Welcome!

Early Head Start-
Child Care Partnerships:
MAKING THE MOST OF IT!
The BUILD Initiative supports state leaders to develop a comprehensive, equitable system (infrastructure, programs, policies and services) that meets the needs of young children and their families.

This systems-building approach effectively prepares our youngest children for a successful future, while carefully using private and public resources.
A System of Systems: the four ovals

- Health, Mental Health, & Nutrition
- Early Learning
- Special Needs & Early Intervention
- Family Support

Cross Cutting Issues

Early Learning Systems

- Governance
- Linkages K-12 Plus
- Regulations
- Finance
- Workforce Development
- Public Will
- Accountability, Standards, Assessment, Data
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Goals of Webinar and Important Caveats

Goals

- Highlight “big picture” aspects of the FOA
- Walk through specific aspects of the FOA and share lessons learned from earlier rounds of competition where applicable
- Discuss state perspective, the various roles states can play in the application process, and actionable steps for each role
- Explain the state TA document developed for the competition
- Respond to questions submitted with webinar registration

Caveats

- Presentation is based on my reading of the FOA and past experiences with Head Start competition
- Should not substitute for reading the FOA thoroughly yourself
- FOA page numbers are referenced so you can read and decide if you have a similar interpretation of the instructions
Big Picture: Available Funding

FOA references two different amounts: $500 and $650 million

- $500 million available in this fiscal year
- $650 million may be available next fiscal year; $150 million in new grants would be funded if money was available
- Applications from this competition could be approved but not funded; could be funded next year with the $150 million (p. 42)

FOA provides guidance on amount of base funding available for each state (p. 55)

- Ranges from $907,920 (AK, DC, ND, VT, WY) to $53,593,746 (CA)
- Can add 2.5% to the state amount for TA (p. 55)
- Startup funding available, though not guaranteed (“…negotiated at the time of award and based on reasonableness, necessity, and the availability of funds” p. 11)
- “ACF retains administrative flexibility to reallocate between states as appropriate…” (p. 42)
Big Picture: Grant Size

Award “floor” is $750,000 and award “ceiling” is $54,933,590

- Proposals should be within these two numbers and not significantly out-of-line with state allocation guidance
- Going above the award ceiling (the $54 million figure) means automatic disqualification
- If a state or program within a state requests the full amount, others should still apply; OHS can award multiple winners and fund for less than the amount requested and there is next year’s funding to consider
- Although no minimum set, ACF recommends no fewer than 72 slots across child care centers/homes (only guidance)
  • May be fewer for organizations in rural areas or those with existing infrastructure to support necessary services (p.5)
# Big Picture: Three Application Approaches*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Approach</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Head Start–Child Care Partnership</td>
<td>100% of services delivered through partnership; Minimum 25% children w/subsidy</td>
<td>10 bonus “priority points” in the application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Head Start Expansion/Partnership Mix</td>
<td>Services delivered directly and through partnership model 25% children in partnership w/subsidy</td>
<td>No additional points but given funding priority if &gt;50% of slots are through partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Partnership Early Head Start Expansion</td>
<td>Traditional EHS model</td>
<td>Must justify no partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Applicant can submit only one application per service area regardless of application approach (p. 2) .
Weighting of EHS–CC Partnership FOA Sections

- **Community Need**: 25 points
  - High-poverty zip (5 points)
- **Project Design**: 30 points
- **Organizational Structure**: 10 points
- **Staffing**: 10 points
- **Budget**: 15 points
- **Partnership Priority**: 10 points
- **Bonus Points**: 6 points
  - Promise zone (3 points)
  - >40% CC subsidies (3 points)
Comparison of EHS–CC FOA to Traditional EHS FOA
(Percentage of Total Application Points)
Page Count Limits Traditional EHS FOA vs. EHS–CC FOA

