pre[k]now
a campaign of the
Pew Center on the States

·NSBA·

THE PEW CENTER ON THE STATES

Federal Policy Series:
January 2010

Tapping Title I: What Every School Administrator Should Know about Title I, Pre-K and School Reform

Chrisanne L. Gayl, M.P.P.
Consultant

Marci Young
Project Director

Kathy Patterson
Government Relations

Pre-K Now
c/o Pew Center on the States
901 E Street, NW
10th Floor
Washington, DC 20004

202.862.9871 voice
202.552.2299 fax

www.preknow.org
www.pewcenteronthestates.org

Decades of research show that quality pre-kindergarten programs can make a critical difference in children's school readiness and their future educational success. Investments in early learning are proven to yield important short- and long-term benefits for students and school districts.[1] Driven by this strong evidence, the movement to expand publicly funded pre-k has grown, and school districts have become central to providing high-quality early learning opportunities for more and more children. Nationwide, as of 2005, 23 percent of three-, four- and five-year-old children attending early education programs do so in public schools.[2] Because school districts already serve students in kindergarten through third grade, they have both a responsibility and the systems necessary to ensure alignment between new pre-k investments and existing early education and K-3rd efforts, whether in public schools or community-based programs.

Many school districts, however, struggle to find the resources to provide needed early childhood programs for families in their communities. One largely untapped funding source that districts can use to support pre-k is Title I of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).[3] Enacted in 1965 to help ensure that children living in high-poverty areas obtain a quality education, Title I is the largest single source of federal funding for school districts and complements state and local allocations for at-risk children at all grade levels.[4]

Under ESEA, school districts may use Title I funds to support a range of education services, including early education. According to the U.S. Department of Education (DOE), "providing high-quality early childhood experiences can help ensure that children in Title I schools and programs have the foundation to meet academic standards and experience success throughout elementary and secondary school."[5]

With the recent infusion of supplemental Title I funds through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), school districts now have an unprecedented opportunity to implement and expand pre-k programs.[6] As a companion to the earlier white paper, "New Beginnings: Using Federal Title I Funds to Support Local Pre-K Efforts," this guide provides basic information that superintendents, school board members and other district officials need to make informed choices about using Title I resources to support quality pre-k programs that serve the earliest learners in the community.

Uses Of Title I Funding

Title I offers an excellent source of funding to support early education. The overarching goals of the program—to help reduce achievement gaps and improve academic performance among students living in poverty—align closely with the benefits of high-quality pre-k. This section contains information for local education agencies (LEAs) on how Title I funds may be used and key requirements of which districts should be aware.

Virtually every school district in the nation receives at least some Title I dollars to serve children from families living in poverty.[7] (Most Title I resources that school districts receive are allocated through a formula in Part A of the legislation, which defines student eligibility and other funding criteria.) School leaders can use Title I funds for a variety of purposes, including pre-k, which ESEA defines as, "a program of educational services for eligible children below the age at which the LEA provides elementary education and is focused on raising the academic achievement of children once they reach school age."[8]

Unfortunately, a lack of data has made it difficult to determine how many school districts are currently using Title I funds for pre-k. In 2002, DOE estimated that between 2 percent and 3 percent of Title I funds were used to support early education,

generally.[9] Another report suggests that superintendents and principals may have been reluctant to utilize Title I for pre-k both because the total Title I appropriation has not grown significantly and more restrictions have been placed on districts' use of their allocations.[10] State Title I administrators report, however, that use of Title I funds for pre-k has become more prevalent in recent years.[11]

Whatever the trend may be, it is important to note that Title I funds are extremely flexible and can be used by districts and schools to support multiple components of pre-k programs, including teacher salaries, professional development, comprehensive services (health, nutrition and other social services), leasing and minor remodeling of facilities,[12] identifying children in need of more intensive services, family engagement initiatives, counseling and diagnostic screenings. Funds may also be used to develop data systems and implement curricula that are aligned with state early learning standards.[13]

Of course, while Title I funds may be used for a broad range of educational services and expenses, certain criteria must be met. Districts may only use Title I funds to expand access to and/or supplement existing services. For example, Title I can be used to expand a half-day pre-k program to full day. There are strong stipulations against using Title I funds to "supplant" other resources, i.e. using Title I money for something previously paid for with state or local dollars. For instance, if a school district is using state and/or local money to provide pre-k for all children, they must ensure that any Title I funds directed toward the program are applied in addition to those existing resources. According to DOE, several situations give rise to a presumption of supplanting:

1. The activity is required by local, state, or other federal law;

2. The LEA conducted the activity in the prior year with non-federal funds; or

3. The LEA uses other funds to provide the same activity for non-Title I students or in non-Title I schools.[14]

Coordination with Community-Based Programs

LEAs may provide Title I-funded pre-k at all locations that house other Title I services, including public schools, public libraries, community centers, privately owned facilities (such as faith-based organizations) and homes.[15] School leaders should consider working with these and other existing community-based programs such as Head Start, Early Reading First, or a program funded under the Child Care Development Block Grant as well as state-funded early learning, especially if appropriate facilities are not available in a school or if districts do not have the capacity or expertise to operate pre-k on their own. Wherever the program is located, the setting should be sufficient to support high-quality services.

