

FINAL REPORT:

PRESCHOOL READINESS ASSESSMENT

CALAVERAS COUNTY

Prepared for:
Calaveras Child Care Council

Prepared by:
Brion & Associates

in conjunction with
Nilsson Consulting

May 2009

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of Study	1
Trends on Preschool Planning at the State Level	2
Organization of Study	2
Acknowledgements	2
2. GENERAL BACKGROUND ON PRESCHOOL FOR ALL	3
Overview of Preschool For All	3
First 5 and the Power of Preschool Program Criteria	5
Summary of Other County Preschool Planning Efforts	7
Measures of Early Education Quality	10
3. PRESCHOOL PROVIDER SURVEY AND FIRST 5 COMPARISON	13
General Information on Providers	13
Children and Families	15
Facilities, Staffing, Education, and Compensation	16
Comparison to First 5 Criteria for Power of Preschool Demonstration Project	18
4. ASSESSMENT OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND FOR PRESCHOOL SERVICES	22
Current Unmet Need for Preschool – Supply and Demand	23
Prioritization of Need for Preschool – Free Lunch and English Learners	28
5. COST IMPLICATIONS OF PRESCHOOL FOR ALL	31
6. REPORT CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	33
Findings	33
Recommendations	35
Conclusions	37
APPENDICES	
A. Preschool Provider Survey Questionnaire and Summary of Results	39
B. Current Supply and Other Demographic Data	48

1. INTRODUCTION

The Calaveras Child Care Council (CCCC) is interested in exploring what is commonly referred to as Preschool For All or universal preschool. There have been many planning efforts throughout the State regarding some type of Preschool For All effort. Some of the CCCC members attended a preschool planning effort sponsored by Tuolumne County and felt it was important to gather information about the “readiness” of the existing preschool system in Calaveras County to provide universal preschool. The goal is to utilize and strengthen existing preschool service providers to meet any “Preschool For All” planning effort that might be undertaken in the County rather than create a new system. The exact name of a preschool effort has not been determined. For purposes of this study we call it “Preschool For All,” which is a popular way to refer to these efforts.

Purpose of Study

The CCCC desired a supply and potential demand assessment for a Preschool For All program in the County, as well as defining and comparing program quality, types of programs, and model programs used throughout the state. The CCCC was also interested in an assessment of current preschool programs and any gaps in service delivery, an assessment of preschool readiness, including education status in various programs and options for delivery of services, and the estimated cost for a system ready to meet the County’s needs for such a Preschool For All program.

Brion & Associates was retained by the CCCC to conduct this study effort. The firm recently completed the CCCC’s 2008 Child Care Needs Assessment and this study integrates data and information from that effort. The purpose of this study is not to design a Preschool For All plan for Calaveras County but rather assess the current state of preschool in the County and provide information on the readiness of the County for a Preschool For All program. There are many decisions and choices to be made locally concerning any Preschool For All effort, including age of children served, and types of providers to offer the services, such as public, private, center based, or FCCH based providers, etc. There could be facility costs associated with Preschool For All, but the primary and greatest cost is the ongoing annual cost of providing the service. How the program is to be funded is always a key issue. Most counties have opted not to serve “all” 3- and 4-year-olds, as the cost is prohibitive. Short of a State or federal funding source it is unlikely that any California county can launch a fully-funded Preschool For All effort serving all 3- and 4-year-olds. First 5 California has funded several counties’ demonstration projects through grants as discussed below in Chapter 2.

To assess “readiness” in Calaveras County we conducted a detailed survey of existing preschool providers, including private centers, The Resource Connection Early Childhood Programs (herein, Head Start), and preschool programs offered by the Calaveras Unified School District (CUSD). As a broad definition of Preschool For All, we have used First 5 California’s “Power of Preschool” demonstration project criteria. While the community, local organizations, or stakeholders that develop a preschool model for Calaveras County may adopt different parameters for a Preschool For All planning effort, this criteria provides a benchmark against which to assess “readiness.”

A community workshop on preschool readiness was held on April 2, 2009. At this meeting we presented the summary of preliminary provider survey results. About 10 people attended, (excluding the consultants), including CCCC members, staff, and community members. This report incorporates information gathered at that meeting.

Trends on Preschool Planning at the State Level

Recently, the California Legislature passed SB 1629 (Steinberg) to establish an Advisory Committee on Early Learning Quality Standards and to develop a quality rating scale that can be used to evaluate early childhood education programs serving children ages 0 to 5 throughout California. The State Legislature recognized the importance of early childhood education and noted that currently our State programs only meet 4 of 10 key benchmarks of quality. The work of the Advisory Committee will be funded through First 5 and be made available to the Governor by the end of 2009. In parallel to SB 1629, the State Legislature also passed AB 2759 (Jones), which proposes to consolidate and streamline existing Title V programs for 3- and 4-year-olds in the State. "AB 2759 helps to reduce administrative costs and burdens and allows funding to get to where it's most needed — to provide more quality preschool and early childhood education programs to children most in need," Assembly member Jones said.¹

Organization of Study

The study is organized into six chapters including this introduction. Chapter 2 provides background information on Preschool For All efforts, quality measures, and First 5 Power of Preschool program criteria. Chapter 3 summarizes the survey results of existing preschool providers in the County. Chapter 4 presents an assessment of the current supply and demand for preschool in the County and information on children receiving free lunch, English Learners and children requiring subsidized preschool (as a possible measure of preschool need). Chapter 5 presents cost estimates of the estimated shortfall or need for additional spaces and services, above and beyond existing service levels, and the final chapter presents the study's findings and recommendations. The study includes two technical appendices with more detailed information and the detailed survey results and questionnaire.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all the members of the CCCC for their assistance and input into the development of this study. CCCC Staff Kerry Williams was the project manager for this effort. Sheila Neal (The Resource Connection Early Childhood Programs), Kim Potter (CUSD) and Kelly Graesch (R&R Manager, The Resource Connection) provided extra help with the survey data and clarifying responses from providers. We would also like to thank the members of the public and local child care providers who attended the community workshop on preschool readiness held on April 2, 2009.

¹ See Dave Jones NewsRelease " Jones and Steinberg Bills Create Largest Preschool/Early Education Program in Nation" (September 26, 2008).

2. GENERAL BACKGROUND ON PRESCHOOL FOR ALL

This section provides general background information on Preschool For All planning efforts and issues as well as choices that jurisdictions must consider when undertaking a preschool planning effort. In particular, this section presents the First 5 California's Power for Preschool program criteria which is used in the study to provide a broad container for assessing Calaveras County's readiness to undertake a Preschool For All effort. In general, the purpose of this study is not to design a Preschool For All effort but rather to provide information on what opportunities and constraints the County would face should they pursue such an effort.

Overview of Preschool For All

In 2006, Proposition 72 was placed on the California Ballot, proposing State funding for a universal preschool program that would target 4-year-old children throughout the State and provide for one year of preschool before attending kindergarten. That ballot measure didn't pass and currently there is no formal, statewide funding source for expanding preschool from its current levels. There is, however, money identified in the Federal Stimulus Package proposed by the Obama Administration and passed by Congress in early 2009 for early care and education. According to the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP), there may be \$18.2 million for early childhood education quality improvements and \$10.5 million for infant and toddler care Statewide. Exactly how that money will trickle down to Calaveras County is unclear at this time. It is possible that some funding for expanding early childhood education may happen, however. In anticipation of possible funding through Proposition 72 in 2006, many counties and cities conducted Preschool For All feasibility studies and other assessments of preschool and developed plans for new program expansion. There were a wide range of plans and approaches developed, each one reflecting the size and diversity of each county along with available staff, funding for research and planning, and the number of children to be served. In large and medium sized counties, the cost of providing some type of universal preschool without a State funding source became daunting, and in more recent studies, plans have been scaled back and refocused. An additional goal of universal preschool, along with higher education and quality standards, is to increase the pay level of preschool teachers throughout California.

According to the California Preschool Planning Toolkit, counties can either look to the Office of Education and/or local school districts to set up Preschool For All programs. In general, they suggest relying on a mixture of providers and agencies, combined with existing funding sources supplemented by new state and federal funding. The Toolkit highlights some key considerations, as follows:²

1. Leverage existing physical facilities thereby avoiding new construction costs or delays in deployment because of construction schedules and slow delivery of portable classrooms.
2. Optimize investments already made in publicly funded programs (by adding funding to the base rather than starting from scratch).

² See "The California Preschool Planning Toolkit" prepared for First 5 California by American Institutes for Research and Karen Hill Scott (October 2006).

3. Increase accessibility to preschool for families who need full-day, full-year child care.
4. Provide parental choice to the maximum extent reasonable.

Some of the choices communities need to make when they decide to embark on a Preschool For All program including the following:

1. *Do we target 3- and 4- year-olds or 4-year-olds only?*

Larger communities have decided to target 4-year-olds only as the quantity of 3- and 4-year-olds is overwhelming. Others have targeted both age groups, but with further defining criteria, such as 3- and 4-year-olds in areas with low API schools.

2. *Of this population what percent will be served? 70%, 80%, or 90%?*

It is generally accepted that not every single 3- and 4-year-old would take advantage and use preschool and since the program is voluntary, some families will choose not to participate. Again, size of the 3- and 4-year-old population plays a role in determining what that percentage is. In Calaveras County we have chosen 70% based on input from the CCCC and current utilization rates for existing preschool programs in the county.

3. *In what setting will the preschool programs occur? Child care centers, Family Child Care Homes, State funded programs, local elementary schools, etc?*

Each county that has considered Preschool For All has an existing mix and delivery system in place and a network of child care providers that might be eligible to participate in such a system. The density of development in a community greatly affects the type and accessibility of possible programs. The relative wealth of a community also impacts the ability of families to take advantage of such programs. In rural areas with lower incomes, transportation costs are a major impediment to families eligible to take advantage of such programs.

These are just the big questions that surround Preschool For All that communities have to grapple with which can vary from area to area. Other issues include education standards for teachers, teacher ratio standards, and quality standards for the providers and facilities. In order to assess Calaveras County's readiness to provide Preschool For All, a set of standards or criteria needs to be used with which to evaluate current conditions. Given that the purpose of this study is to provide information for stakeholders involved in local efforts to develop those standards and criteria, we are faced with a "chicken and egg" situation. Throughout California, the overarching goal of most Preschool For All programs is to raise the quality and education standards of preschool programs.

The Children's Collaborium (formerly CDPI Education Fund) has prepared a planning guideline document for communities trying to implement some type of Preschool For All effort.³ This

³ See "Planning for Preschool For All in your Community" by Scott Moore, Wendy Wayne, Ed.D., and Gary J. Kinley, Ed.D. of The Children's Collaborium (2007), page 2.

document offers advice on how to structure the planning effort and cites First 5 preschool planning efforts extensively. Their outline of main tasks includes the following:

1. Define Preschool For All – who will be served?
2. Determine the Key Program Elements and Guidelines for Quality.
3. Estimate Supply and Demand.
4. Estimate Local Cost of Preschool For All.
5. Financing Preschool For All.
6. Use Assessment of Improvement Program Results.
7. Make the Local Case for Preschool For All.

Several of these tasks are part of this study's scope, including items 1, 3, and 4. The CCCC will determine the final program elements and quality guidelines based on the results of this study. The Children's Collaborium suggests creating a Communications Plan and engaging local elected and appointed officials. They also suggest that communities should⁴:

1. Showcase Proud Programs.
2. Document impact on school performance.
3. Localize estimates of savings.
4. Make the case for equity.

First Five and the Power of Preschool Program Criteria

The State First 5 Commission has done a tremendous amount of work on developing Preschool For All policies and guidelines. In 2003 they started discussing the issues and in 2005 launched The Power of Preschool (POP) Demonstration Program with \$100 million in funding. They selected nine counties to participate in the program. Two of these counties, Merced and Yolo, are more rural in nature, and will be discussed further in this report. In 2008, First 5 issued a progress report on the Demonstration Program, which includes some useful summaries about what constitutes Preschool For All and how it is measured. We will use this information as a broad backdrop with which to assess Calaveras County's readiness for Preschool For All, recognizing that the community may ultimately choose to develop a different set of criteria and standards for its own program.

The main components of the First Five POP program include Teacher Qualifications, Facilities, and Quality Standards. They leave who is targeted for preschool to local jurisdictions. Each of the main components of First 5's POP criteria is summarized below.⁵

Teacher Qualifications:

Defined by number of college units, including ECE units divided into a three-tiered career ladder:

⁴ Ibid, see page 5.

⁵ Power of Preschool Demonstration Program Progress Report, 2008, First 5 California, pages 9 to 11.

1. Entry Level – 24 ECE units for teachers and 6 ECE units for assistant teachers;
2. Advancing Level – 60 units of college with 24 ECE units for teacher and 12 ECE for assistant teacher;
3. Quality Level – BA degree with 24 ECE units for teacher and AA degree and 24 ECE units for assistant teacher.

