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## Universal PreKindergarten in California

Decades of research demonstrate that an early and strong foundation for learning matters. Children who have effective learning opportunities before Kindergarten (K) have an advantage in school and in life over children who do not, especially children with adverse childhood experiences. Children who attend quality preschool programs are more prepared for school in terms of their early literacy, language, and math skills, their executive function, and social-emotional development. In some cases, preschool participants are less likely to be identified for special education services or to be held back in elementary school than children who do not attend developmentally-informed preschool programs that include strong educational components.

California is poised to realize Universal PreKindergarten (UPK) for all four-year-old children, and to expand services for three-year-old children through bold leadership and the unprecedented investments in the Budget Act of 2021, including Universal Transitional Kindergarten (UTK) and expansion of the California State Preschool Program (CSPP).

The tumult of the COVID-19 pandemic accelerated a call to action to ensure a strong educational foundation for all children, emphasizing the critical role of our education system in supporting children and families’ needs and how local flexibility fuels community capacity to meet their needs. California’s leaders responded with historic investments in family support, child development and care, and education. Yet, as the 2020 Master Plan for Early Learning and Care highlights, realizing the promise of early childhood investments will require all partners—across early learning and care, early education, elementary education, and expanded learning and extended care communities—to work together to create a stronger system designed to meet the needs of the whole child and their families.

## The California Universal PreKindergarten Planning and Implementation Grant Program – Overview of County Offices of Education Support Function

The 2022–23 State Budget package allocated additional funding for the UPK Planning and Implementation Grant Program as a state early learning initiative with the goal of expanding access to PreKindergarten (Pre-K) programs at local educational agencies (LEAs). More information about this program is further outlined in the UPK Planning and Implementation Grant Program – LEA Planning Template (LEA Planning Template), which can be found on the California Department of Education’s (CDE’s) website at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/em/>.

Under the provisions of California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 8281.5(d), grant funds are allocated to school districts and charter schools with K enrollment in specific years, according to a specified formula. In addition, funds are allocated to county offices of education (COEs) to support countywide planning and capacity building around UPK.

Grant funds may be used for costs associated with creating or expanding CSPP or Transitional Kindergarten (TK) programs, or to establish or strengthen partnerships with other providers of prekindergarten education within the LEA, including Head Start programs, to ensure that high-quality options for Pre-K education are available for children four years of age. Allowable costs shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, classroom operating costs, planning costs, hiring and recruitment costs, staff training and professional development, classroom materials, and supplies.

As a condition of receiving grant funds, state law requires each LEA to provide data to the California Department of Education (CDE) through the UPK Program Report, ensure expenditures are consistent with their local plan and offer TK to all eligible pupils interested in TK within their attendance area by the 2025–26 school year. LEAs must commit to planning with their county’s local planning council (LPC), local tribes, CSPP, and Head Start program providers in their region.

The CDE encourages COEs to look beyond the first years of implementation and lay the foundation for the full implementation period while supporting LEAs with their UPK Program. **COEs will be required to submit the required data questions outlined in this template through the UPK Program Report.**

Under state law, if the LEA did not develop the 2021–22 UPK plan required pursuant to *EC* 8281.5(c)(3)(B), the LEA must develop a 2022–23 UPK plan for consideration by the governing board or body at a public meeting on or before **March 30, 2023**.The CDE released the UPK Planning and Implementation Grant Program - COE Countywide Planning and Capacity Building Template to: (1) offer planning and implementation questions for COE consideration for supporting LEAs to plan and implement UPK that meet community and family needs, and (2) outline the data that will be required for submission to the CDE through the UPK Program Report to meet the requirements of *EC* Section 8281.5.

The California County Superintendents developed The Universal Prekindergarten Planning Toolkit: A Resource for County Offices of Education in California as a resource guide that can be found on their web page at <https://ccsesa.org/?wpfb_dl=7924>. It offers approaches and examples of how COEs can assist LEAs with planning and implementation for both UPK as well as preschool through third grade (P-3) continuum alignment and capacity building. The toolkit is a companion document to align with focus areas outlined in the LEA Template. California County Superintendents also developed a UPK LEA Assessment Tool to support the ongoing planning and implementation process to expand access to Pre-K programs that can be found on their web page at <https://ccsesa.org/?wpfb_dl=7925>.

