

**MINNESOTA FAMILY
IMPACT SEMINARS**

Options for a Responsive and Accountable Early Childhood System in Minnesota

**April 25th, 2008
Briefing Report**



MINNESOTA FAMILY IMPACT SEMINAR BRIEFING REPORT: OPTIONS FOR A RESPONSIVE AND ACCOUNTABLE EARLY CHILDHOOD SYSTEM IN MINNESOTA

Prepared by: University of Minnesota Children, Youth, and Family Consortium

Overview

This is the first in a series of annual Family Impact Seminars in Minnesota. Following a national model used in 25 other states, Family Impact Seminars connect research and state policymaking by providing state-of-the-art information in an objective, non-partisan manner. Each topical seminar includes forums, briefing reports,

What policymakers need is not more information, but more objective and valid information from reliable, unbiased sources.¹

and follow-up activities explicitly for legislators, key agencies and staff. Rather than lobbying for particular policies, the seminars offer a range of policy options and provide opportunities for participants to identify common ground.

The Family Impact Seminars (FIS) are a project of the University of Minnesota's Children, Youth, and Family Consortium (CYFC) and seek to promote a family perspective in policy development, convene dialogue among policymakers, analyze the impact public policies have on families, and connect family-relevant research and state policymaking. For more information about national Family Impact Seminars, go to <http://familyimpactseminars.org>.

Executive Summary

This report provides a written background for the FIS speakers' presentations. It includes two new ways of examining public policy through 1) the lens of the

ecological model and, 2) by using the Family Impact Checklist. It contains current and projected Minnesota population data for children from birth through five-years-old. Finally, Louise Stoney, who has helped many states develop and establish systems for early care and education, has prepared a brief summary of some of her research along with examples of models from other states. The report concludes with unanswered questions, framed in an ecological perspective. The full report along with a more comprehensive list of resources, as well as a complete bibliography, is available at <http://www.cyfc.umn.edu/policy/fisreport08.pdf>.

Table of Contents

1. Early Childhood Policies From Ecological and Family Impact Perspectives
2. Minnesota's Early Childhood Populations
3. What Is an Early Care and Education System?
4. Why Should We Have an Early Childhood System and How Might It Look?
5. Unanswered Questions

Handouts on the Quality Rating Information System (Stoney), a brief list of resources, the Family Impact Checklist and the Child Care Financing Matrix (Stoney & Edwards, 2003) are included in the back of this report.



¹Strickland, T. (1996). Moving psychology toward (self) recognition as a public resource: The views of a congressman psychologist. In R. P. Lorton, I. Iscoe, P. J. DeLeon, & G. R. VandenBos (Eds.), *Psychology and public policy: Balancing public service and professional need* (pp. 369-389). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

EARLY CHILDHOOD POLICIES FROM ECOLOGICAL AND FAMILY IMPACT PERSPECTIVES

Karen Cadigan & Madge Alberts

A Family Impact Perspective in Policymaking

A family impact perspective in policymaking analyzes the consequences of any policy or program, regardless of whether it is explicitly aimed at families, for its impact on family well-being. This includes the ways families contribute to the problems, how families are affected by problems, and whether families need to be involved in solutions. In the same way that policy makers evaluate the economic or

environmental impact of policies, there are methods for examining the family impact.

A family impact perspective is different from family policy (policy that directly

Policy development often focuses on the results for individuals. The impact on and implications for families, of which the individuals are a part, is a relatively new area of discussion in the policymaking process.

impacts family makeup and is designed to have specific effects on family). A family perspective examines implicit or unintended consequences policies have on families. Policies developed at all levels have an impact on families. Policies such as “No Child Left Behind” or “Welfare to Work” have an obvious relationship to families. Worksite policies have a clear relationship to the employee’s ability to relate to his/her family. Others, such as transportation or feedlot zoning issues may not seem to have an obvious impact on families, but if one looks beneath the surface to the intended and unintended consequences for families of all kinds, an unmistakable relationship is present.

Most policymakers are familiar with the more typical family advocate approach. Advocates campaign for an under-represented group or a particular policy alternative that they believe may potentially enhance family well-being. In doing this, advocates examine options in light of their own value system, using a personal interpretation of the scientific evidence, with the aim of promoting a single policy option that they deem most desirable for families. In contrast

and complement to this approach of influencing policies, policy educators do not lobby for a single policy, but attempt to inform policy discourse by clarifying potential consequences of several policy alternatives. They make an effort to educate by presenting research findings objectively without relaying personal preferences. The University of Minnesota is a natural fit for portraying this perspective because of its role and responsibility as a nonpartisan institution whose goal is to advance the welfare of the state.

