<td>Programs offered to four-year-olds with birthdays between September 2 and December 2, operated by Local Educational Agencies. May run a part-day or full-day program. Program is no cost and all local children are eligible.</td>
<td>Preschool-Age</td>
<td>Majority of stand-alone, full-day classrooms’ average class size is 205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE CALIFORNIA ECE FACILITIES INFRASTRUCTURE

California ECE Facilities. The California Department of Social Services’ Community Care Licensing Division regulates and licenses three types of ECE facilities: small family child care homes, large family child care homes, and child care centers. This report analyzes capacity data of these three types of ECE settings, plus Transitional Kindergarten facilities operated by Local Educational Agencies. See Table 1 above.

State of ECE Facilities Infrastructure. California has nearly three million children under age six. Yet the current ECE facilities infrastructure has the capacity to serve less than a quarter of California’s youngest learners. As decision-makers grapple with how best to move ECE program expansion, the following maps serve as an illustration of the magnitude of California’s ECE challenge.

Child care centers and Transitional Kindergarten Infrastructure. California has 522,462 licensed child care center seats for children ages two through five, plus 90,707 Transitional Kindergarten seats. This leaves 1,401,331 children ages two through five without a currently available licensed child care center or Transitional Kindergarten seat (see Map 1). The facilities challenge significantly impacts families with children under the age of two. California only has 47,443 licensed child care center seats for children ages birth through two. This leaves 921,525 babies and toddlers without access to a licensed child care center seat (see Map 2).

California children who lack access to a ready space are not spread evenly throughout the state. They are concentrated in severely space-short neighborhoods. They are clustered in major urban counties in Southern California, the Central Valley and parts of the Bay Area. For example, Los Angeles has the largest share of children under six without access to a publicly funded ECE seat. (See Table 2).

State of ECE Facilities Infrastructure. California has nearly three million children under age six. Yet the current ECE facilities infrastructure has the capacity to serve less than a quarter of California’s youngest learners. As decision-makers grapple with how best to move ECE program expansion, the following maps serve as an illustration of the magnitude of California’s ECE challenge.

Child care centers and Transitional Kindergarten Infrastructure. California has 522,462 licensed child care center seats for children ages two through five, plus 90,707 Transitional Kindergarten seats. This leaves 1,401,331 children ages two through five without a currently available licensed child care center or Transitional Kindergarten seat (see Map 1). The facilities challenge significantly impacts families with children under the age of two. California only has 47,443 licensed child care center seats for children ages birth through two. This leaves 921,525 babies and toddlers without access to a licensed child care center seat (see Map 2).

California children who lack access to a ready space are not spread evenly throughout the state. They are concentrated in severely space-short neighborhoods. They are clustered in major urban counties in Southern California, the Central Valley and parts of the Bay Area. For example, Los Angeles has the largest share of children under six without access to a publicly funded ECE seat. (See Table 2).

Based on analysis of facilities geographic patterns, the children most in danger of being left out of future ECE investments are disproportionately the very children who are presented as the most compelling reason to provide the program in the first place. Highest need areas are communities with the largest number of children under five without access to a publicly-funded ECE program in their ZIP Code. A comparison of lowest need areas and highest need areas shows that there are striking racial disparities in access. Specifically we see an increase of Asian, Black, LatinX and Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander children in neighborhoods with highest need for facilities and access to publicly-funded programs (Table 3). Moreover, we see that two-thirds of kids in high need areas of California are LatinX. Most surprising about this data is that Asian children make up more of the population in high need areas than in low need areas, and thus have less readily available access to ECE programs.

TABLE 2: California counties with most low-income children under six without access to a publicly-funded ECE seat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Seats Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>323,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>30,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>31,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>48,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>51,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>74,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>55,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>94,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>92,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>90,213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advancement Project’s analysis shows that closing the facilities gap will require supports and investments in family child care homes throughout the state. Licensed family child care homes have seats for 283,544 children under the age of twelve. Family child care homes are a critical piece of the facilities puzzle to meet needs of families throughout the state (see Map 3). These facilities generally provide more affordable and flexible care for families. For example, 41 percent of family child care homes offer evening, weekend, or overnight care. Based on analysis of facilities geographic patterns, the children most in danger of being left out of future ECE investments are disproportionately the very children who are presented as the most compelling reason to provide the program in the first place. Highest need areas are communities with the largest number of children under five without access to a publicly-funded ECE program in their ZIP Code. A comparison of lowest need areas and highest need areas shows that there are striking racial disparities in access. Specifically we see an increase of Asian, Black, LatinX and Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander children in neighborhoods with highest need for facilities and access to publicly-funded programs (Table 3). Moreover, we see that two-thirds of kids in high need areas of California are LatinX. Most surprising about this data is that Asian children make up more of the population in high need areas than in low need areas, and thus have less readily available access to ECE programs.
MAP 1.
Only 613,000 child care center and Transitional Kindergarten seats for more than 2M children ages two through five.

