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Executive Summary

The first five years of a child’s life are essential to her or his social and behavioral development. Physiologically, a child’s brain develops 75-90% of its capacity by the age of 5.\(^1\) Preschool, a term which is used here to describe pre-kindergarten programs targeted at students between the ages of 3-5, features educational activities that encourage social interaction and stimulate intellectual development. Preschool improves learning and school readiness, reduces specific educational disparities between children at school entry, increases educational efficiency, and reduces future social costs.

Unfortunately, not all of the children in Los Angeles currently have access to high quality preschools. Child care represents the bulk of early childhood health and development services provided by or within the city, but there are only 70,237 total available spaces in licensed child care centers or family care homes for Los Angeles’ 181,397 3-5 year-old children.\(^2\) Even if the city chose to increase its capacity such that every family who wanted child care had access to it, it would have insufficient means to pay for it. However, utilizing already existing preschools and particularly focusing on home-based centers by increasing quality could prove to be a worthwhile goal. As a result, the city needs to focus on both center- and home-based centers to ensure all families have access to preschool in Los Angeles.

California is currently facing an operating deficit of several billion dollars, and Los Angeles itself is expected to face a shortfall in the hundreds of millions of dollars. Considering the benefits of preschool, the apparent under-provision of child care or preschool services, and the bleak financial picture, Los Angeles faces a remarkably difficult challenge: to increase the provision of valuable and highly demanded social services without increasing costs or reducing revenues. There is some hope, however. The passage of Proposition 10 provides a revenue stream for early care and education efforts and two bodies - one for the county and one for the state - to coordinate the implementation. Additionally, a variety of public and private organizations have an interest in preschool and would potentially be willing to partner with the city to provide better services.

Therefore, the question that this report attempts to address is this: How can the city of Los Angeles leverage its existing resources to support a universal preschool initiative? This

---

\(^1\) City of Santa Monica. *Santa Monica Early Childhood Initiative Plan, 2001.*\n
\(^2\) US Department of Census 2000; California Resource & Referral Network; First 5 LA; Karen Hill-Scott & Company.
report analyzes the current preschool environment in Los Angeles, identifies obstacles to universal access, and considers the role and resources of the city in service provision. Finally, this report provides recommendations for potential strategies that Los Angeles can employ to leverage its resources in partnership with other public or private organizations. We approached the problem by conducting a literature review, analyzing quantitative data on the current preschool and child care services in Los Angeles, and interviewing a wide spectrum of service providers, local government representatives, and stakeholders in early care and education. Using this research, we identify three broad policy problems:

1. **Insufficient Capacity**: There are far more children in Los Angeles available than spaces in preschools.

2. **Lack of Quality and Affordability**: Inconsistent standards and measures of quality make it difficult for parents to identify high quality preschools. Many of those that are of higher quality are too expensive.

3. **Lack of Coordination**: Child care and preschool services in Los Angeles are provided by a complicated amalgam of overlapping agencies and organizations, including federal, state, county and local governments.

The report considers each of these problems in some detail and, recognizing additional constraints of financial limitations and political feasibility, provides a collection of potential programs, services and policies that the city could implement to either increase access to preschool services within the city, or support the efforts of others to do the same. The options that are likely to provide the greatest benefits with the fewest drawbacks or tradeoffs are reflected in the following recommendations:

**Increase Los Angeles’ Preschool Capacity**

- *Municipal Bonds*: Issue municipal bonds to fund preschool facility development and services

- *Density Bonuses*: Ease density restrictions on buildings used for preschool services by granting density bonuses of 25-35% to preschool developers, and possibly target bonuses to providers serving low- and moderate-income families

- *Long-term Loans for Providers*: Develop Section 108 US-HUD grants to provide low cost, low interest loans to preschool providers to fund the capital costs of developing and opening new preschool centers.
Improve the Quality and Affordability of Preschool Programs

✓ Enrichment Centers: Improve or increase the educational component of existing child care by creating enrichment centers to provide free or reduced cost activities and supplies to small child care centers or family child care homes that would otherwise not have the resources to acquire them.

✓ Expand early care and education curriculum at local colleges and universities: Work with area city colleges to increase the availability of early care and education courses, both regular courses for full-time students who could become staff or directors, and extension, night or weekend courses for the continuing education and development of current service providers.

✓ College Scholarships: Establish a scholarship or fellowship program to encourage students to pursue studies in the field of early care and education, potentially including a local internship or work-placement component to encourage students to consider becoming staff or directors of local preschools or child care programs.

✓ Urban Education Partnership: Influence UEP and other similar organizations to encourage paraprofessionals trained by UEP to open up their own home-based centers.

Improve the Coordination of Service Delivery within the City of Los Angeles

✓ Mayor Hahn’s Role: Have the mayor use his position and reputation as a driving force for universal preschool.

✓ Regular Discussions with All Stakeholders: Conduct regular meetings with internal and external individuals to share perspectives and expertise on preschool issues.

✓ Interagency Preschool Committee: Create an interagency committee to coordinate all city efforts related to preschool.

✓ City Council’s Role: Use Council members’ role to promote universal preschool.

✓ Neighborhood Councils Role: Use neighborhood councils for outreach and funding efforts.

Despite the current financial constraints, the city has an opportunity to strategically leverage select resources to partner with select public and private organizations to support the drive for universal access to preschool for the children of Los Angeles.
Preface

This project addresses the following question: How can the city of Los Angeles leverage its existing resources to support a universal early education initiative (specifically preschool for children between 3-5 years old)? Our approach to answer this question included a combination of methods, intended to both provide us with a thorough understanding of the various issues as well as enable us to suggest effective solutions to the challenges facing Los Angeles. First, we conducted a literature review of recent publications and educational studies on issues both directly and indirectly related to preschool. Second, we began a quantitative analysis of the City of Los Angeles to determine the current landscape of early care and education needs and services. Finally, we conducted a qualitative analysis on three fronts: (1) evaluating the programs and services in other selected cities, (2) collecting impressions of current Los Angeles service providers as to their needs and what supports they would most appreciate, and (3) what current resources are available to Los Angeles, both city resources and potential partnerships, and under what circumstances those resources could be utilized for preschool. This process included collecting and mapping data to learn about the need for preschool in the city. We conducted in-depth interviews with child care providers to learn more about the inputs needed in order to run a preschool. In addition, we spoke to city officials in various cities to learn more about early care and education efforts in other cities, and city officials in Los Angeles to learn about what resources the city currently has that can be leveraged for early care and education. Finally, we spoke to First 5 LA representatives in order to learn more about their efforts and how the city can potentially partner with them to bring about early education. Understanding the inputs to preschool, the resources the city has to leverage, and strategies of other cities gave us the necessary tools to analyze how the city can leverage its resources to promote universal access to early education.
The Value of Preschool

There is a crisis mounting in Los Angeles and across the state of California due to the increasing numbers of children who enter elementary school without the necessary preparation tools to succeed. It is becoming increasingly clear that a powerful way to address this problem is to establish quality preschools for all children. Research has concluded the first five years of a child’s life are essential to the social and behavioral development of children. Physiologically, during the first five years, a child’s brain grows and develops to 75-90% of its capacity. Therefore, early experiences and relationships have a dramatic impact on a young child’s “brain-wiring” which is vital for the brain to communicate and function in a coordinated way. As a result, we have identified three important benefits of providing quality preschools which are: (1) Improves learning and school readiness (2) Reduces educational disparities and (3) Increases educational efficiency and reduces future social costs.

✓ Improves Learning and School Readiness

According to a national study of 22,000 children entering kindergarten, more than thirty percent do not recognize the letters of the alphabet and 42 percent cannot count to 20 out loud. In particular, there is concern that many children lack sufficient exposure to pre-literacy activities - listening to stories, playing with the sound of words and interacting with the meaning of stories while people read to them. Studies show there is a direct connection between pre-literacy experiences and the ease with which children learn to read later on. On the other hand, those children who are exposed to quality preschools have higher rates of school readiness, better language ability and math skills and fewer behavioral problems. Four-year-olds who participated in Georgia’s pre-kindergarten program improved significantly in pre-math, letter and word recognition, vocabulary and oral expression. In addition, a study by Magnuson et al. (in press) confirmed previous studies in its research analysis of data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study–Kindergarten Class of 1998-99. Researchers looked at the effects of a child’s experiences in the year prior to kindergarten on their academic skills and found that

---

3 City of Santa Monica. *Santa Monica Early Childhood Initiative Plan.* 2001.
4 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
children who participated in center-based care versus children who had only parental care performed significantly better on both reading and math skills in kindergarten. Students also had lower retention rates in kindergarten if they had attended center-based care. Furthermore, the differences in academic skills were larger for disadvantaged (poor, low maternal education, single-parent, or non-English speaking mothers) children than non-disadvantaged. They also found that the effects of child care persist at least through the spring of first grade, when they were tested again, though they were not as large.\textsuperscript{10} Other studies have found similar results. One study found that children have higher cognitive skills when they attended more center-based care at age three or four.\textsuperscript{11} Finally, another study found that Head Start has positive effects on academic achievement even several years after entering kindergarten.\textsuperscript{12}

\textbf{Reduces Educational Disparities}

Growing up in poverty greatly increases the probability that a child will be exposed to environments and experiences that impose significant burdens on his or her well being, thereby shifting the odds toward more adverse developmental outcomes.\textsuperscript{13} It is well documented that quality preschools help prepare children from low socio-economic backgrounds as they enter kindergarten. This is particularly important because studies have shown that as children enter school as early as kindergarten they come with different and unequal sets of skills. One of the more comprehensive studies to establish this was performed by Professors Valerie Lee and David Burkham of the University of Michigan. Analyzing data from the US Department of Education’s Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, kindergarten cohort (ECLS-K) they found that before entering kindergarten, the average cognitive score of children in the highest socio-economic status (SES) group are 60\% above the scores of the lowest SES group. Moreover, average math achievement is 21\% lower for blacks than for whites and 19\% lower for Hispanics.\textsuperscript{14} In addressing this problem the same study found that children who attended center-based preschools are more prepared for kindergarten, and therefore have the chance to overcome some of the initial inequality they face.


\textsuperscript{13} City of Santa Monica. \textit{Santa Monica Early Childhood Initiative Plan}. 2001.

\textsuperscript{14} Lee, Valerie E., Burkam, David T. “Inequality at the Starting Gate: Social Background Differences in Achievement as Children Begin School”. \textit{Economic Policy Institute}. 2002.
✓ \textit{Increases Educational Efficiency and Cost Reduction}

Quality preschools greatly increase educational efficiency. Every $1 spent on high quality early education saves $7 in reduced future expenditures for special education, delinquency, crime control, welfare and lost taxes—or an estimated $48,000 in benefits per day from a half-day preschool program.\textsuperscript{15} In addition, based on the fact that 9\% of children in families with incomes in the top 20\% income bracket are held back in school, compared with 18\% in the lowest 20\%, and that preschool helps prevent grade retention, the National Institute for Early Education Research estimates that the savings associated with providing preschool to \textit{all} children is $25,000 per child, or roughly half of the benefit estimated for children from low-income families alone.\textsuperscript{16} Studies found that in Michigan, those children who participated in preschool were less likely to be placed in special education in elementary and secondary school, more were likely to graduate from high school, had 60\% higher earnings, were half as likely to receive public assistance at age 27, and had half as many arrests.\textsuperscript{17} In addition, a similar program in Chicago found that participating children were less likely to repeat a grade and were less likely to participate in delinquent activity as teenagers.\textsuperscript{18}

\textbf{Universal Access to Preschool}

Preschool is not legally or administratively defined by the state, however, most of the early education literature and those in the early education community believe preschool provides not only care but also learning enrichment activities for children ages 3-5. Many feel that the “universal” part of universal preschool is a transitional phenomenon - starting from those whose need is greatest to those whose need is least pressing. In addition, there is growing research which indicates a concern that children least likely to experience the benefits of quality preschool - including the identification of learning problems likely to promote problems in school - are neither those from affluent families who have long placed their children in preschool, nor those from the lowest income families, who are more apt to qualify for publicly funded programs, but

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{17} First Five Los Angeles Commission. \textit{First 5 Master Plan for Universal Preschool in Los Angeles County}. February 12, 2004.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
rather the large group of families in between who do not qualify for subsidized services and cannot afford the full cost of quality programs.\textsuperscript{19} Finally, problems such as grade retention and high dropout are more common among the middle class than often assumed.\textsuperscript{20} Therefore, primarily focusing on low-income families is not sufficient if one intends to effectively prepare all students to be successful in school.