Facilities or Preschool Space

Existing or newly funded spaces in Head Start, State Preschool, General Child Care, private child care centers, and family child care homes.

Quality Standards

Quality standards are one of the key components of a Preschool For All program. The First 5 program includes the following measures of standard. To ensure that POP provides quality preschool experiences, First 5 California developed a series of criteria. Some of these criteria may not be appropriate for Calaveras County.

1. Program

- Periodic health and developmental screenings.
- Performance and program standards that articulate with K-3 standards.
- Environmental rating scales to determine quality of space and furnishings, personal care routines, language and reasoning opportunities, developmental learning activities, teacher/parent/child interactions, and program structure. At point of entry, a provider must at least achieve a score of '4' out of '7', which is obtained by averaging 43 indicators on the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R) and 40 indicators on the Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale-Revised (FCCERS-R).
- Appropriate staff to child and teacher to child ratios (e.g., 3 staff to 24 children, or 2 teachers to 20 children).
- Group size sufficient to prepare children for kindergarten.
- Nutritious meals and snacks.
- Transition support for children entering preschool and preschoolers entering kindergarten.

2. Teaching Staff

- Unique state funding system that reimburses based on the education level of the teachers.
- Qualified diverse workforce, with a three-tier career ladder that encourages professional development as described in the Reimbursement Structure section.⁶

3. Policy and Fiscal

- Program commitments by First 5 county commissions, local partners and diverse preschool providers.
- Collaboration with institutions of higher education.

⁶ In the First 5 POP program, they propose that providers get reimbursed on a sliding scale related to the education levels of teachers, which is different from how State and federal programs currently reimburse providers; all providers currently get the same reimbursement rate per child regardless of the quality of the program.

- Participation in program evaluation.
- Commitment of sufficient local funds to support POP.

4. Family Partnerships

- Effective family outreach and active engagement of parents and families.
- Connection with wraparound child care and other family support services.

Some highlights of the POP project include: Three of the nine POP counties served 3-year-olds in addition to 4-year olds. These counties reported serving 3-year-olds in the following delivery systems:

- 56 % in State Preschool.
- 32 % in Head Start.
- 10 % in new spaces (defined as spaces that would not be receiving federal or other state subsidies for preschool hours).
- The remaining 2% in family child care homes, General Child Care and Alternative Payment.

Eight of nine POP counties reported serving 4-year olds in the following delivery systems:

- 48 % in State Preschool.
- 21 % in new spaces (defined as spaces that would not be receiving federal or other state subsidies for preschool hours).
- 16 % in General Child Care.
- 10 % in Head Start.
- 2 % in family child care homes.
- The remaining 3 % in other programs (e.g., Title 1, Title 22, School Readiness, Alternative Payment, local voucher).

The teaching standards and program quality standards are the main focus of most Preschool For All programs and will be the focus of our review in terms of readiness. The other important goal is increasing the pay of preschool teachers to be comparable to other equally educated teachers.

Summary of Other County Preschool Planning Efforts

The following highlights several preschool planning efforts in California, starting with the smallest comparable county to Calaveras County and moving to the larger urban counties. As these summaries suggest, there are a variety of programs and approaches being used across the State. Some of these are First 5 California Power of Preschool demonstration projects.

Yolo County

The Yolo County Power of Preschool demonstration project does not cover the entire county. Yolo County has about 199,000 residents, over four times the size of Calaveras County. It is a program that is operated by the Child Care Services R&R in partnership with the City of West Sacramento, the local school district, First 5 Yolo, and First 5 California.⁷ So far, the program has served 250 four year olds, 96 of which are English learners, and 6 of which are children with special needs. This program has operated through existing providers and programs including State Preschool, Head Start, private centers and family child care homes for between 3.5 to 4 hours per day, both in the morning and afternoon. A variety of facilities were used, including underused K-12 facilities. Here are some highlights from the program.

- 12 teachers, 2/3s at Quality Level and 1/3 at Advancing Level, and 12 assistant teachers, 42% at Quality Level and 52% at Advancing Level, participated. Five staff are in the local CARES program.
- A variety of curriculum was used including Creative Curriculum, Core Knowledge Preschool Curriculum, Mother Goose Time and Developmental Learning Materials Early Childhood Express.

Innovative Outcomes:

The program has been successful working with family child care home providers, which allows parents much needed all day care intercepted with high quality preschool for a portion of the day. The program has used local developer impact fee revenue to help meet facility needs, which have totaled \$300,000 to date. Lastly, working through State Preschool, teachers were paid comparably to local kindergarten teachers in the local school district.

Merced County

Merced County has a total of about 255,000 residents as of 2008. This program is also a Power of Preschool demonstration project of First 5 California. Started in 2003-04, it includes six of the county's 18 elementary school districts and focuses on 4-year-olds. Most of these school districts have schools with lower API scores. The program is three hours per day, with a minimum of 175 days per year, and has served 1,400 4-year-old children. There were 64 sessions, of which 2/3s were State Preschool programs, and the remainders were Head Start and General Child Care. No family child care homes participated. Highlights include:

- 40 teachers participated, 35% at Quality Level and 65% at Advancing Level, and 40 assistant teachers participated, 50% at Quality Level and 50% at Advancing Levels. Like Yolo County, no Entry Level teachers participated. All staff participated in the local CARES program.

Sonoma County

Sonoma County prepared a feasibility study for Preschool For All in 2006. They focused on low API schools in the County, which narrowed the children to be served significantly from those that were potentially eligible. Their program focused on 4-year-olds only. The study prepared three

⁷See Power of Preschool Demonstration Program Progress Report, 2008, First 5 California, pages 56 to 58.

scenarios or possible approaches to phase-in a Preschool For All effort. The study was overseen by a committee made up of a wide range of local stakeholders in child care, children's services, etc. They identified 5,644 4-year-olds that would possibly participate and about 2,911 existing spaces that might participate in the program. When accounting for the part-time nature of the program, they estimate existing spaces at 3,167 with an unmet need of 2,477 spaces.⁸ Overall, 56% of 4-year-olds are currently served. There were 1,149 kindergarteners in low API schools (i.e., 1-3 scores) or 20% of all kindergarteners in the County. Challenges they face are a very culturally and linguistically diverse range of children, the need for extended or wrap around care, developing a mixed delivery system of preschool, and of course, cost. They estimate the current cost per child of the program at from \$5,600 to \$6,100 per child, and estimate there is a shortage per child of about \$1,200 to \$2,600 per child, based on current State Preschool and Head Start funding. The study estimated it would cost \$1.9 million per year to establish quality preschool in two low API school districts in the county, serving about 418 children. To serve all low API districts is estimated to cost \$4.7 million to serve 952 children. To fund the entire county's 4-year-olds is estimated to cost \$23 million and would take 10 years to implement. To date, the Sonoma County Local Planning Council has not moved forward with any formal Preschool For All effort since this study was prepared.

San Joaquin Valley

The Great Valley Center, a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization, produced a report in 2009 on preschool readiness in the San Joaquin Valley.⁹ The report provides personal stories, data from multiple other reports regarding preschool, and demonstrates the need for quality preschool programs in the San Joaquin Valley. The following eight counties make up the San Joaquin Valley: Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Tulare. This report demonstrates that the children who have the greatest need for child care do not have access to it. Based on 2005 data, of all of the preschools who responded to a survey that was sent out, a minimum of 59% in each county had waiting lists, with Madera County reporting that 100% of its public preschools had waiting lists. For Stanislaus County this figure was 96%. The report states that statewide, 21% of preschoolers don't have access to preschool spaces, under both universal and targeted preschool initiatives. However, communities in the San Joaquin Valley have concentrations of these communities, since the lack of access to spaces is not distributed equally across the state. Lower income and Spanish speaking communities have lower access than other areas. The report cites data from RAND studies and other sources, but overall discusses the great benefits that the San Joaquin Valley would see from quality preschool programs, given its large childhood population and high poverty rates. The San Joaquin Valley counties recognize this is critical for it to attract and maintain a strong workforce in the community.

⁸ See "Preschool Feasibility Study & Phase-in Plan" developed for First 5 Sonoma County, by Susan Muenchow, Jennifer Anthony, Irene Lam, and Karen Manship of American Institutes for Research (2006), page 1 to 6.

⁹ Early Education for the Next Generation: Pre-School Readiness in the San Joaquin Valley. Available for download at www.greatvalley.org.

Measures of Early Education Quality

Quality is a key component of all preschool planning efforts currently. The notion is to raise quality standards, and to adopt standardized measures of quality in local communities. First 5 California's criteria are above and beyond existing Head Start and State Preschool programs, which all use quality measures and standards. Currently, Calaveras County has two staff trained to administer ECERs, which could be self-administered or administered by an outside person trained in these measurement standards.

Child Care Quality Standards and Measures

There are various measures that can be considered indicators of child care quality or indicators that providers are working on program quality enhancement. In the absence of universal high quality standards for all early education and care programs (beyond basic licensing requirements), these diverse measures represent the spectrum of what is currently available. The following are summarized here:

1. Standards programs must meet due to funding source requirements.
2. Voluntary quality assessment—accreditation systems.
3. Participation in quality enhancement projects or accessing services.
4. Program quality assessment tools used as part of one of the above.

Program standards required by California and Federal child care and development funders, as well as those required by the voluntary accreditation systems described below, are very comprehensive. The following components of program quality are addressed in some form: health and safety, physical environment, equipment and materials, staff qualifications and professional development, staffing ratios and group sizes, staff-child interactions, curriculum, nutrition services/education, cultural diversity/competence, parent/family involvement, program administration, and program quality assessment (self and external).¹⁰

Quality standards required by public funding sources

State-funded CDE

Child Care and early education programs funded by the California Department of Education (CDE) Child Development Division must meet Education Code (Title V) standards in addition to Licensing (Title 22). These programs serve children birth to 13 years from low-income families and/or other special populations in center-based and subsidized family child care networks through several categorical programs including: State Preschool, General Child Care, Latchkey, Migrant, Campus, and others.

Among other standards, Title V requires higher staff qualifications and smaller teacher-child ratios in classrooms than Licensing requires. The *Desired Results for Children and Families* is a comprehensive program monitoring system used for program planning, assessment and quality

¹⁰ For a detailed comparison of standards, see "PFA Center-Based Quality Standards" and "Family Child Care Quality Standards" on the Preschool For All San Mateo website: www.smcoe.k12.ca.us/cyfs/pfa.html.

improvement.¹¹ The six areas of desired results, to which all CDE-funded child care and development programs are expected to contribute, are:

- Children are personally and socially competent.
- Children are effective learners.
- Children show physical and motor competence.
- Children are safe and healthy.
- Families support their children's learning and development.
- Families achieve their goals.

Individual plans for each child and family are developed and evaluated, and are part of the program's annual reporting to CDE.

Federally-funded Head Start /Early Head Start

Head Start and Early Head Start programs nationally must implement Head Start Program Performance Standards as well as specific standards for services for children with disabilities.¹² The standards define the objectives and features of a quality Head Start program in concrete terms, articulating a vision of service delivery to young children and families, and providing a regulatory structure for the monitoring and enforcement of quality standards. As with Title V, staff qualifications are higher than required by State Licensing.

Head Start programs must conduct annual self-assessments and receive a federal review every three years, using the Program Review Instrument for Systems Monitoring (PRISM). This comprehensive system ensures that programs make progress toward and meet very high quality standards. It can be assumed that these programs meet, or are working toward meeting, the high standards.

Voluntary Accreditation Systems

The following represent voluntary quality programs:

- National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC): for center-based child care and early education programs for children birth to school-age.
- National Association for Family Child Care (NAFCC): for FCCH programs.
- National AfterSchool Association (NAA; formerly National School-Age Care Alliance, NSACA): for afterschool programs for children 5-14 years.

Each of these systems' accreditation process includes a comprehensive self-study, including parent and teacher surveys, classroom/program observations, documentation of administrative functions, etc. External validators, trained by the sponsoring organization, are assigned to make a one- to several-day visit, depending on program size, to observe and verify the information submitted by the applicant program. Accreditation decisions based on those reports are made by the accreditation organization's review team.

¹¹ For more information on Desired Results, see www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/ci/desiredresults.asp

¹² For more information, see <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/hsb/performance/index.htm>

These three systems are the most commonly used among private (and even publicly funded) programs. Other organizations such as the American Montessori Society offer accreditation that is not widely sought.

Quality of the child care workforce is assessed as part of the requirements of Title V, Head Start, and national accreditation standards. However, the participation of staff in other professional development programs occurs through the CARES¹³ program and other professional development activities.

Quality Measurement Tools: Environment Rating Scales (ERS)¹⁴

The Environment Rating Scales, by Harms, Clifford & Cryer, are widely used measures of program practices in child care and early education.

The Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R: Harms, Clifford and Cryer, 1998) is used for preschool-age programs. Classrooms are rated on seven subscale content areas by a trained observer, and each of the 43 items is scored from 1 to 7, with 1 being inadequate and 7 being optimal. The seven subscales are: Space and Furnishings, Personal Care Routines, Language & Reasoning, Activities, Program Structure, Interaction, and Parents and Staff.

