

California Department of Education

**Report to the Governor, Legislature, Department of Finance, and
Legislative Analyst's Office:
Child Development Staff Retention Program**



Prepared by:

**Child Development Division
Instruction and Learning Support Branch**

June 2012

Description: Legislative report on Child Development Staff Retention

Authority: California *Education Code* Section 8279.7(f)

Recipient: The Governor, Legislature, Department of Finance, and Legislative Analyst's Office

Due Date: April 10, 2012

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, Department of Finance, and Legislative Analyst's Office: Child Development Staff Retention Program

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....1

Report.....2

Attachment A: County Allocations.....5

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, Department of Finance, and Legislative Analyst's Office: Child Development Staff Retention Program

Executive Summary

This report is required by 2011 Budget Act Item 6110-194-0001, Provision 5, Schedule (1.5)(l) and California *Education Code* 8279.7(f). This report updates the Child Development Staff Retention Program legislative report submitted in 2010.

The enclosed report includes, but is not limited to, a summary of the distribution of funds for the California Department of Education (CDE) Child Development Staff Retention Program by county and a description of the use of the funds.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Linda M. Parfitt, Child Development Consultant, Child Development Division, by phone at 916-323-2133 or by e-mail at lparfitt@cde.ca.gov.

You can find this report on the CDE Local Child Care and Development Planning Council Local Planning Council Legislative Reports Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/documents/lrlpcreport2011.pdf>. If you need a copy of this report, please contact Ms. Parfitt by phone at 916-323-2133 or by e-mail at lparfitt@cde.ca.gov.

Report to the Governor, Legislature, Department of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst's Office:

Child Development Staff Retention

The Legislature has made available \$10,750,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2011–12 for child development staff retention activities conducted by the 55 Local Child Care and Development Planning Councils (LPCs) located throughout California. This is a \$4,250,000 reduction from \$15,000,000 provided in previous budget years (FY 2000–09). The purpose of this program is to improve the retention of qualified child development employees that work directly with children in state-subsidized, Title 5 child development programs. This funding is allocated to LPCs based on the percentage of state-subsidized, center-based child care funds in the county. Alpine, Mariposa, and Sierra counties do not have any state-subsidized, center-based programs located in their area, and therefore do not qualify to receive funding for the purposes of this legislation. The remaining 55 counties received a reduced funding allocation based on the previous FY amount.

In accordance with California *Education Code* Section 8279.7(f), Attachment A presents a listing of funds by county that were distributed in FY 2011–12. All participating counties have chosen to use this funding to provide stipends to eligible child development staff and to allow staff to pursue additional education, thereby increasing their likelihood of remaining in the field. In accordance with the legislation and the approved guidelines, funds have also been spent on planning and administrative costs associated with the implementation of the approved local plans.

During FY 2011–12, the following Title 5 staff received stipends from Assembly Bill 212 (AB 212) programs:

- 2,772 Assistant and Associate Teachers
- 1,165 Teachers/Master Teachers
- 887 Site Supervisors
- 205 Directors

As of July 1, 2011, a total of 5,029 Title 5 staff have participated in AB 212 activities. More assistant and associate teachers and teachers participated in the program during FY 2010–11 than the previous year. Many counties chose to target the limited resources toward the lowest-paid staff that work directly with children. They also wanted more teachers to stay in the program and earn higher-level Child Development Permits and educational degrees.

The average range of stipends per employee was between \$1,500 and \$1,000, which helped to pay for books and tuition. Each participant took a minimum of 3 college unit classes this year and many took 6 to 12 college units. The program recognizes individual child development providers for various levels of career ladder attainment and continuous work experience in a Title 5 licensed program. There has been an increased focus on improving the way Early Childhood Educators (ECE) teach and their daily effectiveness with children and families has improved.