**Child Care Requirements**

In California, licensing of child care facilities is issued by the Community Care Licensing Division (CCLD) within the California Department of Social Services. There are regional offices throughout the state that offer information sessions, but ultimately, licensing is done by the state. In California, child care facilities provide “non-medical care and supervision to children up to 18 years old for less than 24 hours a day.”\textsuperscript{21} There are two types of licenses for child care: child care center licenses and family child care home licenses.

A family child care home is operated in the child care provider’s home. In order to obtain a license, a provider must: be at least 18 years old, attend a licensing orientation, submit fingerprints for every person living in the house over 18, have a current tuberculosis clearance, complete 15 hours of Preventative Health Practices training, have a smoke detector and fire extinguisher in the house, provide safe toys, play equipment and materials, submit a licensing application with all the required materials, and pay a licensing fee.\textsuperscript{22} Further, the home must pass a health and safety inspection and licensing staff conducts a pre-licensing visit. Large family child care homes may be licensed for a capacity of either 12 to 14 children. If the home is licensed for 14 children, there may be no more than 3 infants (age 0 to 2), and 2 children must be at least 6 years old. If the home is licensed for 12 children, there may be no more than 4 infants. The ratio of adults to children must be 1:14, and after every 9\textsuperscript{th} child, there must be an assistant.\textsuperscript{23} A small family child care home may be licensed for a capacity of either 6 or 8. If the home is licensed for 8 children, there can be only 2 infants, and 2 of the children must be at least 6 years old.

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.
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old. If the home is licensed for 6 children, there can be no more than 4 infants. There must be 1 adult to every 8 children.  

A child care center is usually operated outside the licensee’s home in a commercial building. In order to obtain a license, a provider must: be at least 18 years old, submit fingerprints for all staff, obtain fire clearance, submit a licensing application and pay a fee. In addition, a provider must attend a series of licensing orientations and verify that the director and all teachers have at least 12 units in early care and education. Directors must also have at least three units in administration or staff relations. In addition, all staff must have verifiable experience working in a licensed child care center or comparable group setting. Education must be verified by a certificate, transcript, and/or a credential from an accredited college or university. The adult to child ratio is 1 teacher to every 12 kids. If there are more than 15 children, there also must be one aid. A variety of daily planned activities must be provided to occupy the children as well as age-appropriate tables, chairs, play equipment, and materials. In order to obtain a license, a face-to-face interview is conducted, and the facility is inspected. Licensing capacity is determined by the indoor and outdoor square footage and by the number of available toilets and sinks. Every child must have 35 square feet of indoor play space, 75 square feet of outdoor play space, and one toilet and one sink for every 15 children. Drinking water must also be available inside and outside the center.  

The main difference between a child care center and a family child care home is that child care centers provide care outside of the home for larger groups of children. The director and their staff are also more qualified, as they are required to have at least 12 units in early care and education. Whereas child care centers are required to provide planned activities, family child care homes only need to have toys and materials available for the children. They are not required to have any planned activities or other forms of “curriculum.” While California does not distinguish among child care, preschool, pre-kindergarten, or day care, it appears that child care centers are more curriculum oriented than the family child care homes. Table 1 provides  

24 California Community Care Licensing Division Los Angeles Northwest Regional Office. Phone Interview.  
26 California Community Care Licensing Division Los Angeles Northwest Regional Office. Phone Interview.  
the numbers of licensed child care centers and licensed family child care homes and how many spaces there currently are in each type of facility.

### Table 1 Number of Licensed Centers and Family Child Care Homes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Center/Homes</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Child Care Centers</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>46,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Family Child Care Homes</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>23,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3722</strong></td>
<td><strong>70,237</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### The Drive to Provide Universal Preschool

Due to stricter regulations and more emphasis on curriculum in child care centers, many are now attempting to enhance family child care to maintain a higher standard of quality. Across the country, people are beginning to see the value of quality preschool - previously, the notion of preschool was tied to child care services. Because of the growing research that cites the educational value of preschool, parents and policy makers realize its importance and are beginning to support preschool programs. In 2000, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services spent $1.5 billion dollars on pre-kindergarten programs, compared to $180 million in 1987.28 A study conducted by The Children’s Defense Fund in 2000 found that there are over 750,000 children enrolled in preschool, and forty-two states offer free or subsidized preschool.29 Currently, most subsidized preschool programs are for poor children, most notably the federal Head Start program. In fact, all funding at the federal level is targeted for low-income children. Several states are changing this strategy, providing universal preschool programs to all children, regardless of income. The perception of preschool is beginning to change from providing services for the most needy to providing services for all children. The idea behind the drive for universal preschool is that preschool is equally as important as K-12 education, and therefore should be guaranteed to all children.

Several states are at the forefront of the preschool movement. Georgia, New York, Oklahoma, New Jersey, and Florida are committed to implementing universal preschool programs that are truly universal—that is accessible for all children. Most notable so far is

---

29 Ibid.
Georgia’s universal preschool program—funded by its state lottery. In Georgia, about 70% of 4-yr-olds participate in free universal preschool services.30

**California Climate**

California has started to address the notion of universal preschool, along with First 5 California. In 1998, California voters passed Proposition 10, which places a 50-cent tax on cigarettes. The money from the tax supports children from the ages of 0 to 5 by “creating a comprehensive and integrated system of information and services to promote early childhood development and school readiness.” 31

The First 5 California Children and Families Commission oversees Proposition 10 money and makes sure that their goals are achieved. First 5 funding is allocated to the various counties across the state, and each county commission then decides how to allocate county funds. First 5 LA has allocated 100 million dollars to develop a plan for universal preschool in the county of LA. The Commission completed their strategic plan in February 2004. Their goal is to launch a universal preschool program this fall and expand quickly over the

---


---
The next few years so that in 10 years, 64% of all 4-year old children will be in preschool programs. First 5 plans to provide high-quality part-day preschool with an optional full-day child care component. Because the state has not defined what quality preschool is, First 5 has stated in their strategic plan that they will introduce a five star system that will rate the quality of a preschool program. Specifically, standards will develop around areas such as administration, staff support, staff qualifications, curriculum, environment, health/safety and developmental appropriateness. First 5 plans to have a monitor who will make site visits to assess the initial quality of the child care facility and subsequent visits to ensure the site continues to either maintain high quality or improve upon the quality. Schools that meet the five star rating will be those that receive the greatest funding from First 5 (See Appendix A).

The First 5 accreditation program will model itself after already existing program standards. These include the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) standards, the National School Age Care Alliance (NSACA) standards, and the Head Start Performance Standards. In order to be accredited by any of these programs, the following factors are taken into consideration: teacher and children interaction, curriculum, relationship between teachers and families, staff qualifications and professional development, administration, staffing, physical environment, health and safety, nutrition and food service, and evaluation. In order to be accredited by NAEYC, teachers must have at least a Child Development Associate Credential or an Associate Degree in Early Care and Education/Child Development or equivalent; preferably teachers would have a Bachelors Degree in Early Childhood Development/Child Development.

---

33 Ibid.
35 Ibid.
A Look around California

First 5 LA is one of the furthest along of the First Five county commissions in implementing a universal preschool initiative. However, they are not alone. Cities in California have also been working to provide their residents with universal preschool. These cities include: San Francisco, San Jose and Santa Monica.

**San Francisco**

San Francisco has been leading California in providing universal preschool for its children. San Francisco is unique among cities in the state because the county and the city are the same, whereas the city of Los Angeles is one of many cities in the county of Los Angeles. This means that San Francisco has incredible flexibility in implementation through partnerships between city and county services. The city has partnered with the City and County of San Francisco Department of Human Services to leverage TANF funding to provide temporary child care to children of CalWORKS parents when a child is mildly ill. They also collaborated together to provide Family Child Care Provider Networks. The city collaborates with the Department of Public Health to provide health services at several child care centers. Not only does the city collaborate with other public agencies; it has also created partnerships and collaborations with private entities. For example, the Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families partnered with the San Francisco Starting Points Initiative, The Miriam and Peter Haas Fund, Providian Financial Corporation, and the Low Income Housing Fund in order to create the Child Care Facilities Fund. The fund offers capital support, training and technical assistance to child care providers. The city has also collaborated with the City College of San Francisco to provide training conferences for family child care providers.36

San Francisco was also successful in passing the Children’s Amendment to increase children’s services for a ten-year period. The city also has an Affordable Child Care Fund, to establish a relationship with a non-profit to provide a child care facility in the city, or build a child care facility on their site.37

Because the city already has a range of existing services, First 5 San Francisco is working with the city’s efforts so that they can complement and build on San Francisco’s already successful strategies. Further, First 5 San Francisco and San Francisco’s early care and

37 Ibid.
education programs are essentially the same, because the county and the city are the same. First 5 San Francisco is still in its planning stages; unlike Los Angeles, they have not finished their planning strategies and will begin using their funding in the future.

**San Jose**

Smart Start San Jose (SSSJ) is the mayor and city council’s Early Education Initiative that was established to improve the quality of early childhood experiences for children. Some of San Jose’s collaborative partners include Santa Clara County Office of Education, Head Start, IBM, David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Goodwill of Santa Clara County, San Jose Unified School District, and San Jose Public libraries. SSSJ is an educational collaborative involving schools, parents, early childhood development professionals, businesses, community-based organizations, and the City of San Jose. The goal is to create 2,600 new early care and educational spaces by 2006. While operation costs are expected to be covered by child care centers, the city of San Jose has a grant program whereby child care centers can apply for funds to help alleviate start-up costs.

**Santa Monica**

The Santa Monica Early Childhood Initiative focuses on improving the ability of families, schools, libraries, parks, community agencies, and government programs to work together for student success. The city intends to accomplish this with a comprehensive approach that includes coordination and integration of community-based health, education and social services for families, building the capacity of existing programs, and establishing a shared data management system to evaluate outcomes. One key aspect which distinguishes Santa Monica from many other cities in California is its focus on health and its incorporation of health policy into child care policy. In addition, Santa Monica intends to work closely with Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District to expand the pre-kindergarten to kindergarten transition. In addition, Santa Monica plans to establish a data system designed to capture baseline information about participating families and track inquiries, enrollments, referrals, services provided, and consumer feedback to provide beneficial coordinated information to enable clear communication between parents and various departments offering services. Another exciting aspect of Santa Monica’s early care and education program is its emphasis on communicating with families in

---

38 San Jose, Early Care and Education Services. “Quality Early Education for Lifelong Success: Smart Start San Jose”.
hospitals from the moment children are born. They intend to do this with “Welcome Baby Visits” in which baby visits will be performed by a specialist who will provide infant development tips, as well as information about community programs and networks providing early care and education. This will give parents the information they need about the importance of early care and education and the programs available to their children at a very early stage, further enhancing the probability of the child’s success later in life.

**Los Angeles Climate**

Like other cities in California, the city of Los Angeles is also interested in helping to provide its residents universal preschool services. But, unlike other cities, Los Angeles is the most populous and diverse city in the state. Table 2 compares the population, median income, and number of children ages 3 to 5 in the city of Los Angeles with other California cities.

**Table 2: City Comparisons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>San Jose</th>
<th>Santa Monica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,694,834</td>
<td>776,733</td>
<td>893,889</td>
<td>84,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Yr Olds</td>
<td>174,926 (4.7%)</td>
<td>18,384 (2.4%)</td>
<td>41,016 (4.6%)</td>
<td>1,868 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Inc.</td>
<td>$36,687</td>
<td>$55,221</td>
<td>$70,243</td>
<td>$50,714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This table is telling because among other California cities trying to provide universal preschool, Los Angeles has the highest percent of 3 to 5 year olds and also the lowest median income. With the highest number of 3-5 year olds and fewer resources on a per capita basis, Los Angeles faces a great challenge in establishing universal access to preschool.