MAP 2.
Only 47,000 child care center seats for nearly 1M children under age two.
Access for preschoolers has made great strides, but families continue to remain without access across the state. Available preschool spaces are scarce for low-income preschoolers, children ages three through five. In California, 821,320 preschoolers are income-eligible for publicly-funded preschool or Transitional Kindergarten. Yet, 61 percent of children who are income-eligible for publicly-funded programs do not have access to these programs (see Map 4).

Babies and toddlers experience the largest disparities and overall gaps in access to ECE. Achievement gaps begin before a child learns to talk. Thus ensuring babies and toddlers, children ages birth through three, access to ECE opportunities is critical. There are 762,797 babies and toddlers who are income-eligible for publicly-funded ECE programs. Yet, 94 percent of children who are income-eligible for publicly-funded programs do not have access (see Map 5).

TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Need</th>
<th>Highest Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Map of California showing family child care homes" /></td>
<td>Access for preschoolers has made great strides, but families continue to remain without access across the state. Available preschool spaces are scarce for low-income preschoolers, children ages three through five. In California, 821,320 preschoolers are income-eligible for publicly-funded preschool or Transitional Kindergarten. Yet, 61 percent of children who are income-eligible for publicly-funded programs do not have access to these programs (see Map 4). Babies and toddlers experience the largest disparities and overall gaps in access to ECE. Achievement gaps begin before a child learns to talk. Thus ensuring babies and toddlers, children ages birth through three, access to ECE opportunities is critical. There are 762,797 babies and toddlers who are income-eligible for publicly-funded ECE programs. Yet, 94 percent of children who are income-eligible for publicly-funded programs do not have access (see Map 5).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAP 4.
Only 39 out of 100 low-income preschoolers have access to a publicly-funded seat.*

MAP 5.
Only 6 out of 100 low-income babies and toddlers have access to a publicly-funded seat.*
AN ACTION PLAN TO BUILD CALIFORNIA’S ECE INFRASTRUCTURE

California decision-makers—the legislature, the governor, and the state superintendent of public instruction—can play a pivotal role in increasing the number of ECE facilities for our children. These decision-makers are entrusted with policy development, policy implementation, and fiscal budgets that support the needs of children and their families. Championing ECE facilities, a fundamental pre-requisite in increasing high-quality ECE programs, requires a close link between short-, mid-, and long-term strategies. Below we lay out an action plan for state decision-makers to ensure we build the ECE facilities infrastructure.

1. SHORT-TERM STRATEGIES

A. Convert the Child Care Facilities Revolving Fund from a loan to a well-funded grant program.

The California Department of Education administers two loan programs to support the current ECE infrastructure. One program is the Child Care Facilities Revolving Fund (CCFRF), generally referred to as the portable facilities loan. The second program is the California Renovation and Repair Loan Program (CRRRL), referred to as the renovation and repair loan. Child care providers may apply for CRRRL loans to renovate or repair existing facilities or to acquire new buildings. The department has not received many applications for these loans for a variety of reasons: available funding or revenue; child care operators receive is used for the operation of the ECE program, the maximum funding allowance is too low, lack of land to place portables and the loan is too long.
To increase ECE facilities development, decision-makers have the opportunity to convert existing loan programs into a well-funded grant program. Additionally, decision-makers should consider expanding eligibility to support family child care and Early Head Start providers to address the large facilities infrastructure gap for babies and toddlers.

Investing in Early Head Start (EHS) child care centers ensures that California continues to draw down federal funding to support our zero- to-three infrastructure. These programs are also essential for meeting the facilities needs of babies and toddlers, outlined in the maps.