Family Impact is an Example of an Ecological Perspective in Policymaking

The family impact perspective recognizes that things that happen to individual family members, as well as things that occur outside the family have a profound effect on the quality and nature of the relationships and actions within the family. This idea is grounded in the ecological model of human development.

The original ecological model developed by Urie Bronfenbrenner in the late 1970s is well-known to most family scholars and practitioners. The model has had many permutations and interpretations over the years, but at base level, it recognizes that each individual, as well as the family as a unit, is significantly affected by interactions among a number of overlapping contexts, systems or environments. This includes systems in which the family and/or its members are directly involved, such as neighborhoods or schools, as well as systems




that are more distant from direct interaction or influence, such as society, culture, and policy.

A model is illustrated here, using the language of individual, family/informal supports, community, and policy. A detailed example of the “Circles of Influence” model is available from the University’s Children, Youth and Family Consortium (www.cyfc.umn.edu/eddisp/).

No matter how one describes it, some fundamental principles apply:

- The influence of all contexts/systems/environments on the individual and the family must be recognized in order to completely understand and assist in family functioning.
- Individuals and families also have an influence on the systems beyond themselves.
- As children grow and develop, they interact directly with more and more systems.
- The larger, macro systems such as society and policy, may not interact directly with families, but they still have a significant influence on families. Some of these influences are unintentional.
- The most effective approach leading to healthy behaviors is a combination of efforts at all levels.

Circles of Influence in Child Development



Adapted for Family Impact Seminars by the University of Minnesota Children, Youth and Family Consortium. Based on Bronfenbrenner’s Ecology of Human Development.

Assessing the Impact of Policies on Families: The Family Impact Checklist

The first step in developing family-friendly policies is to ask the right questions:

- What can government and community institutions do to enhance the family's capacity to help itself and others?
- What effect does (or will) this policy or program have for families? Will it help or hurt, strengthen or weaken family functioning?

The Consortium of Family Organizations developed a framework to assess the intended and unintended consequences of policies and programs on family stability, family relationships, and family responsibilities. Each of the six principles serves as a criterion for how sensitive to and supportive of families policies and programs are. The principles are not rank ordered and sometimes they conflict with one-another, requiring trade offs. Cost effectiveness also must be considered. Some questions are value-neutral and others incorporate specific values. People may not always agree on these values, so sometimes questions will require rephrasing. This tool, however, reflects a broad nonpartisan consensus, and it can be useful to



people across the political spectrum.

Policies are most beneficial to families when they:

- ✓ **Foster and support rather than hinder or replace the major functions of families - family creation, economic support, childrearing, and caring for their members**
- ✓ **Encourage and reinforce family membership and stability**
- ✓ **Recognize the interdependence and strength of family relationships, even when those relationships may be conflicted**
- ✓ **Encourage families to be involved in addressing issues that affect them**
- ✓ **Recognize that there are many forms and configurations of families, and the effects of policies on diverse families may be very different**
- ✓ **Recognize and act on the need to support families who are vulnerable economically and/or socially**

The intent of the framework is to provide individuals or groups with a tool to help think critically about a policy or program in relation to the family. It provides the user an opportunity to formally or informally assess the possible benefits, as well as the possible negative impact, of a policy or program on families.² Sometimes, it might be used to compare and contrast two or more different policy or program options. In other cases, it may be used solely to identify the reasons for and reasons against one specific policy or program. The framework can also be used to help in the initial stages of policy or program development as a way to encourage critical thinking about the potential policy or program and the possible impact it may have on families. The framework is not designed to be an evaluation tool in the sense of determining if the goals of a policy or program have been met. A copy of the framework, titled "Family Impact Checklist" can be found as an insert with this briefing report, as well as at <http://www.familyimpactseminars.org>.

²Bogenschneider, K. (2006). *Family policy matters: How Policymaking Affects Families and What Professionals Can Do* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

MINNESOTA EARLY CHILDHOOD POPULATIONS

Current and Projected Universal Populations

Mary Harrison & Karen Cadigan


How many young children are there in Minnesota? What will our population look like in the coming years?