**TOTAL: 266 PAGES**

- ABSTRACT (1 PAGE)
- COMMUNITY NEED
- PROJECT DESIGN
- ORG STRUCTURE
- STAFFING
- PAST PERFORMANCE
- BUDGET

**100 PAGES**

**15 PAGES**

**50 PAGES**

**FINANCIAL REVIEW NARRATIVE**

**TOTAL: 75 PAGES**

- ABSTRACT (1 PAGE)
- COMMUNITY NEED
- PROJECT DESIGN
- ORG STRUCTURE
- STAFFING
- BUDGET
- PARTNERSHIP
- PRIORITY
- BONUS POINTS
- APPENDICES

**Following Formatting Requirements!**

- Double-spaced in Times New Roman, 12-point font
- Footnotes are Times New Roman, 10-point font
- Exemptions from double spacing: one-page project summary/abstract, resumes, logic models, forms, footnotes, tables, the line-item budget and/or the budget justification
Due Date for Proposals

AUG. 20

Proposal Award

WAITING FOR NOTIFICATION

“SOON AFTER... AWARD”

Service Provision Begins

Ratios, Health, & Safety Requirements Met

Immediately

Full Implementation of HS Program Performance Standards

18 MONTHS

FOA implies that “soon” depends upon “strengths and resources the child care and family child care partners bring to the partnership as well as the contributions of other community organizations”
Review of Grant Criteria

– Pages 24 to 27 of the FOA outline the requirements of the approach section

– Pages 38 to 41 outline the criteria by which applications will be “reviewed and evaluated”

– The sections are almost identical but not exactly

– Slides that follow combine the non-overlapping requirements and criteria from the two sections
1. Community Need and Objectives (pp. 24-25/38–39)

The high-need geographic area chosen has all of the elements necessary for successful partnerships or expansion.

Key pieces to address:

• Clearly describe precise location where need is greatest; where partnership will have greatest impact; describe type of need using state/community needs assessments
• Estimated # of EHS-eligible children/children receiving subsidies by location
• If straight expansion, why not a partnership? Justify.
• Serving high-poverty zip codes listed in appendix?
• Quality of child care providers and anticipated level of effort for them to meet the EHS Program Performance Standards
• No supplantation; improves services for currently enrolled children, new slots, or both?
• For partnerships, ensure at least 25% subsidized children (40%+ receives bonus)
• Justify program option (center/family child care); weeks, days, hours of operation
• Enrollment plan with dates to begin delivering services (“soon”) and for full enrollment
• Recruitment and selection plan to ensure neediest children receive services; 10% children with disabilities
2. Project Design and Approach (p. 39)

The project employs the right partners and the field’s best practices to meet the needs of infants and toddlers within a birth-to-school-entry continuum.

Key pieces to address:

- Plan for comprehensive services, including early intervention
- Describe involvement of service providers to prevent duplication
- Correct ratios and group sizes (EHS or state if more strict)
- Plan to use curriculum and quality teaching practices that promote progress toward infant and toddler school readiness goals
- Describe system of screening and referral
- Formal linkages with HV, HS, and Pre-K to develop a birth-to-school-entry continuum
- Formal linkages with part C so children with disabilities receive appropriate services
- Plan for family engagement/parent involvement
- Have partner sites been selected? If no, what is the plan for recruiting partners to begin services “soon” after award?
3. Organizational Infrastructure and Management Systems (pp. 26/39–40)

The applicant has the capacity to implement and oversee the partnerships and comply with Federal/State/local laws and regs

Key pieces to address:

• Organization/staffing structure supports provision of all comprehensive services
  ▪ Clearly defined roles/responsibilities of grantee and child care partners?

• Governing board/senior management can provide effective oversight of operations and accountability, including Policy Council; represent diversity of community; and conduct community assessment, ongoing monitoring, and self-assessment

• Describe composition and expertise of governing board that is in compliance with Head Start Act
  ▪ Family involvement in governance through Policy Council

• Evidence applicant can administer program in high-quality way, including across sites if applicable (i.e., past performance providing high-quality services for infants/toddlers)