Similar instruments are used for Family Child Care Homes, Infants/Toddler and School-age environments. The Family Day Care Rating Scale uses 40 items (plus 8 related to serving children with disabilities) that are organized into 7 subscales: Space and Furnishings for Care and Learning, Basic Care, Language and Reasoning, Learning Activities, Social Development, Adult Needs, and Provisions for Exceptional Children.

The Environmental Rating Scales are increasingly being used by programs for self-assessment and quality improvement and by external assessors for program monitoring, as a component of the systems described earlier. Widespread concerns about the reliability of rating scale scoring by program staff and external assessors are being heard since the ‘proper use’ as envisioned by the scale developers is very complicated and extensive training is needed to properly administer them. (To illustrate, scores from self-assessments by child care program staff tend to be higher than those by highly trained external raters.) Nonetheless, their use on their own or as part of program quality improvement activities and assessment systems assures that a high quality comprehensive tool is being used.

¹³ Comprehensive Approaches to Raising Educational Standards – formally known as Compensation and Retention Encourage Stability.

¹⁴ For more information on these scales, visit the website of the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: www.fpg.unc.edu/~ecers

3. PRESCHOOL PROVIDER SURVEY

In order to gain a current understanding of the status of preschool and preschool readiness in Calaveras County, we sent out surveys to center-based child care facilities and preschools throughout the County. We sent the surveys to all eight private child care facilities, eleven Head Start and Early Head Start programs¹⁵, and the four Calaveras Unified School District programs, called Growing Together Preschools (herein CUSD Preschools), for a total of 10 preschool providers at 23 sites or locations. Of the private child care facilities, four of the eight, or 50% responded to the survey. For Head Start and Early Start the questions were answered in aggregate for all 11 centers. For the Head Start and Early Head Start programs we received capacity and enrollment data by program or centers along with some education, language and operations data. For the CUSD Preschools, we received information on all four locations, or a 100% response. The overall response rate for the survey was 83% (19 of the 23 responded) which is a much higher than the average response rate for mail surveys, which typically average 15% to 20%.¹⁶

The results of the survey are summarized below in a more qualitative way. **Appendix A** provides a copy of the survey questionnaire, and detailed survey results by question.

Please note that the data presented below are for those providers that responded to the survey and do not represent the entire population of providers for any particular data item.

General Information

Providers

The Head Start and CUSD Preschool facilities are public providers or entities. Of the four private facilities that responded, three are individual proprietors and one is a nonprofit corporation/parent co-op. Two of the private facilities have been in business for over 20 years, while the other two are relatively new, with one that has been in existence for four years and the other for just over one year. Head Start has been providing services in the County for 23 years and of the four CUSD Preschools that responded, two have been in operation for three years and the other two for one year.

Licensing

Child care centers and preschools can be regulated and licensed by different agencies. In Calaveras County, three of the four private facilities, the Head Start Programs, and all of the CUSD Preschools are all regulated by Title 22 by the California Department of Social Services. Head Start and two of the four CUSD Preschools are also regulated by Title V of the California Department of Education. Head Start is also monitored by Head Start Program Quality Standards.

Supply and Enrollment

¹⁵ There are two Early Head Start programs that serve 3 year olds, with 8 spaces per program.

¹⁶ Although we had a high response rate with the surveys overall, not all questions on the survey were completely filled out. Because of the small number of providers by type, we do not have results that can be extrapolated by geographic area. Some responses to specific questions are not reported because too few respondents provided answers and we want to adhere to our promise of confidentiality.

Based on surveys that were completed, we found the following information on licensed supply and current enrollment for 3- and 4-year olds in Calaveras County. Overall, about 87% of preschool spaces in the County are estimated to serve 3- and 4-year olds, the target of our study.¹⁷ This figure accounts for that fact that most of the Head Start programs serve 3- and 4-year olds. Other programs serve a higher ratio of 2- and 5-year olds than Head Start. The 87% figure assumes a weighted average based on Head Start programs.

- Private facilities have the capacity to serve 102 children and are currently serving 68 children, or 66%. Three of the four centers are not fully occupied while one center has a waiting list for both 3- and 4-year olds.
- Head Start has estimated 192 children are enrolled. While some of the Head Start programs are licensed for more children than those served they are limited by federal guidelines on how many children they can serve and these additional licensed spaces cannot be filled and are not counted. Head Start Programs are restricted to 20 spaces per program. For Early Head Start we only count the Toddler spaces in these two programs (8 spaces each). We have capacity data on all Head Start programs.
- CUSD Preschool has four preschool-oriented programs with a total of 132 spaces, of which 88 are occupied current, or an estimated 67% occupancy rate.
- Overall, of those providers that responded to the survey, we estimate there are a total of 426 preschool spaces at private centers, Head Start programs and CUSD preschool programs combined. Overall, 348 spaces are currently occupied. The survey excluded preschool spaces at family child care homes and actual total supply of preschool spaces is higher as discussed in Chapter 4.

Cost of Care

The cost of preschool care at private child care centers ranges from \$600 to \$700 per month for full-time care and \$500 to \$550 per month for part-time care. Of the four CUSD Preschools that responded to the survey, only one included cost for care, which was \$22 per day for part-time care and \$30 per day for full-time care, which is equivalent to approximately \$476 per month for part-time care and \$650 per month for full-time care. We assume that the other CUSD Preschools have the same or similar fees. Head Start programs are publicly funded and are provided free of charge to qualifying families.

Financial Aid and Subsidies

Of those private providers that responded to the survey a total of 10 children are enrolled in programs to assist with tuition. This is approximately 15% of all children enrolled in private centers responding to the survey. Of these, a total of 5 children receive assistance from the Alternative Payment Program through the Resource Connection.

Finances

¹⁷ The study targeted only 3- and 4-year olds. If any 5-year old children are included in the supply numbers, it is because they were not kindergarten-ready in the fall when the school year commenced.

In our survey, we asked respondents to provide either a copy of their annual operating budgets listing revenue sources or an estimate of revenues from a list we provided. We did not receive enough responses to this question on the survey for us to draw any conclusions or make any assumptions, and we cannot provide any details due to the low response and confidentiality issues. The funding streams for private and public centers are so diverse that it would be impossible to make any accurate averages based on this limited data.

Operations - Schedule

Most of the private facilities, six of the eleven Head Start programs, and one of the four CUSD Preschools operate year-round, from approximately 7am to 6pm, Monday through Friday. Head Start programs start at 6am. Three CUSD Preschools are operated during the school year, as well as five Head Start Centers. One of the four CUSD Preschools will be part-time only, beginning in the fall of 2009. All of the private centers that responded offer year-round care. None of the survey respondents indicated that they provide after-hours care or weekend care.

Children and Families

Special Needs

From the surveys received, we have data on the special needs kids at all of the private centers, CUSD Preschools, and Head Start programs. The San Andreas CUSD Preschool is an inclusion site and there are 10 children with severe special needs. There are another five children that receive special education services at their other three sites, including speech and occupational therapy. At private centers there are a total of four children enrolled with special needs and 32 children with special needs are enrolled in Head Start programs or 17% of total children enrolled at Head Start and EHS.

Kindergarten Readiness

In the survey, we asked respondents to describe activities that they engage in to help children transition successfully to kindergarten. The CUSD Preschool programs notify parents of kindergarten open houses, meet regularly with kindergarten teachers to learn about the kindergarten curriculum, and have kindergarten teachers visit the preschool classroom. The Head Start programs prepare children for the transition in multiple ways, similar to the CUSD Preschools, including notifying parents of 4-year-olds of kindergarten open houses, meeting regularly with kindergarten teachers to learn about the kindergarten curriculum, inviting kindergarten teachers to visit the preschool classroom, and writing transition plans with parents.

Private centers also prepare children for kindergarten in the same ways listed above for CUSD Preschools and Head Start. Some of them also take field trips to local kindergartens and have assessments and parent conferences to discuss the transition. One center also offers a pre-kindergarten program one day per week from January through June.

Family Involvement

The CUSD Preschools involve families by having parent or family member volunteers and monthly parent meetings. One CUSD Preschool has parent education workshops and activities and a parent library and resource materials, and another CUSD Preschool has a program involving families called “Raising a Reader.”

Head Start involves family at their centers by providing parent or family member volunteers, parent education workshops or activities, a parent advisory committee, a parent library and resource materials, family nights, and a boot camp for new dads.

Private centers vary in their family involvement. One has field trips and holiday functions and potlucks. Two others have parent or family member volunteers, parent education workshops and activities, as well as a parent library and resource materials. One has no family involvement, as self-reported in their survey.

Facilities, Staffing, Education, and Compensation

Facilities

In response to the most pressing problems centers face with the physical conditions of their space, most respondents cited problems with poor maintenance of facilities, such as structural problems, problems with heating or air, and poorly maintained exteriors. Half of the private centers also cited lack of adult staff storage and meeting places. Another problem cited was complacent landlords who were not willing to make improvements to the buildings.

Quality Ratings

Two of the four private centers have used the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scales (ECERS), as have the Head Start centers and CUSD Preschools and most are familiar with the Rating Scales. Approximately half of respondents are interested in learning more about them.

Staff Experience and Demographics

We received information on eight teachers from the four private centers that responded to the survey. The average age of the teachers is 30.6 years, ranging from 21 to 45 years old. Overall they have an average of 6.2 years of experience, ranging from 2 to 15 years. Seven of the eight teachers are White and one is Hispanic. Six of the eight teachers have completed some college and two have Bachelors degrees. Two of the eight are able to communicate fluently with children in another language (unspecified). We also received information on three Assistant Teachers/Aides at the four private centers. Their average age is 25.3 years old, ranging from 18 to 40. They have an average of 7.3 years of experience in early childhood education, ranging from less than one year to 20 years. All three are White and have some college education. None of them can communicate with children fluently in any language other than English.

We received information about the workforce at all CUSD Preschools. There are a total of three site supervisors, eight teachers and three Assistant Teachers/Aides between the four sites. The majority of teachers are in their thirties and forties, with one in their late twenties and one in their fifties. Their experience ranges from 2 to over 15 years. Five of the eight teachers have an

Associates degree with ECE units, one holds a masters degree, and the other two are working on ECE units. CUSD staff includes one Hispanic and the rest are White. The three Assistant Teachers/Aides have an average of four years of experience, ranging from one to eight years. All three have completed some college and have some units in early childhood education. One teacher and one Assistant Teacher/Aide are able to communicate fluently with children in a language other than English (unspecified).

For Head Start Programs, the median age of their 13 teachers is 39 and they have an average of 3.7 years experience in early childhood education. For the teachers, 31% are White and 69% were unspecified. All teachers have completed some level of higher education, with 7% of teachers holding Masters degrees, 23% have Bachelors degrees, 32% have an Associates degree, and 38% have completed some college (but have not received a degree). None of the teachers are able to communicate fluently in another language. For the 22 Assistant Teachers/Aides, their median age is 42 years old with an average of 2.69 years of experience in early childhood education. Their racial breakdown is 22% White, 5% Black, 5% Hispanic, and 68% unspecified. Of the Assistant Teachers/Aides, 23% have Associates degrees and 77% have completed some college. Nine of the Assistant Teachers/Aides, or 41%, are able to communicate fluently in a language other than English.

Head Start also employs five site supervisors; whose average age is 42 years old and average experience in early childhood education is 9.6 years. They are 80% White and 20% unspecified. Eighty percent have Associates degrees and 20% have Bachelors degrees.

Staff Compensation and Benefits

The four private centers that responded all provide different benefits for their employees.¹⁸ Paid sick leave ranges from 0 to 7 days annually and paid vacation days range from 0 to 10, with some adding a day for each year of employment. Three of the four provide paid holidays (separate from vacation days).

The CUSD Preschools provide paid sick leave, vacation, holidays, and time off as well as health care and dental coverage for employees and dependents. They also contribute to employee retirement plans. All CUSD preschool program staff receive the same benefit package and offers to participate.¹⁹ No salary information was provided for CUSD Preschools.

For Head Start, employees have six days of paid sick leave, 10 paid vacation days annually for the first two years and 15 days after two years, 12 paid holidays per year, and paid health care and dental coverage for the employee only (not dependents). Head Start pays Assistant Teachers/Aides \$10.24 per hour, teachers are paid \$11.97 per hour, and site supervisors receive \$16.15 per hour.

¹⁸ Salary information was not provided for two of the four centers and due to confidentiality issues we cannot report salaries for the remaining two.

¹⁹ Per telephone conversation with Kim Potter, CUSD and Joanne Brion, and Michelle Nilsson, May 2009.

Staff Development and Continuing Education

Almost all centers/programs encourage professional staff development by encouraging staff to enroll in the CARES program,²⁰ providing on-the-job training and funding costs for classes, workshops, and conferences, and providing days off for staff to attend classes and conferences.