One major benefit of collaborating with other entities is that districts are able to build upon existing infrastructure rather than implementing entirely new programs, which often can be time consuming and expensive.[16] (See, for example, Case Study #1, page 6.)

Title I funds can be combined with local, state and other federal resources (see Table A) to expand programs, minimize barriers to implementation and improve quality. For example, districts that use Title I funds to supplement existing program resources may be able to:

- Serve children who are on the waiting lists of other early education programs;
- Hire additional personnel to provide enhanced or more intensive services to Title I-eligible children;
- Extend the pre-k instructional day and/or school year in existing programs;
- Offer "wraparound" care for children in Head Start or other early education programs; and to
- Provide comprehensive services to Title I-eligible children who do not qualify for Head Start.

Table A. Federal Funding Sources for Pre-K in Addition to Title I

Pre-K Funding Sources	Program Description
Head Start	Federal funding for a designated comprehensive early childhood program model. Eligibility prioritizes children ages three to five living at or below the federal poverty threshold, with a certain number of slots set aside for children with disabilities.
State Pre-K	Public funding—currently provided by 40 states and the District of Columbia—for early learning. The way in which these funds are distributed to local pre-k programs varies by state.
Early Reading First	Federal grant program that supports early childhood centers and schools. These centers' efforts help low-income pre-k children develop early language, cognitive and pre-reading skills.
The Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG)	Primary federal program subsidizing child care for low-income families. Use of CCDBG funds varies by state and is subject to parents' income and work requirements.
The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)	Federal program that guarantees a free, appropriate public education to children with disabilities. Part B, Section 619 of the program is devoted specifically to pre-k.
Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)	Federal block grant that can be used for state pre-k programs targeted for low-income, at-risk children. Use of TANF funds is subject to requirements regarding parents' employment status.
Federal Impact Aid	Federal funds provided to school districts that serve military-dependent children and children residing on Indian lands or military bases or in federal low-rent housing properties, including children in pre-k programs.

Federal regulations require districts that choose to offer services through a local Head Start agency, Early Reading First or other comparable early education program to describe how they will coordinate and integrate pre-k services, including the children's transition into elementary school, as part of their Title I plan. Regardless of where they are provided, Title I-funded pre-k programs must comply, at a minimum, with Head Start performance standards.[17] In addition, reporting requirements of each funding source must be met.

When using Title I funds for pre-k, education leaders must also be aware of any existing state requirements that govern aspects of locally operated programs.[18] "New Beginnings" offers more specific considerations that districts should keep in mind if they want to use Title I funds in conjunction with state pre-k dollars.

Strategies for School Reform

The flexibility and goals of Title I allow school districts to include pre-k as an integral part of their reform efforts. This section explores some of the best practices used by districts to improve educational equity and increase student achievement through early learning.

School leaders are increasingly realizing that high-quality pre-k, when coordinated with the early elementary school years, can be instrumental in achieving the goals of Title I and other school reform efforts. Such a pre-k-3rd vision can maximize student performance by aligning learning standards and teaching practices across the pre-k and early elementary years.

LEAs and schools—especially those designated as "in need of improvement" under ESEA—should consider how pre-k could align with existing efforts to bolster achievement in the early grades and support an overall school reform agenda.[19] In fact, schools are able to use Title I school-improvement dollars—in addition to their regular Part A funds—for pre-k if the program is an explicit part of and carried out in accordance with the district's or school's improvement plan.[20]

Below are a number of pre-k-related strategies that districts may wish to consider in utilizing Title I funds to complement overall school reform efforts:

- **Increase pre-k access for at-risk children**. Whether through the creation of new programs or the expansion of existing ones, increasing access for children at risk of falling behind in reading and math by third grade can help districts close achievement gaps and meet early proficiency targets.
- **Align pre-k-3rd learning goals and standards**. School districts need to ensure that their pre-k curriculum is developmentally appropriate and aligns with what children will be learning in kindergarten through third grade.
- **Establish common standards and expectations across all pre-k programs**. In addition to aligning their own pre-k-3rd programs, school districts can work to improve consistency of standards and expectations between public school-based and community-based programs to guarantee that, upon entering kindergarten, all children are on an equal footing.
- **Extend pre-k program hours and/or school years**. Districts can complement existing resources to expand pre-k programs to a full-day or full-year schedule in order to realize additional gains for children through increased instructional time and intensity.[21]