A grant program may provide family child care homes with funding to pay for zoning permit applications, fire safety inspections and equipment requirements, and/or the purchase of child care friendly furniture and materials. It is important to underscore that family child care homes are where the vast majority of infant and toddlers are served, and expansion of this sector will strengthen services to our youngest children. In addition, family child care homes provide families with critically needed flexible hours that match their work schedules. Adults in this sector often times possess cultural and linguistically skills representative of the children they serve. Family child care homes play a crucial role in providing a “public purpose” that otherwise would be unmet.

B. Conduct an inventory of state-owned property and land that may be converted or developed into ECE facilities.

California has a “Statewide Property Inventory.” This inventory includes the state’s real property assets, including land and buildings that are not being fully utilized.

To meet the demand and need for ECE services, California decision-makers have an opportunity to identify state-owned property and land that where existing buildings could be converted or new ECE facilities built in accordance with state and local regulations. State decision-makers can prioritize identification of buildings that are currently underutilized and convert them to ECE facilities that serve the community’s needs.

2. MID-TERM STRATEGIES

A. Include ECE as a legal element in state general plan guidance for local jurisdictions.

Land-use planning is essential for meeting the current needs of society and ensuring the efficient use of resources for future generations. California state law requires that local jurisdictions submit general plans that reflect considerations for the community’s growth and sustainability. California law also requires each plan to address mandated elements: land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. Cities and counties that have identified disadvantaged communities must also address environmental justice in their general plans, including air quality.

The general plan is more than the legal underpinning for land-use decisions; it is a vision of how a community will grow, reflecting community priorities and values. Missing within these guidelines is the long-term planning for a sustainable ECE infrastructure. Sacramento decision-makers have the opportunity to ensure cities plan for family-friendly communities with housing at affordable prices, parks, quality public schools, safe neighborhoods, and access to child care. To do this, Sacramento decision-makers can spearhead efforts to require an eighth element in general plans: the Early Care and Education Infrastructure Element. An ECE Infrastructure Element may require jurisdictions to work with Local Child Care and Development Planning Councils to identify child care need, assess suitable land for child care, address zoning barriers to child care development, and create local plans for addressing child care needs.

In greater Los Angeles, ECE facilities development presents various challenges. “To build high quality ECE facilities that are safe, secure and developmentally appropriate, you need critical increases in funding,” states Roberto Viramontes, Director, Public Affairs, at Educare Los Angeles at Long Beach. Educare partnered with Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD). The district provided land to build the new facility, which is now located at Clara Barton Elementary School in north Long Beach. Roberto adds, “This type of public-private partnership allowed us to focus on the development of a high-quality facility that serves children and families in a comprehensive way, while also being connected to the K-5 system.” Educare Los Angeles at Long Beach offers a beautiful outdoor play-space, 16 classrooms, a staff training room, a parent meeting room, a multipurpose room, a lactation room as well as a conference room. With the development of this new facility, opportunities were specifically created to fully serve children and families and consistently support the professional development of Educare staff. At Educare Los Angeles at Long Beach, everyone learns and grows together, which are the hallmarks of a high-quality facility and program which should be replicated in as many ECE facilities in California as possible.
3. LONG-TERM STRATEGIES

Create a statewide ECE Facilities Bond to ensure a stable and dedicated funding stream for ECE facilities for highest need communities.

For California to address the needs of our youngest learners, we must build new ECE facilities, as well as modernize existing family child care homes and child care centers. A dedicated funding stream is essential to ensure all ECE facilities are educationally and environmentally sound, to continue to enhance neighborhoods as centers of their communities and to remain useful for decades. To do this, we recommend creating a statewide ECE facilities bond with a strong emphasis on equity.

According to a Getting Down to Facts II report, titled “Financing School Facilities in California: A Ten-Year Perspective,” before the late 1940s, local school districts were responsible for the financing of new school construction and modernization projects. We learned then that the system was falling short and State intervention was needed to fix the problem. Multiple programs over the years have provided facility funding to school districts in California. In short, a state responsibility for facilities finance has been critical in the K–12 system. Yet, for our very young children, there has been no parallel programming for financing facilities.

American voters, including California families, recognize that safe and developmentally-appropriate ECE facilities are an essential component of building healthy and economically sustainable communities. Sacramento decision-makers have an opportunity to grow a system that will build out our ECE facilities infrastructure. This will require long-term investments, with appropriate policies and procedures to ensure implementation.