The following graph uses projection data from the U.S. Census Bureau.³ In 2006, there were between 66,000 and 73,000 children in each age group. By 2020, there are projected to be around 80,000 children in each age group.

These numbers help illustrate the scope of early childhood policy issues. When thinking about early care and education for young children, it is helpful to have a picture of how many children are involved.



Population Projections for Children Ages Birth through Five in MN: 2012 and 2020
(Source: US Census Bureau)



³ Steven Ruggles, Matthew Sobek, Trent Alexander, Catherine A. Fitch, Ronald Goeken, Patricia Kelly Hall, Miriam King, and Chad Ronnander. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 3.0* [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Population Center [producer and distributor], 2004. <http://usa.ipums.org/usa/>

Children in Poverty


The following graph uses data from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey and provides a picture of the number of children birth to five in Minnesota in 2006 by poverty level.⁴ Decades of research show that children who live in poverty are an identifiable group with particular risk for poor developmental outcomes.⁵ While an ecologically based system would be universal in scope, it would include special features for targeted populations such as children in poverty.

From 2000-2006, an average of about 13% of Minnesota's young children lived in families at or under the 100% federal poverty guideline (FPG), or an income of \$20,000 for a family of four.⁶ Over this time, on average, an additional 13% lived in families whose incomes were between 100% and 175% of poverty. Thus, over 25% or about one out of



four (1/4) of children, on average, lived at or under 175% of the poverty level in Minnesota from 2000 through 2006.

**Number of Children Ages Birth through Five in MN, 2006:
By Age and Poverty Level**
(Source: US Census Bureau)



⁴ Steven Ruggles, Matthew Sobek, Trent Alexander, Catherine A. Fitch, Ronald Goeken, Patricia Kelly Hall, Miriam King, and Chad Ronnander. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 3.0* [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Population Center [producer and distributor], 2004. <http://usa.ipums.org/usa/>

⁵ E.g., Brooks-Gunn, J., Duncan, G. J., & Maritato, N. (1997). Poor families, poor outcomes: The well-being of children and youth. In G. Duncan & J. Brooks-Gunn (Eds.), *Consequences of Growing Up Poor* (pp. 1-17). New York: Russell Sage and McLoyd, V. C. (1998). Socioeconomic disadvantage and child development. *American Psychologist*, 53(2), 185-204.

⁶ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2006). Federal Register, 71 (15), pp. 3848-3849. <http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/06poverty.shtml>


Support and Funding

In 2005, the Itasca Project, led by a group of CEOs and other business, non-profit, government and education leaders in Minnesota, published a report detailing how spending on Early Childhood is allocated in Minnesota.⁷ Eighty percent (80%) of the total spending on early childhood is by families. The remaining twenty percent (20%) is by government.⁸ Family expenditures include formal and informal child care and early education arrangements that meet the family's needs for quality, proximity, and accessibility.

Early Childhood Spending in MN

(Families = 80% & Govt = 20%)


Source: McKinsey Report, Itasca Project, 2005



Government Spending on Early Childhood in MN 2005

(20% of Total Spending on Early Childhood in MN)

Source: McKinsey Report, Itasca Project, 2005



Twenty-percent (20%) of early childhood funding comes from government, with the federal government spending \$169 million, the state spending \$145 million, and local government spending \$23 million.

Of the total government spending about half has an early education focus with the objective to prepare children for kindergarten (around \$164 million), and half has a childcare focus with the objective to allow parents to work or enroll in training programs (around \$173 million). Government expenditures include childcare programs such as Basic Sliding Fee and the Childcare Assistance Program, as well as education-focused programs such as Head Start, Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE), School Readiness, and others.

⁷The Economics of Early Childhood Care and Education in Minnesota: Report of the Itasca Project Task Force on Early Childhood Development. Prepared by the McKinsey Group: 2005. <http://www.theitascaproject.com/ECDRreport.pdf>


WHAT IS AN EARLY CARE

Louise Stoney

Webster defines the word *system* as “a set or arrangement of things so related or connected as to form a unity or organic whole.”⁹ At present, early care and education includes a number of different sub-systems: Head Start, subsidized childcare, public pre-kindergarten, and others. While each of these sub-systems has its own internal consistency, they do not work together to form an organic whole. Additionally, some services function outside these systems, for example, childcare provided by family, friends and neighbors. There are also types of supports that do not currently exist, such as paid family leave.