- **Offer additional literacy instruction for English Language Learners (ELLs)**. To realize significant gains in pre-reading skills and print awareness for ELLs,[22] districts can provide additional language instruction for these children and their families.
- **Provide joint professional development opportunities**. In addition to improving instructors' skills, offering opportunities for all pre-k teachers and assistants, including Head Start and community-based providers, to participate together in professional development creates a rich environment for collaboration, which can spur cooperation and improve the quality of all programs in the community.
- **Implement age-appropriate screenings and assessment tools**. Districts may administer diagnostic screenings or other age-appropriate assessments to gauge pre-k children's development and enact progress monitoring, which can help inform instruction and identify children who would benefit from early intervention.
- **Provide comprehensive services**. Districts can provide health, nutrition or other social services to meet the needs of individual students enrolled in a targeted assistance program (see page 9) if funds are not reasonably available from other public or private sources.
- **Hold parent-education seminars**. By fostering higher-quality parent-child interactions, family-education initiatives enhance learning both at home and in the pre-k classroom.

Appendix B of this guide provides specific publications school leaders can consult when implementing these and other reform strategies.

Model Districts

Case Study # 1: Montgomery County, MD[23]
In 1999, when Dr. Jerry Weast became superintendent of the Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS), a suburban Maryland school district just north of Washington, DC, he developed a plan to redirect resources to schools in underserved communities. This targeted support was designed to assist schools and close the achievement gap between and among all groups of children. The Board of Education and Superintendent saw pre-k as the critical starting place for establishing a foundation for learning. According to Dr. Weast, "We found that there wasn't enough time, if we just went back to kindergarten. We needed to go back into preschool; certain things needed to be addressed before children got into kindergarten."[24]

System-wide reform efforts began with high-quality early education, with a focus on supporting young children's mastery of foundational skills in literacy and math. The school system adopted the "Early Success Performance Plan," a reform initiative that aligns a research-based curriculum with assessments and instruction, beginning at the pre-k level. The performance plan also included numerous system-wide supports in the early grades, such as reduced class sizes, summer learning opportunities and an instructional-management system yielding real-time data for teachers and administrators.

In 2007, shortly after implementing full-day kindergarten, MCPS looked to expand pre-k instruction for its most vulnerable students. As a Head Start grantee, the district already operated Head Start programs and employed their staff.[25] This made it easier for MCPS to offer its Title I schools the opportunity to expand existing half-day Head Start to a full day with the help of federal Title I funds. The intent was to provide more instructional time for children living at or below the federal poverty threshold.

Initially, principals in 10 Title I schools were interested in expanding their Head Start classes. During the 2007-08 and 2008-09 school years, the district operated 13 full-day Head Start classes in these 10 schools. Any income-eligible child residing within the attendance area of a designated school could participate in the program. With the extended hours, teachers were able to double the time spent on developing early literacy, reading and math skills.

Student progress on two major assessments, conducted during the pre-k year, indicates increased achievement as a result of participation in the full-day program. A recent study conducted by the district shows that, compared with their peers in half-day pre-k, children who attended the full-day program made significantly larger gains in reading skills and some gains in math. These outcomes were particularly strong for female and Hispanic students and for students receiving English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) instruction.[26]

To finance the program, MCPS devoted $877,300, or 4 percent, of its 2008-09 Title I funds to pay for the extended portion of the day, including salary and benefits for the teachers and aides, funding for substitutes to allow instructors to participate in professional development and additional instructional materials.[27] Including other services like health and transportation, the total per-pupil expense for the program, including federal, state and local dollars, is estimated to be $10,685.

Given the tremendous success of the initiative, MCPS added eight more extended-day Head Start classrooms for the 2009-10 school year. To fund this continued expansion, the district committed a total of $635,000, or 10 percent, of its Title I supplement from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Case Study # 2: Elk Grove, CA[28]
Under the leadership of then-superintendent Dave Gordon, Elk Grove Unified School District (EGUSD) near Sacramento, California, began using Title I funds to support pre-k in the mid-1990s during a period of rapid growth in the district. The district expanded from 29,000 to 60,000 students in just a few years. This growth brought with it an increase in federal Title I funds, and district officials wisely invested some of these new resources to expand its pre-k program. As one district official remembers, "It was a matter of being creative as to what was there and how to use it for the benefit of children."[29]

With support from the school board, district officials sought to provide a seamless transition for students from pre-k to kindergarten. The district developed pre-k content standards, linked them to those of grades K-6 and provided professional development for teachers to align classroom practices accordingly.

District Profile	Montgomery County Public Schools, MD
Total District Enrollment	141,777
Demographics of Children	38.1% White, 23.2% African American, 22.7% Hispanic, 15.6% Asian American; 12.5% of students receiving English for Speakers of Other Languages Services (ESOL)
Total Title I Allocation	$20,049,271 in 2008-2009
Title I Used for Pre-K	$1,536,555 in 2009-2010 (regular and stimulus funds)
Pre-K Program Description	Pre-k programs are located in all Title I schools. Title I resources are used as part of a schoolwide model to expand Head Start services from half day to full day in 21 classrooms, with emphasis on foundational literacy and math. Additional family supports are provided.