As a result, it is imperative for the city of Los Angeles to determine where to best utilize its limited resources. To accomplish this task, we examined where children ages 3 to 5 live in the city, where preschool services and child care services already exist, whether there is a need for preschool and child care services and if so, where the need exists. The data for the following maps were provided by Data Trends, Karen Hill-Scott & Company, First 5 LA, the California Resource and Referral Network, and the Census 2000. Please note that this data “is only a static snapshot of a dynamic industry,” as the enrollment data for child care is constantly changing. Further, the data on child care enrollment includes only licensed child care providers. Due to the

---

40 Dang, Darren. Interview.
fact that it is extremely difficult to find enrollment data on unlicensed family child care homes, we were unable to include it in our analysis. In addition, the data used in these maps is only an estimate. Because the data we have is organized by zip code, it overestimates the population of 3 to 5 year olds in the city and the enrollment and need data. Some of the bordering zip code areas in the city of Los Angeles have the same zip code as areas that are outside the city. For example, 90201 is a zip code for an area inside the city of Los Angeles. It is also the zip code number for Beverly Hills, which is its own separate city. Therefore, the numbers we have are slightly inflated. In our analysis we also include five year olds. However, it is important to realize that some five year olds might already be in a kindergarten program and would therefore not need preschool services. Finally, we assume that parents are sending and want to send their children to preschools in their neighborhood. Therefore, we do not take into consideration, for example, parents who send their children to a preschool near their work which might be located outside of their neighborhood. Due to these factors, it is possible that the numbers used in our analysis overestimates child care need in the city. However, despite these imperfections, the data gives a fairly comprehensive picture of preschool age children in Los Angeles and the preschool services that are needed.
In Map 1 the darker areas show where the concentrations of children ages 3 to 5 in the City of Los Angeles are high.

Map 1

Three to 5 year olds in the city of Los Angeles make up roughly 4.7% of the total population. The percent of children varies by zip code, making up anywhere between 0 to 7.33% of the population. Low concentration neighborhoods include Pacific Palisades, Bel Air, West Hollywood, Westwood, Venice, Central LA, and Gateway. High percentages of children ages 3 to 5 are found in three concentrated areas: the valley including neighborhoods such as Panorama City, Canoga Park, and Van Nuys; the eastern part of the city including the eastern part of South East LA, South Central LA, Boyle Heights, Central LA, and Northeast LA; and the southern part of the city, including Wilmington.

In addition, Table 3 and Figure 1 and Figure 2 illustrate population projections for children ages 3 to 5 and demonstrate that ECE (early care and education) is a growing factor and will continue to be an issue that the City of LA must be involved with eventually.
Table 3: Los Angeles Population Growth Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>3-5 year olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3,694,834</td>
<td>174,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,835,943</td>
<td>181,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,085,633</td>
<td>193,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>4,654,068</td>
<td>220,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data extrapolated from Los Angeles MTA Strategic Plan 2002.

Figure 1

Projected Population of the City of Los Angeles

Figure 2

Projected Population of 3-5 year Olds in City of Los Angeles

Source: Data extrapolated from Los Angeles MTA Strategic Plan 2002.
Map 2 shows the number of licensed child care spaces for 3 to 5 year olds in the city of Los Angeles by zip code.

Neighborhoods with low concentrations of child care spaces are similar to the neighborhoods with low concentrations of children age 3 to 5. Generally, a low number of child care spaces exist in Bel Air-Beverly Crest, Hollywood, Central LA and Gateway. There are also few child care spaces in some of the valley neighborhoods, including Studio City, Canoga Park and Encino. A high concentration of child care spaces can be found in South Central LA, Pacoima, Granada Hills, Woodland Hills, West Adams-Baldwin Hills, Leiment, and Crenshaw.

Map 3 shows the unmet need of licensed child care spaces for children ages 3 to 5 in the city of Los Angeles. In order to calculate the unmet need, we replicated Fist 5 LA’s unmet need formula and subtracted the supply from the demand; that is, we subtracted the total child care spaces available from the population of 3 to 5 year olds: NEED = POPULATION 3 to 5 YEAR OLDS (by zip code) – TOTAL CHILD CARE SPACES. The following is a table for the city of...
Los Angeles (by zip code). Table 4 shows that the city has a shortfall of 111,160 child care spaces.

**Table 4: Shortfall of Childcare Spaces in the City of Los Angeles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population of 3 to 5 year olds</td>
<td>181,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed child care and preschool capacity</td>
<td>70,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space shortfall for 3 to 5 year olds</td>
<td>111,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The neighborhoods with the greatest need for child care spaces are: Wilmington, South East LA, the eastern part of South Central LA, North East LA, Wilshire, Sylmar, Panorama City, and Pacoima.
In order to determine which areas have the greatest need in proportion to the amount of children in the area, we calculated the percent of need in each zip code area.

Map 4

Areas with high percentages of need are: Canoga Park, Sylmar, Panorama City, Sun Valley, Tujunga, and Van Nuys in the Valley; Bel Air-Beverly Crest and Playa Del Rey in West LA; North Hollywood, Hollywood, Wilshire, North East LA, Boyle Heights, West Lake, Wilshire, Central LA, South Central LA and South East LA in East Los Angeles; and Wilmington, Harbor City, and San Pedro in South LA. Table 5 shows the zip codes with the least need and the greatest need for child care spaces in the city.
Table 5: Areas with the Greatest and Least Need for Child Care Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Children Ages 3 to 5</th>
<th>Available Spaces</th>
<th>Unmet Need</th>
<th>% Unmet Need</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90021</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>-295</td>
<td>-440%</td>
<td>SE LA, Central City North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91367</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>-671</td>
<td>-62%</td>
<td>Woodland Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90013</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>Central City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91325</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>-166</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>Northridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91311</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>-159</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>Chatsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90065</td>
<td>2394</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>NE LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90057</td>
<td>2436</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>2155</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Westlake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90210</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>Bel Air – Beverly Crest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90006</td>
<td>3635</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>3,317</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>Westlake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91402</td>
<td>4107</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>3,797</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>Panorama City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This map shows that a large majority of the city is in need of child care services. Of the 106 zip codes in the city, only 8 zip codes have a greater supply then the demand. Seven zip codes have a supply which meets the demand. Twenty-seven of the zip codes have a need less than 50% and 64 zip code areas have a need of more than 50%. Map 5 clearly shows the need for child care services in the city of Los Angeles.
Student CAT/6 scores are another indicator of the need for school-readiness provided by preschool services. The CAT/6 assessment is the normed California Standards Test taken by all students in grades 2-11. The earliest available test scores for elementary school children is second grade, but it is reasonable to assume that gaps in school readiness that existed in kindergarten still dominate in second grade. Therefore, these test scores are a good indication of how prepared children are for school. Looking at the CAT/6 Reading scores, there are large gaps depending on which zip codes students attend school. These scores have been averaged for all schools within each zip code. Schools in South Central, Central LA, and University LA (all in East LA) have the worst reading scores. Many other schools at the low end of the range are in East or South Central LA, and some in the North Valley (Sun Valley, Pacoima, etc.). The neighborhoods with the best scoring schools are generally on the West Side (Pacific Palisades, Beverly Hills, Brentwood, Marina Del Rey) and in the West Valley (Sherman Oaks, Studio City, Woodland Hills, Encino). Therefore, students in these low-scoring neighborhoods are in greatest need of pre-kindergarten support, to achieve a school-readiness level that is comparable to higher scoring neighborhoods. These are the neighborhoods that should be targeted for use of preschool resources.
In Los Angeles there are numerous federal, state and city subsidized preschool programs that provide care to low income families who meet federal poverty guidelines and who have children age 3 to 5. As a result, research has shown that children who suffer the greatest from the lack of a preschool education are not those with parents who are in the lowest income bracket but rather children in poor and working class families. Preschool programs that are available to LA’s lowest income families include Head Start, State Preschools, the Alternative Payment Program (APP), CalWORKS and School Readiness Language Development Program (SRLDP).

As a result of the many programs available to extremely low income families, those who end up suffering the most are working and lower income families because they do not qualify for subsidized programs and also cannot afford the cost of other child care. In Los Angeles, the cost of licensed care is rapidly increasing such that even the middle class have a difficult time paying child care costs. According to a child care needs assessment study by PACE, the average cost of care in Los Angeles County is $461 per month for preschoolers. This means that parents making up to $30,000 a year spend on average 22% of their income on child care, while median-income families pay about 17% of their income on child care. Therefore, as income decreases, a higher percentage of income must be dedicated to child care. The poor and working class are forced to spend what little money they do have on child care services. Many working class families are unable to afford quality child care services and must leave their children with family, friends, or neighbors while they are at work.

As a result, in our analysis we wanted to see whether low income families are in greatest need of child care services. Therefore, we mapped need with median income. Income groups are broken into 3 categories: lowest income, ranging from $0 to $17,999; lower income ranging from $18,000 to $35,999; and middle income ranging from $36,000 to $75,000.

---

42 Head Start is a federally funded program that provides preschool to low-income families who meet the federal poverty guideline ($18,400 for a family of 4). State preschool provides both part-day and full-day programs by providing funds to grantees that then contract with various preschool programs in Los Angeles. The APP is a voucher program that gives families the opportunity to send their children to in-home child care, family child care, or child care centers. CalWORKS consists of three stages, each of which provides child care benefits to families who are receiving, or who have received cash assistance in the past two years. SRLDP is a program provided by Los Angeles Unified School District and prepares children with readiness and language skills and is targeted toward children who speak English as their second language.
44 Ibid.
45 We use $17,999 as the cut off for the lowest income because the federal government has established that in order to qualify for Head Start, a family must be living in poverty and therefore income cannot exceed $18,400 for a family of four.
from $18,000 to $35,999; and highest income, ranging from anything above $72,000. In the map, the medium income range is left gray in the map in order to make the map clearer. Need is also broken into three categories of low need, medium need, and high need. Low need ranges from -439.7% to 7.69%; medium need ranges from 7.7% to 39.41%; and high need ranges from 39.42% to 92.44%.

Map 6

Map 6 similarly illustrates that the need of child care services is great throughout the city. Zip code areas considered high need make up a majority on the map. Further, the table at the bottom shows that all income groups in Los Angeles are suffering from the lack of child care, with the lower income groups the worst off, with 83% of the lower income zip codes in the high need category. It is also important to note that the lowest income category includes 6 zip code areas that have an income of $0 because no one lives there (there are only administrative/office buildings). For example, one of the zip codes is 90095, which is the UCLA campus. The census does not have a value for the area’s medium income- but since child care spaces exist, they are
shaded on the map. If we disregard these 6 area codes in the analysis, the table then looks like this:

**Table 6: Levels of Child Care Need and Income Levels by Zip Code**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Need</th>
<th>Med. Need</th>
<th>High Need</th>
<th>Total Zip codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Income</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Income</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
<td>34 (83%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med. Income</td>
<td>8 (17.5%)</td>
<td>8 (17.5%)</td>
<td>30 (65%)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


While we did not perform any statistical analyses to determine whether these percentages are statistically significant, we can say that the percentages show there is great need in the entire city of Los Angeles for child care, and those that need it the most are children whose parents earn more than the federal poverty level, disqualifying them for subsidized programs. Medium income parents also have a high percentage of need for child care spaces at 65% of high need; lowest income groups have a high need of 60% and high income families have a high need of 50%.

We expected the reason that the lowest income neighborhoods do not have the greatest need is due to a wealth of subsidized centers in those areas. When we look at where these maps are located (see Map 7), it is clear that the lowest income($0-17,999) and the lower-income ($18,000-35,999) benefit most from the Head Start services. However, because there are many more lower-income neighborhoods (as opposed to only five small lowest income areas), Head Start centers are not pervasive enough to reach all families.
This analysis shows that not only is Los Angeles in dire need of child care services, but also affordable child care spaces for lower income families. However, this analysis does not even begin to look at whether the day care and family child care homes that exist in the city have an educational component to be considered quality preschool programs.
Quality Preschool Characteristics

In order to learn more about the quality of preschools in Los Angeles, we conducted 22 phone interviews with preschools from Districts 1 through 15. These preschools varied from public/non-profits such as Head Start, to private and religious preschools. Almost all of the preschools we spoke to have a waiting list, and while not all categorized their neighborhood as one with a shortage of preschools, the fact that waiting lists ranged from three months to one year illustrates the high demand for preschools across the city of LA. Among the preschools we spoke to, six were family child care home providers. We spoke to these providers to assess how the city of LA can help enhance resources available to these family child care providers to develop quality care.

Through our interviews we found that a major difference between the family child care providers and child care centers is the lack of a formal curriculum. Many of the child care centers we spoke to emphasized formal curriculum such as High Scope and Montessori. The home care providers, on the other hand, emphasized circle time and arts and crafts, rather than a specific curriculum for school readiness. According to Carol Howes, child care quality appears more important than either child care form, (home care or center-based care) or age of entry in predicting children’s development. However, accurately assessing whether the preschools we spoke to are providing quality care for their children is difficult. This is largely due to the fact that there are no formal licensing requirements for educational curriculum. However, since First 5 is planning to use NAEYC’s accreditation program to help model their five star system, we use their accreditation program as a measure of quality.