## Universal PreKindergarten County Office of Education Countywide Planning and Capacity Building Template

This template mirrors the format of the LEA Template and includes required questions. Collectively, these required questions form a set of core planning and implementation questions the CDE believes are critical for COEs to answer in order to effectively support the development of comprehensive, responsive, and community-centered UPK Programs locally.[[1]](#footnote-2)

* **Required questions:** All COEs will be required to answer the required data questions outlined in this template in the UPK Program Report that will be issued by the CDE. [[2]](#footnote-3)

The CDE will be collecting information on the answers to the COE required questions after March 30, 2023, in the UPK Program Report. This will allow the CDE to learn about how COEs are supporting LEAs as they move through the planning and implementation process.

The questions required for submission to the CDE should be answered based on how the COE supported LEAs as well as how the COE plans to continue to support implementation of UPK in the county through 2025–26.

The UPK COE Planning Template is organized as follows:

1. Self-Certification
2. Projected Enrollment and Needs Assessment
3. Focus Area Planning and Implementation
	1. Vision and Coherence
	2. Community Engagement and Partnerships
	3. Workforce Recruitment and Professional Learning
	4. Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
	5. LEA Facilities, Services, and Operations

Local partnerships are critical to successful UPK implementation both at the district and county levels. COEs should play a key role in facilitating the development and strengthening of partnerships with local service providers in support of local UPK implementation that meets children and families’ needs. Many funding opportunities available to support UPK implementation have been made available, and COEs are in a unique position to coordinate efforts across LEAs so that funding can achieve maximal impact. To that end, the CDE encourages COEs to include plans to hire personnel to focus on effective UPK implementation in their county including supporting communication and coordination with LEAs, extended learning and care programs and partners, other local service providers, institutions of higher education (IHEs), and other community partners involved in UPK planning, implementation, and grant management.

### Key Considerations

### Universal Transitional Kindergarten Implementation Timeline

As a condition of receipt of grant apportionment, school districts and charter schools must implement universally available TK for all four-year-old children by 2025–26 (*EC* Section 48000[c][1]). COEs should support LEAs to consider how this implementation timeline will impact elements of their UPK Program, including whether implementing UTK on a faster timeline through early admittance TK (ETK) (children who turn four between July 1 and September 1 of the school year will not qualify for ETK, but will qualify for TK in 2025– 26) will allow the LEA to reach economies of scale with regard to the number of classrooms and TK teachers needed. The table below illustrates the UTK implementation timeline, including eligibility and ratios.

#### Table: TK Eligibility, Ratio, and Class Size Requirements by Fiscal Year

| **Type of Requirement** | **2022–23**  | **2023–24**  | **2024–25**  | **2025–26** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Eligibility** | Turn five betweenSeptember 2 andFebruary 2; at district discretion, turn five between February 3 and the end of the school year\*\*\* | Turn five betweenSeptember 2 and April 2; at district discretion, turn five between April 3 and the end of the school year\*\*\* | Turn five betweenSeptember 2 and June 2; at district discretion, turn five between June 3 and the end of the school year\*\*\* | Turn four bySeptember 1 |
| **Ratios** | 1:12 | 1:10\*\* | 1:10\*\* | 1:10\*\* |
| **Class Size \*** | 24\* | 24\* | 24\* | 24\* |

\* Average class size across the school site.

\*\* Subject to future legislative appropriation.

\*\*\* Pursuant to *EC* Section 37200 the end of the school year is June 30th.

### Supporting a Preschool through Third Grade Continuum

The P-3 Alignment Initiative is rooted in research that suggests the gaps in children’s opportunities and learning outcomes demand system-level reform at the state, county, district, school, and community level. Through this work, the CDE hopes to disrupt inequities, address bias, and promote equitable opportunities for California’s early learners. UPK implementation presents a critical opportunity to strengthen P-3 alignment, as a means of sustaining and accelerating the improved child outcomes associated with high-quality, early learning experiences. Additional information about the CDE’s P-3 Alignment Initiative can be found at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/p3/>.

COEs should support LEAs implement UPK Programs that are aligned with the vision of a P-3 continuum. This includes supporting districts to engage leadership and staff from across different departments and divisions in the UPK planning and implementation effort. These could include district staff from the early education department (if there is one), curriculum and instruction, student programs, workforce, human resources, business services, special education, multilingual education, expanded learning and afterschool, and facilities. COEs should support LEAs to engage the families and extended learning and care providers in these planning and implementation efforts as well.

