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I. Theory of Change

*If*...state early childhood administrators defined and articulated the most important policy issues for the future of children, birth to grade 3?

*If*...state early childhood administrators articulated what is needed to ensure policy is implemented well? Result in real impact on children, families, and teachers?

*If*...the voice and experience of “pioneer” early childhood leaders was systematically captured to inform our future?
What would be different in 2030, and beyond

Then...

- Governors, chiefs, legislators would have a clearer understanding of what is needed to effectively implement state policy.
- State policy would be more aligned, realistic and evidence-based.
- State early childhood administrators’ knowledge and experience would be valued and they would have greater support to successfully implement policy.
- The legacy of our veterans will guide our ability to ensure a legacy for future generations.
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The Pioneers in Early Childhood Education

The Views of State Early Childhood Education Agency Staff on Their Work and Their Vision for Young Children:

INFORMING A LEGACY FOR YOUNG CHILDREN BY 2030
II. Methodology

- For the purposes of this project we defined state early childhood education agency staff as those individuals working in state agencies, primarily state education agencies or state early childhood agencies, with responsibility for programs serving children birth through third grade.

- First we conducted five focus groups with state early childhood education agency staff during May and June 2018 with 56 individuals from 29 states and Washington, D.C.

- Then we designed a national survey based on the key themes that emerged from the focus groups.
  - The survey was sent via email to 558 State Early Childhood Education Agency Staff in all 50 states; Washington, D.C.; and eight U.S. territories during August and September 2018.
  - 150 individuals responded to the survey. Response rate was 26.8%.
Limitations

This is the first national survey with the purpose of learning more about individuals working in state agencies on early childhood education programs. We encountered challenges in:

- **Defining the population** and clarifying the nomenclature—state early childhood education agency staff or state early childhood specialist or state early childhood administrator?

- Sample is not representative of all state early childhood education agency staff -- we had a wide range of responses from individual states, no response from 5 states.

- Findings are exploratory…but still illuminating!
III. Findings - What did we learn?

- Who are State Early Childhood Education Agency Staff?
- How do State Early Childhood Education Agency Staff work?
- What matters most to State Early Childhood Education Agency Staff?
- What is their vision for early childhood education by 2030?
Who are state early childhood education agency staff?

Not surprising—white women, highly educated, with lots of direct service experience

Somewhat surprising—63% in position less than 5 years

SURPRISING—Intend to leave state work in next 5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>White 82%</th>
<th>Women 88%</th>
<th>40 or older 84%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background &amp; Experience</td>
<td>Master’s degree or higher 89%</td>
<td>20+ years in ECE 56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Roles</td>
<td>Direct service experience: 92%</td>
<td>State-level experience 52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECE Educator: 63%</td>
<td>ECE Administrator: 49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECE PD Provider: 53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Role &amp; Trajectory</td>
<td>In role for &lt; 5 years 63%</td>
<td>Intend to leave state work in next 5 years 41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What authority do respondents have for ECE programs?

- Senior person in charge of the agency’s early childhood programs
- Direct or Manage programs but report to the senior person
- Staff member or consultants (Note on “consultant” as internal to state agency but may not be a permanent state position).

![Pie chart showing distribution of responses]

- 36.7% n = 55: I am a staff member or consultant that helps to administer one or more ECE programs
- 24.0% n = 36: I direct or manage one or more ECE programs and report to a senior person
- 6.0% n = 9: I am the senior person in charge of the agency’s ECE programs
- Other

N = 150
Survey respondents were asked whether they administer programs that serve(s) children who are:

- birth to age 5,
- kindergarten through third grade, or
- both.

The majority of respondents work in birth to age 5 or birth through third grade.

**Top Five Birth-Age 5 Programs**
- State Pre-K Program: 53%
- IDEA Part B, 619: 27%
- EHS/Head Start: 23%
- CCDBG: 22%
- IDEA Part C: 21%

**Top Five K – 3 Programs**
- B-3rd Grade Standards: 22%
- Curriculum & Instruction: 20%
- Kindergarten: 20%
- Professional Learning: 16%
- Reading/Literacy: 15%

N = 143

Many State ECE Staff Plan to Leave Current Role

40.8% reported an intention to leave their work in state agencies within the next five years.

What does this mean for the sustainability of the profession?

N = 152
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Years in Current Position by Role and Program Administered

How many years have you been in your current role?

- Director/Manager
- Senior Person
- Staff Member/Consultant

IDEA
Other
Preschool

Less than 1 year
1 - 5 years
6 - 10 years
11 - 15 years
16 - 20 years
More than 20 years
Career Goals by Role and Program Administered

What can we do to “grow the field”?

Where do you see yourself in five years?
What they bring, what they want

**Assets They Bring**

- Prior work in the field, classroom experience, and a deep content knowledge of ECE;
- Current connections and relationships at the community-level (e.g., with districts, practitioners, and other stakeholders); and
- Advocacy and communication skills.

### Areas of Professional Development Desired by Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective program evaluation</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with the federal government</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration and communication strategies</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early childhood landscape</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government processes</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with advocates</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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How they view themselves and their leaders

“...[W]e're the implementers, we're the "doer's. ... I think that ... our voice needs to just be a little bit louder in... framing policy, in framing practice.”

Traits that respondents believe are essential in strong leaders:

- “Big picture” visionary
- Champion of ECE
- Strong interpersonal skills
- Humility and curiosity
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How they influence policy?

- **“Full access”** developed relationships where they can meet with legislators, testify before committees, and respond to questions from legislative staff, but may need permission to do so;

- **“Limited access”** communicate with legislators and their staff but only through, or accompanied by, a supervisor or legislative liaison;

- **“No access”** respondents are not allowed to talk to legislators or their staff under any circumstances.