Surprisingly we found that in California, only 522 child care centers are NAEYC accredited. In Los Angeles, out of 899 child care centers, only 46 of those centers are NAEYC accredited. This means that only 5% of the preschool programs in Los Angeles are NAEYC accredited. With such a low percentage of preschool programs offering this high standard of quality, very few children are entering school with the necessary preparation tools to succeed.

While the 22 interviews we conducted do not comprehensively represent preschools in Los Angeles, some of the many quality preschool characteristics we gathered information on

---

include teacher and staff salaries, adequate supplies, equipment, conferences, training, mileage, travel and employee benefits. The following are of particularly importance when assessing quality preschool characteristics and will help Los Angeles develop successful quality preschools.

✓ **High teacher qualifications**

Only a small number of the preschools we spoke to employ teachers with a Bachelors Degree, and even fewer with a Masters Degree. More common, however, are teachers with Associate of Arts (AA) Degrees. According to First 5, the most successful preschools will have master teachers with a BA degree or higher in early child education or child development and at least 200 hours of supervised field work. As a result, First 5 believes more rigorous requirements and certification standards for those who teach young children must be implemented and at a minimum the state should approve a professional development program for publicly funded preschool providers.

✓ **Fair teacher compensation**

While increasing master teacher qualifications will inevitably raise teacher compensation, doing so will also help decrease high teacher turnover rates. Therefore, compensation should be linked with education level and experience. With increasing qualifications for preschool teachers, many believe that the salaries of these teachers should be comparable to K-12 teacher salaries.

✓ **Low teacher-child ratio**

Many of the preschools we spoke to exceed the permissible number of children allowed, typically with a teacher child ratio of 1:12 (instead of 1:8). Research has shown, however, that while a low teacher-child ratio is important, the quality of care can be better defined by staff qualifications. For example, First 5 recommends a ratio of 3:24 master teacher-child ratio, 2:20 with a master teacher and a teacher with an AA and additional staff and volunteers.

✓ **Quality infrastructure/facilities**

A number of the preschools we spoke to described the strict regulations of how many children per square feet is permitted by the county. In addition, there are many regulations concerning the building, play equipment, conversion costs and the licensing process. However, many researchers believe there is an absence of a comprehensive infrastructure or support system.
to ensure the successful delivery of early care and education services. 47 As a result, First 5 believes elements of infrastructure should also include personnel preparation, construction and renovation of facilities, technical assistance, quality assurance monitoring, and applied research and program evaluation to promote accountability.

✅ Quality curriculum

While the preschools we spoke to offer a variety of curricula from High Scope, to Montessori, to various faith based curricula, research shows that a curriculum that is intended to develop children’s social-emotional, cognitive, linguistic and physical development is most beneficial for children and promotes a successful transition into kindergarten. As a result, the California Department of Education and its Child Development Division is developing a Pre-kindergarten Learning and Development Guideline that will be published later this year. This will prove to be a useful resource to child care centers to provide a more “academic” emphasis to prepare children for school.

✅ Value of diversity

The majority of preschools we spoke to emphasized the diversity of their classrooms. For example, many preschools in District 6 have a large population of Armenian children and as a result have teachers who are able to communicate with the kids in both Armenian and English. In addition, the majority of preschools we contacted indicated that at least one teacher and/or teacher assistant is a Spanish speaker. Recognizing that preschool age children are at their prime for language acquisition is important when developing a curriculum for English language learners. It is also important to help the kids preserve their first language and the culture in which it is rooted. According to First 5, English language learners need the support of programs that reinforce their two languages. This is of particular importance in LA given the large proportion of first generation children for whom English is not their first language.

Coordinating Service Provision in Los Angeles

Preschool services do not provide themselves. Unfortunately, identifying where preschool is most needed and knowing which elements are most valuable is not the end of the story. A city as large and diverse as Los Angeles faces a complex array of problems that are linked inextricably to children’s issues - homelessness, housing shortages, health hazards, community blight, and public safety issues. As a result, there are a number of different local agencies who all have a particular interest in child care. Nor does the city of Los Angeles necessarily provide all of its own services - there is considerable overlap with both county agencies and the local school district, as well as some provision by state and federal organizations. Like the old adage about having too many cooks in the kitchen, the large number and variety of service providers make the coordination of preschool services especially difficult. In some ways these agencies are able to provide complementary services with little or no coordination. In many others, however, the different interests lead to conflict.

To better understand the role various agencies within the city play in establishing universal preschools, we interviewed city officials from a broad spectrum of city services, including various departments, commissions, and the city council. We found that insufficient communication and competing priorities made it very difficult for interagency cooperation on preschool issues. The numerous benefits of child care have ironically made it more difficult to coordinate services. Some agencies want to prioritize the educational component, while others consider the health and development benefits to be of greater value. Still others may feel that child care should be a comparable to a social service - a program that allows homeless children access to resources, or provides single parents a safe environment for their children while they work. While these benefits are not necessarily exclusive, the lack of a coordinated, cohesive policy has resulted in service providers competing for limited resources to provide programs that best serve the interests they perceive as most important.

This lack of coordination has resulted in missed opportunities for the city to access a number of potential resources. Funding from Prop 40, 46, California Housing and Community Development (HCD), Housing Urban Development (HUD), Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), and Federal funding from the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) are all potentially available. If the city coordinates efforts to combine the interests of several different agencies, it might be able to secure some of these outside funds to provide efficient,
comprehensive services.

In addition to intra-city coordination concerns, the city also faces the task of coordinating efforts with other public and private providers. Unlike other cities, Los Angeles has to work with entities outside of its jurisdiction regarding policy programming and implementation. In the area of early care and education, these include First Five LA, the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE), the Los Angeles County Department of Health, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), and an assortment of private businesses, philanthropic organizations, and both for-profit and nonprofit providers.

For Los Angeles to successfully provide high-quality preschool services to the children who need them, it will necessarily require the city to understand its own various policy interests, and unite around a common set of priorities. Once this is accomplished, the city can work to coordinate the logistics of service provision with various public and private entities that combine to form the early care and education landscape in Los Angeles.
Policy Problems and Criteria for Evaluation

Returning to the general question, we intend to answer how Los Angeles can leverage its existing resources to support the drive for universal access to preschool. We have established that preschool does, in fact, provide general value - both educational value to the students in the form of learning, development and school readiness, and value to Los Angeles in the form of decreased costs for social services and allowing parents more flexibility to work and contribute to the community. We have also identified that the current preschool and child care services are not expansive enough to accommodate all of the families who might want to participate in them. Finally, we established that services are provided by a number of different players, both public and private, and spanning all levels of government. Each of these players has different and sometimes competing interests in the purpose and priorities of preschool.

This analysis suggests three broad problems: there is insufficient capacity, there is a lack of preschools that are both of a high educational quality and affordable, and there is a lack of coordination among service providers, both within the various bodies of the city of Los Angeles and between the city and external public and private organizations. Using these three problems, we developed a set of criteria that would ensure that any options we consider directly address the problem areas, and are sensitive to the very real financial and political constraints that the city faces.

Given the complexity of these problems, we are unlikely to find a single, elegant solution. Rather, we looked for a series of complementary options that may not have tremendous individual impact but, when taken together, make significant improvements to the larger problems. As such, we needed to develop a set of criteria that each individually address some problem or constraint faced by the city, but allow for different and distinct policies, programs, or services that could combine for the greater good. We therefore considered two branches of criteria: those that directly address the observed problems, and those that recognize the effective constraints. Options we identify will not necessarily meet each of these criteria, but should meet enough to be worthy of consideration. Options we recommend must address one or more of the problem-focused criteria, while not significantly violating any of the constraint-focused criteria.
Problem-focused criteria

Having divided the problems into three general categories, we need a set of criteria that specifically address each of these concerns. Options we consider should have the effect of improving the capacity, quality and affordability, or coordination of preschool services. Considering those outcome goals, and again focusing on the preschool population of children ages 3 to 5, we have established the following four criteria:

Criteria #1: Increase the capacity of preschool

The goal of a universally accessible preschool program is to ensure that all families who need and want preschool are able to access it. Increasing the quality of the educational components of preschool does not improve the situation much if the number of families that have access to those opportunities is limited. Existing preschools and child care centers lack the capacity to meet the needs of all of Los Angeles' children. The previous maps demonstrate that a large percent of the population of 3 to 5 year olds are not enrolled in some type of licensed child care. While the lower and working class experience the most need, the need for preschool affects all income levels, as the demand for preschools far exceeds the supply of existing programs. Further, with the population growth of 3 to 5 year old children in the next 25 years, the problem of preschool capacity will only intensify.

Options we consider should serve to increase the preschool capacity in Los Angeles. This could be achieved two ways, either by increasing the capacity of existing preschool programs, including home-based programs, or by developing new preschools. Therefore, our options should include methods for the city of Los Angeles to increase the capacity of preschool.

[Diagram showing the shortfall of licensed child care spaces for 3-5 year olds in Los Angeles]

Criteria #2: Improve the quality of the educational component

Criteria #3: Make preschool programs more affordable

Increasing the number of preschool spaces is a worthy goal in and of itself, but there are considerably greater benefits if these programs include a high-quality educational component as well. To provide truly universal access to preschool, programs must also be affordable. The benefits of preschool would not be equitably distributed if the “good” preschool programs were priced so high that a significant percentage of the population could not afford them.

Evaluating the quality of a preschool is not an easy task. The only consistent defining characteristic of preschool - from government licensing to individual service providers - is the age of the children it serves. Most existing licensing requirements focus on the physical environment and organizational issues (number/age of children per staff member, length of the day or program, etc). Many existing child care programs, in fact, are more custodial in nature with few aspirations for an educational component. Those that include an educational component, or those preschool programs focused primarily on learning and development, usually include some sort of tuition or fee for service. This implies two interrelated policy concerns. First, if a parent wanted his/her child in preschool or a child care program with an educational component, could he/she afford to put them there? Second, if a parent found an affordable preschool or child care program, how “good” is the educational component?

While the city may consider different elements of quality as having a higher or lower priority, any solutions we propose must ensure that the relative educational value of a program is increased. Options we consider should have the virtue of either providing an educational component to a more custodial focused program, or increasing the educational value or impact of a program with a pre-existing educational component. Additionally, the options we consider should either reduce the cost of private service provision and, by extension, the cost to parents, or increase the provision of public or subsidized programs.

Criteria #4: Improve the coordination of service delivery

Not only is there overlap and some lack of communication among the county, city and other potential entities, there is also an internal lack of coordination among the various city agencies (See Appendix B). As a consequence, it is nearly impossible for the city of Los Angeles to plan a clearly articulated and coordinated set of policy priorities, nor is there an authoritative, centralized body to implement the policies if they were established. Improved
coordination requires improved communication (understanding each others’ needs), which would result in the smoother implementation of policy. Options we consider in this category should either provide the opportunity for better intra-city coordination of preferences, priorities and services, or facilitate representation and cooperation between the city and other external organizations with overlapping interests in the provision of preschool.

**Constraint-focused criteria**

Public policy is not created within a vacuum, but rather within a complicated amalgam of competing and sometimes conflicting interests. Los Angeles faces certain financial and political constraints that limit its ability to provide universal access to preschool. Los Angeles faces the challenge, therefore, of increasing the provision of a valuable and highly demanded social service while remaining sensitive to serious financial constraints and often competing interests. To ensure that the options we consider recognize these constraints and are responsible and realistic, we have an additional three criteria for consideration:

**Criteria #5: Cost & Revenue Neutral**

The nature of our policy problem lies in the fact that the city of Los Angeles has no surplus resources to allocate to preschool. The current state and local operating deficits mean that no new funding streams can be anticipated, and some existing funding streams may well be reduced or eliminated. As a result, what limited revenue sources the city does have access to (property and sales taxes, fees for services, etc.) need to be maintained, if not increased. The role of the city in any options we consider, therefore, must be limited to leveraging existing resources - policies in this area must remain both cost and revenue neutral.

**Criteria #6: Amenable to Partnerships**

One of LA’s key existing resources is its ability to partner with other entities. Without the realistic opportunity to generate new funding for programs, this may be the best method for Los Angeles to provide more universal access to higher quality preschools. If the city can collaborate with others who have complementary resources, it can best serve the needs of the preschool population. Therefore, any options we consider must have the benefit of attracting partners to provide services.
Criteria #7: Political Feasibility

Any kind of policy recommendation must be possible to implement. This means that it will be amenable to a combination of constituencies, such as citizens, elected officials, public managers, and private and public organizations with distinct and usually different interests.