### Full-Day Extended Learning and Care

State law does not require LEAs to operate a TK program that offers full-day early learning to all children the year before K; however, LEAs must articulate how they are offering access to full-day, early learning programming to all students, and how they are partnering with other programs, such as those listed in the statute, to ensure every child has access to extended learning and care that, combined, equates to a full-day of programming that meets the community’s needs. COEs can play an important role in supporting LEAs to identify the needs of families and design a UPK implementation model that meets these needs.

Additionally, starting in the 2022–23 school year, LEAs receiving Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELO-P) funding must offer nine hours of combined instructional time and expanded learning opportunities per instructional day to at least all unduplicated children enrolled in TK and at least 30 intersession days; however, LEAs are not required to exclusively use ELO-P funding to meet the requirement. LEAs can instead partner with Head Start, CSPP, After School Education and Safety (ASES) program, or other community-based childcare programs to fund and provide the additional extended learning and care hours needed to reach nine hours. (*EC* Section 46120). This would allow the LEA to use ELO-P funds to provide additional service hours or services for additional children. COEs can assist LEAs in developing partnerships with extended learning and care partners to provide these services. Some strategies include making connections across district and extended learning program staff, facilitating input and engagement sessions, convening partner meetings, providing lists of contacts, and more.

### Creating Joint or Aligned Plans

*(LEAs that did not previously create a 2021–22 UPK plan)*

COEs are encouraged to support joint planning and implementation efforts in instances where a joint plan is most effective or feasible. LEAs are permitted to partner in creating a joint UPK Plan; however, each LEA must submit their UPK Plan individually through the UPK Program Report. Small and rural LEAs serving similar communities, especially those with low TK or K average daily attendance (ADA), are strongly encouraged to consider creating a joint UPK Plan which includes non-district learning programs serving four-year-old children. LEAs are also encouraged to consider partnering with other nearby LEAs to create a joint UPK Plan or with their COE to create a single, countywide plan. These joint plans should be developed in conjunction with CSPP, Head Start, other preschool programs, and early learning and care providers. COEs play a critical role in supporting these joint planning efforts among LEAs. COEs are also encouraged to collaborate with other COEs, as needed and applicable, in order to support capacity and effectiveness of the planning, implementation and support provided.

## Universal PreKindergarten Template

### Self-Certification

In the data collection survey submitted to the CDE, COEs must self-certify they are implementing a plan for how all children in the attendance area of the COE will have access to full-day learning programs the year before K that meet the needs of parents, including through partnerships with the LEA’s expanding learning offerings, ASES, CSPP, Head Start programs, and other community-based early learning and care programs.

For those COEs that did not previously create a plan by June 30, 2022, plans must be presented to the governing board for consideration by March 30, 2023.

1. Please complete the following table:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| COE Name | Contact Name and Title of the Individual Self-Certifying the Statement Above | Email | Phone |
| [Enter COE name here] | [Enter contact name and title here] | [Enter email here] | [Enter phone number here] |

1. Did the COE develop a joint plan with another COE?
	1. Yes
	2. No
2. If the COE answered Yes to Question 2, what other COEs are part of this joint plan? [open response]
3. Did the COE support any LEAs to develop joint plans?
	1. Yes [If yes, list LEAs; open response]
	2. No

### Projected Enrollment and Needs Assessment

#### Recommended Planning Questions

The CDE recommends COEs prioritize these questions as part of their UPK Plan in addition to required questions.

1. How has the COE supported LEAs to develop enrollment projections or conduct needs assessments?

#### Required Questions

The CDE will be collecting this information after the COE plan is presented to the governing board and after districts have presented their plans to their local governing boards.