According to the surveys, the primary factor that prohibits staff from continuing their education at all centers is that staff members have competing family responsibilities. The other two most common reasons cited were inconvenient location and inconvenient times of higher education coursework. From further discussion with providers and child care community members, access to continuing education is limited due to the rural nature of the County. People must travel a considerable distance to get to classes or take online classes in order to further their early childhood education. The high cost of tuition and books was also cited several times as a barrier to continuing education.

Comparison to First 5 Criteria for Power of Preschool Demonstration Project

This section compares the status of current preschool services in the County to the criteria developed by First 5 California for their Power of Preschool demonstration project. As discussed in the introduction, there are currently no local efforts in Calaveras County to develop a detailed plan to develop a Preschool For All program and thus, in order to evaluate “readiness” we need some type of benchmark with which to compare the existing conditions in the county. Two of the main components of Preschool For All are increasing teaching qualifications and education and quality standards.

Teacher Qualifications:

- Defined by number of college units, including ECE units divided into a 3-tiered career ladder:
 - Entry Level – 24 ECE units for teachers and 6 ECE units for assistant teachers;
 - Advancing Level – 60 units of college with 24 ECE units for teacher and 24 ECE for assistant teacher;
 - Quality Level – BA degree with 24 ECE units for teacher and AA degree; and 12 ECE units for assistant teacher.

Based on responses from the survey, most of the preschool teachers at private centers fall into the Entry Level category as defined by First 5. Only two of the eight teachers have Bachelors degrees, but not enough units of ECE to be Quality Level.²¹ Of the three Assistant Teachers/Aides, they too are mostly Entry Level, with one qualifying as Advancing Level.

For the CUSD Preschools, two of the three Assistant Teachers/Aides meet the Advancing Level qualification.

²⁰ The CARES program will end in June 2009 due to funding priority changes at First 5 Calaveras.

²¹ One teacher has a Bachelors degree and 20+ units of ECE, but it is not clear if it is over 24 units as needed to be in the “Quality Level.”

The Head Start programs provided us with averages, therefore, on average, teachers have 31 units of ECE, but only 30% have a Bachelors or Masters degree, making them qualify as Quality Level. We cannot distinguish which category the remaining 70% of teachers belong to because we do not know how many units of college they have completed. For the Assistant Teachers/Aides, 23% have a minimum of an Associates degree and on average they have 23 units of ECE, so we can assume that these 23% of Assistant Teachers/Aides meet the Quality Level. Again, we cannot place the remaining 77% in either the Entry Level or Advancing Level group because we are lacking detailed information.

Facilities or Preschool Space

- Existing or Newly funded spaces in Head Start, State Preschool, General Child Care (State Preschool), private child care centers, and family child care centers.

The County has a variety of preschool centers and providers including all those listed above. The four main types of preschool are provided by Head Start, Calaveras Unified School District (CUSD Preschools), private centers, and family child care homes. These providers are mostly either public entities or private businesses; a few non-profit programs exist as well. All the Head Start programs also receive State Preschool funding, and some of the CUSD programs also receive State subsidies. Chapter 4 discusses the current estimates of child care spaces, by type and location and provides an estimate of shortages of preschool spaces by location. Some areas have a surplus of spaces relative to demand from children that live in those areas. This is because some Planning Areas have larger concentrations of employment and people bring their children to preschool near their place of work.

The State's zip code priority analysis; required each year to help focus subsidy dollars to areas with the greatest need, prioritizes areas with at least ten children and the percent un-served by three levels or priorities. Some areas have need but have less than ten children, which would not make sense for a formal preschool program or center but could be served by family child care homes. This analysis is also discussed more in Chapter 4.

This analysis assumes two estimates of demand for preschool. One is based on a conservative estimate of supply and the other on a broader based estimate of supply derived from the results of the survey. Under the conservative scenario, there is a shortage of child care spaces for preschoolers of about 160 spaces. Under the broad approach there is a surplus of about 87 spaces. Thus, actual need is probably somewhere in the middle. It should be noted that under each approach, some Planning Areas are underserved. This issue is discussed further in the last chapter of the report.

Quality Standards

One of the key components of any Preschool For All effort is adopting some form of quality measures, with which to evaluate program curriculum and other measures of quality. Chapter 2 includes a discussion of the various quality measures that exist.

1. Program

- Periodic health and developmental screenings.
- Performance and program standards that articulate with K-3 standards.

- Environmental rating scales to determine quality of space and furnishings, personal care routines, language and reasoning opportunities, developmental learning activities, teacher/parent/child interactions, and program structure. At point of entry, a provider must at least achieve a score of '4' out of '7', which is obtained by averaging 43 indicators on the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R) and 40 indicators on the Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale-Revised (FCCERS-R).

All Head Start programs participate in quality measures, and most providers indicated that they were willing to participate. Of the four private centers that responded to the survey, two have used ECERS as well as CUSD Preschools and Head Start centers. Approximately half of all survey respondents say they are interested in learning more. We do not have data on whether programs conduct health and developmental screenings or the K-3 program standards. If the CCCC were to adopt these two measures of quality, new questionnaires would need to be developed.

Another component of quality is teacher ratios. First 5 identifies the following desired criteria on this issue:

- Appropriate staff to child and teacher to child ratios (e.g., 3 staff to 24 children, or 2 teachers to 20 children).
- Group size sufficient to prepare children for kindergarten.
- Nutritious meals and snacks.
- Transition support for children entering preschool and preschoolers entering kindergarten.

The Head Start and CUSD programs are generally small classroom oriented programs with high teacher ratios. The private centers range in size of 8 to 30 preschoolers, depending on the provider. Two of the private providers each have 15 preschoolers enrolled.

We presume all providers offer nutritious meals and snacks and this question was not included in the survey.

From the survey results, a large majority of the centers offer multiple ways to offer kindergarten transition support, including notifying parents of kindergarten open houses, bringing kindergarten teachers to visit the preschool, field trips to local kindergartens, assessments, and transition plans.

2. Teaching Staff

- Unique state funding system that reimburses based on the education level of the teachers.
- Qualified diverse workforce, with a three-tier career ladder that encourages professional development.

None of the existing programs are reimbursed based on teacher education levels; this is a proposed concept by First 5 California to encourage teachers and providers to increase education levels and quality. This criterion could be possible but it requires the State to adopt such a program. Recent changes in State Preschool and the new task force to look at consolidating programs discussed in the introduction may include such a policy. This would surely encourage teachers and staff to increase their education levels.

3. Policy and Fiscal

- Program commitments by First 5 county commissions, local partners and diverse preschool providers.
- Collaboration with institutions of higher education.
- Participation in program evaluation.
- Commitment of sufficient local funds to support POP.

These criteria were not part of our survey questionnaire, although First 5 Calaveras is an integral part of the services offered to preschoolers in the County. Up until recently they provided funding for the CARES program which has assisted over 100 child care staff and providers to receive additional ECE training. Under a Preschool For All plan, the stakeholders or organizers would need to develop a more formal relationship with First 5 around the effort. In most counties, First 5 is a key player and funder of Preschool For All efforts.

4. Family Partnerships

- Effective family outreach and active engagement of parents and families.
- Connection with wraparound child care and other family support services.

Per the survey results, the majority of preschool providers, both public and private, engage parents through parent volunteering, parent meetings and workshops, parent advisory committees, parent libraries and family nights. Based on the survey results it appears all of the existing programs and providers try to involve families and create family partnerships.

Overall, the existing centers and providers that offer preschool services have staff and teachers that meet some of the education requirements. Based on the review of some other Counties' preschool efforts, Calaveras County offers similar education levels and ratios of staff. However, as will be discussed in Chapter 6, more work could be undertaken in this area to track and assist staff and teachers to obtain additional education.

4. ASSESSMENT OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND FOR PRESCHOOL SERVICES

In general, most communities start out with the goal of providing Preschool For All for most 3- and 4-year-olds. Once the initial analysis is complete and the magnitude of the need is identified, many communities opt to focus on a smaller segment of the 3- and 4-year-old population. Some communities choose to start with all 4-year-olds only. Some decide to target 3- and 4-year-olds in low Academic Performance Index (API) school districts. Given that the CCCC has not defined a specific population of children to serve with a Preschool For All planning effort, we have explored a few ways of measuring potential need. In general, the focus of this study is all 3- and 4-year-olds, and adjusting that population by 70% to account for those children that would not participate.

This chapter focuses on the current supply and demand for preschool and provides estimates of each based on the provider survey results and information from the 2008 Needs Assessment. Two estimates of current preschool supply are provided that allows for a range of potential need or shortage of preschool spaces. One estimate is considered more conservative and based on the results of the provider survey and the other from the data from the 2008 Needs Assessment. This provides a range of preschool need for the CCCC to consider in future years. Given that one of the key decisions in any preschool planning effort is choosing who will be served, other information is provided that might be used by the CCCC to narrow the initial Preschool For All planning effort. This data includes free lunch and English Learners data, and an assessment of the need for subsidies for preschool for 3- and 4-year-olds using the Zip Code Priorities analysis approach.

Given that Calaveras County does not have any low API elementary school districts, this screening mechanism isn't useful. Another way communities focus their efforts is to target areas and children from low-income families that might not be able to afford preschool without some financial assistance or subsidies. One measure of this is the number of children receiving free lunch by school district. Calaveras First 5 has used this method for their School Readiness assessments. Another possible measure is the number of children for which English is a second language, typically called English Learners, by school district. These two measures could be used to target specific elementary school districts and neighborhoods but doesn't give a precise estimate of the number of 3- and 4-year-olds that might need assistance. These two approaches indicate the general location of where children in need are located, by school district.

To arrive at how many 3- and 4-year-olds might need financial assistance, we have adapted the CDE Zip Code analysis. In 1998, AB 1857(Escutia) amended the Education Code, Section 8499.5, to include specific expanded mandates for Local Child Care Planning Councils (LPCs) (8499.5 (a) through (e)). One of these was an expansion of the existing LPC mandate to identify local priorities for the distribution of new State child care and development and preschool funding. The Education Code language specifies how LPCs are to conduct their work in order to identify priorities which will ensure that all the child care and preschool needs of the county are met to the greatest extent possible. The priorities are to be submitted annually to the California Department of Education and used by the Department to determine funding decisions.²² The structure of this

²² See Local Planning Council Priority Setting Process for State Child Care and Preschool Funds (Adopted 1/28/09) from the California Department of Education as provided by Kerry Williams, CCCC.

analysis allows us to estimate the need for preschool funding by zip code and estimate the number of children currently underserved for preschool services, based on current subsidized preschool spaces in the County by location.

Overall supply and demand conditions are presented first followed by the Free Lunch and English Learners data, and then the zip code analysis for 3- and 4-year-olds.

Current Unmet Need for Preschool – Supply and Demand

Existing Supply of Preschool in Calaveras County

There are four main types of preschool currently in the County. These include programs offered by:

1. Private centers, including co-ops;
2. Family Child Care Homes, large and small;
3. Head Start and State Preschool Programs; and
4. Calaveras Unified School District Programs.

The 2008 Needs Assessment estimates that there are a total of 75 providers that offer preschool age spaces for children ages 2 to 5 in Calaveras County. About 35 of these are small family child care home (FCCHs) providers, 10 are large FCCHs providers, and the remainder are public agencies and private centers. There are a total of about 669 preschool spaces serving children preschool age, or 2- to 5-year-olds, as of 2008. These spaces are preschool and day care spaces and thus, are not all considered preschool for purposes of this study.

For this analysis we have prepared two estimates of preschool supply. The first, a simple estimate of preschool spaces, which assumes 50% of these spaces are available for 3 and 4 years olds and the remainder serve 2 and 5 year olds. This presumes the spaces are distributed equally amongst each age group served by preschool providers. This approach results in an estimate of 335 spaces available for preschool, and is called conservative as it may underestimate supply.

One of the questions in the preschool provider survey was how many of their preschool spaces are filled by 3- and 4-year olds. The average result of the survey finds 87% of preschool providers serve 3-and 4-year olds, given that this is the prime preschool age. Thus, the broader estimate of preschool supply uses this factor and results in an estimate of a total of 582 preschool spaces available to serve 3- and 4-year olds. Given that not all providers responded to the survey, this estimate could overstate the supply of preschool spaces.

Table 1 summarizes the two estimates of supply discussed above. Two Planning Areas do not have any preschool providers, e.g., Planning Area 5 and 10. These areas also have very little population. The area with the most supply is Jenny Lind/Valley Springs/Burson or Planning Area 9. This area also has a large concentration of residents and employment uses.