• Demonstrate strong fiscal controls and cost-effective fiscal management across sites, including partners
**EHS–CC Partner Roles and Responsibilities (p. 8)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Level</th>
<th>Grantee Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>– Ensuring adult–child ratios and group sizes meet Early Head Start standards <em>or</em> state, territory, or tribal requirements (whichever requirements are most stringent)</td>
<td>– Ensuring the provision of all comprehensive services, including health, mental health, oral health, nutrition, education, and parent engagement services for all enrolled EHS–CC Partnership children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Implementing an evidence-based curriculum that is developmentally appropriate for infants and toddlers</td>
<td>– Ensuring that all administrative and financial management requirements are met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Conducting ongoing assessment of children to individualize the instruction and learning for each child</td>
<td>– Ensuring all EHS–CC Partnership teachers meet minimum staff qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Providing health and nutrition services, including all developmental, sensory, and behavioral screening and assistance with provision of follow up services</td>
<td>– Providing professional development, coaching, and supervision for all teachers with emphasis on continuity of care and relational learning that supports children and their families and fosters school readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Engaging parents in the full range of child development and family support services</td>
<td>– Employing at least one full-time family worker per every 40 enrolled children and families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Ensuring a minimum of two annual home visits for each enrolled child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Supporting the inclusion and delivery of services to children with disabilities (at least 10 percent of funded enrollment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Ensuring the physical environment and facilities meet all Head Start Program Performance Standards, including requirements for square footage, health and safety, appropriate crib and sleep spacing and arrangements, and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Ensuring compliance with all applicable regulations, including state and/or local child care licensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Ensuring children retain services regardless of their subsidy status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Engaging parents in program decision making through involvement on the Policy Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Must be articulated through a contract of formal agreement.
The exact role for each partner will vary at the local level, depending on existing and proposed services…
4. Staffing (pp. 26–27/40)

“The proposed staff will be able to form strong relationships with children and families and will be able to implement each evidence-based program component.”

Key pieces to address:

- Teaching staff will comply with EHS regulations within 18 months
- Applicant can recruit and train a sufficient number of staff to support program design
- Applicant will use a variety of professional development approaches to address specific staff needs
- Plan addresses all providers, including family child care if applicable
- Family service worker caseloads are reasonable based on planned enrollment
7. Budget and Budget Justification (pp. 29/40–41)

“The costs of the project are appropriate and reasonable in relation to the project narrative, and my organization can ensure the efficient and most effective use of Federal funds.”

Key pieces to address:

- Budget aligns with model, and is reasonable and cost-effective
- All staff positions are included in budget to cover comprehensive services and to meet ratios and group size
- Cost of diapers and formula included in budget?
- Children will continue to be served if subsidy is lost
- Significant portion of funding will be directed to child care partner
- Applicant will use a combination of federal, state, local, and private sector funding (not applicable for pure expansion)
- How will applicant meet 20% non-federal share requirement?
- Justify start up costs—are they necessary?
More About the Budget

• Attend Shelby Holman’s webinar tomorrow

• Understand that there are three funding categories:
  – Start-up
  – Base
  – Technical Assistance

• Make sure you correctly calculate the non-federal match requirement
  – It is 20% of the entire program budget and not just the federal portion of the grant
  – If you are requesting $800,000 in federal funding, the total project budget would be $1,000,000 with a $200,000 non-federal match ($200,000 is 20% of the $1,000,000 budget)
# Priority Conditions

*Across the FOA, there are statements about funding priority—some come with points and some do not.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Condition</th>
<th>Bonus Points</th>
<th>Funding Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHS–CC Partnerships</td>
<td>100% of services provided through EHS–CC Partnership <em>(10 POINTS)</em></td>
<td>≥ 50% slots funded through EHS–CC Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Poverty Areas</td>
<td>Services in a high-poverty zip code <em>(5 POINTS)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise Zone</td>
<td>Serve substantial # of children residing in federally designated Promise Zone *(not Promise Neighborhood; includes Philadelphia, San Antonio, Los Angeles, Kentucky Highlands, &amp; Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma) <em>(3 POINTS)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Subsidy</td>
<td>≥40% EHS-eligible children have child care subsidies <em>(3 POINTS)</em></td>
<td>≥25% EHS-eligible children have child care subsidies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum of Care &amp; Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Create a seamless continuum of care and education for children from birth to age 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Broad-Scale Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td>Show impact of broad-scale impact <em>(SEE NEXT SLIDE)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Results of the competitive objective review are taken into consideration by ACF in the selection of projects for funding; however, objective review scores and rankings are not binding. Scores and rankings are only one element used in the award decision-making process." (p. 41)
Other Priority Conditions (continued)