1. What data sources has the COE used to support LEAs in the development of enrollment projections or needs assessments? [select all that apply]
	1. TK and K census day and cumulative enrollment counts from 2013 through 2019 as reported to the CDE (these may be acquired through the CDE TK Data web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filestkdata.asp>)
	2. Count of births in each ZIP Code in California as reported by the California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHS); estimated counts of births in each LEA from 2013 through 2019; and estimated count of births in each LEA three, four, five, and six years prior to 2013 through 2026 (these may be found on the CHHS Live Birth Profiles by ZIP code web page at <https://data.chhs.ca.gov/dataset/cdph_live-birth-by-zip-code>)
	3. Estimated population of three-, four-, five-, and six-year-old children for each county from 2013 through 2026 produced by the Department of Finance (DOF) (these may be found on the DOF Projections web page at <https://www.dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/projections/>)
	4. “P-2B County Population by Age” (XLSX), the DOF County Population Projections by Age projection (these can be found on the DOF Projections web page at <https://www.dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/projections/>)
	5. CHHS Live Birth Profiles by ZIP Code (these can be found at <https://data.chhs.ca.gov/dataset/cdph_live-birth-by-zip-code>)
	6. CDE TK and K enrollment by school and LEA (these can be found on the CDE TK Data web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filestkdata.asp>)
	7. Other local birth rate data
	8. Head Start Program Information Report
	9. California Department of Social Services (CDSS) Licensing data
	10. Quality Counts California (QCC) Common Data File
	11. Local First 5 needs assessments
	12. American Institute for Research Early Learning Needs Assessment Tool
	13. California Child Care Resource and Referral (R&R) Network data tools
	14. None of the above
	15. Other [open response]
	16. Not applicable
2. Has the COE partnered with local Head Start providers, CSPP, local childcare and development planning councils (LPCs), R&R agencies, or other early learning and care partners to leverage existing data to inform LEA needs assessments? [Select all the apply]
	1. Head Start providers
	2. CSPP providers
	3. LPCs
	4. R&R agencies
	5. Other early learning and care partners [open response]
	6. None of the above
3. Has the COE provided technical assistance to LEAs in any of the following areas related to projecting enrollment and assessing needs? [select all that apply]
	1. Support for parent surveys to gauge interest in service delivery models
	2. Data analysis capacity building to support staff to refine enrollment projections and project staffing needs based on community context
	3. Information on program eligibility requirements to project enrollment across programs
	4. Information on available resources and programs to support workforce pipeline development to staff UPK
	5. Projecting staffing needs
	6. Other [open response]

### Focus Area A: Vision and Coherence

#### Recommended Planning Questions

1. How has the COE differentiated UPK planning and implementation support for different LEAs given diverse community contexts? [open response]
2. In what ways has the COE supported LEAs to develop local visions for UPK, and to the extent practicable, P-3 alignment? [open response]
3. How has the COE supported LEAs to build connections with extended learning and care partners to create vision and coherence for UPK and P-3 systems? [open response]
4. How has the COE integrated any COE child development and early education staff, including LPC and R&R staff, as applicable, with other relevant staff in other COE departments to ensure effective communication and coordination (for example, Special Education, Curriculum and Instruction)? [open response]

#### Required Questions

1. What is the COE’s vision for UPK from a countywide perspective? [open response – character limit 1000]
2. What activities are you prioritizing as a county to achieve your vision? [choose up to three]
	1. Professional development
	2. LEA partnerships
	3. Community outreach
	4. Reorganization of staff positions
	5. Establishing new leadership positions
	6. Other suggestions needed
3. What priority areas has the COE focused on supporting for the greatest impact on LEA UPK planning and implementation? [open response – character limit 1000]
4. Who is the individual (at the COE) that is responsible for key functions pertaining to implementing UPK? [open response]
	1. First and last name:
	2. Title:
	3. Email:
	4. Phone Number:
5. How many districts and charters have accepted or participated in COE-administered UPK planning supports within the county to date? [number ranges, drop down]
	1. 1-2
	2. 3-4
	3. 5-6
	4. 7-8
	5. 9-10
	6. More than 10
	7. All districts in the county
6. What proportion of districts and charters is the COE supporting within the county? [percent ranges, drop down]
	1. Less than 10%
	2. 10-25%
	3. 26-50%
	4. 51-75%
	5. 76-99%
	6. 100%
7. Has the proportion of districts requesting support increased? [select one]
	1. Yes
	2. No
8. Has the COE supported districts to incorporate UPK into their Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs)?
	1. Yes
		1. If yes, what districts? [open response, list districts)]
	2. No
	3. Unsure
9. What organizational structures did the COE implement to ensure that COE child development and early education staff collaborate and coordinate effectively with staff in other departments within the COE? [choose up to three]
	1. Convening members of multiple departments at regular intervals
	2. Inviting diverse representation of departments within the COE when convening UPK partners
	3. Reorganizing staff or offices
	4. Establishing internal listservs, updates, or other communications channels
	5. Hosting shared learning events (for example, brown bag lunches)
	6. Developing intra-COE professional developments plans or structures
	7. None
	8. Other [open response]
10. Did the COE support LEAs in the county to either apply to operate a CSPP contract or apply to expand existing CSPP contracts? [select one]
	1. Yes - the COE supported LEAs in applying to expand existing CSPP contract(s) in 2022–23
	2. Yes - the COE supported LEAs in applying for new CSPP contract(s) in 2022–23
	3. Yes - the COE will support LEAs in applying to expand existing CSPP contracts in future years (if funding is appropriated by the legislature)
	4. Yes - the COE will support LEAs that plan to apply to administer a new CSPP contract in future years (if funding is appropriated by the legislature)
	5. No - The COE has no plans to support LEAs in beginning or expanding a CSPP contract in future years
	6. No - The LEAs in the county do not hold a CSPP contract nor plan to apply for a CSPP contract in the future
11. In which of the following Focus Area A: Vision and Coherence areas has the COE provided technical assistance to LEAs? [select the most supported topics, up to three]
	1. Adjusting classroom practices to support the district’s UPK model (for example, mixed-age classrooms)
	2. Creating inclusive classrooms, including implementing Universal Design for Learning
	3. Models for administrative structures that support effective UPK programs and facilitate connections with the ELO-P and non-LEA-administered early learning and care programs
	4. Support for developing and applying to administer a CSPP contract
	5. Developing templates or frameworks for drafting a P-3 vision that incorporates partners’ and parents’ voices
	6. Technical assistance on how to integrate UPK and P-3 in the district LCAP
	7. Guidance on best practices for smooth transitions through the P-3 continuum
	8. Considerations for TK early admittance
	9. Implementing internal organization changes to ensure LEA child development and early education staff collaborate and coordinate effectively with staff in other departments within the LEA (for example, Special Education, Curriculum and Instruction)
	10. Other [Open Response]