As in the K–12 field, California decision-makers can explore bond measures to finance ECE facilities development. In addition, we recommend that legislature ask the California Department of Education to create a Taskforce to explore the levels of need to ensure that ECE facilities bond resources are allocated both to areas with scarcity in ECE facilities and to a high percentage of families who are low-income. The Taskforce would create the mechanism for distribution of ECE facilities bond dollars.
CONCLUSION

This report documents the ECE facilities crisis and lays out an action plan for leaders in Sacramento to build a system responsive to the demand of families and children statewide, especially low-income children of color. To maximize our children’s potential so they, in turn, can positively contribute to California’s well-being, we need to seriously consider increasing the number of available ECE facilities. Together, we can build a Golden State our children deserve.

APPENDIX:

1. COMMUNITY VOICE METHODOLOGY

Local child care and development planning councils (LPCs) support the overall coordination of child care services. LPCs plan for child care and development services based on the needs of families in local communities. They do so by serving as a forum to identify local priorities for child care and the development of policies.

### TABLE A-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>LPC COORDINATOR</th>
<th>OFFICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Michele Sartell</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Department of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://childcare.lacounty.gov/">https://childcare.lacounty.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Matilda Soria</td>
<td>Office of Fresno County Superintendent of Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.fcoe.org/departments/lpc/">https://www.fcoe.org/departments/lpc/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Michael Garcia</td>
<td>Santa Clara County Office of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.sccoe.org/depts/students/lpc/Pages/default.aspx">https://www.sccoe.org/depts/students/lpc/Pages/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Raechelle Bowlay-Sutton</td>
<td>Community Action Partnership of San Luis Obispo County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.capslo.org">www.capslo.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Tony Tyson</td>
<td>San Francisco Office of Early Care and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.sfoece.org">www.sfoece.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2017 and 2018, the LPCs, in partnership with the Advancement Project California, worked to create heat maps that illustrate child care need access across the state of California. Each county received two maps: one map showed the percentage of children under three eligible for state subsidized child care, and the other showed the percentage of eligible children served.33 Table A-1 below details pilot projects in five counties and their LPC coordinators.

A critical element of LPC pilot project involved uplifting community voices across the five counties to strengthen and align the research data with the
needs and realities of each county. Advancement Project California and LPC partners conducted five input sessions that included over 115 ECE experts, parents, and child care providers. Each community input session included a brief presentation of child care need data. A key research question posed during these sessions was: “What factors create or cause barriers to accessing ECE services in the county?”

Key Barriers
Community input sessions identified several barriers:
- facilities;
- workforce compensation;
- affordability and housing;
- quality ECE; and
- child care hours incompatible with workforce (parents’) needs.

ECE facilities shortages were prioritized across the five counties for significantly contributing to the gap in access to ECE services. Participants shared that even if state funding were to increase, not enough seats or facilities are available to house all eligible children. Community input sessions and interviews with organizations named in the “Acknowledgement” section, informed the barriers elevated in the “Challenges to Building the ECE Infrastructure” section of this report. This report is meant to be responsive to community voices by uplifting the facility challenge to state decision-makers and providing policy recommendations to reduce facilities development barriers.

2. DATA METHODOLOGY
Advancement Project California utilized the following data indicators and sources to calculate ECE facilities infrastructure capacity and access illustrated in this report.

TABLE A-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA INDICATORS</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE AND YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Number of licensed child care center seats</td>
<td>California Child Care Resource and Referral Network, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of licensed family child care home seats</td>
<td>California Department of Education, 2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of children under age three/ages three through five/under age six in low-income households earning less than 70 percent of State Median Income</td>
<td>California Department of Finance Population Projections, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of children under age three/ages three through five/under age six enrolled in Early Head Start, Head Start, Title 5 Family Child Care Homes, Alternative Payment Programs, California State Preschool, CalWORKs Stage 2 and Stage 3</td>
<td>US Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, 2013-2017, Tables B01001B/H/C/D/E/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of children under age two/ages two through five/under age six</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of Black, LatinX, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, and White children under age five</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEFINITIONS
Babies and Toddlers and Preschool. In the analysis for Maps 4 and 5, children under age three are considered babies and toddlers, while those ages three through five are considered preschool age. U.S. Census Bureau, Cartographic Boundary County/State/ZIP Code Tabulation Area shapefiles were used to create maps.

PUBLICLY-FUNDED ECE CAPACITY. Enrollment in the following programs: Early Head Start, Head Start, Transitional Kindergarten, Title 5 Family Child Care Homes, Alternative Payment Programs, California State Preschool (Part/Full Day), CalWORKs Stage 2, and CalWORKs Stage 3.