Table 1
Estimated Supply of Preschool Spaces for 3- and 4-Year Olds
Preschool Readiness Assessment – Calaveras County

Planning/Community Area	Conservative: Supply of Preschool Spaces (3-4 Yr Olds) at 50%	Broad: Supply of Preschool Spaces (3-4 Yr Olds) at 72%
1. Copperopolis	18	32
2. Angels Camp / Altaville	49	84
3. Murphys / Douglas Flat / Vallecito	44	76
4. Hathaway Pines / Avery / Arnold / White Pines / Dorrington	34	55
5. Mountain Ranch / Sheep Ranch	0	0
6. Rail Road Flat / Glencoe / Mokelumne Hill	8	13
7. West Point / Wilseyville	12	23
8. San Andreas	58	107
9. Valley Springs / Jenny Lind / Burson	112	192
10. Wallace	0	0
Total Calaveras County	335	582

Estimated Demand for Preschool in Calaveras County

For this analysis we assume 70% of all three and four year olds would require and use preschool, if it was readily available. In general, communities use from 70% to 80% in such studies. Given the rural nature of Calaveras we use the lower of the two figures. The estimate of demand for preschool is based on an estimate of 3- and 4-year-olds by Planning Area as shown in **Table 2** below. As shown, there are approximately 495 3- and 4-year-olds in the County. About one-fourth of these children are located in Planning Area 9, or the Valley Springs / Jenny Lind area. The second largest concentration of these children are in Planning Area 4, Arnold and surrounding areas, with 97 children and Planning Area 9, Copperopolis with 78 children. **Table 2** summarizes the first estimate of supply and demand and potential shortfall, which is considered conservative.

Table 2
Standard Estimate of Preschool Care by Planning Area - 2008
Assuming 50% of Preschool Spaces serve 3- and 4-Year Olds
Preschool Readiness Assessment - Calaveras County

Planning/Community Area	Children Needing Preschool (3-4 Yr Olds) (1)	Percent Distribution	Supply of Preschool Spaces (3-4 Yr Olds) (2)	Percent Distribution	Preschool (3-4 yr olds) Surplus/ (Shortfall)	Percent of Demand Met
1. Copperopolis	78	16%	18	5%	(60)	23%
2. Angels Camp / Altaville	36	7%	49	15%	13	136%
3. Murphys / Douglas Flat / Vallecito	48	10%	44	13%	(4)	92%
4. Hathaway Pines / Avery / Arnold / White Pines / Dorrington	97	20%	34	10%	(63)	35%
5. Mountain Ranch / Sheep Ranch	11	2%	0	0%	(11)	0%
6. Rail Road Flat / Glencoe / Mokelumne Hill	24	5%	8	2%	(16)	33%
7. West Point / Wilseyville	34	7%	12	4%	(22)	36%
8. San Andreas	34	7%	58	17%	24	169%
9. Valley Springs / Jenny Lind / Burson	124	25%	112	33%	(12)	90%
10. Wallace	9	2%	0	0%	(9)	0%
Total Calaveras County	495	100%	335	100%	(160)	68%

(1) Assumes 70% of 3 and 4 year olds would participate in a preschool for all program.

(2) Assumes 50% of all preschool spaces from 2008 Needs Assessment, which defines preschool as 2 to 5 year olds.

Sources: Calaveras County - The Resource Connection; Brion & Associates.

Assuming 50% of the current supply of preschool spaces is available for 3- and 4-year-olds, results in an estimated supply of 335 spaces countywide. This translates into 68% of the possible preschoolers having a space available overall countywide. Preschool at day care centers and family child care homes generally serves from 2- to 5-year-olds. Under this 50% approach there is a shortage of preschool spaces of about 160, countywide. By Planning Area, however, there are shortages and surpluses. Planning areas that have a lot of employment uses and other public uses will have more of a concentration of providers, as people tend to want their children near their place of work during preschool years, if possible.

Based on the results of the preschool provider survey, we estimate that 87% of all preschool spaces are used for 3- and 4-year-olds. This makes sense because many 2-year-olds do not meet preschool requirements until they are closer to the age of three, and many 5-year-olds transition into public kindergarten. **Table 3** summarizes the comparison of supply and demand under this

assumption. Using the 87% estimate there is a surplus of 87 preschool spaces countywide. While there is a surplus countywide, as shown, there are some areas that still have significant shortfalls. This includes Planning Areas 1, 4, 5 and 6. The Wallace area does not have any supply and thus has an estimated shortfall.

Table 3
Revised Estimate of Preschool Care by Planning Area - 2008
based on Survey Results
Preschool Readiness Assessment - Calaveras County

Planning/Community Area	Children Needing Preschool (3-4 Yr Olds) (1)	Percent Distribution	Supply of Preschool Spaces (3-4 Yr Olds) (2)	Percent Distribution	Preschool (3-4 yr olds) Surplus/ (Shortfall)	Percent of Demand Met
1. Copperopolis	78	16%	32	6%	(46)	41%
2. Angels Camp / Altaville	36	7%	84	14%	48	232%
3. Murphys / Douglas Flat / Vallecito	48	10%	76	13%	28	158%
4. Hathaway Pines / Avery / Arnold / White Pines / Dorrington	97	20%	55	9%	(42)	57%
5. Mountain Ranch / Sheep Ranch	11	2%	0	0%	(11)	0%
6. Rail Road Flat / Glencoe / Mokelumne Hill	24	5%	13	2%	(11)	54%
7. West Point / Wilseyville	34	7%	23	4%	(10)	69%
8. San Andreas	34	7%	107	18%	73	313%
9. Valley Springs / Jenny Lind / Burson	124	25%	192	33%	68	155%
10. Wallace	9	2%	0	0%	(9)	0%
Total Calaveras County	495	100%	582	100%	87	118%

(1) Assumes 70% of 3 and 4 year olds would participate in a preschool for all program.

(2) Based on Provider Survey Results conducted in Fall of 2008; assumes 87% of preschool spaces are for 3-4 yr olds.

Head Start spaces are assumed to predominately serve 3 and 4 year olds; the remainder of spaces are 71% 3-4 year old spaces.

Sources: Calaveras County - The Resource Connection; Brion & Associates.

Need for Subsidizes Preschool Spaces

Table 4 presents an analysis of how many 3- and 4-year-old children qualify for subsidized care compared to how many subsidized spaces are available. This analysis uses the methodology of the annual Zip Code Priorities analysis limited to 3- and 4-year-olds only. As shown, of the total 495 children that possibly would want preschool, there are about 299 of these children who are estimated to live in families that earn less than State Median Income (based on 2000 data). This represents about 60% of 3- and 4-year-olds evaluated in this study as potentially needing preschool. Based on data from Child Development Division (CDD) for Fiscal Year 07-08, there are an estimated 219 subsidized preschool spaces, provided through a variety of sources from the State and Head Start. Based on this information there is a shortage of 80 preschool spaces

countywide. Subsidies come from Calaveras Works and Human Services Agency (herein Calworks), Alternative Payment, State Preschool - part-time and full day; CDD funded subsidized center-based care, and Head Start. All Planning Areas have shortfalls except Angels Camp, San Andreas, and Valley Springs, which have very slight surpluses. Children from other Planning Areas likely use these surplus spaces, which total six.²³

Table 4
Need for Subsidized Preschool Spaces by Planning Area
Preschool Readiness Assessment - Calaveras County

Planning/Community Area	Children Needing Preschool (3-4 Yr Olds) (1)	Estimated 3-4 Yr Olds Below State Median Income	Existing CDD Subsidized 3-4 Yr Old Spaces	3-4 Children Needing Subsidized Preschool (1)	Percent of Total Children
1. Copperopolis	78	44	21	(23)	-30%
2. Angels Camp / Altaville	36	30	31	1	4%
3. Murphys / Douglas Flat / Vallecito	48	28	22	(6)	-12%
4. Hathaway Pines / Avery / Arnold / White Pines / Dorrington	97	42	11	(31)	-32%
5. Mountain Ranch / Sheep Ranch	11	7	2	(5)	-47%
6. Rail Road Flat / Glencoe / Mokelumne Hill	24	17	8	(9)	-39%
7. West Point / Wilseyville	34	28	18	(10)	-30%
8. San Andreas	34	24	28	4	12%
9. Valley Springs / Jenny Lind / Burson	124	74	75	1	1%
10. Wallace (3)	9	6	3	(3)	-31%
Total Calaveras County	495	299	219	(80)	-16%

(1) Based on Zip Code Priorities Analysis for CDD - 2009; represents children not currently served in the County by area.

(2) Includes subsidized spaces from CDD and Head Start.

Sources: The Resource Connection, Calaveras County; Brion & Associates.

Prioritization of Potential Need – Free Lunch and English Learners

²³ See Appendix B for more detail by zip code and a correspondence table showing planning areas, community name and zip codes.

As another measure of possible demand to focus on, this section reviews data on children receiving free and reduced lunch, and those that are considered English Learners. Both of these data can be seen as indirect measures of potential need.

There are ten elementary schools where children receive free or reduced lunch. The average of children at these schools that receive free or reduced lunch is about 42% of all students. There is an estimated 1,368 children in the program at all schools combined. This data is for the school year 2007-08 and is the latest data available. For this school year, the unofficial total enrollment at these schools is estimated to be 3,242. Eight of the ten Planning Areas have schools where children receive free and reduced lunch. The highest percentage is at Rail Road Flat Elementary, with 74%, followed by West Point with about 70%. **Table 5** summarizes this data by School, School District and shows the corresponding Planning Area.

We could take these percentage rates by school and apply them to the estimate of 3- and 4-year-olds in each Planning Area. For those Planning Areas for which there is a percentage factor of the number of children receiving free and reduced lunch, this factor is similar to the percent of households under State Median Income, from the 2000 census. Applying the factors in **Table 5** to the estimate of children in 2008, results in about the same estimate of children possibly needing subsidized preschool estimated with the Zip Code Analysis. Based on this comparison, the approach used in the Zip Code Analysis appears reasonable.

In **Table 6** we have summarizes the number of kindergarteners and first graders that are considered English Learners by the State Department of Education. Given there are so few students in each district they are reported by school district and not by school. Vallecito Union has 8 K and 1st graders, Mark Twain Union has 16 K and 1st graders, and Calaveras Unified has 12 such students, for a total of 36 children.

While both of these measures present areas where additional focus on preschool could be targeted, given that the data do not specifically address 3- and 4-year-olds, this data provides a general indicator of where need might be located. Given these limitations of the data, other measures might be required such as a parent survey.

Table 5
Free and Reduced Lunch Program by School and District
Number of Elementary School Children Participating in 2007-08 School Year
Preschool Readiness Assessment - Calaveras County

Elementary School (1)	Unified School District	Area	Planning Area	Subsidized Lunch				
				% of Students in Free or Reduced Price Lunch (2)	No. of Students in Program	Percent Distribution	Unofficial Enrollment	Percent Distribution
1 Albert A. Michelson Elementary	Vallecito Union	Murphys	3	31.9%	99	7%	310	10%
2 Hazel Fischer Elementary	Vallecito Union	Arnold	4	42.6%	98	7%	230	7%
<i>Average/Total Vallecito Union</i>				<i>36.5%</i>	<i>197</i>	<i>14%</i>	<i>540</i>	<i>17%</i>
3 Copperopolis Elementary	Mark Twain Union Elem.	Copperopolis	1	41.9%	121	9%	289	9%
4 Mark Twain Elementary	Mark Twain Union Elem.	Angels Camp	2	47.8%	250	18%	523	16%
<i>Average/Total Mark Twain Union</i>				<i>45.7%</i>	<i>371</i>	<i>27%</i>	<i>812</i>	<i>25%</i>
5 Jenny Lind Elementary	Calaveras Unified	Jenny Lind	9	31.9%	244	18%	766	24%
6 Rail Road Flat Elementary	Calaveras Unified	Rail Road Flat	6	74.1%	63	5%	85	3%
7 San Andreas Elementary	Calaveras Unified	San Andreas	8	52.1%	172	13%	330	10%
8 Valley Springs Elementary	Calaveras Unified	Valley Springs	9	38.3%	181	13%	472	15%
9 West Point Elementary	Calaveras Unified	West Point	7	69.6%	87	6%	125	4%
10 Mokelumne Hill Elementary	Calaveras Unified	Mokelumne Hill	6	47.3%	53	3.9%	112	3.5%
<i>Average/Total Calaveras Unified</i>				<i>42%</i>	<i>800</i>	<i>58%</i>	<i>1,890</i>	<i>58%</i>
Totals				42.2%	1,368	100.0%	3,242	100.0%

Data downloaded from State DataQuest website for school year 07-08, on March 23, 2009.

Sources: California Department of Education - DataQuest; Brion & Associates.