Pre-k and kindergarten teachers meet regularly to discuss student expectations and to modify instructional practice. Staff attends bi-weekly professional development sessions and receives ongoing support from instructional coaches.

In the 2008-09 school year, Elk Grove served approximately 960 pre-k students using a combination of state pre-k, Head Start and Title I funds. The district allocated more than 15 percent of its Title I resources to support half-day programs at nine elementary schools. Total per-pupil expenditures were about $5,000, including federal and state funding. Enrollment is offered on a first-come, first-served basis for children who reside within the boundaries of the Title I school.

One particularly interesting initiative within the district's Title I-funded pre-k expansion is the "Twilight Program," which operates three days a week from 3:15 p.m. to 6:15 p.m. Originally established to address space constraints, the program is now a popular option among working families. Four year olds attend pre-k while their older siblings are offered tutoring help and parents are encouraged to participate in English as a Second Language, parenting and job-training classes.

District officials have observed significant gains in both reading and math for children who attended pre-k as compared with those who did not. Data collected in 2005 show that pre-k students scored higher than the comparison group on the California Standards Tests in grades two and three. Pre-k students also did better on both the reading and math portions of the norm-referenced CAT/6 administered in grade three.[30]

The success of Elk Grove's pre-k program has encouraged the Sacramento County Office of Education to develop a five-year plan to provide pre-k for all children at risk for underachievement. As part of the effort, the county is hoping to encourage area schools to utilize Title I resources to help establish programs and has developed a guide, "Ready for K…With ESEA."[31]

District Profile	Elk Grove Unified School District, CA
Total District Enrollment	62,000
Demographics of Children	29% White, 22% Hispanic, 20% African American, 20% Asian American, 8% Pacific Islander; 9,946 Limited English Proficient students
Total Title I Allocation	$9 million in 2008-09
Title I Used for Pre-K	$1,393,000 in 2008-09
Pre-K Program Description	The district operates several school-readiness programs (Head Start, state pre-k and Title I), which are funded from different sources and have varying requirements. Title I funds support three-hour programs multiple times a week in the morning, afternoon or late afternoon ("twilight") to children who reside within the boundaries of nine Title I schools.

Program Approaches

When deciding to establish or expand a pre-k program with Title I funds, a district will need to calculate its available resources and determine how it wishes to allocate funding. This section explains the two main approaches for establishing a Title I program and identifies questions school leaders should ask when assessing their options.

To be eligible for Title I funding, a school must have an attendance area with a concentration of poverty[32] equal to the district's average poverty rate or 35 percent of the student body (whichever is less).[33] When allocating Title I funds, districts must first focus on schools—including elementary, middle and high schools—in communities with more than 75 percent of households in poverty. Districts may then choose to serve more schools if resources allow and have some latitude in determining those allocations. Since the decision to use Title I funds for pre-k can be made either at the district or school level, leadership from principals, superintendents and school board members is critical.

Once resources have been allocated and pre-k identified as a program for funding, Title I resources can be used for one of two approaches:

Schoolwide Program - Schools with 40 percent or more students from families living in poverty are eligible to provide schoolwide programs that focus on raising student achievement by improving instruction throughout the entire school. A schoolwide program is not required to identify particular children as eligible; rather, all children in the attendance area are able to participate. Nationwide, 90 percent of children served in Title I pre-k attend schoolwide programs.[34]

Targeted Assistance Program - Schools that do not meet the 40-percent threshold or choose not to operate a schoolwide program can use Title I funds to provide targeted services to specific students. To be eligible, three- and four-year-old children must be at risk of failing to meet the state's early learning standards. According to DOE, "This determination must be made on the basis of designated criteria such as teacher judgment, interviews with parents and appropriate measures of child development."[35]

Determining which program option to use and the amount of available resources a district has to devote to a specific strategy involves many complicated choices and competing priorities. Education leaders can begin to assess their options by asking the following questions:

How much Title I funding could be made available for pre-k?

- **What is the district's projected Title I allocation?** District leaders need to know the amount of Title I funds they are going to receive and if the projected allocation is more or less than the previous year. This information is critical to setting district priorities.
- **Does the district plan on carrying over any Title I funds from last year?** A district may carry over up to 15 percent of its allocation from one year to the next and has considerable discretion in handling these funds.[36]
- **Does the district anticipate transferring any federal funds under Titles II, IV, and/or V into Title I?** Districts may transfer up to 50 percent (with greater limits imposed under particular circumstances) of the federal funds they receive under the Improving Teacher Quality (Title II-A), Educational Technology (Title II-D), 21st Century Schools (Title IV) and Innovative Programs (Title V) grants to their Title I program. While these other funds may be transferred into a Title I program, Title I funds may not be transferred out of Title I to other programs.
- **What amount of its Title I funds will the district set aside to address its priorities and/or its ESEA status?** LEAs may choose to reserve some

funds for district-wide needs such as professional development and family engagement prior to allocating resources to individual schools.[37] In addition, if the district is designated for either "program improvement" or "corrective action" under ESEA, it will need to set aside a certain percentage of its Title I funds for expenses such as supplemental services and transportation. Under ARRA, school districts may seek a waiver from DOE for one or more of these statutory "set-aside" requirements of Title I funds.[38]

How will Title I funds for pre-k be allocated?