PUBLICLY-FUNDED ECE DEMAND. Children under age six in low-income households, defined as households earning less than 70 percent of the state median income. This data and Capacity are then used to calculate the number and percentage of children in low-income households without access to licensed publicly-funded ECE.

HIGHEST NEED AND RACIAL DISPARITIES. To understand our need, we calculated the number of children, under six, who lack access to a publicly-funded ECE program in their ZIP Code. Then, we assigned ZIP Codes to an ECE need category based on the percentile of the number of children without access. For example, ZIP Codes with the most children without access make up the Highest Need Areas. We then calculated the total number and percentage of Black, Latinx, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, and Non-Hispanic White children under age five residing in each category of need to better understand the racial disparities in ECE access.

ENDNOTES
1 Facilities refer to all types of out-of-home settings used for ECE programs, including child-minding, preschool, child care centers, Child Care Centers (such as Head Start, California State Preschool Program, Part-day programs) and Transitional Kindergarten.
3 This report utilizes publicly-funded programs to capture the existence of programs available to children. It does not account for investments by federal, state, or local entities.
6 Deborah Styck and Peggy Plays. “Getting Down to Business: Early Childhood Education in California. The Early Learning Landscape (September 2009).
9 Achievement gap is the unequal or inegalitarian distribution of academic support and educational resources amongst different racial and economic backgrounds.
14 Advancement Project California analysis of American Community Survey 2015-2018 5-year estimates finds there are 2,949,059 million children under six in California.
16 California State Legislature, Senate Bill (SB) 1381, 2010-11. School districts are required to provide preschool instruction and services to children ages three through five during the preschool years and nine months of age and up who request services for Transitional Kindergarten. However, enrollment is not mandated and is voluntary for families.
18 31 All groups include Latinx, except for White. For example, a Black child who is Latinx is included in both groups.
19 To provide as accurate a representation as possible for California’s Native population, Advancement Project California (APCA) has worked with several partners on the Race Counts project and with a Native American tribal organization across the state. From this work, APCA learned that Native Americans often do not identify as a racial group. Thus, the representation of Native Americans in any data currently collected requires rigorous analysis in order to fully understand racial disparities.
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid.
25 Early Head Start to be federally funded early learning program for families and their children under three. The program provides center-based care and home visiting programs. Center-based programs are 54 hours. The program provides education, social services, mental health, nutrition, disability, health, and family engagement support to families and their children.
30 2017 California Child Care Facilities Development and Financing in California.
32 Early Learning Facilities Policy Framework; Bi-Partisan Policy Center (November 2018).
33 Los Angeles County maps are publicly available and can be found at All County Facilities Planning and Development. For other county maps, please contact education@advanceproj.org.
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A History of California Legislation

1913
First licensure standards created for institutions caring for children

1943
Child care center program established through funding from the Federal Latham Act

1947
State took over funding of the state child care center program, eligibility of program extended

1957
State child care center program made permanent, program eligibility extended

1963
Compensatory education pilot projects established, including preschool programs

1965
State preschool program created based on the federal Head Start program

1972
The Child Development Act consolidated all child care and preschool programs under one comprehensive program, California Department of Education designated as the single agency responsible for all child care and preschool programs

1976
Resource and Referral established
Alternative Payment programs established, including preschool programs

1980
The Child Care and Development Services Act integrated alternative child care programs into state child development programs, established a state Standard Reimbursement Rate (SRR) & differential Cost of Living Adjustment (CDLA), and established a capitol outlay account for child care facilities

1988
Proposition 98 passed by voters to provide public education (K-12) with guaranteed minimum level of funding. The Proposition was ambiguous as to whether or not state-subsidized child development programs were included and if so, whether it was limited to programs operated by school districts

1992
CTA v. Huff ruled that non-school district child development programs would be included in Proposition 98’s base funding guarantee

1997
California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) established, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program
Child care established as an entitlement to program recipients

1998
Children and Families First Act passed by voters to create the First 5 California Commission

1999
First 5 California established as a commission focused on children’s health and education during their first 5 years

2001
Child development programs eliminated from Proposition 98

2011
State increased funding commitment to child care and early learning

2015
State increased funding for early childhood education back to $3 billion, with most of the return funnelled to preschool programs

2017
Regional Market Rate (RMR) increased
SRR received a 10% increase
State Median Income restored to 70% of current year estimates and added an exit ceiling at 85% of current year for family eligibility
The California Budget & Policy Center estimated 1.5 million children are income eligible but not receiving child care subsidy assistance

2018
First 5 California celebrated its 20th year

Special thanks to: On The Capital Doorstep: A History of Major Legislation Affecting Child Care and Preschool Funding
Pat Dorman for earlier versions
AB 194 invests $1 billion to increase the number of subsidized child care slots for the highest need families in California, expanding access to the state’s early childhood education (ECE) programs.