Options for Consideration

In the sections that follow, we identify a set of options within each of the broader problem areas for the city to consider. These options are intended to represent a broad spectrum of possible approaches. While all of the options address at least one of the identified criteria, some leave much to be desired considering the current situation. They are included here both to represent the wide variety of possible approaches, and to recognize that local government is a dynamic, evolving process - ideas that are not feasible today may well be the ideal solution if preferences, priorities and constraints change tomorrow. We then consider all of the options against our criteria and the general policy goal, and identify a set of recommendations that are the most likely to address the problem areas within the constraints faced by the city.

Options to Increase Preschool Capacity

Options in this category should increase the capacity or availability of preschool spaces in the city to move the city towards universal access. Several officials have suggested that the best way for Los Angeles to support or promote universal preschool is to leverage its land towards that goal. In the greater Los Angeles area, land and space issues are paramount and may be the most difficult challenges facing the expansion of preschool services. This section considers the following nine options for increasing child care capacity:

1. City Ordinance on Local Development Projects
2. Leverage Existing Space
3. Create Developer Incentives- Density Bonuses and Adaptive Reuse Program
4. Identify Vacant or Abandoned City-Owned Buildings
5. Proposition 40 Monies
6. Municipal Bonds
7. Utility Credits for Providers – Empowerment Zone Businesses
8. Tax Incentives/Credits for Providers
9. Long-Term Loans for Providers
1. City Ordinance on Local Development Projects

San Francisco has been very successful in its implementation of a city ordinance (established in 1985) that imposes certain requirements on developers building 50,000 square feet or more of hotel or office space within city limits. Developers must meet the directive by either building a child care facility on-site, establishing a relationship with a non-profit to provide child care, or by paying $1 per square foot developed. Developer fees are then allotted to the Child Care Facilities Fund. This Affordable Child Care Fund created by the city ordinance has provided significant dollars (approximately $400,000 in 2001) and space to the city’s child care efforts.48

Such a mandate could be passed by the Los Angeles City Council and imposed on new developments within the city. The ordinance would cost the Los Angeles government and its taxpayers nothing directly, while investing private resources in the city. However, while passing this type of ordinance in 1985 or during the dot-com boom of the late 1990’s would be easy, in today’s economy the costs imposed on developers might turn some of them away from the city, and encourage them to develop just outside city limits. City Council members and Mayor Hahn may believe that this type of mandate will take business away from the city, something they cannot afford to do in such fiscally dismal times.

Impacts:
- Would increase access to some low income families
- Would increase the number of spaces for children
- Costs would be covered by new developers

Limitations:
- Developers and Businesses may potentially be driven away
- Unlikely to have the support of the Los Angeles City Council because of the potential opposition of developers, and the potential of driving away businesses

2. Leverage Existing Space

Los Angeles is currently developing a database of property under the mayor's Maximizing Our Real Estate (MORE) program. These underutilized spaces for development

---

will be parceled out according to the city’s needs. However, many of these spaces may not be suitable for Early Care and Education (ECE). Finding alternative spaces and facilities is of critical importance, according to First Five, a major way in which the city can assist First Five’s goals is to assist in land use planning and zoning/permit issues.

To facilitate these alternative spaces, it may be a good idea to create mixed use sites as well as housing development projects. The Child Care Policy Task Force has already recommended that the LA Planning Department work with the Commission for Children, Youth, and Their Families (CCYF) and the mayor to implement a comprehensive child care developer incentive plan. If not covered under the Planning Department, a similar effort should be applied to housing policies in order to encourage Multi-Family Housing Project (MHP) related developments. MHPs are units which are likely to have a high density of tenants with children. Efforts to encourage the creation of on site child care and early learning sites are ongoing and should continue.

**Impacts:**

- Database would serve to help identify needed space and therefore add to existing capacity
- Based on interviews with First Five, the city can help considerably in terms of allocation of space via zoning and permit processes, and city ordinances

**Limitations:**

- Based on interviews with officials in the Department of City Planning, the problem is not one of space as expressed in terms of zoning, permits and other city requirements, but one of space in general. Namely the fact that space for development for any project in LA is so dear

### 3. Create Developers’ Incentives - Density Bonuses and the Adaptive Reuse Program

Density restrictions limit the number of tenants that can live or work in a given amount of building space. Easing of these restrictions, or density bonuses, for developers who include child care space as part of their development would allow them to collect more rent from additional tenants, and thus provide incentives for them to build such space. These bonuses can be fashioned in two ways that may provide incentives to preschool expansion. First, a density

---

bonus of 25 or 35 percent can be granted to those developers that develop or sponsor some type of on-site child care facilities. Second, the city could provide bonuses to developers who build within 1,500 square feet of a child care facility for children of low and moderate income families. In addition to the incorporation of density bonuses to create incentives, the city should include parking and open space requirement waivers that developers typically must abide by. These additional requirements would otherwise offset the benefits provided by density bonuses.

The adaptive reuse program allows developers to take advantage of incentives in the form of codes and ordinances that would allow them to convert older buildings to be used for certain purposes such as housing and neighborhood revitalization.

**Impacts:**

- The impact would depend on the reaction of developers. Potentially, the incentives would provide more facilities for families who do not have existing access to preschool and early care
- There would be no costs to the city
- There would also be no costs to developers

**Limitations:**

- The city faces opposition from neighborhood groups. Some groups are opposed to measures granting incentives to developers to increase the capacity of tenants with children
- The Housing Department and the Planning Department would need to coordinate with CCYF

4. **Identify Vacant or Abandoned City-Owned Buildings**

Officials at the city of Los Angeles stated that there are a number of existing city-owned buildings that are not in use. These buildings, if identified, could be converted to use for preschool services. Unfortunately, we were informed that these facilities cannot be identified at this time and within the time frame allotted for this project. In the future, the city should explore this option and perhaps maintain a database of these facilities and their condition. Perhaps the city can play a role in using the adaptive reuse program to benefit early care and education services.
Impacts:

- Would not cost the city extra money
- The use of city owned buildings could be partnered to any organization the city chooses, since the city owns the facilities

Limitations:

- There is a long, cumbersome process for the city to acquire and convert such facilities
- The city may decide to use these facilities for other purposes it deems necessary
- Usage for ECE is not guaranteed even if these facilities are available

5. Proposition 40 Monies

Funds from Proposition 40, or AB 1602, provide a 2.6 billion dollar state bond measure which can be used in conjunction with recreation centers. This proposition was passed by voters in November 2002. These monies are dedicated to local parks and recreation facilities. The Department of Parks and Recreation may be more amenable to a partnership with CCYF and could share the funds and facilities with them. A coordinated effort by these two bodies to pursue any funding opportunities may be a feasible option.

Impacts:

- Monies may create additional spaces to be used for ECE purposes

Limitations:

- Uncertain if monies are allocated already to specific projects
- Monies are limited, and will only be available for a short period of time

6. Municipal Bonds

Los Angeles could issue municipal bonds for the purposes of funding preschool facility development and preschool services. These municipal bonds can be either approved by the city council or put on the ballot by the city council. Traditionally, the city has floated municipal bonds for the purposes of financing facility construction and development, especially for firehouse construction and renovation of LAPD department stations. The city council, however, is increasingly considering the use of municipal bonds for other purposes, such as funding senior centers and recreation centers. Similarly, CCYF and the mayor’s office may be interested in this as a tool to leverage funding for preschool facilities. The advantage of this approach is that

---

51 California Assembly Bill 1602, California Clean Water, Clean Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks, and Coastal Protection Act of 2002.
52 City Council Staff. Interview.
Building Blocks for LA’s Children

it would have a minimal effect on current city expenditures. Municipal bonds do collect interest and must be paid back over time, but not immediately. The disadvantage is that while such bonds pay for capital/construction costs, the funds would not cover operating costs. Therefore, the city must establish partnerships that guarantee operating expenses along with any such bonds (some possible partnerships are explored later). The current fiscal crisis may make voters and elected officials averse to voting for bonds, so passage may have to await a policy window.

Impact:

➢ The city will be able to expand capacity without immediate cost to the city

Limitations:

➢ The issuance of a bond will mean that the city will bear the financial burden sometime in the future
➢ Municipal bonds cover primarily capital costs, and therefore the city would have to insure that operating costs would be allocated for any project, lest there be a newly constructed, yet underutilized facilities

7. Utility Credits for Providers – Empowerment Zone Businesses

The Department of Water and Power (DWP) offers a five-year electrical rate reduction, starting with 35% the first year, for new and expanding businesses located in the city’s State Enterprise Zones or Federal Empowerment Zones. While offering special utility rate reduction or utility credit for any child care provider is probably infeasible, intensive development of child care businesses in the city’s Empowerment Zones eligible for electrical rate reduction can provide a modest decrease in these businesses’ utility costs. This would therefore lower their provision costs and increase their ability to provide affordable care. LA’s Empowerment Zones include parts of downtown LA and just south of downtown (See Appendix C). This option is not a change in policy per say, simply an existing policy that should be leveraged.

Impacts:

➢ Incentive for care providers and developers to create more spaces for preschoolers

Limitations:

➢ Would cost the city revenue in foregone revenue in the form of reduced rates
➢ It is unclear if this will be an incentive enough for early care providers and preschools

8. Tax Incentives/Credits for Providers

Los Angeles also offers a special tax rate for child care providers as a business incentive. The tax rate for child care providers is $23.65 per year for the first $20,000 or less of gross receipts plus $1.18 for each additional $1,000 or fractional part thereof in excess of $20,000.

Other tax credit schemes exist as part of economic development programs, which may be applied to for-profit preschool service providers. At the state and federal levels, there are various tax credit/incentive programs for businesses within the Federal Empowerment Zone or State Enterprise Zone, which are all administered by the Community Development Department (CDD) within the city. In addition, effective January 1, 1999, qualified businesses located within the City Business Tax Economic Incentive Area may be eligible for additional business tax relief under the L.A. Municipal Code (Section 21.26).

While offering additional tax incentives for child care providers may encourage potential preschool providers to open new centers and/or expand their service capacities to some extent, this option would not be a priority for the city for two reasons. First, any tax relief policy is not budget neutral, and second, the marginal impact of additional tax relief may be relatively small considering the fact that the current tax rate for child care providers is already small.

Impacts:

- Has the potential to increase capacity by creating incentives for preschool providers to implement new programs
- Has the potential to revitalize certain neighborhoods/zones

Limitations:

- It is uncertain whether tax incentives are enough of an inducement for child care providers to implement new programs
- This option would cost the city money indirectly in potential tax revenue lost

54 Section 21.189.3 of the LA Business Tax Ordinance defines child care as “providing non-medical care for children under 18 years of age in need of personal services, supervision or assistance essential for sustaining the activities of daily living or for the protection of the individual on less than a 24-hour basis.” Non-profit organizations, if recognized under IRS Section 501 or State Tax Section 23701d, are eligible for the Los Angeles City Business Tax exemption.


56 The specific location of those tax incentive eligible zones can be obtained at: http://www.cityofla.org/Cdd/bus_state.html
9. Long-Term Loans for Providers

San Francisco developed Section 108 U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) loans to child providers to fund the capital costs of child care centers. These long-term loans are partly subsidized (up to 80%) by the San Francisco Department of Human Services. These loans offer great support to providers building new facilities, converting facilities, or performing critical maintenance on a facility. Los Angeles could develop a similar loan program with HUD to support providers in dire need of resources. However, city departments do not currently have the funds to subsidize these loans directly.

In addition, state loans and grants are available from the California Community Housing and Development Department (HCD). Through the MHP program, funds are available for child care that is linked to housing units assisted by MHP. The Child Care Facilities Finance Program provides and guarantees loans for development and expansion of child care centers and home-based centers.