- **What are the poverty levels of schools within the district?** Calculating the relative poverty levels of schools within the district will determine which schools must and which schools may receive funding. LEAs rank schools by the percentage of children from households in poverty and must prioritize funds accordingly.
- **How will Title I funds be allocated among schools in the district?** A district may either allocate a greater concentration of funds among a few schools or spread smaller amounts to a larger number of schools. For example, a district that has a few very high-poverty schools may wish to concentrate its Title I resources on schoolwide pre-k programs within those schools. In a district where children in poverty are distributed more widely, however, administrators may prefer a targeted assistance program for specific students.
- **Are there other demographic variables that impact the prioritization of local resources within the district?** In addition to poverty levels, districts may wish to consider other factors such as the number of ELLs or students with special needs within a school, as well as schools with greater numbers of students who are not meeting proficiency standards.
- **Are there schools in the district with existing pre-k services?** Depending on a district's priorities and the amount of available funding, education leaders may decide to use Title I dollars to expand existing programs whether in schools or community-based settings. This is often more cost effective than creating entirely new programs.

How will services be provided?

- **Does the district plan on utilizing outside facilities to offer its program?** If the district plans on using other facilities, such as child care centers or private schools, there may be additional costs involved in securing space, which will need to be taken into consideration.
- **Does the district or school plan on partnering with any outside providers?** If other entities will be shouldering a portion of the costs, this will have a significant impact on the allocation of resources.

The answers to the above questions will be critical in determining the amount of Title I funds a district has available and how it chooses to use them for pre-k. Whatever approach a district determines is best for its particular situation will likely involve numerous discussions between school leaders, budget officials and other stakeholders. It is important to note, however, that whatever amount is spent on pre-k, it should be enough to ensure the delivery of a high-quality program.

Conclusion

As school districts look to meet reform goals and improve student performance, they should consider establishing or expanding early education programs and should make use of all the resources at their disposal. Federal Title I funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is particularly good for supporting the high-quality pre-k programs that give young children the foundation they need to be successful in the early grades and beyond.

pre[k]now

a campaign of the
Pew Center on the States

Acknowledgements

Chrisanne Gayl is an education consultant with more than a decade of government relations and education policy experience at the federal, state and local levels. She has served as director of federal programs at the National School Boards Association and held positions with the Workforce Alliance and the Office of the Governor of California. Ms. Gayl is the author of numerous publications on pre-kindergarten policy and practice. chrisanne@implementprek.com

Marci Young is the project director for Pre-K Now, leading its campaign to advance high-quality, voluntary pre-kindergarten for all three and four year olds. Prior to joining Pre-K Now, Ms. Young was the director of the Center for the Child Care Workforce, a project of the American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation and a deputy director in the AFT's educational issues department where she oversaw all of the organization's early childhood projects and activities to promote high-quality early childhood education. She was the Executive Director of CCW when it was an independent nonprofit agency, where she co-authored several studies about early childhood education with specific emphasis on improving the status and condition of the workforce. Before that, she was a kindergarten teacher at an elementary school in Montgomery County, Maryland. Ms. Young holds a bachelor's degree in economics from Stanford University and a master's degree in early childhood education from the University of Pennsylvania.

Kathy Patterson joined Pre-K Now in March 2007 as federal policy director after serving 12 years as a member of the District of Columbia Council. In January 2009 she became a senior officer with the Pew Center on the States, managing federal policy advocacy across the PCS children's campaigns—including home visiting and oral health for children as well as pre-k. She helps to advance our agenda on Capitol Hill and works closely with other national organizations to pursue shared early education goals.

Pre-K Now
Pre-K Now, a campaign of the Pew Center on the States, collaborates with advocates and policy makers to lead a movement toward high-quality, voluntary pre-kindergarten for all three and four year olds. The Pew Center on the States identifies and advances effective policy approaches to critical issues facing states.

The National School Boards Association
The National School Boards Association is a not-for-profit organization representing state associations of school boards and their member districts across the United States. Its mission is to foster excellence and equity in public education through school board leadership. NSBA achieves that mission by representing the school board perspective before federal government agencies and with national organizations that affect education, and by providing vital information and services to state associations of school boards and local school boards.

pre[k]now

a campaign of the
Pew Center on the States

Appendix A: Research on the Benefits of High-Quality Pre-Kindergarten

Economic benefits

"A Cost-Benefit Analysis of Universally-Accessible Pre-Kindergarten Education in Texas." Aguirre, Elisa, et al. College Station: The Bush School of Government & Public Service, Texas A&M University, 2006.