Table 6
Kindergarten and First Grade English Learners by School and District
2007-08 School Year
Preschool Readiness Assessment - Calaveras County

Elementary School	Unified School District	City	Planning Area	K and 1 English Learners by Primary Language Spoken					
				Kindergarten English Learners (percent of total)	First Grade English Learners (percent of total)	Spanish	Other Languages	Total	
1 Albert A. Michelson Elementary	Vallecito Union	Murphys	3						
2 Hazel Fischer Elementary	Vallecito Union	Arnold	4						
<i>Average/Total Vallecito Union</i>				23.8%	14.3%	8			8
3 Copperopolis Elementary	Mark Twain Union Elementary	Copperopolis	1						
4 Mark Twain Elementary	Mark Twain Union Elementary	Angels Camp	2						
<i>Average/Total Mark Twain Union</i>				10.3%	12.1%	10	3		16
5 Jenny Lind Elementary	Calaveras Unified	Jenny Lind	9						
6 Rail Road Flat Elementary	Calaveras Unified	Rail Road Flat	6						
7 San Andreas Elementary	Calaveras Unified	San Andreas	8						
8 Valley Springs Elementary	Calaveras Unified	Valley Springs	9						
9 West Point Elementary	Calaveras Unified	West Point	7						
10 Mokolunne Hill Elementary	Calaveras Unified	Mokolunne Hill	6						
<i>Average/Total Calaveras Unified</i>				20.9%	4.7%	10	1		12
						28			36

(1) English Learner (EL) students are those students for whom there is a report of a primary language other than English on the state-approved Home Language Survey and who, on the basis of the state approved oral language (grades K-12) assessment procedures and including literacy (grades 3-12 only), have been determined to lack the clearly defined English language skills of listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing necessary to succeed in the school's regular instructional programs.

Note that there are more English Learners at each school that listed above; this list is only kindergarteners and first graders and is only available at the District level.

Data downloaded from State DataQuest website for school year 07-08, on March 23, 2009.

Sources: California Department of Education - DataQuest; Britton & Associates.

5. COST IMPLICATIONS OF PRESCHOOL FOR ALL

The above analysis shows that under two different approaches, there could be either a shortage of preschool spaces or a surplus overall, countywide. On an individual Planning Area basis, some areas would have shortfalls even as the County is in balance overall. There are two cost components of providing preschool: the annual fees costs, or operating costs, and the one time costs of providing new facilities if they are needed. This section discusses the various cost implications of providing Preschool For All.

For each of the private providers, the cost structures are so varied that computing an average cost per child isn't appropriate. For instance, one provider has a high mortgage cost while the other does not. One provider is a parent co-op with very low costs. The Head Start costs are the same for all programs more or less, with some differences based on the various pay of teachers and staff. We received total financial information for the Head Start programs combined and not separate by program.

The most challenging issues of costing out a Preschool For All program include the following:

- How will existing Head Start programs be incorporated into the PFA program?
- How will the cost differentials between private and public providers be addressed?
- How will Family Child Care Home providers be integrated into the program? FCCH have a different cost structure than center based providers.
- Will programs operate two sessions per day or will they have four hours of preschool with wrap around childcare?
- Will there be a set wage by type of staff and teacher for the program?
- How will existing subsidized preschool spaces be integrated into the program?

The facilities costs will depend on the type of new facilities constructed or developed. The following cost factors were developed for Alameda County in 2007, based on actual project costs for recent projects in the Bay Area.

- \$17,400 per space for new child care center spaces.
- \$8,700 per space for existing child care centers which choose to expand.
- \$12,926 for commercially leased space with child care tenant improvements (TIs).
- \$500 per space for new Family Child Care Homes (FCCHs).
- \$1,500 per space for small FCCHs to expand to large FCCHs.
- \$10,400 per space for school age programs at existing schools.
- \$4,400 per space to expand programs with the Parks and Recreation Department.
- \$7,975 per space is the average cost across all types of care.

Actual costs in Calaveras County could be lower, particularly in this current economy where the construction industry has been hard hit. As shown, center based care is the most expensive type of facility to provide. In general, given the constraints of what families can pay for child care, there is very little profit in the child care industry that can be used for debt financed construction. Even low interest loans for constructing facilities offered by the State go begging because providers do

not make enough profit for the loan payments. It is presumed that some type of outside funding would be required to finance new preschool spaces in the County.

In Sonoma County's preschool planning study, they identified the cost of providing Preschool For All as the difference between existing subsidized programs and the additional costs of having a full day program with wrap around childcare with increased standards associated with the Preschool For All program. In general, the cost difference ranged from \$1,200 to \$2,650 or from 8% to 17% more per preschool space than existing program costs, including existing public subsidies. These costs factors are related to upgrading existing State Preschool and Head Start programs. In that study some of the differences between existing programs included teacher-student ratios, class size and education levels and thus, pay for teaching staff.²⁴ This study used the First 5 California Power for Preschool demonstration project criteria for their cost estimates. For State Preschool, the existing cost per child was about \$3,450 which would need to increase to \$5,600 and for existing Head Start, the cost per child was \$4,475 and would need to increase to \$5,700 per child. Once the full program was implemented the cost would increase slightly to about \$6,100 per child, after about 10 years. In year 5, the study targets 418 new or upgraded slots for a cost of \$1.9 million.

It is our understanding that the Calaveras Head Start program is moving forward with expanding their programs. One key component of any Preschool For All program in Calaveras County will be working with the Head Start and State Preschool programs to create a delivery system that is efficient and cost effective.

Given the current estimated shortfall shown in **Table 4**, it is estimated that an expanded Preschool For All program serving all un-served but eligible children might cost in the range of \$500,000 to \$1 million per year, depending on the type of program. How existing programs could be used, each of which have a different cost structure, would need to be determined. Whether or not year around services or school year services would be provided also needs to be determined.

²⁴ See "Preschool Feasibility Study & Phase-In Plan – Sonoma County" prepared for First 5 Sonoma County by American Institutes for Research (2006).

6. REPORT CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report explores the Preschool For All planning in Calaveras County and whether existing providers can meet the needs of such a program. Given that Calaveras County has not specifically undertaken a decision to develop a formal Preschool For All plan, this work is exploratory in nature and provides key information to CCCC members and community stakeholders so they can make informed decisions about the opportunities and constraints of undertaking such an effort. Overall, the goal is building existing resources, systems, and providers to meet such a Preschool For All mandate, should it move forward.

The study included a detailed survey of existing providers of preschool, both private and publicly funded programs. Family Child Care Homes were not included in the survey. Through the course of conducting the study we encountered various challenges and opportunities. This section reports a summary of findings followed by a set of recommendations that have been developed by the consultants with input from Staff and the CCCC members.

Findings

- 1. Overall, should State or federal funding become available for Preschool For All, the County would be in a good position to implement such a program. It would require coordination with Head Start, State Preschool providers, the local school districts, including CUSD and private center based and FCCHs providers.***

We believe there is a role for each of these providers to meet Preschool For All goals. In many counties, use of existing providers and centers is essential in order to keep program costs affordable. There would be additional administrative costs associated with the effort but overall the existing system could be expanded and expanded. The exact role of FCCHs providers would need to be fleshed out in the future. Organizations such as First 5 Calaveras would also play an important role in helping to plan and implement such as effort, as there is a wealth of experience within the First 5 system on preschool planning and implementation, as discussed in this report.

- 2. A large portion of existing preschool spaces in the County are provided by Head Start and/or State Preschool funding, and the Calaveras Unified School District, which have high teacher education levels and adhere to quality assessments and measures, which is consistent with Preschool For All efforts.***

The two main components of any Preschool For All effort are higher teacher education levels across all types of providers and programs and Quality assessments and measures. About one third of the estimated preschool spaces for 3- and 4-year olds in the County are currently provided by Head Start or Early Head Start programs. Given the high existing standards of this program, the additional costs of adapting the spaces to some type of PFA program, which would be fairly small, given the experience discussed above in Sonoma County. In addition, Head Start is considering expanding its programs in the County currently.

3. *Non-subsidized center-based preschool is in short supply in the County.*

Based on discussions at the Preschool Community Workshop and other discussions with County Staff, there is a shortage of center-based preschool spaces and programs in the County. There are only a handful of private center based preschool providers in the County. Four of them responded to our survey. Many families looking for preschool do not qualify for State or federally subsidized care and cannot afford the cost of private care. As discussed in the 2008 Needs Assessment, the cost of preschool care can range from \$123 to \$142 per week per child. These costs do not assume “formal” preschool, which would have added costs. For single parents, child care for two children can consume about 33% of family income on average, and for two parent households, about 24%.

The location of where this care is needed isn’t clear from either this study or the 2008 Needs Assessment. A parent survey is required to determine the best location of this type of child care.

4. *There is a need for an additional 80 subsidized child care spaces countywide as estimated in Table 4 (see Chapter 4).*

There are a number of Planning Areas that have a shortage of subsidized child care spaces for 3 -4 year olds. The following areas have shortages as follows: Copperopolis-23 spaces, Murphys – 6 spaces, Arnold - 31 spaces, Mountain Ranch/Sheep Ranch – 5 spaces, Railroad Flat – 9 spaces, West Point/Wilseyville – 10 spaces, and Wallace – 3 spaces. Some of this need could be met by expanded Head Start or CUSD and other local school district programs.

5. *The current delivery system of preschool in the County is structurally divided into four distinct types of providers: Head Start, CUSD, private center based providers and Family Child Care Home providers, each with unique opportunities and constraints relating to PFA.*

To develop a Preschool For All program will require four specific program sections that address the unique structure, cost, location, and other attributes of each of these providers. Most of the FCCHs in the County are small home providers. It is unlikely that they could afford to have staff with the education levels required of a Preschool For All program without funding. Small FCCHs present about 21% of the total preschool spaces in the County in 2008 (2- to 5-year olds). There are 10 large FCCH providers in the County. Some of these providers could be interested as they would have more “preschool” age spaces available but they would need funding as well for the increased costs. For Head Start, many of the providers have more licensed spaces than they can use because of the 20 space limit of the Head Start funding criteria. These potential spaces have not been counted in the analysis. Providing additional preschool programs at existing elementary schools seems to be a viable option but this option would need to be explored with each school district.

In general, we did not receive detailed responses from enough providers by type to make strong conclusions about the cost of providing preschool in the County. Given that there is no identified potential funding source for such an effort also makes it difficult to provide cost estimates for a PFA plan at this time.

6. In most Preschool For All planning efforts, there is concern and distrust expressed by private providers as they believe the State will take over providing preschool in much the same manner as occurred with Public School Kindergartens.

Some providers we talked with expressed concern that this planning effort would lead to their going out of business as more publicly funded programs would be more affordable than their programs, etc. At least one provider did not respond to our survey and expressed this concern over the phone. More outreach and communication is needed with existing preschool providers to help them feel more comfortable with the planning process and to make them feel included in the Preschool For All effort should it move forward.

7. Preschool Planning at the zip code or Planning Area level is constrained by the lack of detailed data available at this level due to the suppression of information by the US Census for many zip codes.

Over half of the zip codes in the County do not have data on children and income; the data are suppressed due to the small size of such populations. Each of the zip codes in the County has very different demographic characteristics. For the 2008 Needs Assessment the 21 zip codes were aggregated into 10 Planning Areas, consistent with the 2003 Needs Assessment. When data was not available by zip code, factors for nearby zip codes were used. We have continued this approach for this analysis but it poses certain potential over or underestimates in the data by zip code.

Recommendations

This study provides some initial information that can be used to develop a “Preschool For All” planning project, should the CCCC wish to pursue such a plan. It is clear that more detailed assessment is required but before this takes place, the CCCC needs to make some determinations as to what type of plan they would like to pursue, what age or geographic areas they would like to focus on, whether they want to “phase-in” a plan, etc. Many counties decide to start with 4-year-olds first in an effort to narrow down the scope of the effort. Low income children are also the focus in many counties. However, Calaveras has a good supply of subsidized spaces relative to many of the counties we have worked in. This is due to the small size of the county and the relatively lower incomes in the County.

Based on the results of this study, we have the following recommendations. These are not presented in any particular order of importance. It is up to the CCCC to set priorities and adopt recommendations based on those priorities.

- ❖ *With many new members on the CCCC it seems that some reassessment of their interest in Preschool For All planning should be undertaken. The Strategic Plan update under way is the perfect venue to gain this refined direction from the council.*

This report is being completed before the 2010 Strategic Plan and will provide key information for the CCCC members to help them focus their interest and efforts pertaining to Preschool For All over the next five years. Some key questions to consider include:

- Who will be served?
- How will it be funded?
- Will any subset of 3- and/or 4-year olds be targeted first?
- Should efforts be phased in?
- Should Head Start and State Preschool programs be targeted first and expanded?
- How will support for teachers and staff be funded now that CARES funding through First 5 has ended?
- What can the CCCC do to assist in the development of more on-line opportunities for teachers and staff to gain more ECE units of education?
- What quality measurement system should the Calaveras community adopt as part of a Preschool For All effort?

- ❖ *Given the rural nature of the County and the small population, providing for preschool in some areas will be a challenge. It seems that inclusion of Family Child Care Home providers will be required in any delivery system that is adopted.*

More information is required about small and large FCCHs providers and how they might participate in a Preschool For All planning effort. We suggest that workshops be held with FCCH providers that are potentially interested in participating in this effort. This study did not focus on FCCH providers or include them in the survey, based on direction of the prior CCCC members.