### Focus Area B: Community Engagement and Partnerships

#### Recommended Planning Questions

1. In what ways has the COE supported LEAs to understand and prioritize family needs and choices? [open response]
2. How has the COE partnered with and supported districts to offer full-day options? [open response]
3. How has the COE partnered with and supported districts to use UPK to expand preschool offerings and prevent the loss of preschool enrollment? [open response]
4. How has the COE partnered with and supported districts to prevent the loss of preschool facilities? [open response]
5. In what ways has the COE supported LEAs to engage with extended learning and care partners in the development of the LEA’s UPK Plan? [open response]
6. In what ways has the COE supported LEAs to partner with local R&Rs; LPCs; and existing early education, child care, and expanded learning providers within the LEA’s attendance boundary to support parents to access services across LEA-administered and non-LEA-administered programs for extended learning and care and other supports? [open response]

#### Required Questions

1. Has the COE collaborated with other COEs (for example, sharing resources, developing joint plans, administering joint technical assistance sessions) to provide UPK planning and implementation support to LEAs?
	1. Yes – [open response, describe]
	2. No
2. Which partners has the COE worked with or convened to support UPK implementation in their county? [select all that apply]
	1. Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs)
	2. LPCs
	3. R&R Agencies
	4. First 5 County Commission
	5. CSPP Providers
	6. Head Start Providers
	7. Community-based organizations (CBOs) providing early learning and care
	8. Parent engagement centers (for example, Parent Training and Information Center [PTIC], Community Parent Resource Center [CPRC], Family Empowerment Centers [FEC])
	9. District curriculum groups
	10. District early learning groups
	11. District business officials’ groups
	12. Other [open response]
	13. None of the above
3. What forums has the COE joined, administered, or convened to elevate and support UPK implementation within the county? [select all that apply]
	1. LPCs
	2. R&R Agency meetings or forums
	3. First 5 County Commission meetings
	4. Local QCC meetings
	5. County Child Welfare Agency meetings or forums
	6. County Board of Supervisors meetings
	7. Local Parent Teacher Association forums
	8. Other local forums [open response]
	9. Other regional or statewide forums [open response]
	10. None of the above
4. How has the COE worked with community-based extended learning and care providers to share information about UPK planning and implementation? [select the three most used strategies]
	1. Joined or convened meetings with community-based providers
	2. Provided information about TK expansion directly to providers
	3. Provided information to the R&Rs and LPCs to share with providers
	4. Provided information about changes in law and eligibility for early learning and care programs
	5. Provided information on how community-based providers could alter their service models to provide early learning and care opportunities for younger children or to provide extended learning and care after school
	6. Helped community-based providers identify which district they are located in
	7. Helped connect community providers to staff at their local school or district
	8. Other [open response]
	9. None of the above
5. In which of the following Focus Area B: Community Engagement and Partnerships areas has the COE provided technical assistance to LEAs? [select the most supported topics, up to three]
	1. Support for parent surveys and engagement activities to understand parent needs and support authentic choice.
	2. Support for community engagement activities including best practices for coordination with LPCs, Local QCC Consortia, First 5 County Commissions, Head Start Policy Councils, and other early learning and care leadership tables.
	3. Guidance on best practices for enrolling more children with disabilities in UPK classrooms and providing services in inclusive settings.
	4. Strategies for meeting the ELO-P requirements through different models of extended learning and care, including models of blending and layering funding to support the nine-hour day and ensuring developmentally-informed environments for young children.
	5. Strategies for increasing UPK enrollment and parent awareness of programs.
	6. Provided information and technical assistance on the intersection of TK and ELO-P.
	7. Provided information and technical assistance on the intersection of TK and other early learning and childcare care programs (both Title 5 and Title 22).
	8. Shared information about allowable blending, braiding and layering of programs, including examples.
	9. Provided information about various funding streams that are available to districts to support inclusion programs (for example, early intervention special education dollars).
	10. Other [Open Response]