**Impacts:**

- No costs to the city and would improve affordability and capacity

**Limitations:**

- The city would have to coordinate its efforts among different agencies (such as LAHD and CCYF)
- HUD funding variable

**Options to Improve Quality and Affordability**

The next set of options includes strategies to maximize the effectiveness, quality and affordability of existing service spaces. It is incredibly difficult to identify a program or service that addresses all of the quality components of a preschool program described earlier. To simplify our analysis, we used interviews with current service providers to identify three areas of greatest need for improvement: the learning component, staffing, and costs of service. We then identified potential options within each of those areas that the city could use to address these concerns with potential partners. Specifically, we identify the following program options in each of these categories:

---

Learning Component:

1. Create enrichment centers
2. Organize provider networks
3. Partner with Urban Education Partnership

Staffing:

4. Expand ECE curriculum through local community colleges
5. Develop a scholarship/grant program for local students pursuing ECE degrees

Costs of Service Provision:

6. Partner with Los Angeles Unified School District
7. Use city resources to transport children

Learning Component: The educational value of a preschool is determined by the activities, lessons, and resources it dedicates to the learning component. These options serve to either support the learning components already in place, or to add or expand learning components to child care services that might be more custodial in nature.

1. Create Enrichment Centers

Dedicate city resources (libraries, parks, recreation centers, etc.) to have collections of supplies available to family care or small center-based providers. Supplies might include consumable supplies like paper and paints for art projects, reusable supplies like games or sporting equipment, or curriculum materials like books, software and videos. The physical locations and possibly the staff would be provided by the city, who could then partner with someone to provide the funding for the materials and supplies. These centers might be available to directors and staff, or could provide services (games, activities) to children. Depending on the specific goals and partners the city desires, these resources could be targeted to address specific issues, like English-learning materials for children with language-acquisition needs.

Impacts:

- Reduces costs of service provision
- Enables custodial child care programs to be more educational
- Allows families to continue with existing, trusted providers
- Increases the role and profile of the city in service provision
➢ Allows the city to provide targeted supplies, activities, and resources that best meet its preferences

*Limitations:*

➢ Requires a partner to pay for the supplies and references
➢ Requires city employees at resource centers to spend less time on other duties

2. **Organize and/or Support a Los Angeles Provider Network**

Currently provider networks exist at the national level and at the state level. For example, California has the California Child Development Administrator Association. But this group is not necessarily representative of the providers in the city of Los Angeles as it only represents child care providers of publicly funded Child Development programs. In order to better connect the city day care providers, the city of Los Angeles could organize and/or support a provider network or possibly separate networks for family care providers and center-based providers. These networks would create a link between providers so that they can share information more easily regarding what does and does not work in terms of curriculum, interesting and creative activities for the children, where to apply for funding, or advice on how to expand an existing center. A local provider network could also put together training courses for teachers and directors of day care and pre-kindergarten centers. Providing a network would link the city’s providers together so that they could share information; ultimately, it would help all providers to learn more about how to make their day care or pre-kindergarten program more successful.

*Impacts:*

➢ Likely to improve the educational quality of participating programs
➢ Likely to improve the coordination between the city and service providers

*Limitations:*

➢ While possible to do with a limited investment of resources, it would be difficult to do effectively
➢ Requires providers to be willing to participate in the program
➢ Potential conflicts of interest between providers (municipal, county, state, federal, and private) may complicate coordination
3. **Urban Education Partnership**

The Urban Education Partnership (UEP), a non-profit organization in Los Angeles, has a Family Care – School Readiness initiative through which identified community residents are trained as paraprofessionals to teach parents how to engage their young children and prepare them for school. This initiative is very useful in its current form as it attempts to reach families, who may not be served by child care centers, in innovative ways. However, this idea could be developed to serve more children and could use other approaches.

We have discussed other ideas with UEP that could enhance and expand preschool service in LA. They just received a new round of funding for their initiative described above from First Five LA which replaces their previous funding source. They also received funds to start the initiative in a neighborhood of South Los Angeles.

Another strategy they could employ is to train their paraprofessionals, and additional paraprofessionals, to work at center-based or family-based care. Towards that end, UEP plans to use some of the First Five funds to offer child care training classes through LAUSD adult school classes. They also encourage the paraprofessionals to further their education in other ways, by getting GEDs and taking college credits. We would also suggest that UEP and other similar organizations encourage paraprofessionals and other community residents to open up their own home-based centers. While it is important to improve the quality of existing centers, it is also important to open new ones to serve more children. Home-based centers are an efficient way to do this since they are housed in facilities that already exist and typically do not require much additional upkeep.

The UEP plans to use kindergarten teachers to help preschool providers improve their school readiness curriculum. They are also employing outreach workers in the community to educate residents about available services, and developing school readiness kits which will be available to families. These steps are excellent strategies in improving preschool quality and reaching as many families and children as possible.

Other non-profit organizations, such as Para Los Niños, Volunteers of America, Drew Child Development Corporation, and the California Child Care Resource & Referral Network, are also working to help young children prepare for school and have received First Five funds for school readiness initiatives. UEP and these other organizations, can use all of the above

---

59 Urban Education Partnership staff. Interview and internal materials.
methods to improve school readiness for a great number of children in Los Angeles. All of these efforts can combine to reach many currently underserved children. Because First Five funds are, of course, limited, these non-profits must strategically attract funding from other sources to promote sustainability of preschool services.

**Impacts:**

- Provides structure and experience to improve the quality of the educational component
- Targeted partnership with an organization that has a secure stream of funding for the immediate future
- Provides a partner with pre-established reputation and connection to the community
- Initial program targets an area that our analysis suggests is currently underserved

**Limitations:**

- Assumes mutual interests with UEP
- City has limited influence on the role of UEP, and the services they provide

**Staffing:**

There will be a need to increase the supply of caregivers and preschool staff. Devising partnerships with community colleges within their Education or Child Development programs can feed a continuous new supply of child care professionals. These partnerships would be something like internships/externships that community colleges would have their students participate in to earn credit towards their degree. Increased enrollment capacity of 104,098 (according to First Five’s Master Plan) necessarily implies a need for more child care staff, and the quality characteristics suggest that those staff with college degrees in fields related to ECE would be most effective. A goal for Los Angeles, therefore, would be to pursue policies that increase both the availability and education level of preschool staff. We have identified the following options to accomplish this goal:

4. **Expand ECE Curriculum at Local Area Community Colleges**

   The city of Los Angeles could work with existing area city colleges to increase the number of courses offered in the field of early care and education. This may involve hiring more staff, shifting staff from another course to ECE courses, or asking staff to put more hours into ECE courses. It may also require additional course development, or simply adding more of the existing courses offered. New curriculum could include a requirement that students participate
in an internship in which they must work at a preschool in LA. Finally, colleges could provide extension-type courses offered at night and weekends for continuing education, so that preschool staff can learn additional skills and improve the overall quality of their preschools.

There are nine community colleges in the LA area which currently serve 130,000 students across 36 cities. It may also be possible to promote such expansion and internship requirements at other institutions, such as UCLA, USC, and Cal State LA. By expanding the curriculum at these colleges, students will be encouraged to explore the ECE field and thus more likely to pursue jobs in that area after graduation. This will not only allow existing centers to fill staff vacancies and expand their ability to serve children, it may also encourage these students to begin their own centers, particularly if community colleges educate them in this process. Of course, students from these colleges can work outside of the city of Los Angeles, but it will still increase the numbers of staff in the city.

**Impacts:**

- Likely to improve the quality of education
- Requires almost no direct investment from the city

**Limitations:**

- May increase cost of service provision (skilled employees demand higher compensation)
- City has limited influence over local college and university participation
- City has limited influence over students to stay in Los Angeles

5. Develop a Scholarship/Fellowship Program for Local Students Pursuing ECE Degrees

Establishment of a scholarship or fellowship program for students interested in early education degrees would also encourage students to pursue a career in this field. Many childcare positions are not highly paid and students may be reluctant to devote their studies to such a field, particularly if they are accruing school debt. Scholarships would enable them to pursue their field of interest without these concerns. This would produce similar results as those suggested for expansion of ECE curriculum above. Scholarships could have certain conditions attached; for example, recipients must work in a Los Angeles city-based center for three years following graduation. Scholarships could be full or partial, depending on available funds at the colleges and the possibility of garnering resources from an outside source or partner.

**Impacts:**

- Likely to improve the quality of education
➤ Provides short-term access to skilled interns at almost no cost
➤ Provides relatively secure access to additional jobs
➤ Guarantees at least a limited commitment of students to work in Los Angeles

Limitations:
➤ Requires a well-funded partner to provide scholarships
➤ Requires significant time and coordination from the city (develop an application and selection process, coordinate payment, monitor progress, enforce requirements, etc.)

Costs: Due to the increasingly high costs of providing preschool services in Los Angeles (real estate, maintenance and renovation to meet state standards, staffing, insurance and liability, etc.) developing new preschool programs is likely to be cost-prohibitive to private providers. For either new or existing programs that function on a fee-for-service basis (either as profit or nonprofit ventures), one would expect the high costs of service provision to translate into high fees for consumers. This is the case even for custodial child care programs. To add to these cost demands for high-quality learning components and staffing, one could reasonably foresee an environment where wealthier families in Los Angeles would have access to high-quality privately operated preschool programs, while less wealthy families would rely on under-provided subsidized services, like Head Start. Programs that reduce these costs to service providers would presumably lower the costs to consumers, which would ensure more equitable distribution of preschool services. We have identified the following alternatives that might allow the City to leverage its existing resources to address this concern:

6. Partner with Los Angeles Unified School District

Partnering with Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) to enable the city to use Title I funds can serve as a useful way for the city of Los Angeles to expand and improve upon the quality of preschools. According to the California Department of Education, Part A of Title I, funds may be used for eligible preschool children. Specifically, local educational agencies (LEAs) may use these funds as follows:

1. A participating school may use its Part A funds to operate a preschool program.
2. An LEA may reserve an amount from its total allocation to:

---

60 Title I refers to those students who score at or below the 36th percentile. A school with a majority of students who score at or below the 36th percentile receive federal funding through No Child Left Behind.
• Operate a Part A preschool program for eligible children in the entire district or a portion of the district.

• Distribute to specific Title I schools to operate Part A preschool programs.

Title I, Part A funds may be used for eligible preschool children. To be eligible, preschool children must be failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the State's student performance standards. These preschool children must be selected for Part A services based on certain criteria, including teacher judgment, interviews with parents, and developmentally appropriate measures. Those children who participated in a Head Start or Even Start at any time in the two preceding years are automatically eligible for Part A services.61

According to the California Department of Education, there are several ways in which preschool programs may be funded under Part A. For example:

• A participating school may use its Part A funds to operate a preschool program.

• An LEA may reserve an amount from the LEAs total allocation to operate a Part A preschool program for eligible children in the district as a whole or for a portion of the district.

• An LEA may reserve an amount from the LEAs total allocation and distribute those funds to specific Title I schools to operate Part A preschool programs.62

**Impacts:**

- Likely to improve both quality and affordability
- Provides access to a relatively steady and secure funding source for operational expenses

**Limitations:**

- Assumes mutual interests between Los Angeles and LAUSD
- Requires considerable investment of time from both the city and LAUSD for coordination and implementation
- Diminishes control and influence the city may have over priorities of preschool
- Program applies only to Title I-eligible children, which may or may not be an area of greatest need
- May require programs to limit or screen out non-Title I-eligible children from preschools receiving this funding

---


62 Ibid.
7. Share Local Transportation Resources with Providers

Transportation costs are particularly prohibitive for small centers and family care programs. Insurance and vehicle leasing/purchasing costs far exceed the resources of smaller operations and many of the larger ones. The age of the children involved make public transportation infeasible for reasons of both safety and supervision. Providers would need assistance in order to transport children to any off-site activity or opportunity. Nor does it make sense for a single center or family care program to own or operate its own vehicle, as they would be unlikely to use it more than occasionally.

Many of the home-based centers in Los Angeles we spoke with indicated that they used their own vehicle to pick up and drop off children who had other arrangements during part of the day. Providers also need access to local opportunities, including playgrounds, schools, libraries, and potentially even the enrichment centers described earlier. For these purposes, the city could provide access to local vans or mini-buses appropriate for the transportation of young children. Ideally, these would be extra fleet vehicles owned by the city available without incurring additional procurement expenses. What expenses are involved (operation, gas, insurance, maintenance and drivers) might be covered by partnering with organizations that have similar resources in place (like LAUSD school buses) that would result in lower costs due to efficiencies of scale. These might also be covered by securing a funding partner to cover related expenses. This program would be most successful for providers in communities without easy, convenient or safe access to resources (schools, parks, playgrounds), or those that provide other transportation services for children.