"An Economic Analysis of Pre-K in Arkansas." Belfield, Clive R. Washington, DC: Pre-K Now, 2006.

"Interpreting the Evidence on Life Cycle Skill Formation." Cunha, Flavio, James J. Heckman, Lance Lochner, and Dimitriy V. Masterov. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2005.

"The Fiscal Impacts of Universal Pre-K: Case Study Analysis for Three States." Belfield, Clive R. Washington, DC: Committee for Economic Development, 2005.

"The Economic Promise of Investing in High-Quality Preschool: Using Early Education to Improve Economic Growth and the Fiscal Sustainability of States and the Nation." Washington, DC: Committee for Economic Development, 2006.

"Age 21 Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Title I Chicago Child-Parent Centers." Reynolds, A. J., J. A. Temple, D. L. Robertson, and E. A. Mann. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 24 (2002): 267-303.

Educational benefits

"The Effects of State Prekindergarten Programs on Young Children's School Readiness in Five States." Barnett, W. Steven, Cynthia Lamy, and Kwanghee Jung. New Brunswick: National Institute for Early Education Research, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 2005.

"The Effects of Oklahoma's Universal Pre-K Program on School Readiness: An Executive Summary." Gormley, William, Jr., Ted Gayer, Deborah Phillips, and Brittany Dawson. Washington, DC: Center for Research on Children in the United States, Georgetown University, 2004.

"The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study through Age 40." Schweinhart, Lawrence J. Ypsilanti, Michigan: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 2004.

"Preschool Programs Can Boost School Readiness." Gormley, William T., Jr., Deborah Phillips, and Ted Gayer. Science 320 (2008).

"The Effects of New Jersey's Abbott Preschool Program on Young Children's School Readiness." Lamy, Cynthia, W. Steven Barnett, and Kwanghee Jung. New Brunswick: National Institute for Early Education Research, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 2005.

Appendix B: Additional Resources

The following publications gathered from national organizations, state education agencies and other nonprofit organizations provide guidance for education leaders on developing pre-k programs and strategies in their districts.

"Taking Stock: Assessing and Improving Early Childhood Learning and Program Quality." National Early Childhood Accountability Task Force, 2007.

This report offers recommendations from a panel of experts for designing the best possible approaches to using assessments to strengthen the early childhood field.

"Beyond the School Yard: Pre-K Collaborations with Community-Based Partners." Wat, Albert, and Chrisanne Gayl. Washington, DC: Pew Center on the States, 2009.

School administrators can collaborate with community-based programs to expand high-quality early learning opportunities to more young children. This report highlights what some programs are doing to work together and examines the benefits and challenges of collaboration between K-12, Head Start, faith-based organizations and other community-based groups.

"Leading Early Childhood Learning Communities: Professional Development for Leaders." National Association of Elementary School Principals, 2007.

The guide presents information and strategies to help principals embrace early childhood learning; engage families and communities; promote appropriate learning environments for young children; ensure quality teaching; use multiple assessments to strengthen learning and advocate for high-quality early childhood education.

"Planning for Pre-Kindergarten: A Toolkit for School Boards." The Center for Public Education, an initiative of the National School Boards Association, 2009.

This toolkit is designed to help school boards think through the issues involved in establishing high-quality pre-k. It includes resources and tools to help school boards establish policies, implement effective programs, engage their communities and become advocates for good pre-k programs.

"Expanding Access to High Quality Pre-K Programs." California School Boards Association, 2008.

This resource and policy guide was developed to support efforts by local school districts and county offices of education to expand access to pre-k programs. It provides a range of resources for school leaders, including strategies for developing local partnerships and engaging community members in the district's pre-k-related activities, technical assistance opportunities and financial resources to support pre-k programs.

"Getting It Right from the Start: The Principal's Guide to Early Childhood Education." Kostelnik, Marjorie J., and Marilyn L. Grady. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 2009.

This practical manual shows principals what successful early childhood education programs look like and how to achieve quality results in their schools and communities. The authors provide an inside view of the field, touching on key areas of operation and discussing ways to avoid common pitfalls. Blending research-based content with practical applications, this accessible guide helps principals and other administrators implement effective early education strategies.

Effective Early Childhood Programs: Turning Knowledge into Action. Landry, Susan H. Houston: The University of Texas, 2005.

The book is intended for teachers, parents and other individuals interested in creating and sustaining high-quality pre-k programs. Chapter topics include the foundation of pre-k education and the elements of quality, among others. The book also provides detailed guidance on best practices for early childhood education and development, derived from evidence generated from scientific investigations.

"Community Approaches to Serving Four-Year-Old Children in Wisconsin: Lessons Learned from Wisconsin Communitites." Madison: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 2003.