### Focus Area C: Workforce Recruitment and Professional Learning

#### Recommended Planning Questions

1. How has the COE supported LEAs to recruit the educators needed to implement its UPK Plan (including CSPP teachers, assistant teachers, TK teachers, and TK teachers’ instructional aides and assistants)? [open response]
2. How has the COE supported LEAs to facilitate the development of district early education leadership teams (across grade levels and departments) and site-based horizontal and vertical articulation (P-3) teams to support successful student transitions, share strategies, and collaboratively monitor student progress?

#### Required Questions

1. How has the COE supported LEAs to develop strategies to provide professional learning for educators across the LEA’s P-3 continuum? [select all that apply]
	1. Provided professional learning for lead teachers, assistant teachers, administrators, coaches, and other staff
	2. Provided professional learning for TK staff, kindergarten through third grade staff, on site preschool staff, and off-site preschool staff
	3. Other [open response]
2. How has the COE supported LEAs to provide professional learning on P-3 for site and district leadership?
	1. Professional learning opportunities for district level administrators
	2. Professional learning opportunities for site level administrators
	3. Other [open response]
3. How has the COE supported districts in creating a pipeline of ethnically, culturally, and racially diverse, multilingual TK and early education teachers? [select top three priority strategies]
	1. Created pipeline programs to elevate the qualifications of existing early education staff, including targeted recruitment of racially and culturally diverse individuals
	2. Created a plan to ensure wages increase as qualifications increase
	3. Encouraged workforce programs to offer culturally competent mentoring and coaching
	4. Provided learning cohorts organized by primary language
	5. Encouraged preparation programs to offer coursework during non-traditional hours, for example, after 6 p.m.
	6. Offered coursework online or coursework that can be completed on candidates’ own time
	7. Offered or collaborated to offer paid internship and apprenticeship programs
	8. Worked with schools to set targets for hiring a diverse workforce
	9. Worked with local public IHEs to establish or implement culturally and linguistically responsive preparation programs
	10. Worked with private IHEs to establish or implement culturally and linguistically responsive preparation programs
	11. Other [open response]
4. Which of the following strategies does the COE use to support a pipeline of diverse and effective prospective TK teachers to earn a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential? [select top three priority strategies]
	1. Partnered with one or more local accredited institutions of higher education (IHEs) or other COEs to help support teachers holding less than a full credential to complete requirements to earn a Preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential
	2. Applied for a California Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program grant (<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/grant-funded-programs/Classified-Sch-Empl-Teacher-Cred-Prog>)
	3. Applied for a California Teacher Residency Grant Program (<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/grant-funded-programs/teacher-residency-grant-program>)
	4. Requested to join an existing intern preparation program to recruit and prepare teachers
	5. Requested to join an existing apprenticeship cohort program to recruit and prepare teachers
	6. Established a relationship with other LEAs to establish pathways for high school students interested in a career in CSPP or in P-3 teaching through Career Technical Education programs, dual enrollment programs, clubs, registered apprenticeships, or other such early recruitment opportunities
	7. Partnered with the California Center on Careers to contact registrants who might be interested in becoming teachers in the county
	8. Applied for workforce development funding and competitive grant opportunities from the CDE
	9. Provided a stipend for tuition and fees for coursework leading to a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential
	10. Collaborated with IHEs to offer unit-bearing coursework at a local LEA site during times that work for teachers and other interested staff members [list IHEs; open response]
	11. Partnered with an IHE to provide other services to candidates seeking to earn a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential
	12. Partnered with another COE to provide other services to candidates seeking to earn a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential
	13. Lead a coalition application for statewide grants (for example, partner with districts to apply for statewide grants)
	14. Created a countywide matrix of workforce programs to share with LEAs and prospective educators