Impacts:

- May increase the educational value
- Allows city to provide centralized resources (like enrichment centers) more efficiently

Limitations:

- Significant issues related to liability and insurance
- Assumes availability of resources- not an effective option if it requires the city to purchase additional vehicles or hire additional drivers
Options for Fostering Coordination

To address the lack of coordination problem, Los Angeles must develop strategies to increase the coordination both among existing city departments, and between the city and other public entities or outside organizations. Different city agencies have different interests when it comes to the purpose of preschool. To provide services in an effective and efficient manner, Los Angeles needs to address any internal conflicts or contradictions. Additionally, the city has an opportunity to play a key role in bringing various departments and outside organizations together for the purpose of providing universal preschool. We have identified the following options for better coordinating the cities efforts:

1. **Use the Mayor to Increase the Profile of Preschool**
2. **Regular Discussions with All Stakeholders**
3. **Inter-Agency Preschool Committee**
4. **Use the City Council to Increase the Profile of Preschool**
5. **New City Agency**
6. **Use Neighborhood Councils for Outreach Efforts**
7. **Dedicate a Clearinghouse Agency for the Public**

1. **Use the Mayor to Increase the Profile of Preschool**

As mentioned above, several officials have suggested that Mayor Hahn play a role by being a voice for universal preschool. We wholeheartedly endorse this recommendation and believe that his efforts can focus the public’s attention and support on universal preschool. Mayor Hahn could publicly announce, via television spots, press releases, or other medium, the importance of preschool for all children in preparing them for school. As a respected public official, he could use his repute to support universal preschool access and sponsor related projects and efforts. The more of a public issue preschool access becomes, the more the public will support it and encourage parents, business, community members, and public officials to make it a priority. The success of LA’S BEST, the city’s after-school program for elementary school students, can serve as a model for the mayor. The mayor’s continual support of LA’s BEST has helped the program grow, which has affected the academic levels and overall enrichment of LA’s children. The mayor’s high profile involvement in this program can be replicated with a preschool initiative.
Impacts:
- Garners the public’s support for a universal preschool access movement
- Establishes preschool as a city-wide priority
- Encourages city agencies and departments and outside governmental entities to focus efforts on preschool for Los Angeles

Limitations:
- Push for a movement will only go so far, resources and staff are still greatly needed
- City agencies and departments may be reluctant to shift some of their efforts and resources towards preschool when it is not their main priority

2. Regular Discussions with All Stakeholders
Aside from making public statements and gestures regarding universal preschool access, the mayor should make an effort to bring all interested parties together to discuss how best to support this effort. These parties include the CDD, CRA, Housing Authority, Housing Department, LACOE, First Five LA, CCYF, preschool providers, elementary school teachers, city council members, and non-profit and funding organizations. Representatives of these entities should meet on a regular basis to discuss their own perspectives on the issue, the city’s priorities, and how they can combine forces to best address universal preschool. A member of the mayor’s staff could be responsible for convening these meetings. (See Figure 3 on the following page)

Impacts:
- Establishes preschool as a city-wide priority
- Establishes effective communication and coordination amongst key stakeholders
- Involves community members as well as members of the preschool provision community

Limitations:
- City agencies and departments may be reluctant to shift some of their efforts and resources towards preschool when it is not their main priority
Figure 3: Los Angeles Stakeholder Discussions
(Red = local relationships, Blue = non-local Relationships)
3. Inter-Agency Preschool Committee

The mayor should also create an inter-agency preschool committee within the city, to include members of the CDD, CRA, Housing Authority, Housing Department, CCYF, and the City Council. This committee would be a standing entity that would serve the purpose of coordinating all efforts for the city related to preschool. Because these various departments are all responsible for some piece of providing preschool in the city, they need to collaborate so that their efforts are the most effective, do not duplicate, and dovetail logically with each other. The inter-agency committee would be a formal way for this to happen, and would provide a sense of coherence for the city’s child care policy. (See Figure 4 on the following page)

*Impacts:*

- Establishes preschool as a city-wide priority
- Establishes effective communication, coordination, and collaboration amongst various city entities
- Establishes a formal venue and body for discussion of child care policy issues

*Limitations:*

- City agencies and departments may be reluctant to shift some of their efforts and resources towards preschool when it is not their main priority
Figure 4: Los Angeles Inter-Agency Preschool Committee

LOS ANGELES INTER-AGENCY PRESCHOOL COMMITTEE

MAYOR’S OFFICE
Deputy Mayor for Education and Parks/Recreation, Office for Economic and community development

CITY COUNCIL
Appropriate Council members and/or staff

CRA
Community Redevelopment Agency

CDD
Community Development Department

DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARKS

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

LAHA/LAHD
LA Housing Authority & LA Housing Department

DONE
Department of Neighborhood Empowerment (Neighborhood Councils)

CCYF
Commission for Children, Youth, and their Families
4. Use the City Council to Increase the Profile of Preschool

Aside from the meetings and committee mentioned above, the City Council has a significant role to play for universal preschool so they should be included in the city’s preschool efforts. Like the mayor’s office, Council members have access to the media, particularly local/neighborhood papers. Specifically, Council members Wendy Gruel and Janice Hahn have been very outspoken in their support of ECE issues by introducing motions to strengthen LA’s relationship with First Five LA.63 Council members are also able to introduce motions or ordinances that would affect preschool funding, such as bond proposals. Therefore, the inter-agency committee mentioned above would not only report to the mayor, but also to the city council, so that consensus can be built around strategy and policy.

**Impacts:**

- Obtains council member constituencies’ support for preschool via the media
- Uses the legislative venue to gain resources for preschool

**Limitations:**

- City council motions or ordinances may be politically infeasible if members do not first gain support from other members and their constituencies

5. New City Agency

In addition, or instead of, the inter-agency preschool committee, the city of LA could create a permanent city agency for the city’s preschool policies and initiatives. This agency would be a formal body that would set the city’s preschool priorities and regularly work with other entities and organizations to support universal preschool. Of course, such an agency would likely require new staff and cause major changes for other city entities already involved in preschool provision.

**Impacts:**

- Establishes preschool as a city-wide priority, perhaps more so than options 1, 2, and 3
- Establishes a formal agency for discussion of child care policy issues
- Demonstrates to outside entities Los Angeles’ commitment and willingness to devote resources to preschool

**Limitations:**

- Requires significant city funding for the agency and its staff

---

63 City Council staff. Interviews.
6. Use Neighborhood Councils for Outreach and Funding Efforts

Neighborhood Councils are an important resource the city can partner with for funding and outreach. Neighborhood Councils are comprised of citizens who work to improve their communities in a variety of ways - beautification, promoting arts and crafts projects within their schools and neighborhood crime prevention programs. Many Neighborhood Councils (NCs) have education committees or family committees. These committee meetings are regularly attended by local activists, businessmen, women, and representatives from the public sector - staff from the city council, city department staff, local school board, and even staff from the state legislature. One way the city can use its influence is to suggest that NCs make early care and education a top priority. This can be done in a few ways. First, NCs usually distribute their own newsletters. These newsletters can publicize opportunities for low income families to apply to subsidized care programs. Second, the NCs attract funding from local nonprofits and businesses regarding beautification and education projects at their local schools and community centers. Therefore, newsletters that publicize the need for early care in a certain community might attract funding to augment and expand existing community care centers from local activists and local business leaders. Finally, NCs that use community/recreation facilities and religious centers might be eligible to partner with the federal government, specifically the Department of Health and Human Services, to apply for grant monies to create and operate early care and education programs. The city can play a leading role to make this an issue, as well as assisting them with grant applications.

Impacts:

- Attracts funding opportunities to use for the development of preschools
- Involves community members in the development of preschools
- Involves outreach to families
- No cost to the city

Limitations:

- Child care issues may not be a high priority for some neighborhoods and their councils
- It may take some time to make this a focused agenda for these communities.

7. Dedicate a Clearinghouse Agency for the Public

In order to distribute information to the public more readily about preschool programs, the city of Los Angeles could dedicate an agency or body to serve as a LA-area clearinghouse.
This clearinghouse would provide information for parents who want to learn more about pre-kindergarten services, or for potential providers interested in starting their own pre-kindergarten program.

For parents searching for preschool services for their children, the “clearinghouse” would provide an extensive list of resources that parents can utilize. Because search engines exist on how to find a preschool or day care center close by on the California Community Care Licensing webpage and the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network webpage (R&R Network), the city of Los Angeles “clearinghouse” would not have to reinvent the wheel. Rather, it could serve as an entry porthole for parents and provide information that is missing. For example, low-income and non-English speaking communities have a hard time accessing the R&R Network because of language barriers and lack of access to computers. Therefore, the clearinghouse must reach out particularly to these communities. This could be achieved by publishing quarterly newsletters for parents in different languages on information regarding the importance of preschool, exercises and educational games to play with your children, and reminders for parents to read to their children. These newsletters could not only be accessible online, but also be in print form and be distributed at local libraries, toy stores, recreation and park centers, churches, and other places where children’s goods are sold. For non-English speaking communities, volunteers could go door-to-door to distribute and share information with residents.

For those interested in starting their own preschools, the clearinghouse would provide information on how to proceed. This would include information on what is essential to start a preschool or day care center, information on the licensing process, and links to other organizations and websites that provide the same information, but for the whole state of California. This clearinghouse would also provide potential providers a list of places to look for funding that is specific for the City of Los Angeles; for example, it would provide information on First 5 funding, including details on how to apply and the requirements to apply, city funding, Title 1 funding with the Department of Education, and foundation funding.

The clearinghouse would provide quarterly newsletters in different languages to both parents looking for preschool programs and potential providers looking for funding sources. These publications could be distributed in local city offices; for example, the potential provider newsletter could be submitted at licensing information sessions, held at the local California
Community Licensing office and in community libraries. There could also be a website or a hotline that also provides information, preferably accessible in different languages.

**Impacts:**

- Coordinates the existing information regarding preschools in the area
- Provides parents and providers with the information they need to make informed decisions
- Reaches out to those parents and providers who are harder to reach

**Limitations:**

- Requires funding for staff and newsletters, though probably less than option 5

By coordinating their preferences, priorities and services, the mayor and the city will be making a clear, persuasive statement that they place high priority on the future of universal preschool. The fiscal constraints the city faces, however, make it impossible for Los Angeles to act independently. To assist the city in its external coordination efforts, we have identified several potential partnerships that the city could explore:

1. **First Five LA**
2. **Philanthropic & Non-Profit Organizations**
3. **Churches & Community Centers**
4. **Educational After-School Organizations**
5. **Federal Early Learning Opportunity Act**
6. **Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE)**
7. **Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)**

1. **First Five LA**

First Five Los Angeles is an excellent resource for the city of Los Angeles both as a potential funding source and partner in the effort to provide Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK) for Los Angeles County. First Five LA’s master plan for UPK states that this money will be distributed via contracts with individual child care providers to provide funding for services and infrastructure. First Five is primarily targeting its funds for service provision, and is using some funds initially for facility development in identified “hot zones”. These are the areas of greatest
need (number of 4-year olds minus the number of preschool spaces for 4-year olds). Only two of their hot zones are in the city of Los Angeles (See Appendix D).  

Right now, the relationship between the city of Los Angeles and First Five LA is an informal one consisting primarily of information exchange. The Executive Director of the Commission for Children, Youth, and their Families sat on the expert panel for First Five LA to determine the vision of UPK. However, there is a motion in the LA City Council to formalize this relationship so that they could work together more constructively. For example, collectively, they can identify areas of need where the city can use its resources to build facilities and First Five can use its resources to fund operating costs.

In San Mateo County, First Five San Mateo has directly funded city efforts for child care. For example, First Five has provided funds to both Redwood and Daly City to run family centers and family resource centers. They also provided San Mateo City with a planning grant to develop child care friendly space. Although First Five LA has no current plans to fund specific city projects in this way, if they are able to develop a partnership via the motion mentioned above, perhaps such a funding relationship can be further established. A useful step would be for Los Angeles to present First Five with data on its neediest areas, particularly as compared to areas outside of LA. This would demonstrate the city’s commitment to the needs of its citizens. First Five LA has no plans to prioritize the city of LA over other cities in the county however, and maintains that it must serve the entire area.

We spoke to various representatives of First Five LA, First Five San Mateo, and First Five San Francisco about how they believed cities like Los Angeles could best partner with First Five. They suggested two principal ways for LA to do this. First, they felt that the city’s greatest asset is its access to physical space (land and/or buildings), something which First Five does not have control over. Any means by which the city can use these resources to assist the development of child care facilities would be very helpful to preschool providers. Second, representatives believe the city and the mayor have an opportunity to be the voice for universal access to preschool. The mayor’s publicly expressed support on an issue such as universal preschool could be an excellent motivation for city residents and members of city government to provide their support.