A system of early childhood development and education that will serve all children birth to five and their families can be constructed from the current sub-parts, with some modest additions. The key to developing this system is alignment. The graphic, above right, identifies five components of the system, which include:

- **Quality Standards - Research indicates standards that are most likely to result in good outcomes for children.**¹⁰ Standards for programs (e.g. ratios, class size, curricula) and for practitioners (e.g.



training and education) can be expressed in ways that are easily understood and linked to technical assistance, funding, monitoring and public information. The Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS) that many states have developed are an example of how standards can be “tiered” so that all parts of the Early Care Education (ECE) system are included (see box to the right & see “Hypothetical QRIS” handout). When the various sub-systems within early care and education are rooted in *common* standards, then the system has a shared vision and can begin to achieve shared results.

- *The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction uses the state’s Five-Star Child Care Quality Rating System as a common standard, and then layers additional requirements (for their ‘More at Four’ preschool program) on this base.*
- *Colorado and Pennsylvania have worked with their education departments to develop systemic links between preschool programs and the quality rating system.*
- *The Los Angeles Universal Preschool Master Plan recommends a five-star quality rating system for the preschool program, aligned with existing standards including California Desired Results, national program accreditation, and Head Start Performance Standards.*

⁸ Much of the information for this section is drawn from: Mitchell, A, & Stoney, L. (2008). Financing Early Care and Education Systems: A Standards-Based Approach. In A. Tarlov, A. & M.P. Debbink (Eds.), *Investing in early childhood development: Evidence to support a movement for change*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

⁹ Webster’s New World Dictionary (second edition) (1970).

¹⁰ Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University (2007). *A Science-Based Framework for Early Childhood Policy: Using Evidence to Improve Outcomes in Learning, Behavior, and Health for Vulnerable Children*. http://www.developingchild.net/pubs/persp/pdf/Policy_Framework.pdf

AND EDUCATION SYSTEM?⁸


- **Professional and Program Development - Quality standards are meaningless if programs and practitioners are not able to comply.** To this end, an ECE system includes initiatives to help programs meet quality standards (such as on-site evaluation and technical assistance) as well as support for practitioners (training and education systems, mentoring opportunities, career counseling, and so forth). Many of the current ECE sub-systems have supports for programs and practitioners, such as the Head Start Training and Technical Assistance system, technical assistance and training provided by childcare resource and referral agencies, higher or continuing education offered at colleges and universities, public preschool teacher resource centers, and many others. These systems typically operate independently and are not always linked to practitioner or program standards. Common standards create a strong incentive to explicitly link these efforts so that all resources are consistent and used most effectively.
- **Monitoring and Accountability - Agencies that fund or administer early care and education services typically establish mechanisms to monitor compliance with standards.** But each has a different method. In a systems approach the sub-systems work together to align their policies and procedures to ensure compliance with common standards.
- **Financial Assistance - If all available financial assistance is linked to meeting a common set of standards, then all parts of the early care and education system begin to move in the same direction.** There are many ways to provide financial assistance for early care and education services. These include: DIRECT subsidies to the childcare industry (such as grants or tax benefits for programs or wage supplements for staff) and PORTABLE subsidies to help families pay for child care

(such as tiered public or private payment rates—or individual tax benefits). An effective financing system will include both portable and direct subsidies, link all funds to quality measures, and establish policies to ensure that funds from multiple sources may be tapped to serve a single child or classroom of children (See QRIS Handout).

- **Engagement and Outreach - System reform cannot work unless practitioners and consumers understand what quality standards mean, why they are important, what they can do to comply, and how compliance will benefit them individually and collectively.** Effective outreach is not

Financing ECE Programs

Total Revenue = Portable + Direct Assistance



just about disseminating information; it is about changing behavior. For example, when Maine doubled the state dependent care tax credit for families who use “quality” child care, the number of parents interested in finding out the quality status of their child’s program increased dramatically. The number of childcare teachers participating in professional development, and the number of programs seeking accreditation, increased as well. In this case, a finance-related policy change had direct effects on consumer and practitioner engagement.

WHY SHOULD WE HAVE AN EARLY CHILDHOOD SYSTEM? HOW MIGHT IT LOOK?

Louise Stoney

Minnesota needs an early childhood system because family economics have changed.