	15. Other [describe, open response]
	16. None of the above
5. Which of the following strategies did the COE employ to support diverse and effective prospective TK teachers, including multilingual educators, to meet the requirements under *EC* Section 48000(g)(4)? [select top three priority strategies]
	1. Partnered with a local IHE offering eligible early childhood education or childhood development coursework
	2. Partnered with an IHE or COE to operate cohort models for LEA teachers earning 24 units
	3. Provided information on scholarship and grant opportunities
	4. Applied for workforce development funding and grant opportunities
	5. Provided a stipend for tuition, fees, and other programmatic costs associated with obtaining credit-based coursework or a degree
	6. Provided a stipend for tuition, fees, and other programmatic costs associated with obtaining a Child Development Teacher Permit
	7. Offered advice to existing teachers on ECE requirements and how to meet the requirements
	8. Offered IHE coursework at a local LEA site during times that work for teachers
	9. Developed or work with an established mentorship program to support new TK teachers
	10. Led a coalition application for statewide grants (for example, partner with districts to apply for statewide grants)
	11. Created a countywide matrix of workforce programs to share with LEAs and prospective educators
	12. Other [describe, open response]
	13. None of the above; the LEA currently has enough Multiple Subject Teaching Credential holders who have at least 24 units in early childhood education, or childhood development, or both; professional experience in a classroom setting with preschool-age children that is comparable to the 24 units of education described in subparagraph (a); or a Child Development Teacher Permit issued by the CTC
6. Which of the following strategies did the LEA employ to support diverse and effective prospective CSPP or LEA-operated preschool teachers, including multilingual educators, to obtain a Child Development Teacher Permit? [select top three priority strategies]
	1. Partnered with an IHE (including both community colleges and four-year IHEs) offering eligible early childhood education or childhood development coursework
	2. Partnered with an IHE or COE to operate cohort models for educators working towards a Child Development Teacher Permit
	3. Provided information on scholarship and grant opportunities
	4. Received workforce development funding and grants
	5. Provided a stipend for tuition, fees, and other programmatic costs associated with obtaining credit-based coursework or an associate or baccalaureate degree
	6. Offered advising and transcript analysis to prospective CSPP teachers on requirements and support individual planning for how to meet the Child Development Teacher Permit requirements
	7. Offered unit-bearing coursework at a local district site during times that work for teachers
	8. Other [describe, open response]
	9. None of the above
7. In which of the following Focus Area C: Workforce Recruitment and Professional Learning areas has the COE provided technical assistance to LEAs? [select the areas most supported, up to three]
	1. Additional guidance on UPK workforce requirements (TK, CSPP, and other early learning and care providers)
	2. Created joint professional learning opportunities for preschool and elementary school teachers within LEAs or across LEA- and CBO-administered programs in the county
	3. Shared strategies to support the teacher pipeline (for example, strategies for recruiting multilingual educators, the impact of cohort models, ways to implement apprenticeships or residency programs, etc.)
	4. Created professional learning opportunities to provide school site leaders with more early childhood knowledge
	5. Built partnerships with IHEs or COEs to support professional learning opportunities and degree attainment
	6. Supported for communications to recruit prospective educators and shared grant and scholarship opportunities to support degree attainment
	7. Other [Open Response]

### Focus Area D: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

#### Recommended Planning Questions

1. How has the COE supported LEAs to review and assess curriculum for UPK classrooms that aligns with the *California Preschool Learning Foundations* and the *California Preschool Curriculum Frameworks*? [open response]
2. How has the COE supported LEAs to integrate and align classroom practices for UPK (TK and other preschool programs the LEA operates or has on site). [open response]
3. How has the COE supported LEAs to implement instructional practices to support children with disabilities in UPK (for example, implementing Universal Design for Learning, providing specialized services in the classroom with peer models, implementing social-emotional strategies such as the Pyramid Model)? [open response]
4. How has the COE supported LEAs to implement instructional practices to support language and overall development of multilingual learners? [open response]