EXISTING LAW/BACKGROUND

Well established research shows that high-quality early childhood education programs equip young children with the social, emotional, and cognitive skills they need to be ready to enter kindergarten and have a bright future. ECE programs also provide necessary support to our state’s working families by allowing them to go to work knowing that their children will be in a safe and enriching environment. Yet, families often find that ECE programs, particularly child care, are expensive and difficult to find, especially for low-income communities.

There is currently a severe shortage of child care in California. Recent data shows that 1.2 million children are eligible for state-subsidized child care but do not receive it due to the lack of access in the state (California Budget & Policy Center; 2016). The shortage is most acute for our youngest children, ages zero to three, with less than 14% of infants and toddlers who qualify for subsidized child care actually receiving services. These large gaps in access mean that of our state’s children are missing out on essential learning opportunities.

To ensure the future success of our state, there is a critical need to substantially increase the availability of subsidized child care for young children.

This bill would improve access to subsidized ECE programs in the state by investing $1 billion dollars to create additional child care slots. This funding will go towards Alternative Payment programs and General Child Care, which generally serve the vast majority of eligible infants and toddlers in the system where the need is most dire. This critical investment will bring California closer to meeting the high demand for child care in the state to address the needs of families.

SUPPORT

Child Care Resource Center (Sponsor)
Child Care Law Center (Sponsor)
California Alternative Payment Program Association (Sponsor)
Parent Voices (Sponsor)

CONTACT

Amer Rashid
Legislative Aide
(916) 319-2047
amer.rashid@asm.ca.gov
AB 125 (McCarty) Early Childhood Education: Reimbursement Rates

**Sponsor:** First 5 California  
**Staff Contact:** Suzy Costa, (916) 319-2007  
**As Introduced:** 12/3/18

**SUMMARY**  
AB 125 would establish a single regionalized state reimbursement rate system – called The Child Care Stabilization Formula – for child care, preschool, and early learning services.

**ISSUE**  
California has a mixed delivery system that provides child care, preschool, and early learning services for the state’s youngest learners. California is strengthened by its ability to provide parents with a choice when it comes to selecting the early learning experiences that are most appropriate for their children and their families.

The Standard Reimbursement Rate (SRR) does not cover the true cost of providing care across different economic regions of the state. In all areas of the state, and some significantly more than others, the SRR is lower than the true cost of providing care (as measured by the Regional Market Rate (RMR) survey), which further limits access.

However, California currently has two different and unaligned systems for reimbursing early learning services: child care providers meeting Title 22 standards are reimbursed using a RMR that accounts for geographic economic cost factors, while state-contracted early learning centers that meet Title 5 standards, in addition to Title 22 standards, are reimbursed at a flat SRR. This unaligned, two-system approach limits access, fails to maximize program quality, and is forcing many child care providers out of business in California.

Low reimbursement rates result in an early childhood education (ECE) teacher shortage and contribute to excessive turnover as ECE teachers leave the profession. These issues also contribute to a limited supply of early education and child care opportunities for children.

**SOLUTION**  
To address the problems of a bifurcated rate system, reimbursement should be streamlined and expended in a way that:

1) Compensates teachers and programs for the cost of providing care;  
2) Is responsive to the economic diversity of California;  
3) Recognizes the costs of meeting varying quality standards, regulations, and contracting burdens; and  
4) Incentivizes quality and participation in research-based quality improvement efforts as a means to improve child outcomes.

AB 125, The Child Care Stabilization Formula, would establish a single regionalized state reimbursement rate system for child care, preschool, and early learning services that would achieve these four goals. Through these reforms, California can achieve a more equitable system to support children and families and maximize public benefit.

**COMPANION BILLS**  
AB 123 (McCarty) – Pre-K for All  
AB 124 (McCarty) – Preschool Facilities Bond Act of 2020

**SUPPORT**  
First 5 California (sponsor)  
Child Care Resource Center  
EveryChild California  
First 5 Los Angeles
SUMMARY
AB 324 would create guidelines for the early care and education (ECE) professional development and retention system to strengthen, recruit, and retain the ECE workforce.