• FOA prioritizes applicants that can show evidence of broad-scale impact through:
  – changes in state policies, including licensing that supports higher quality infant and toddler care or reduces the likelihood of families losing subsidies when family conditions change by partnering with businesses, foundations, or non-profits to leverage funds; or
  – by partnering with higher education to produce a highly qualified infant and toddler workforce community-wide or statewide.

“Results of the competitive objective review are taken into consideration by ACF in the selection of projects for funding; however, objective review scores and rankings are not binding. Scores and rankings are only one element used in the award decision-making process.” (p. 41)
Opportunities for States to Support EHS–CC Partnerships
(not requirements of the FOA, just some ideas…)
Potential State Roles

As the applicant

– State is the grantee and acts as fiscal sponsor for the grant
– Selects geographic location for slots, partners, and is in charge of all program model components like curriculum, assessment, and services to meet Head Start Program Performance Standards as they apply to EHS

As a supportive partner

– State helps local applicants make their proposals stronger by bringing state resources to bear to support the application

As an interested observer

– Interested in the opportunity but would face staff mutiny if the state took on anything else in any capacity
– Focus on current obligations and effectively implementing changes that are in the works
– Supportive of eventual winner
The Big Things States Can Do to Be Supportive Partners

Help applicants identify the highest need areas and to articulate the specific characteristic of that need

- Make applicants aware of all sources of demographic data and needs assessments
- Share access to and relationships with important data partners including higher-education, think tanks and foundations

Help applicants understand the quality of providers through TQRIS data

- How do the elements used to assign a score in the state’s quality rating system align with the stated responsibilities of the child care partners in the FOA
  - Adult-child ratios; teaching credentials; curriculum implementation; assessment family engagement; other services
  - What can applicants use from these ratings to make the case that the providers will be able to implement the EHS standards in 18 months;
  - Data can also be used as a justification for start-up and the timing of service provision
The Big Things States Can Do to Be Supportive Partners

**Help applicants understand where the children receiving subsidies are**
- Providers serving high numbers of children receiving subsidies will help applicant in meeting the 25% and 40% thresholds

**Help applicants understand the state’s workforce, professional development, and quality improvement systems and ways to leverage those resources**
- Will help applicants make the case that they are leveraging resources to create the greatest impact

**Help applicants understand the availability and flow of other nutrition, health, mental health, home visiting, etc. services in the state**
- Will help applicants make the case that they are leverage resources to create the greatest impact

**Help applicants build the birth-through-five continuum**
- Information about state prekindergarten can help applicants make their case about transitions and creating a birth-to-five continuum
# Description of Technical Assistance Document

## Table 2: EHS–CC Partnerships Criteria and State Opportunities for Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EHS–CC FOA CRITERIA</th>
<th>APPLICANT MUST...</th>
<th>STATES CAN...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Geographic Location</td>
<td>☐ Describe precise geographic location and boundaries of service area&lt;br&gt;☐ Define area(s) of greatest need using data from state, county, or community assessment&lt;br&gt;☐ Estimate number of EHS-eligible infants and toddlers in service area&lt;br&gt;☐ Estimate number of infants and toddlers receiving child care subsidies in service area&lt;br&gt;☐ If proposing Non-Partnership Expansion, must justify why EHS–CC Partnership is not an option for proposed service area</td>
<td>☐ Provide access to or share information about state data resources regarding child and family demographic indicators at the community level&lt;br&gt;☐ Provide any relevant data from the state longitudinal data system&lt;br&gt;☐ Provide data regarding special populations (e.g., children with disabilities, dual language learners, homeless infants, toddlers, and pregnant women, children in foster care, etc.)&lt;br&gt;☐ Assist applicants in identifying child care partners who receive subsidy, who participate in the state QRIS and have the potential to implement EHS standards using QRIS scores&lt;br&gt;☐ Facilitate relationships between local applicants and state-level data partners (Universities, think-tanks, Annie E. Casey KIDS COUNT grantees, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some Final Thoughts