This report documents the lessons learned from existing four-year-old kindergarten collaboratives between public schools and private providers. It summarizes real-life experiences in six communities around the state and provides helpful guidance for future policymaking.

"Preschool Issues Concerning English Language Learners and Immigrant Children: The Importance of Family Engagement." Naughton, Sandra. Oakland, CA: Children Now, 2004.

This brief provides recommendations on strategies for engaging the families of English language learners in their children's pre-k experience.

"Early Childhood Curriculum, Assessment, and Program Evaluation: Building an Effective, Accountable System in Programs for Children Birth through Age 8." National Association for the Education of Young Children and National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education. Washington, 2003.

The resource provides a position statement as well recommendations for effectively implementing early education curriculum, child assessments and program evaluation.

"Community-Based School Readiness Integration Partnerships: Promoting Sustainable Collaborations." Gasko, John W., and Kaitlin Guthrow. Texas Early Childhood Education Coalition, 2009.

This guide builds upon efforts to create a seamless, integrated, birth-to-five early childhood education system in Texas. In particular, it highlights successful community-based partnerships and locally adaptable tools that assist in the collaboration process.

"Ready for K... With ESEA: The A B C's of How to Use Title I, Part A ESEA Funds for Preschool in California." Sacramento County Office of Education. California County Superintendents Educational Services Association, 2009.

This resource for county, district and school administrators in California highlights the benefits of high-quality early learning programs and details federal guidelines on allocating Title I funds to children at the greatest academic risk. The report offers contextual considerations for school districts and first steps toward initiating a comprehensive and inclusive planning and implementation process.

Endnotes

[1] See Appendix A for a full range of references on the economic and educational benefits of high-quality pre-k programs.

[2] I.U. Iruka and P.R. Carver, "Initial Results from the 2005 NHES Early Childhood Program Participation Survey," U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2006).

[3] *Elemenatary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (2001 Reauthorization, Also Known as "No Child Left Behind")*, Public Law 107-100, (Jan. 8, 2002).

[4] Stephanie Stullich, Elizabeth Eisner, and Joseph McCrary, "National Assessment of Title I Final Report: Volume I: Implementation," U.S. Department of Education (National Center for Education Statistics Insitute of Education Sciences, 2007), 1. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pdf/20084012_rev.pdf.

[5] U.S. Department of Education, "Serving Preschool Children under Title I: Non-Regulatory Guidance," (Washington2004), 1. http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/preschoolguidance.pdf.

[6] Together with annual appropriations, districts will receive more than $27.4 billion in federal Title I funds during fiscal year 2009. Districts have the option of spreading them out over as many as five years. See: Pre-K Now, "New Beginnings: Using Federal Title I Funds to Support Local Pre-K Efforts," (Washington: Pew Center on the States, 2009). http://www.preknow.org/documents/titleI_Sep2009.pdf.

[7] Stullich, Eisner, and McCrary, "National Assessment of Title I Final Report: Volume I: Implementation," 10.

[8] *Elemenatary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (2001 Reauthorization, Also Known as "No Child Left Behind")*, 2002.

[9] Danielle Ewen, Jennifer Mezey, and Hannah Matthews, "Missed Opportunities? The Possibilities and Challenges of Funding High-Quality Preschool through Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act," (Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy, 2005), 11. http://www.clasp.org/admin/site/publications/files/0216.pdf.

[10] Committee for Education Funding, "Budget Response Fiscal Year 2009," (Washington, DC: Committee for Education Funding, 2008), 2. http://02d7575.netsolhost.com/cef/wp-content/uploads/2009/06/CEF-Budget-Response-FY09-REVISED.pdf.

[11] Author's survey of state Title I administrators, conducted September 2009.

[12] The cost to rent or lease space in privately owned buildings is an allowable use of funds if the space is necessary to ensure the success of the program, appropriate space is not available to the grantee and the cost is "reasonable." Title I funds may also be used for minor alterations that do not involve building construction or structural alterations to buildings. See: U.S. Department of Education, "Serving Preschool Children under Title I: Non-Regulatory Guidance."

[13] Ibid.

[14] Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, "Guidance: Funds under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Educaiton Act of 1965 Made Available under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009," U.S. Department of Education (Washington2009), 28. http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/recovery/guidance/title-i.pdf.

[15] U.S. Department of Education, "Serving Preschool Children under Title I: Non-Regulatory Guidance," 17.

[16] For more information on the benefits and strategies of pre-k collaboration, see: Albert Wat and Chrisanne Gayl, "Beyond the School Yard: Pre-K Collaborations with Community-Based Partners," (Washington, DC: Pew Center on the States, 2009). http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewcenteronthestatesorg/Beyond_the_Schoolyard.pdf

[17] U.S. Department of Education, "Serving Preschool Children under Title I: Non-Regulatory Guidance," 24.