Lessons learned from both the CARES (Comprehensive Approaches to Raising Educational Standards) and AB 212 programs highlight the core elements necessary for a successful ECE workforce development program:

- Stipends are necessary incentives to encourage ECE participants to increase their education and professional development.
- Career advisors help participants navigate the educational and financial maze of obtaining an educational degree.
- Support for participant cohorts that include tutoring in math and science along with English translation increases the successful outcome of many ECE students, since many come from immigrant families.
- The development of individualized professional development and education plans helps participants build a portfolio of achievements to add to their resumes.
- The importance of linking multiple quality training activities together on a regional basis (e.g., the California Preschool Instructional Network or the Program for Infant/Toddler Care) gives participants additional opportunities to share best practice ideas and activities on a regular basis.
- Research-based practice to develop a competencies-based career ladder, research alignment with the ECE college course curriculum, and ongoing coaching and mentoring of both teachers and directors are essential to improve the long-range positive career outcomes of the participants.
- Program participants are more than twice as likely as non-participants to remain in the same child care center over a two-year period.

However, compensation is still an issue that has not been adequately addressed, especially since the overall budget reductions since FY 2008–09 have taken a significant toll on child development programs in California. The U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) has released a new report, *HHS and Education Are Taking Steps to Improve Workforce Data and Enhance Worker Quality* (GAO-12-248, February 15, 2012). Based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2009 American Community Survey, the report finds that the average annual incomes were \$11,500 for a child care teacher and \$18,000 for a preschool teacher. 77 percent of full-time and part-time ECE

workers and 61 percent of full-time workers earned less than \$22,000 per year, slightly below the federal poverty level for a family of four.

AB 212 programs make a difference in both classroom quality and child outcomes by providing (1) increased staff compensation and benefits; (2) tutoring and mentorship support; (3) school financial aid assistance; (4) career counseling; (5) professional staff development; and (6) access to higher education for the staff that work directly with young children every day. Increased teacher retention rates also save Title 5 agencies' money because they have lower staff recruitment and training costs. Children and families benefit in terms of continuity of care and building trusting relationships with nurturing adults who help build a child's foundation of lifelong learning through positive teaching experiences.

Child Development Staff Retention Program (AB 212)
FY 2011–12 Attachment A

	COUNTY	2011-12 Allocation
01	ALAMEDA	\$699,391.00
03	AMADOR	\$9,091.00
04	BUTTE	\$45,373.00
05	CALAVERAS	\$9,091.00
06	COLUSA	\$12,259.00
07	CONTRA COSTA	\$305,045.00
08	DEL NORTE	\$10,232.00
09	EL DORADO	\$46,394.00
10	FRESNO	\$390,255.00
11	GLENN	\$9,175.00
12	HUMBOLDT	\$46,106.00
13	IMPERIAL	\$109,755.00
14	INYO	\$10,202.00
14	INYO	\$9,091.00
15	KERN	\$341,595.00
16	KINGS	\$31,859.00
17	LAKE	\$26,476.00
18	LASSEN	\$9,091.00
19	LOS ANGELES	\$3,078,883.00
20	MADERA	\$23,417.00
21	MARIN	\$64,654.00
23	MENDOCINO	\$36,281.00
24	MERCED	\$74,618.00
25	MODOC	\$9,602.00
27	MONTEREY	\$202,800.00
28	NAPA	\$40,481.00
29	NEVADA	\$20,630.00
30	ORANGE	\$443,943.00
31	PLACER	\$27,325.00
32	PLUMAS	\$9,091.00
33	RIVERSIDE	\$390,815.00
34	SACRAMENTO	\$382,215.00
35	SAN BENITO	\$16,105.00
36	SAN BERNARDINO	\$497,857.00
37	SAN DIEGO	\$685,333.00
38	SAN FRANCISCO	\$585,606.00
39	SAN JOAQUIN	\$213,233.00
40	SAN LUIS OBISPO	\$48,972.00
41	SAN MATEO	\$226,099.00
42	SANTA BARBARA	\$119,532.00
43	SANTA CLARA	\$416,245.00
44	SANTA CRUZ	\$88,700.00
45	SHASTA	\$52,465.00
47	SISKIYOU	\$15,244.00
48	SOLANO	\$77,622.00
49	SONOMA	\$79,341.00
50	STANISLAUS	\$172,364.00
51	SUTTER	\$30,847.00
52	TEHAMA	\$11,875.00
53	TRINITY	\$9,091.00
54	TULARE	\$224,736.00
55	TUOLUMNE	\$9,091.00
56	VENTURA	\$147,516.00
57	YOLO	\$64,585.00
58	YUBA	\$32,305.00

\$10,750,000.00