19th century industrialization supported a model where men engaged in paid work and


women took responsibility for unpaid work – especially caring for young children. At that time, a man with little or

no education could earn a family-supporting wage. Care and education of young children was widely considered a private, family concern.¹¹ But the world has changed dramatically. Between 1970 and 2000 the percentage of mothers in the workforce almost doubled—from 38 to 67 percent. These women make a significant contribution to

family earnings. As the table (below) indicates growth in family income over the past twenty years, it is primarily due to two wage earners. **Without wives' earnings, families in the bottom 2 quintiles would be in poverty and thousands of middle and upper-middle class families (the 3rd and 4th quintiles) would struggle to pay their bills.** The need for two wage earners also makes families very financially vulnerable, especially if one has to leave the workforce – to care for children, an ill family member or themselves. In the past, women were essentially an economic 'escape hatch' for the family. If something happened to the primary breadwinner, they could step in, join the workforce, and help stabilize the family income. This is no longer true. Indeed, many families are blindsided by the serious financial ramifications of childbirth or family illness.¹²

A 2005 Wilder Foundation study of child care use in Minnesota reported that approximately 74% of families use non-parental care at some point during the week.¹³

Contribution of Wives' Earnings to Family Income
(Percent change 1979-2000)



¹¹ Folbre, Nancy (2008). Valuing children: Rethinking the economics of the family. Boston: Harvard University Press.

¹² Information in this paragraph comes from: Bernstein, J. & Kornbluh, K. (2005). Running faster to stay in place: The growth of family work hours and incomes. New America Foundation http://www.newamerica.net/files/archive/Doc_File_2437_1.pdf

¹³ Chase, R., Arnold, J., Schauben, L., & Shardlow, B. (2005). Child care use in Minnesota: 2004 Statewide household child care survey. St. Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation. p.44-45. <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfsrver/Legacy/DHS-4623-ENG>

¹⁴ Information from this paragraph comes from the following sources: 1) DeLong, J.B., Goldin, C. & Katz, L.F. (2002). Sustaining US Economic Growth http://www.j-bradford-delong.net/Econ_Articles/GKD_final3.pdf 2) Heckman, J. (2006). The technology and neuroscience of skill formation. Invest in Kids Working Group. Committee on Economic Development. Partnership for America's Economic Success. http://www.partnershipforsuccess.org/docs/ivk/iikmeeting_slides200607heckman.pdf and 3) Heckman, J. (2007). Proposed life cycle formation and the economic benefits of early childhood interventions. Presentation to the National Association for the Education of Young Children (click on link to access ppt slides). http://www.partnershipforsuccess.org/index.php?id=7&tag_list=persons&tag_item=17

¹⁵ Folbre, Nancy. (2008). Valuing children: Rethinking the economics of the family. Boston: Harvard University Press.

¹⁶ Schulman, K. (2003). Key facts: Essential information about child care, early education, and school-age care. Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund.

Minnesota needs an early care and education system because early learning is a key economic investment.

Alan Greenspan, former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, spoke often about education and economic growth. He stressed that upgrading workforce quality is crucial for maintaining economic competitiveness. Similarly, University of California's Brad DeLong and the University of Chicago's James Heckman underscore that educational attainment of US employees has been declining for several decades and now threatens to slow future growth. Each of these economic leaders stresses that increasing workforce quality requires better education and that the best way to boost educational attainment is to start early—in the first few years of life, when brains are at their peak capacity.¹⁴

Unlike the country's K-12 and higher education systems, ECE services are largely paid for and arranged for by parents themselves. **Few employed parents—even middle class professionals—can afford as much caretaking and learning as their children need. Market prices, even at mediocre quality levels, exceed that of public college tuition in all but one state.**¹⁶ Many working parents limit expenses by juggling schedules, piecing together arrangements of friends and family, and racing home from work. In short, the system of private responsibility for ECE is financially difficult for

If American working parents were to withdraw their services from the marketplace to care for and educate their young children, what would that cost the nation? – Nancy Folbre¹⁵

families at any income level.¹⁷ Despite the growing need for a quality US workforce, thousands of children simply do not receive the early learning opportunities they need to succeed in school and life.

How could we have an ECE system that would not be just “more big government”? How could we develop a system at a time when budgets are tight?