[18] For minimum quality standards each state has put in place for its pre-k program, see: W. Steven Barnett et al., "The State of Preschool: 2008 State Preschool Yearbook," (New Brunswick: National Institute for Early Education Research, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 2009).

[19] Those eligible for school improvement dollars under the Title I program, may use them for pre-k if the pre-k program is a strategy that addresses the specific academic issues that caused the district or school to be identified for school improvement.

[20] U.S. Department of Education, "Serving Preschool Children under Title I: Non-Regulatory Guidance."

[21] See: Ellen Frede et al., "The Apples Blossom: Abbott Preschool Program Longitudinal Effects Study (APPLES) Preliminary Results through 2nd Grade Interim Report," (New Brunswick: National Institute for Early Education Research, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 2009). http://nieer.org/pdf/apples_second_grade_results.pdf; Susanna Loeb et al., "How Much Is Too Much? The Influence of Preschool Centers on Children's Social and Cognitive Development," *Economics of Education Review* 26 (2007): 52-66; Kenneth B. Robin, Ellen C. Frede, and W. Steven Barnett, "Is More

Better? The Effects of Full-Day vs. Half-Day Preschool on Early School Achievement," (New Brunswick: National Insitute for Early Education Research, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 2006). http://nieer.org/docs/?DocID=144.

[22] William T. Gormley, Jr., Deborah Phillips, and Ted Gayer, "Preschool Programs Can Boost School Readiness," Science 320 (2008).

[23] Information for Montgomery County School District provided to author by district staff via questionnaires (June 2009 and October 2009), and meetings.

[24] Pre-K Now, "Investing Title I Funds in Pre-K," (Washington: Pew Center on the States, 2009). http://www.preknow.org/advocate/confcalls/titleI.cfm.

[25] MCPS is the delegate agency in Montgomery County providing Head Start services under contract to the grantee agency, the Montgomery County Community Action Agency.

[26] Huafang Zhao, Shahpar Modarresi, and Shihching Liu, "Impact of Full-Day Prekindergarten Program on Student Academic Performance," (Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools, Office of Shared Accountability, 2009). http://www.preknow.org/documents/MCPS_Full_day_Head_Start_study.pdf.

[27] The Head Start grant and local in-kind dollars pay for the half-day, and Title I dollars pay to extend the day. The MCPS local in-kind funding commitment to Head Start for FY 2009-2010 is $1,678,985.

[28] Information obtained from author's interviews with current and former district staff, Oct. 2009.

[29] Elizabeth Pinkerton, Phone, Sept. 2009.

[30] "EGUSD's Pre-Kindergarten Programs: Summary of Prek and Non-Prek Students' 2004 and 2005 STAR Results," Fact Sheet. Elk Grove Unified School District.

[31] Sacramento County Office of Education, "Ready for K... With ESEA: The A B C's of How to Use Title I, Part A ESEA Funds for Preschool in California," (California County Superintendents Educational Services Association, 2009). http://ccsesa.org/index/attachments/Ready_for_K_with_ESEA.pdf.

[32] LEAs have several options for defining "poverty" when determining eligibility or making allocations. Most districts use the income threshold for the federal free and reduced-price meal program (FARMs).

[33] Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, "Non-Regulatory Guidance: Local Educaitonal Agency Identification and Selection of School Attendence Areas and Schools and Allocation of Title I Funds to Those Areas and Schools," U.S. Department of Education (Washington, 2003). ftp://help.isbe.net/webapps/eGMS/T1Targeting.pdf.

[34] Danielle Ewen and Hannah Matthews, "Using Title I to Finance Early Childhood Programs: Lessons from States and Districts," (Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy). http://www.clasp.org/admin/site/documents/files/titleiforweb.ppt.

[35] The use of family income to determine eligibility is allowable, especially when there are not sufficient Title I resources to serve all children, but it may not be the sole basis for determining eligibility. In addition, children who participated in a Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First, or a Title I preschool program at any time during the two preceding years, homeless children, and children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children are automatically eligible. See: U.S. Department of Education, "Serving Preschool Children under Title I: Non-Regulatory Guidance."

[36] Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, "Non-Regulatory Guidance: Local Educaitonal Agency Identification and Selection of School Attendence Areas and Schools and Allocation of Title I Funds to Those Areas and Schools."

[37] Office of Assessment and Accountability, "Developing a Title I Budget," West Virginia Department of Education (2009).

[38] U.S. Department of Education, "Non-Regulatory Guidance on Title I, Part A Waivers," (Washington, 2009). http://www.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/title-i-waiver.doc.

Pew Center on the States

The Pew Center on the States is a division of The Pew Charitable Trusts that identifies and advances effective solutions to critical issues facing states. Pew is a nonprofit organization that applies a rigorous, analytical approach to improve public policy, inform the public and stimulate civic life. www.pewcenteronthestates.org

THE PEW CENTER ON THE STATES