Access to Policymakers

- **2.4%** Full access (n = 3)
- **17.3%** Limited access (n = 22)
- **24.4%** No access (n = 31)
- **55.9%** Other (n = 71)
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How they collaborate?

Focus group participants called for greater levels of public–private partnerships, specifically with the philanthropic community.

Stakeholder Engagement

Strongest levels of collaboration

- other state agencies, advisory panels, state-level associations, and local education agencies.

Lower levels of engagement

- governor’s office, legislators, and the philanthropic community.
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### What Matters Most

We asked respondents to rank the following birth through third grade policy initiatives from highest to lowest priority for funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall rank</th>
<th>Policy Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social-emotional &amp; behavioral/ mental health supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teacher compensation &amp; financial relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Professional development for ECE program staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increase pre-K funding to expand access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Family engagement initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supports for children with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Curriculum and implementation supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ECE higher education reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Increase child care subsidy reimbursement rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Data systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Supports for children who are DLLs/English learners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 131
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Position Matters When Ranking Policy Priorities

**FAMILY ENGAGEMENT INITIATIVES**

- Director/Manager
- Staff/consultant

**SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL BEHAVIORAL MENTAL HEALTH SUPPORTS**

- Director/Manager
- Staff/consultant
Policy Priorities Differ Based on Program Administered

Family engagement initiatives were ranked significantly lower by Preschool programs (M=6.5, SD=2.4) than those that administer Other early childhood programs (M=5.2, SD=3.0).

Social-emotional behavioral/mental health supports policy were ranked significantly higher by those that administer IDEA programs (M=3.4, SD=2.1) than respondents who administer Preschool programs (M=5.0, SD=2.3).

Supports for children with disabilities were ranked significantly higher by those who administer IDEA programs (M=3.6, SD=2.9) than those that administer Preschool program (M=6.9, SD=2.4) and Other early childhood programs (M=6.5, SD=2.8).

Teacher compensation and financial relief policy were ranked significantly higher by respondents who administer Preschool programs (M=4.3, SD=3.2) than those that administer IDEA programs (M=6.5, SD=3.0).
Vision for 2030

What statistic would you most like to see change by 2030 (even if it is not currently being measured)?

- Access, Cost, & Quality of ECE Programs: n = 123
- ECE Workforce: n = 114
- Child Outcomes: n = 39
- ECE System: n = 31
- Family Economic Well-Being: n = 25
- Supports for Children with Disabilities: n = 17
- Family Supports & Engagement: n = 14
- Social, Emotional, & Behavioral Supports: n = 7
- Other: n = 5

HTTP://CEELO.ORG/CEELO-LEGACY-2030/
#1 Access to high-quality programs – Top response of 123 respondents

#2 Strengthening the ECE workforce – Within this category, responses address the compensation of ECE professionals (n = 70), education and qualifications (n = 21), professional development (n = 11),

#3 Improving Child outcomes— included general school readiness or later academic success; social–emotional well-being, literacy achievement, and health; school attendance; suspension and expulsion, and decreasing the achievement gap.

#4 Strengthening the Early Childhood System - including system coordination, funding, data systems and coordination of ECE and K-12
Coordination as a strategy to achieve vision

“We can feel like we’re doing it really well in the classroom context, but children and families exist in a much bigger context, and if we really want sustainable positive outcomes for families, we need to think more realistically than just the classroom.”

-- Focus group participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall rank</th>
<th>Priorities for Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaboration, communication, and cross-sector work across agencies/departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Efficient systems for blending/ braiding/layering of program funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teacher qualification requirements and compensation parity across settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Consistent regulations, law, rules, and standards across programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vertical alignment (birth-3rd grade) of learning &amp; development standards, curricula/teaching practices, and child assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Data coordination/sharing across state-level entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Consistent eligibility criteria for families across programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Program Administered Matters When Ranking Priorities for Coordination

**EFFICIENT SYSTEMS FOR BLENDING/BRAIDING/LAYERING OF FUNDING**

- Preschool
- IDEA
- Other

**TEACHER QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

- Preschool
- IDEA
- Other

X axis refers to 7 strategies noted on Slide 25
1. Higher Education Reform
2. On-going Professional Learning
3. Compensation and Financial Relief
4. Qualification Requirements, Career Pathways, and Recruitment
5. Well-Being of the Workforce
6. Workforce Data
7. Diversity and Cultural Competence

Innovative approaches to enhancing the quality of the ECE workforce that you have seen or would like to see in one
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## Strategies to Increase Investments

- Public-private partnerships for innovative projects;
- Coordinated, sustainable funding housed within one agency;
- Equity in funding across education (birth to age 8 and pre-K to 12; rural and urban areas, small and large districts); and
- Adequate funding to build state capacity

### PROMISING FUNDING STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall rank</th>
<th>Policy Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blending/braiding/layering (e.g., EHS–CC Partnerships)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Earmarks or set-asides for targeted populations (e.g., infants/toddlers, at-risk children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Local or state tax initiatives (e.g., property, sales, or tobacco taxes; taxing districts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shared services models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Refundable tax credits to subsidize programs or providers working in those programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Revenues from lottery or gaming activities to support improvements in quality and access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Social impact bonds/pay for success models</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meaning & Use

What does this data mean? for implementation of policy? for government systems that promote efficiency and accountability?

What actionable strategies does this data suggest to ensure a Legacy by 2030 for young children?

➢ What information/resources would be helpful?
➢ How could you engage your stakeholders?
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Next Steps

✓ Disseminate Legacy 2030 Survey Report
✓ Disseminate Pioneer Podcasts
✓ Launch Early Childhood Legacy 2030 State Action Network
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