One of the first and most important steps toward building an effective system is acknowledging that most early care and education services are delivered by the private sector, in for-profit, nonprofit and faith-based center-based programs as well as thousands of home-based businesses. By and large, the only public agencies providing early care and education are public schools that offer primarily part-day classes for preschoolers; these classrooms represent a small fraction – probably less than 6% – of total ECE services.¹⁹ In short, ECE is essentially a market-driven service: providers offer services for a price; consumers choose among those services and pay the price.²⁰

Unlike many market-based services, ECE is unique because it serves both public and private needs.²¹ As a private good, it enables parents to work. As a public good, it prepares children for school, enhances the productivity of our educational system, and helps strengthen our future workforce. But the public good aspect of ECE services is vulnerable to market

What could you buy with your Social Security check, or your IRAs for that matter, if everyone else in your generation had simply forgotten to have children or failed to invest in them? – Philip Longman¹⁸

¹⁷ Harrington, M. (1999). Care and equality: Inventing a new family politics. New York: Routledge.

¹⁸ Longman, P. (2004). The empty cradle: Freedom and fertility in an aging world, New York: Basic Books.

¹⁹ The National Institute for Early Education Research reports that in 2006 state pre-kindergarten programs served 942,766 children and a third of these children were served outside the public schools. Assuming the ECE industry serves 10 million children the 628,510 enrolled in school-based pre-K represent slightly more than 6% of the total. <http://nieer.org/yearbook/pdf/yearbook.pdf>

²⁰ Stoney, L. & Mitchell, A. (2007). Using tax credits to promote high quality early care and education services. Written for the Partnership for America's Economic Success. Alliance of Early Childhood Finance. <http://www.earlychildhoodfinance.org/Publications/Tax%20Credit%20Paper%20Final%20formatted%20version%20-%202011%202007.pdf>


²¹ Warner, M.E., Adriance, S., Barai, N., Halla, J., Markeson, B., Morrissey, T., & Soref, W. (2004). Economic development strategies to promote quality child care. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Department of City and Regional Planning. <http://government.cce.cornell.edu/doc/pdf/EconDevStrat.pdf>

forces, which are focused on short-term factors such as price and convenience, rather than the long-term benefits of quality early education.²² While market forces can work at cross purposes with what is needed to support the long-term health of our economy—high-quality ECE services—government can craft market interventions aimed at addressing these issues. In this way, building and financing an ECE system becomes a unique public/private partnership. Public dollars can be used strategically to help structure markets, promote accountability and provide incentives to ensure that the industry develops, and consumers are able to purchase, high-quality services that support early learning.

There are many ways to finance ECE (see Child Care Financing Matrix handout).²³

Effective programs use funds from many sources. An important first step for states is to establish policies that make it easier for an ECE program to tap and “LAYER” funds from multiple public and private sources (including parent fees) for a particular child or classroom (see box below).²⁴ LAYERING, which maximizes the use of all available funds, is most likely to occur when the various entities that finance ECE use common accountability standards, policies, procedures, budgets, monitoring, etc. Many states are moving in this direction, using Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS) as a framework for accountability and finance.

Layering Portable & Direct Subsidies



²² Stoney, L., Mitchell, A. & Warner, M. (2006). Smarter reform: Moving beyond single program solutions to an early care and education system. Community Development 37(2), 101-115. <http://government.cce.cornell.edu/doc/pdf/101-115%20stoney%20mitchell%20warner.pdf>

²³ Financing Matrix: <http://www.earlychildhoodfinance.org/ArticlesPublications/ccfinancingmatrix-LouiseStoney.pdf>

²⁴ Layering Portable and Direct Financing Table –created by Louise Stoney and Anne Mitchell, Alliance for Early Childhood Finance, for a ppt presentation entitled “Powerful policy for improving and unifying early care and education” delivered at a Forum to explore a QRIS in Connecticut, Feb. 7, 2008.



ECE is a Fragile Industry

The ECE “system” is essentially a hodge-podge of center- and home-based care and education programs that offer services of varying quality. Many have very weak fiscal and administrative capacity or worse, none at all (a single person might serve as director, bookkeeper and classroom teacher).

In the same way that government invested in farm cooperatives or research and development for new technologies, it can partner with the private sector to make strategic investments that enable small early care and education businesses achieve needed economies of scale and strengthen both quality and financial management. In some states ECE providers are forming new administrative structures that allow multiple providers to share staff and administrative costs or forge new alliances that help improve program quality and child outcomes. This approach is a win-win. Providers have a more stable financial and administrative base. Funders have stronger and more consistent accountability, and — most importantly — children and families receive better quality services.