- ❖ *A parent survey of interest in Preschool For All services and programs should be undertaken.*

Planning staff often assume that if programs are made available and are affordable or free that parents will make use of them. In many cases this turns out not to be true. Questions regarding what parents do now versus what they would do if cost was not an issue are important to determine. Often parents' current use is implied to represent actual demand. With child care, availability, location, and cost of care can constrain parents' choices and thus, their current use of care does not represent their desire for services. Questions concerning whether parents need wrap around care would be important as well as the type of provider preferred such a public, non-profit, private, etc., or center-based versus FCCH-based care.

- ❖ *The new Census data will be available in 2011 and the demand analysis included in this study should be revisited when this data is available.*

Much of the income and demographic data used in this analysis is from the 2000 Census. As outlined in the 2008 Needs Assessment, the State Department of Finance projects some important changes in the number of children in the County by age and ethnicity. Given the significant changes in the economy, high unemployment rates and lack of new housing development throughout the State, many of the assumptions and data used are outdated. The population estimates used in the 2008 Needs Assessment are based on a transportation planning forecast for the County from 2006. This data was adjusted in 2008 to assume slower growth for the first five years of the Needs Assessment. However, even that adjustment may not have captured the significant changes in the economy and housing market. It also appears there are more children receiving subsidies for child care than our census data would suggest are eligible. This means that actual family incomes are less than they were on average in 2000, which is not surprising.

- ❖ *The CCCC should monitor the discussions and outcomes of the Governor's new Advisory Commission on early childhood education, and other aspects of preschool funding.*

The work of this newly appointed commission may change the nature of how preschool funding is provided and allocated to counties. While it is hoped that funding may increase, it may not due to State Budget problems. This fluid situation should be monitored to determine how it might impact the County's planning efforts for preschool.

- ❖ *With Head Start and State Preschool funded spaces comprising a large portion of the current preschool supply, the County already has a large portion of its spaces conforming to some type of quality measurement and standards.*

Short of developing a formal Preschool For All planning effort, the CCCC could consider adopting a preferred quality standards criteria and work towards helping providers complete the assessment. These quality standards would have a strong impact on the care children are receiving and could be seen as a precursor to any formal efforts.

Conclusions

There are some existing opportunities to enhance existing preschool programs to meet some form of Preschool For All criteria. There are also some constraints the County will face. Exactly how to work with private center-based and FCCCH providers in a manner that will engage them will be important as well as Head Start and CUSD programs. Depending on how the supply of preschool is calculated there may not be the need for that many new preschool spaces. Implementing a Preschool For All effort may be more a matter of the annual operating cost of increased service

standards rather than a facility cost issue. Some areas which are very low density will pose additional cost and transportation challenges for any new preschool program.

Without a clear outside funding source, such as new State or federal funding or federal income tax credits for preschool, funding any type of formal Preschool For All effort will be a challenge in all California communities. However, we still believe that it is important to work on this issue so that should funding become available the County will be posed to take advantage of such funding. This study represents the first task of developing a formal Preschool For All effort. The large portion of preschool spaces currently funded by Head Start and State Preschool is an advantage, but more spaces are needed for families that are above the income thresholds for those programs.

The CCCC can continue to work with existing providers to increase overall quality of existing preschool programs, and conduct outreach to the community about the importance of early care and education in general and preschool in particular. These issues may be addressed in the new Strategic Plan for Child Care that is currently being developed for Calaveras County.

**APPENDIX A:
PRESCHOOL PROVIDER SURVEY
QUESTIONNAIRE AND
AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS**

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Center-based Child Care and Preschool Provider Survey

Universal Preschool Planning Study – Calaveras County

Name of Center: _____
Address: _____
Phone: _____
Survey Completed by: (Name, Job Title) _____
Date completed: _____

The purpose of this survey is to assess the readiness of center-based child care and preschool providers to provide high-quality and affordable preschool services for all three and four year olds in Calaveras County who need it. Please check the box that best describes your center.

In addition, please help us to collect additional data on the educational attainment level of your preschool teachers, which is located at the end of this survey in **Attachment A**. Note if you have more than four preschool classrooms please copy and fill out the workforce matrix (**Attachment A**) for each classroom.

1. The center is operated by:
 - a for-profit corporation (if you checked this box, skip to #4)
 - (3; 16% of total) an individual proprietor (if you checked this box, skip to #4)
 - (12; 63% of total) a nonprofit corporation (if you checked this box, answer #2)
 - (4; 21% of total) a public entity (if you checked this box, skip to #3)
2. Which category best describes the type of nonprofit corporation that operates your center:
 - (1; 8% of total) a parent cooperative
 - a church or synagogue
 - a single purpose nonprofit corporation limited to providing child care and development services
 - (11; 92% of total) a multi-purpose nonprofit corporation with multiple services not limited to providing child care and development services
 - other kind of nonprofit entity: _____
3. Which category best describes the type of public entity that operates your center:
 - (4; 100% of total) School District
 - County Office of Education
 - City agency: _____
 - County department (other than County Office of Education: _____)
 - Community College District
 - Other public entity: _____

4. For how many years has your center been providing child care and development services? _____

- 30+ years*
- 20+ years*
- 1+ year*
- 4+ years*
- 1 year*
- 3 years*
- 3 years*
- 1 year*
- 23 years*

This is a list of years that each center has provided services. Head Start responded in aggregate and listed 23 years. We cannot calculate an average as we do not have exact information for each location.

5. How is the quality of your center regulated or monitored (check all that apply):

- (1; 5% of total)* Legally exempt from any state licensing or regulation
- (17; 89% of total)* Regulated under Title 22 by the California Department of Social Services
- (13; 68% of total)* Regulated under Title V by the California Department of Education
- (11; 58% of total)* Monitored as a Head Start program under Head Start Program Quality Standards
- Accredited by National Association for the Education of Young Children
- (1; 5% of total)* Accredited by another national accrediting body (Please name: *California Adult Education through CCOE*)

Many centers are regulated by multiple regulations, therefore, the percentages add up to over 100%.

6. Complete the following chart to show enrollment in your center by age.

Age Group	Licensed capacity	Targeted or desired Enrollment (if less than your licensed capacity)	Actual Current Enrollment	Number on Waiting List
3 years old				
4 years old				
5 years old but not in kindergarten				

7. Please attach a copy of your center's current tuition fee schedule for all age groups. If not defined in the schedule you attach, please tell us how you define:

Full-time care: _____

Part-time care: _____

Extended day: _____

This information was provided by one of the three CUSD Preschools, Head Start (as an aggregate), and all of the private centers. Given the various ways that it was reported, we are unable to make any comparisons or assumptions here. Please see report for a more detailed discussion.

8. Attach a copy of your current annual operating budget which shows your revenue sources OR estimate how much you collect annually from each of the following sources to operate the Center:

\$ _____ Tuition from parents.

\$ _____ Government contracts (Head Start, State Preschool or child care subsidy).

\$ _____ Government grants (First 5, other)

\$ _____ Contributions from the larger community.

\$ _____ Foundation or corporate grants.

\$ _____ Fundraising events.

\$ _____ United Way.

\$ _____ Other (please describe: _____)

\$ _____ TOTAL ANNUAL REVENUE

This information was provided partially by the four private centers, and not at all for the CUSD Preschools. Head Start did provide data in aggregate. Given the range of answers, we cannot report answers here due to the small range of responses and confidentiality.

9. Attach a copy of your current annual operating budget OR estimate how much you spend annually to operate the Center on:

\$ _____ Regular Personnel (Staff wages, benefits, insurance and taxes)

\$ _____ Temporary or substitute staffing costs

\$ _____ Staff training and professional development

\$ _____ Rent or mortgage payments for the facility

\$ _____ Utilities (electric, gas, water, garbage)

\$ _____ Maintenance and repairs for the building

\$ _____ Liability and other kinds of insurance.

\$ _____ Professional services (accounting, bookkeeping, legal, audit)

\$ _____ Equipment and furnishings

\$ _____ Instructional materials and supplies

\$ _____ Food

\$ _____ Other

\$ _____ TOTAL ANNUAL OPERATING EXPENSES

This information was provided partially by the four private centers, and not at all for the CUSD Preschools. Head Start did provide data in aggregate. Given the range of answers, we cannot report answers here due to the small range of responses and confidentiality.

10. What is your center's annual operating schedule?
(10; 53% of total) Year-round
(9; 47% of total) School-year
() Other: _____

11. What is your center's daily operating schedule? Check all that apply.
(18; 95% of total) Monday through Friday, ___am to ___pm
7:30am-5:30pm
7:30am-5:30pm
7am -6:00pm
7:30am-6:00pm
7:00am-6:00pm
7:30am-1:00pm
8:30-11:30am
6:00am-5:30pm (varies by Head Start location)
() Weekends
() Overnight or Graveyard Shifts
() Evening Care
(1; 5% of total) Other: Tuesdays and Thursdays, 7:30-11:00am

12. How many three and four year olds currently enrolled in the Center receive financial assistance from a public entity so that parents are not obligated to pay the full cost of the program? Note: Place the number of children assisted by each category of funding next to that category (do not count the same child twice—choose the category that contributes the most to the cost):

154 kids total Number of HEAD START-assisted three and four year olds.

5 at one center; 2 at other center Number of 3 and 4 year olds assisted by the ALTERNATIVE PAYMENT PROGRAM.

na Number of three and four year olds enrolled under the center's contract with the California Department of Education for STATE PRE-SCHOOL. (both CUSD and Head Start receive State Preschool Funding but the exact number of spaces funded is not available)

68 kids total Number of three and four year olds enrolled under the center's contract with the California Department of Education for GENERAL CHILD CARE.

_____ Other: none; 5 child care resources; 1 3-year-old purple form and 2 2-year-olds blue form; none

13. What is your current enrollment of three and four year olds who have a diagnosed disability or special need identified by an entity other than the center?
CUSD Preschools: 10 at one location, 5 at other three locations
Private Centers: 2 for speech therapy at one location; 2 at another location; 0 at the other two locations
Head Start: 32 children

14. What types of family involvement do you implement at the center. Check all that apply:
(2 of 19; 11% of total) Parent cooperative (14 of 19; 74% of total) Parent or family member volunteers
(15 of 19; 79% of total) Parent education workshops or activities
(11 of 19; 58% of total) Parent Advisory Committee
(15 of 19; 79% of total) Parent library and resource materials
() Other: monthly parent meetings; adult education; Raising a Reader; family night; bootcamp for new dads
() None

Please note that Head Start responded in aggregate and counts for 11 centers.

15. Please attach a written description of your program's educational philosophy or curriculum which you provide to parents, OR provide a link to a web page description, OR describe your philosophy or curriculum briefly below:
Not enough responses to this question to report results.

16. Please describe any activities that your center engages in to help children have a successful transition to Kindergarten. Check all that apply.
(17 of 19; 89% of total) Notify parents of four year olds of Kindergarten Open Houses.
(3 of 19; 16% of total) Conduct Kindergarten information workshops for parents.
(19 of 19; 100% of total) Meet with Kindergarten teachers regularly to learn about the Kindergarten curriculum.
(18 of 19; 95% of total) Invite Kindergarten teachers to visit the preschool classroom.
() Other: field trips to local kindergartens; assessments; transition plans; research kindergarten standards
() None

17. Please identify the THREE MOST PRESSING problems with the physical condition of your center:
_____ Inadequate disabled accessibility for children.
_____ Inadequate disabled accessibility for adults.
(2 of 18; 11% of total) Insufficient indoor program space.
(1 of 18; 6% of total) Insufficient outdoor play space.
_____ Inadequate number, inconvenient location or poor condition of children's toilets-sinks.
(1 of 18; 6% of total) Inadequate number, inconvenient location, or poor condition of adult bathrooms.
(2 of 18; 11% of total) Poorly maintained interior classrooms (painting, flooring and basic repairs.
_____ Poorly maintained or inadequate playground equipment.
(12 of 18; 67% of total) Poorly maintained or inadequate heating and ventilation systems. (includes 11

Head Start programs)

(12 of 18; 67% of total) Structural problems with the building (roof, frame, basement, etc.) (includes 11 Head Start programs)

(4 of 18; 22% of total) Lack of adult staff storage and meeting space.

(3 of 18; 17% of total) Poorly maintained or unattractive exterior paint, landscaping, signage, doors, windows.

_____ Other: _____

Note: Because Head Start answered in aggregate, any item they checked in this list counts as 11 responses, though it is not clear if the same problems exist at all facilities or just certain facilities.

18. What factors directly prevent you from addressing the problems with the physical condition of your facility?

(4 of 18; 22% of total) Lack of funds to fix known problems.

(2 of 18; 11% of total) Lack of knowledge to identify and assess the problems.

(2 of 18; 11% of total) Lack of time to research the problems and solutions.

(3 of 18; 17% of total) Not enough time and money to implement routine maintenance and repairs.

Note: Because Head Start answered in aggregate, any item they checked in this list counts as 11 responses, though it is not clear if the same problems exist at all facilities or just certain facilities.

19. Check the employee benefits which your Center provides its employees:

(17 of 19; 89% of total) Paid sick leave (varied; some blank, others 6 days and 7 days) number of days annually).