BACKGROUND
Research shows that quality childcare is critical to a child’s development and lifelong wellbeing. Ninety percent of a child’s brain develops by age 5, and billions of neural connections are formed daily based on a child’s everyday experiences and interactions. The daily interactions and experiences a child has in childcare is directly linked to their brain development and builds the foundation for their future brain function and learning capabilities. However, quality childcare programs are in high demand, and many parents cannot find affordable and quality options for their children. Part of the problem is due to a shortage in the childcare workforce, low wages, educational barriers to entry, and high start-up costs.

In 2000, AB 212 (Aroner) authorized funds from the California Department of Education (CDE) for childcare development staff retention. These funds aim to retain quality staff who have experience working directly with children in state-subsidized, Title 5 child development programs. The funds are used to provide services such as: increased staff wages and benefits, tutoring and mentorship programs, financial aid assistance, career counseling, and professional development.

PROBLEM
Under existing law, there is limited guidance as to how AB 212 funds should be expended. This has led to wide variety in implementation of the funds throughout the state. Large inconsistencies exist in the intentionality of the programs, the resources and support provided to educators, and the measurements of success used. For example, one county uses AB 212 funds to provide coursework reimbursements. Other counties blend their AB 212 funds with other funds to form a more robust professional development program. In 2010, state law was amended to allow Los Angeles County to spend unused AB 212 funds for Title 22 programs, which were not previously eligible. With these funds, Los Angeles County focused on academic credits for degrees.

These inconsistencies have led to varying levels of support and retention of ECE staff. Though AB 212 funds still play a crucial role in the ECE system, it requires clearly defined goals and implementation strategies in order to ensure its success.

THIS BILL
AB 324 requires CDE to develop guidelines for the use of AB 212 funds. The new guidelines will still allow for local flexibility, but will create a standardized, effective, and measurable funding program. These guidelines will prioritize stipends that recruit, strengthen, and retain a quality, diverse ECE workforce.

CONTACT
Itzel Vasquez-Rodriguez | Assembly Fellow
(916) 319-2004 x2282
Itzel.vasquez-rodriguez@asm.ca.gov
February 13, 2019

The Honorable Gavin Newsom
Governor, State of California
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Governor Newsom:

We are writing to thank you for including such a strong focus on early childhood in the "California for All" State Budget Proposal for Fiscal Year 2019-20. The proposed funding of nearly $2.0 billion to increase access to full-day preschool, expand support services for young children and their families, and build capacity for child care workforce development and infrastructure is a historic investment in the well-being of our youngest children and their families.

In recognition of the need to build capacity for early care and education, Los Angeles County continues to coordinate efforts across numerous County Departments and other key community stakeholders in order to expand critical services and support systems for young children and their families. The bold vision included in the proposed budget provides a unique opportunity to build on the County’s current efforts to expand access, improve quality, strengthen the workforce, and build infrastructure to support the local early care and education system.

We appreciate your commitment to universal pre-kindergarten and other critically needed support services, such as home visitation programs. We also would like to encourage additional investments in infant and toddler care, as well as other related services, to increase access to subsidized programs. While the inclusion of funds to support the development of a long-term plan for quality subsidized child care is a big step in the right direction, there is also a need in the County to mitigate the severe gap in subsidized services that currently exists for our infants and toddlers.
Thank you for your strong commitment to strengthening families and improving the well-being of all of California's children.

Sincerely,

JANICE HAHN
Chair of the Board
Supervisor, Fourth District

HILDA L. SOLIS
Supervisor, First District

SHEILA KUEHL
Supervisor, Third District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Supervisor, Second District

KATHRYN BARGER
Supervisor, Fifth District
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Assembly Blue Ribbon Commission on Early Childhood Education

The Assembly Blue Ribbon Commission held its hearing on March 11, 2019 to take public comment on their draft report.

To view the hearing, go to http://calchannel.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=7&clip_id=5975.

The link to the draft recommendations are available at https://speaker.asmdc.org/sites/speaker.asmdc.org/files/pdf/BRC-All%20Draft%20Sections%203.11.19.pdf.

Written comments will be accepted until March 20, 2019 at Assembly.BlueRibbonCommission@asm.ca.gov.

The Commissioners anticipate a final release of the report in April 2019.