How have other states done it? Are there incremental steps Minnesota can take based on what other states have done?

As previously discussed, a key step in improving ECE quality and finance is enacting policies that link funding and quality. Quite a few states have used the QRIS and find that this approach addresses two issues: 1) families have more

information and are supported in choosing quality and 2) providers, and early care and education markets as a whole, are encouraged to continually strive for improvement (See Handout: “Hypothetical QRIS”). Innovative examples include:

Louisiana School Readiness Tax Credits - Louisiana recently enacted a package of four, refundable credits (for parents, teachers, programs and investors) linked to attainment of quality standards as measured by the state’s Quality Rating and Improvement System and teacher training/education. Investor credits are designed to encourage business support for high-quality programs. For more information, visit: <http://www.laccrra.org/qrs/help/SchoolReadinessTaxCredits-Explanation.pdf>

Pennsylvania Merit Awards -Pennsylvania makes grants available to programs that participate in their quality rating and improvement system and make continuous improvement. These grants are designed to work in tandem with other supports, such as tiered subsidy reimbursement rates, prekindergarten or Head Start funding and parent fees. For more information, visit: <http://www.pakeys.org/stars/Default.aspx>

NC More at Four Funding - North Carolina links eligibility for prekindergarten funding to participation in the quality rating and improvement system. To be eligible for pre-K funding, programs must have attained at least 4 stars (in their 5 star system). Responsibility for monitoring compliance is shared among the funding agencies. For more information, visit: http://www.ecs.org/dbsearches/search_info/PreKProgramProfile.asp?state=NC


The financing strategies noted above began incrementally. In each case, the first step was to establish a statewide system of common standards (e.g. QRIS) and then think strategically about how to link funds to this system. **This approach makes it possible to plan for fiscal reform, and take first steps, even when new dollars are not available.** Once the framework is established, new funds can be added when they become available.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

Mary Harrison

The 2008 Family Impact Seminar aims to encourage policy makers to think about policy choices related to early childhood education through the lens of how they impact families. Using the ecological model, here are some remaining unanswered questions²⁵. The questions are based on the Family Impact Checklist. Policymakers have the power to make choices which greatly impact the other circles in the model.

Circles of Influence
in Early Childhood
Development:
Adapted for
Policy Makers



The Family Impact Seminars provide information and perspective to inform policy choices. The questions asked and the options explored during the seminar are intended to encourage policymakers to think more intentionally about the ways policies affect Minnesota families. Now and in the future, Minnesota Family Impact Seminars are here to provide policy makers with a new frame and new information on the issues important to Minnesota families.

²⁵ Adapted for Family Impact Seminars by the University of Minnesota Children, Youth and Family Consortium. Based on Bronfenbrenner's Ecology of Human Development. Format of questions based on the Family Impact Checklist. For the full checklist, go to http://www.familyimpactseminars.org/fi_checklist_aipf.pdf

Advisory Committee

Members of the Bipartisan Early Childhood Caucus Leadership:

Representative Sandra Peterson (DFL)	Senator Geoff Michel (R)
Representative Lynn Wardlow (R)	Senator Tarryl Clark (DFL)
Founder & Ex-Officio Chair Representative	Nora Slawik (DFL)
Bipartisan Early Childhood Caucus Consultant	Lisa Venable, MA

Acknowledgements

The Minnesota Family Impact Seminar and report are made possible with support from:

Greater Twin Cities United Way
Hennepin County Strategic Initiatives and Community Engagement (SICE) Department
The Bipartisan Early Childhood Caucus
The Policy Institute for National Family Impact Seminars
The University of Minnesota's:
Children, Youth, and Family Consortium (CYFC)
Children, Youth and Family Policy Work Group
Office of Public Engagement
Center for Early Education and Development (CEED)

Presenters and Moderators

Karen Cadigan

Policy Director, University of
Minnesota's Children, Youth
and Family Consortium (CYFC)
200 Oak St. SE
McNamara Suite 270A
Minneapolis, MN 55455
612-625-8976
cadigan@umn.edu

Andrew Furco

Associate Vice President for
Public Engagement, University
of Minnesota
130B Morrill Hall
100 Church St. SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455
612-624-1562
afurco@umn.edu

Scott McConnell

Director of Community
Engagement, University of
Minnesota's Center for Early
Education and Development
(CEED)
250 Education Sciences Bldg.
56 E. River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455
612-624-6365
smcconne@umn.edu