Don’t forget about the big themes while you are in the weeds
- Community impact and leveraging of resources
- Birth to five continuum
- Improving the quality of child care to have an impact beyond just the children receiving EHS services

Define the undefined
- Words like “soon” related to implementation and “substantial” related to provider payments need to be defined by you and justified

Outcomes are a product of quality, intensity, and fidelity

Avoid automatic disqualification factors

Narrative and budget teams should work side by side
Educators blast DPS for $4M loss in Head Start funding

Detroit Public Schools spokeswoman Michelle Zdrodowski blamed a technical glitch for the missed deadline. She said the application was due by May 2, 2013, but district employees “encountered technical difficulties with uploading the information.” The district appealed the decision but still wasn’t able to get funding, she said.

— Detroit Free Press, June 11, 2014
Questions and Answers
Questions Submitted with Registration to the Webinar

Q: I need to understand the class size requirements. EHS is capped at 8 per classroom but does that include child care kids as well? If child care regs and state ratios say you can have more in the classroom, can you have more than 8?

A: No. The goal of the Partnerships is for the providers to meet Head Start Program Performance Standards for children birth-to-three. These are ratios of 1 to 4 and class sizes of no more than 8. You cannot have more children in a classroom.

Q: How do you enroll both EHS and CC children? Do you prioritize EHS eligible children? For existing child care centers, does that mean that you have to un-enroll fee-based children who are already enrolled?

A: Only EHS eligible children can be funded with the Federal money that will be granted by this FOA. Ideally, you would identify EHS-eligible children at the center and apply to provide them services. In addition, Head Start regulations permit up to 10 percent of enrolled children to be from families that do not meet these criteria.
Questions Submitted with Registration to Webinar

Q: How will full-day/full-year be defined?
A: Full day is at least 6 hours and full year is at least 48 weeks per year.

Q. Are pregnant women included as part of the "caseload" in funded slots?
A: I don’t know and this is a great question to submit ACF. The FOA does not explicitly prohibit services to pregnant women but they are rarely mentioned. It would be important to submit a question to ACF for clarification.

Q: Do we know what the cut-off point for funding will be since some of our programs cannot have 100% child care Partnerships, are not in the zip codes nor are Promise Zones.
A. No, but not being able to draw down all of the priority points should not stop you from applying. ACF claims flexibility in who they fund a number of times throughout the FOA. You want to address as many of the priority areas as you can.

Q: Can Child Care and Development Funds be used as part of the non-federal match?
A: Unequivocally no.
Questions Submitted with Registration to Webinar

Q: The FOA states that it is not expected that the provision to serve children from families between 100 and 135 percent of poverty would apply to this FOA? Does this mean we will not be able to have 35 percent of our enrollment consist of incomes between 100 and 130 percent of poverty? Isn’t this expansion about serving working families?

A: According to the FOA, children below poverty should be served. The FOA discusses serving the neediest children and justifies this point by stating dramatic unserved need for EHS services for children below poverty and the fact that 60% of infants and toddlers receiving subsidies are also eligible for EHS (p. 10). Ten percent of the children serve can be above the poverty threshold.

Q: My agency does not have EHS. Is this an opportunity to do EHS as well as the EHS—CC partnerships?

A: Yes, the FOA is clear on page 1 that “new entities or existing entities can apply” and that there is an option for a mixed model of EHS and partnerships.
Website for more information and to formally submit to ACF

http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/grants/ehs-ccp

My contact information:

JeffreyC@PolicyEquity.com
www.PolicyEquity.com
Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships: MAKING THE MOST OF IT!

Let us know!

Susan Hibbard
shibbard@buildinitiative.org
www.buildinitiative.org

How are you using this opportunity to advance your systems work?