#### Required Questions

1. If any LEAs in the county administer CSPP, did the COE support them with providing any of the following language model(s) for CSPP students? [select all that apply]
	1. Dual language program with a language allotment[[3]](#footnote-4) of 50/50 [open response for language offered]
	2. Dual language program where a non-English language is intentionally used 90 percent of the time, and English is used 10 percent of the time [open response for non-English language offered]
	3. Dual language program where a non-English language is intentionally used 80 percent of the time, and English is used 20 percent of the time [open response for non-English language offered]
	4. Dual language program where a non-English language is intentionally used 70 percent of the time, and English is used 30 percent of the time [open response for non-English language offered]
	5. Home language instructional program where all instruction is in a non-English language
	6. Home language instructional program where home language instruction is intentionally incorporated in another way [Open response - Please describe:]
	7. English-only instruction with home-language support
	8. None
	9. Other [describe, open response]
2. In which of the following Focus Area D: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment areas has the COE provided technical assistance to LEAs? [select the areas most supported, up to three]
	1. Guidance on how to adopt the *California Preschool Learning Foundations* and the *California Preschool Curriculum Frameworks* into a specific UPK setting (for example, mixed-age classrooms)
	2. Guidance on the selection, development, or integration of developmentally-informed curricula and aligning curricula across the early grades
	3. Guidance and best practices on how to monitor and support curriculum fidelity in UPK settings
	4. Guidance on how to support effective classroom organization practices and behavior management strategies to ensure a positive learning environment for a diverse population of UPK students
	5. Guidance on instructional practices to support children with disabilities in UPK (for example, implementing Universal Design for Learning, providing specialized job embedded services in the classroom with peer models, and implementing social-emotional strategies such as the Pyramid Model) and partnerships with early learning and care providers to support services for children with disabilities
	6. Specific instructional strategies to support specific skills including, but not limited to, children’s social-emotional development and home language development
	7. Guidance on appropriate assessment selection and utilization (for example, Desired Results Developmental Profile, Ages and Stages Questionnaire, Work Sampling System, BRIGANCE Early Childhood Screen, and so on)
	8. Guidance on creating dual language immersion or bilingual programs
	9. Other [open response]

### Focus Area E: LEA Facilities, Services, and Operations

#### Recommended Planning Questions

1. How has the COE supported LEAs to address facilities issues to support offering extended learning opportunities, including in intersession and summer?
2. How has the COE supported LEAs to address transportation issues resulting from UPK implementation? [open response]
3. How has the COE supported LEAs to ensure TK students have access to meals and adequate time to eat? [open response]

#### Required Questions

1. How many LEAs are having facility issues? [select one]
	1. None
	2. Some
	3. Half
	4. Almost all
	5. Unsure
2. In which of the following Focus Area E: LEA Facilities, Services, and Operations areas has the COE provided technical assistance to LEAs? [select the areas most supported, up to three]
	1. Guidance on how to modify an elementary school classroom to serve young children, including but not limited to proximity of bathrooms within or near classrooms and location of parking near drop-off locations
	2. Strategies to address transportation issues related to UPK access and enrollment
	3. Guidance to support strategies that ensure TK students have access to meals, and LEAs implement age-appropriate meal time practices, including adequate time to eat
	4. Making modifications to district data systems to support access to UPK assessment data and other relevant information across community and elementary school settings
	5. Best practices for preventing displacement of early learning education programs operated by non-LEA administrators on LEA campuses and transitioning programs to serve younger children (or to offer extended learning opportunities, including in intersession and summer)
	6. Utilizing outdoor learning environments
	7. Other [open response]

## Technical Assistance and Capacity Building Questions

The CDE is collecting information on the type(s) and topics of technical assistance that COEs may need to support LEAs to implement effective UPK programming.

**Required Questions**

1. How is the COE developing capacity to support UPK? [select all that apply]
	1. Hiring a dedicated staff person to focus on UPK or P-3
	2. Providing technical assistance or coaching on key issues such as braided and blended funding models, curriculum and instruction best practices
	3. Facilitating standing capacity building, peer learning, or collaboration meetings
	4. Integrating the LPC with UPK planning and implementation efforts
	5. Serving as a liaison between LEAs and early education community partners
	6. Holding forums for parents
	7. Partnering with other COEs to increase or share expertise
	8. Partnering with the local First 5 County Commission
	9. Joining UPK or P-3 webinars offered by the CDE
	10. Joining trainings or webinars offered by other organizations
	11. Other [open response]
2. What actions is the COE taking to support challenges encountered by LEAs? [open response]
1. The CDE may collect additional data related to UPK implementation in future years as well. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. The required questions referred to in this template are being provided to COEs in advance of the survey to assist in the planning and implementation process. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. The Percentage of instructional time spent on the target language and English (for example, in a 50/50 Spanish/English program, 50 percent of instructional time is spent on each language) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)