Senator Geoff Michel

133 State Office Bldg.
100 Rev. Dr. MLK Jr. Blvd.
St. Paul, MN 55155
651-296-6238
sen.geoff.michel@senate.mn

Representative Sandra Peterson

345 State Office Bldg.
100 Rev. Dr. MLK Jr. Blvd.
St. Paul, MN 55155
651-296-4176
rep.sandra.peterson@house.mn

Louise Stoney

Co-Founder,
Alliance for Early Childhood
Finance
308 Thais Rd.
Averill Park, NY 12018
518-674-5635
louise.stoney@gmail.com

Amy Susman-Stillman

Director of Applied Research
and Training, University of
Minnesota's Center for Early
Education and Development
(CEED)
40 Educational Sciences Bldg.
56 E. River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455
612-624-3367
asusman@umn.edu



INFORMATION FOR THIS REPORT COMPILED BY:

Madge Alberts is program coordinator with the University of Minnesota's Children, Youth and Family Consortium (CYFC). Madge works with all staff, as well as faculty and community partners to look at ongoing ways the Consortium can link community needs and University resources. She is editor of Consortium Connections, and works with other print and web-based publications of CYFC. Madge has an undergraduate degree from UMD, majoring in Home Economics, and a MA in Religious Studies with focus in pastoral care and counseling from United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities. Before joining CYFC, Madge worked with the U of MN Extension as a family development specialist/educator.

Sara Benning serves as the Special Projects Coordinator at the University of Minnesota's Children, Youth and Family Consortium (CYFC). With an undergraduate background in Family Social Sciences, Sara recently received her Masters of Liberal Studies (MLS), an interdisciplinary masters program, from the University of Minnesota. As both a staff member and former student at the University of Minnesota, Sara provides the communities CYFC serves with a growing range of experiences as she organizes University-community events, projects and activities that address the pressing needs of children, youth and families.

Karen Cadigan is Policy Director at the University of Minnesota's Children, Youth and Family Consortium (CYFC). She is also Director of Outreach and Public Policy at the Center for Early Education and Development. She coordinates the University of Minnesota's graduate certificate program in Early Childhood Policy studies and has provided assistance to Minnesota's Bipartisan Early Childhood Caucus since 2004. Karen worked in public schools for seven years in rural Virginia and in Minnesota. She is a nationally certified school psychologist and Ph.D. candidate with research and teaching experience in early literacy, preschool assessment, and policy development related to children and families. Karen is a Bush Leadership Fellow and a graduate of Minnesota's Head Start program.

Mary Harrison holds Master of Public Policy (MPP) and Master of Social Work (MSW) degrees and is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in Social Work at the University of Minnesota. Her policy background includes work with the Minnesota State Legislature. Her practice experience includes management of a program for young children, birth to six, at risk of abuse and neglect as well as clinical practice both in a preschool mental health day treatment program and with individuals and families. She is a Licensed Graduate Social Worker.

Louise Stoney is an independent consultant specializing in childcare and early childhood education policy and co-founder of the Alliance for Early Childhood Finance. She has worked in public policy for more than twenty-five years, including positions as a staff member in the New York State legislature, policy director for a state childcare resource and referral network, and instructor for the Center for Women in Government at the State University of New York at Albany. As a consultant, Louise works with state and local governments, national policy organizations, child advocacy groups, and foundations. Her client list includes administrators and advocates in over 30 states, seven cities (including New York, San Francisco, Miami and the District of Columbia) and the Cherokee Nation. She has worked for more than 23 national organizations including groups such as the National Conference of State Legislatures, National Governors Association, the United Way, Cornell University, Committee for Economic Development, the American Enterprise Institute, and Smart Start's National Technical Assistance Center. Through her work with Anne Mitchell on the Alliance for Early Childhood Finance, she has spearheaded a national conversation on early childhood finance reform. Louise is currently working with the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the David and Laura Merage Foundation to develop and test new administrative models and shared platforms for the early care and education system.

*Report design by
Madeleine Quinlan.*

*Photos in this report from
BigStockPhoto, Karen Cadigan,
and Patrick O'Leary.*



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Driven to DiscoverSM



Center for Early Education and Development



CHILDREN, YOUTH &
FAMILY CONSORTIUM



Early Childhood Caucus