(18 of 19; 95% of total) Paid vacation (varies from 2 days to over 10 days) number of days annually in the first year, and the following in subsequent years

(18 of 19; 95% of total) Paid holidays (___ paid holidays annually).

(3 of 19; 16% of total) Paid Time Off (PTO) in lieu of sick or vacation (not filled in) number of days annually in the first year, and the following in subsequent years _____).

(12 of 19; 63% of total) Employer paid health care coverage for the employee only.

(3 of 19; 16% of total) Employer paid health care coverage for the employee and dependent.

(12 of 19; 63% of total) Employer paid dental coverage for the employee only.

(3 of 19; 16% of total) Employer paid dental coverage for the employee and dependent.

(4 of 19; 21% of total) Employer contribution to employee retirement plan.

() Other: _____

20. How does your Center promote the professional development of staff? (Check all that apply.)

(18 of 19; 95% of total) We encourage staff to enroll in CARES.

- (18 of 19; 95% of total) We provide on-the-job training to staff.
- (16 of 19; 84% of total) We fund the cost for staff to attend classes, workshops and conferences.
- (16 of 19; 84% of total) We provide staff with days off to attend training and classes.
- () Other: *One center pays for renewal of First Aid and CPR and a portion of ECE college classes; Head Start offers education assistance to pay for education expenses.*
21. What are the top three factors that prevent your staff from continuing their education?
- (15 of 19; 79% of total) Inconvenient location of higher education coursework.
- (14 of 19; 74% of total) Inconvenient schedule of higher education coursework.
- (0 of 19; 0% of total) Inability to pay for substitutes to enable staff to take off work.
- (4 of 19; 21% of total) High cost of tuition and books.
- (0 of 19; 0% of total) Staff hold jobs in addition to employment at the center.
- (16 of 19; 84% of total) Staff have competing family responsibilities.
- () Other: _____
22. Has your Center previously assessed classroom quality using the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scales?
- (17 of 19; 89% of total) Yes (if yes, indicate when this occurred last varied)
- (2 of 19; 11% of total) No
23. Please assess your familiarity with the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scales.
- (16 of 19; 79% of total) Very familiar.
- (1 of 19; 5% of total) Somewhat familiar
- (2 of 19; 11% of total) Not familiar.
24. Please state your interest in learning more about the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scales.
- (14 of 19; 74% of total) Very interested.
- (0 of 19; 0% of total) Somewhat interested.
- (5 of 19; 26% of total) Not at all interested.
25. If offered the opportunity to have a trained and reliable assessor assess the quality of your preschool classrooms using the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scales, how likely are you to use that resource:
- (6 of 19; 32% of total) Very likely.
- (13 of 19; 68% of total) Somewhat likely.
- () Not at all likely.
26. Please complete the workforce chart included as Attachment A by classroom for all of the preschool teaching staff at your center:

Thank you for participating in this survey effort. Your responses are very important to our overall planning effort for universal preschool. If you have any questions regarding this survey you may contact either:

Joanne Brion, consultant to Calaveras Child Care Council at joanne@brionassociates.com
or (707) 570-1477 OR

Kerry Williams, Child Care Coordinator for Calaveras Child Care Council at
kwilliams@hrcccr.org or (209) 754-5348 ext. 110

ATTACHMENT A

This information on educational attainment of preschool teachers is being collected so that we can prepare for *Universal Preschool*. We appreciate your taking the time to fill this form out so we can better serve you.

Preschool Classroom	Teacher	Assistant Teacher or aide	Assistant Teacher or aide	Other teaching staff
Age of Teaching Staff				
Years of experience in early childhood education (total)				
Years teaching at your center				
Annual salary (or hourly wage)				
Ethnicity				
Communicate fluently with children in a language other than English (yes/no)				
Educational attainment (HS or less; some college; Associate Degree; Bachelor's or higher)				
Child Development Permit Level				
Total number of college credits in early childhood education				
Some formal training or college coursework in children with special needs (yes/no)				

Please see discussion in report regarding the teacher information.

**APPENDIX B:
CURRENT SUPPLY AND OTHER DEMOGRAPHIC DATA**

Appendix B Table Index
Preschool Readiness Assessment - Calaveras County

Table No. Name

Table B-1 Demographics Estimated By Area in 2008

Table B-2 Preschool by Type & Location

Table B-3 Preschool Supply and Enrollment from Survey - 2009

Table B-4 Low Income 3-4 Year Olds in Calaveras County - 2009

Table B-5 Calaveras Planning Areas, Community Names and Zip Codes

Source: Brion & Associates.

**Table B-1
Demographics Estimated By Area 08
Preschool Readiness Assessment
- Calaveras County**

	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008
City/Area-2008	1. Copperopolis	2. Angels Camp / Altaville	3. Murphys / Douglas Flat / Vallecito	4. Hathaway Pines / Avery / Arnold / White Pines / Dorrington	5. Mountain Ranch / Sheep Ranch	6. Rail Road Flat / Glencoe / Mokelumne Hill
Population (1)	6,523	4,689	5,549	12,273	2,549	2,899
Percent Distribution	12.4%	8.9%	10.6%	23.4%	4.9%	5.5%
Estimated 2-5 year olds (2)	223	103	137	276	32	69
Children 3 and 4 years old	112	51	68	138	16	35
Percent Distribution	15.8%	7.3%	9.7%	19.5%	2.3%	4.9%
3 & 4 yr olds as % of Population	1.7%	1.1%	1.2%	1.1%	0.6%	1.2%
Percent Needing Preschool Spaces	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%
No. of 3-4 year olds Needing Pre:	78	36	48	97	11	24

(1) Based on TAZs in planning areas, from PMC report.

(2) Population by age is based on percentage of children by age from the 2000 US Census and applied to the total population and then adjusted for the Department of Finance's overall countywide forecast of population by age.

(3) Assumes that 70% of all children ages 3 and 4 years old require a preschool space.

Sources: PMC Report; 2000 US Census; Brion & Associates.

**Table B-1
Demographics Estimated By Area i
Preschool Readiness Assessment
- Calaveras County**

	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008
City/Area-2008	7. West Point / Wilseyville	8. San Andreas	9. Valley Springs / Jenny Lind / Burson	10. Wallace	Total County or Average (2)
Population (1)	2,666	3,414	10,900	947	52,408
Percent Distribution	5.1%	6.5%	20.8%	1.8%	100%
Estimated 2-5 year olds (2)	96	98	354	26	1,414
Children 3 and 4 years old	48	49	177	13	707
Percent Distribution	6.8%	6.9%	25.0%	1.8%	100.0%
3 & 4 yr olds as % of Population	1.8%	1.4%	1.6%	1.4%	1.3%
Percent Needing Preschool Spaces	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%
No. of 3-4 year olds Needing Pre:	34	34	124	9	495

**Table B-2
Preschool by Type & Location
Preschool Readiness Assessment
- Calaveras County**

Planning Area Name and Number	Small Family Child Care Homes (1)			Large Family Child Care Homes (1)			Child Care Centers - CUSD and COE Centers				FCCHs-Centers in Calaveras	
	No. of Providers	2 to 5 Years or Preschool	Total Spaces	No. of Providers	2 to 5 Years or Preschool	Total Spaces	No. of Providers	24 Months or Infant	2 to 5 Years or Preschool	Total Spaces	No. of Providers	2 to 5 Years or Preschool
1. Copperopolis	3	12	24	1	8	14	2	0	16	40	6	36
2. Angeles Camp / Altaville	3	12	24	0	0	0	4	0	86	131	7	98
3. Murphys / Douglas Flat / Vallecito	5	20	40	2	16	28	4	0	52	101	11	88
4. Hathaway Pines / Avery / Arnold / White Pines / Dorrington	4	16	32	1	8	14	3	16	43	107	8	67
5. Mountain Ranch / Sheep Ranch	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Rail Road Flat / Glencoe / Mokelumne Hill	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	40	3	16
7. West Point / Wilseyville	1	4	8	0	0	0	1	0	20	20	2	24
8. San Andreas	4	16	32	2	16	28	6	21	84	165	12	116
9. Valley Springs / Jenny Lind / Burson	14	56	112	4	32	56	8	11	136	307	26	224
10. Wallace	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	35	140	272	10	80	140	30	48	449	911	75	669

(1) Breakdown of spaces by age for FCCHs is based on California state licensing requirements.

Sources: Calaveras Child Care Council; Brion & Associates.

**Table B-3
Preschool Supply and Enrollment from Survey - 2009
Preschool Readiness Assessment - Calaveras County**

Type of Provider	Licensed or Max Capacity	Enrollment - 3-4 yr olds	% of Capacity
Private	44	30	68%
Private	23	15	65%
Private	15	15	100%
Private	20	8	40%
Head Start	20	20	100%
Head Start	16	16	100%
Head Start	20	20	100%
Head Start	20	20	100%
Head Start	20	20	100%
Head Start	20	20	100%
Head Start	20	20	100%
Head Start	20	20	100%
Head Start	20	20	100%
Early Head Start	8	8	100%
Early Head Start	8	8	100%
CUSD	36	26	72%
CUSD	36	28	78%
CUSD	12	12	100%
CUSD	<u>48</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>46%</u>
	426	348	82%

*Note these providers exclude family child care homes, which also provide preschool spaces.
Licensed Capacity for Head Start programs is not available as most programs cap out at 20 spaces.
and thus, only enrolled capacity is counted in this analysis.
Both Early Head Start programs also serve 4 infants each.
All of the Head Start programs receive some State Preschool funding.
Sources: Calaveras Child Care Council; Brion & Associates.*

Table B-4
Low Income 3-4 Year Olds in Calaveras County - 2009
Preschool Readiness Assessment - Calaveras County - 2009

Zip Code	Area Name	08 Priority	Total 3-4 Children in 2008 (1)	Percent of Children under SMI (2)	Estimated \ 3-4 Children Under SMI	CDD Subsidized 3-4 Spaces	HS Subsidized 3-4 Spaces	Supply of Subsidized 3-4 Spaces	Estimated Shortfall of Subsidized Spaces
95221	Altaville	3	6	45%	3	2	2	4	(1)
95222	Angels Camp	1	45	59%	27	7	20	27	(0)
95223	Arnold/Dorrington	2	129	29%	37	6	3	9	28
95224	Avery	3	5	45%	2	2		2	0
95225	Burson	3	23	45%	10	1	5	6	4
95226	Campo Seco	3	11	45%	5	0		-	5
95228	Copperopolis	1	112	40%	44	6	15	21	23
95229	Douglas Flat	3	4	45%	2	0	2	2	(0)
95232	Glencoe	3	6	45%	3	0		-	3
95233	Hathaway Pines	3	5	45%	2	0		-	2
95245	Mokelumne Hill	2	16	56%	9	1	2	3	6
95246	Mountain Ranch	2	14	45%	6	0	1	1	5
95247	Murphys	2	56	39%	22	8	10	18	4
95248	Rail Road Flat	1	13	45%	6	2	3	5	1
95249	San Andreas	1	49	49%	24	0	28	28	(4)
95250	Sheep Ranch	3	2	45%	1	0	1	1	(0)
95251	Vallecito	3	8	45%	4	0	2	2	2
95252	Valley Springs/J	1	147	40%	58	13	56	69	(11)
95254	Wallace	3	13	45%	6	1	2	3	3
95255	West Point	1	35	63%	22	0	15	15	7
95257	Wilseyville	3	13	45%	6	0	3	3	3
Totals			711	42%	299	49	170	219	80

(1) DOF forecasts children as % of population will decline in Calaveras County from 2000 levels; this adjustment reduces children comparable to 2000 levels.

(2) Based on percent of children in 2000 that lived in families earning less than State Median Income.

**Table B-5
Calaveras Planning Areas, Community Names and Zip Codes
Calaveras Child Care Needs Assessment-2008**

Planning Area	Community Areas	Census Place (1)	ZIP
Planning Area 1	Copperopolis	Yes	95228
Planning Area 2	Angels Camp	Yes	95222
	Altaville	No	95221
Planning Area 3	Murphys	Yes	95247
	Douglas Flat	No	95229
	Vallecito	Yes	95251
Planning Area 4	Hathaway Pines	No	95233
	Avery	Yes	95224
	Arnold	Yes	95223
	White Pines	No	95223
	Dorrington	Yes	95223
	Camp Connell		95223
	Tamarack		95223
Planning Area 5	Mountain Ranch	Yes	95246
	Sheep Ranch	No	95250
Planning Area 6	Rail Road Flat	Yes	95248
	Glencoe	No	95232
	Mokelumne Hill	Yes	95245
Planning Area 7	West Point	Yes	95255
	Wilseyville	No	95257
Planning Area 8	San Andreas	Yes	95249
Planning Area 9	Valley Springs	Yes	95252
	Jenny Lind	No	95252
	Burson	No	95225
	Campo Seco		95226
	Milton		95252
	Paloma		95252
Planning Area 10	Wallace	Yes	95254

Source: Brion & Associates.