---

65 First Five San Mateo staff. Interview.
Another way for the city of Los Angeles to be more directly involved with First Five LA is to nominate a city representative to be on the Board of Directors for a new non-profit entity that will have oversight responsibility for the Los Angeles [County] Universal Preschool Program, created by the First Five LA Commission. If the city could identify a potential candidate, such as an interested city council member, this person could play a significant role in the distribution of First Five funds while demonstrating the city’s commitment to universal preschool. Nominations are due April 2nd however, so the city should take action immediately (See Appendix E). If nominations cannot be made by that time, a councilmember or a member of the mayor’s staff should try to have representation on the First Five Commission itself.

LA’s relationship with First Five LA should be a priority for the city. First Five is leading the current effort for universal preschool; for the city to be part of that effort, it must partner with First Five in some way. However, there are other partnerships that have great potential for Los Angeles universal preschool. The following entities should be explored further to leverage whatever they have to offer.

2. Philanthropic & Non-Profit Organizations

Philanthropic and non-profit organizations may be able to provide resources the city cannot. The city should identify such organizations that have an interest in child care and preschool issues, and that may wish to offer their services and/or resources to the city. For example, a non-profit may be able to provide the materials for an enrichment center which home-based providers can visit to gather appropriate quality materials for their children. Local philanthropic organizations, such as the Broad Foundation and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, have deeper pockets and can provide needed funding for a range of services and facilities.

3. Churches & Community Centers

Local churches and community centers could be a great resource for preschool facilities. Given the lack of space in Los Angeles, the city can take advantage of facilities in churches and community centers that may be unused during several hours of the day. This could be a valuable resource for preschool providers who need, but cannot find or afford, such scarce facilities. Churches and community centers are organizations that are traditionally very involved in the community and have an interest in its future. In addition, members of the community probably feel more comfortable sending their children to providers housed there than somewhere
unfamiliar. The city should identify these resources or contact non-profit organizations that have existing relationships with churches or community centers.

4. **Educational After-School Organizations**

   Educational organizations such as Sylvan Learning Center could be a partner for the city in a similar manner as church and community centers. Because after-school programs are not typically busy during the day while K-12 students are in school, their space could be used for preschool during “off hours”. Although it may be difficult to conduct preschool activities when K-12 students are being served, providing half day programs through these organizations should be explored. If space is not available, these organizations could also be used to disseminate information regarding preschool education by providing materials and training to parents using the after-school programs.

5. **Federal Early Learning Opportunity Act**

   In 2003, the Administration for Children and Families awarded Early Learning Opportunity Act (ELOA) discretionary grants to 43 Local Councils in 28 States. The awards range from $254,519 to $1 million. The project period for all of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 ELOA grants is September 30, 2003 through February 28, 2005 (17 months). This grant can potentially serve as a substantial source of money for the city to help fund quality child care centers. While this grant is not guaranteed every year, applying for this funding is imperative. Each of the grantees will promote early childhood literacy as part of their approved project. They are also required to provide parent involvement and health services. Given the numerous programs that this grant funds, the city of Los Angeles should apply for ELOA grants on a yearly basis to help support quality preschool expansion.

6. **Los Angeles County Office of Education**

   Currently LACOE works with Head Start by providing funding for wrap around care programs. As a result, there may be similar opportunities for the city of LA to work with LACOE in developing preschools across the city. Unfortunately, Los Angeles does not have the direct relationship with LA County that San Francisco has with San Francisco County, one

---

<www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ccb/policy1/funding/ELOAFy03grantees.doc>.

67 The ELOA, or Early Learning Opportunity Act is a discretionary funding stream authorized by congress to provide grants to localities in the area of early care and education. 

---
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which allows for shared jurisdiction over the same area. Therefore, the city should attempt to overcome these constraints by cultivating relationships with LA County and the LACOE.

7. **Los Angeles Unified School District**

While LAUSD and First Five LA are not actively working together to expand preschool education in Los Angeles, such a collaboration could prove to be successful. At this time, both the city and First Five have made it clear that they do not wish to collaborate with LAUSD for various reasons. However, LAUSD plays a critical role in preschool provision in several ways. The school district runs its own centers and it also offers education classes for those who work at child care centers. In addition, the CTA initiative, Improving Classroom Education Act, on the November 2004 ballot would require that all state funds directed at preschool be distributed only to unionized school district staff.\(^68\) Therefore, the city and other parts of the state may need to refocus their efforts towards making preschool part of the local school district. Finally, much of the recent campaign for universal preschool has made a case that preschool should be part of the public education system and housed by local public schools. There are clearly logistical challenges for LAUSD in particular since they currently lack enough classrooms for enrolled K-12 students. LAUSD would therefore probably not provide infrastructure, but it would potentially provide the administration of a universal preschool system. Some officials we spoke to do believe that universal preschool is heading in the direction of public education, and that parents will support such a development. Los Angeles should be aware that this is the vision of universal preschool and that they will need to explore partnerships with LAUSD in the future.

**Recommendations**

Based on our analysis of the condition of early care and education in Los Angeles, interviews with service providers, survey of other California cities’ efforts, asset scan of existing city resources, interviews with preschool-related entities and other experts, and analysis of the inputs necessary to increase capacity and improve service quality, we identified three major interrelated policy problems: Insufficient Capacity, Inconsistencies in Quality and Affordability, and Lack of Coordination. We then examined a variety of options for addressing each problem, weighing each option against the criteria we had outlined:

1. **Increase the Capacity of Preschool**
2. **Improve the Quality of the Educational Component**
3. **Make Preschool Programs More Affordable**
4. **Improve the Coordination of Service Delivery**
5. **Cost & Revenue Neutral**
6. **Amenable to Partnerships**
7. **Political Feasibility**

The matrix in Table 7 displays all options outlined above and summarizes to what degree each fulfills the criteria.

In sum, we identified several options in all areas of improvement that are feasible for the city. Although First Five officials believe that the city’s greatest resource is its access to land, we found that many of the options that would leverage land availability are infeasible, mainly due to lack of coordination, lack of priority given to preschool needs, and lack of available city funds. However, municipal bonds, density bonuses, and long-term loans from the federal government provide alternative ways for the city to fund preschool facility development.

Enrichment centers, expanded curriculum and scholarships at community colleges, and Urban Education Partnership programming are the best, most effective ways for the city to improve service quality and/or affordability. The other options we evaluated would make less of an impact on preschool services and are more difficult to orchestrate.

Finally, given the issues mentioned above, Los Angeles must improve its level of coordination with regard to the preschool initiative if it intends to make it a priority. Perhaps the greatest role the city can play is to build momentum for the universal preschool movement and collaborate with city departments and other partners to coordinate, focus efforts, and find creative means for improving preschool in LA. The mayor’s role in this initiative will be critical as he has the political power to foster public support and bring individuals and groups together.

We also recommend exploring all of the aforementioned entities for collaboration and partnerships, particularly with First Five LA. Many of these partners can be used to enhance the recommended strategies for the city. We have identified ways in which Los Angeles and these entities can join forces to best leverage their resources. This is explained in detail in Table 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy goal</th>
<th>Alternatives</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Problem-focused</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Constraint-focused</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommended</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City ordinance on Local Development Projects</td>
<td>✓ Would increase number of spaces/ slots</td>
<td>✓ Would increase access to some low income people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage Existing Space</td>
<td>✓ would increase number of spaces/ slots</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Developer Incentives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Vacant or Abandoned City-Owned Buildings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 40 Monies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Bonds</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Credits for Providers</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Incentives/Credits for Providers</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Loans for Providers</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Building Blocks for LA’s Children

### Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy goal</th>
<th>Alternatives</th>
<th>Problem-focused</th>
<th>Constraint-focused</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Improving Quality and Affordability</td>
<td>Create Enrichment Centers</td>
<td>✓ Increase capacity of preschool services ✓ Increase educational components ✓ Reduce cost of service provision ✓</td>
<td>✓ Funding from partners is required ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organize/Support Provider Networks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partner with Urban Education Partnership</td>
<td>✓ Provides structure and experience to improve the quality of the educational component ✓</td>
<td>✓ Provides a partner with a pre-established reputation and connection to the community ✓ No new city expenditure ✓</td>
<td>✓ Targeted partnership with an organization that has a secure stream of funding for the immediate future ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expand ECE Curriculum at Local Area Community Colleges</td>
<td>✓ Increase availability by increasing labor at no cost to the city ✓ Improve teacher quality N/A May increase service costs due to high skilled workers ✓ Improve coordination among colleges, providers, and potential teachers ✓ Requires almost no direct investment from the city ✓ Community Colleges ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Local ECE Scholarship/Grant Program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Guarantees at least a limited commitment of students to work in Los Angeles, Improve teacher quality, Provides short-term access to skilled interns at almost no cost, Requires a well-funded partner to provide scholarships, Community Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner with LAUSD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Conditional: applies only to Title-I-eligible children, Provides access to a relatively steady and secure funding source for operational expenses, Schools, ? depends on the direction of the school board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Local Transportation Resources with Providers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>May require the city to purchase additional vehicles and/or hire additional drivers, Schools, Questions of legal liability may make this option too cost ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy goal</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Constraint-focused</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problem-focused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fostering Coordination</td>
<td>Use the Mayor to Increase the Profile of Preschool</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular Discussions with All Stakeholders</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create an Interagency Preschool Committee</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council's Role</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council motions or ordinances may be politically infeasible if member do not first gain support from other members and their constituencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Create a New City Agency</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requires significant city funding for the agency and its staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Neighborhood Councils for Outreach Efforts</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicate a Clearinghouse Agency for the Public</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requires funding for staff and newsletters, though probably less than creating new agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Table 8  Recommendations

*We recommend the following options to increase the capacity of preschool*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>LA City Resources</th>
<th>Partner Resources</th>
<th>Potential Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Municipal Bonds</td>
<td>Issuing municipal bonds to fund preschool facility development and services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operating costs from potential providers or others</td>
<td>City Council Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Density Bonuses</td>
<td>Easing density restrictions on buildings used for preschool services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Private buildings</td>
<td>Private building owners Potential preschool service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two options:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Granting density bonuses of 25-35% to preschool developers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Targeting bonuses to providers serving low- and moderate-income families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Long-term Loans for Providers</td>
<td>Developing Section 108 US-HUD loans to preschool providers to fund the capital costs of preschool centers</td>
<td>Federal Sec. 108 HUD loans</td>
<td>HCD/ MHP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We recommend the following options to improve the quality and affordability of preschool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>LA City Resources</th>
<th>Partner Resources</th>
<th>Potential Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. <em>Create Enrichment Centers</em></td>
<td>Dedicate city resources (libraries, parks, recreation centers, etc.) to have collections of supplies available to family care or small center-based providers</td>
<td>Physical locations (libraries, parks, recreation centers)</td>
<td>Educational materials and supplies</td>
<td>Existing/ potential preschool providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <em>Partner with Urban Education Partnership</em></td>
<td>Encourage that UEP should influence UEP-trained professionals to open new preschools Suggest that UEP should strategically attract funding not only from First Five but also from other sources to promote sustainability of preschool services.</td>
<td>Time and energy of city leadership</td>
<td>First Five and other funding to UEP and other organizations for school readiness initiatives</td>
<td>UEP First Five (funding resource for UEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <em>Expand ECE curriculum at city colleges</em></td>
<td>Work with existing area city colleges to increase the number of courses offered in the field of early care and education (hiring more staff, shifting staff from another course to ECE courses, or asking staff to put more hours into ECE courses) Encourage students' internships Encourage continuing education for quality enhancement of existing services</td>
<td>Time and energy of city leadership</td>
<td>Knowledge and expertise of city college faculty Spaces and staffs at city colleges</td>
<td>City colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <em>Develop a Local ECE Scholarship/Grant Program</em></td>
<td>Establishing a new scholarship/fellowship program for students pursuing ECE studies Scholarships could be full or partial, depending on available funds May include internship and/or commitment to work in Los Angeles for a period of time</td>
<td>Time of staff for application selection and administration</td>
<td>Funds for scholarships Funds for additional staff if necessary</td>
<td>City colleges Philanthropic organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We recommend the following options to foster coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>LA City Resources</th>
<th>Partner Resources</th>
<th>Potential Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8. Use the Mayor to Increase the Profile of Preschool | Mayor Hahn play a role by being a voice for universal preschool  
Example: public announce, via television spots, press releases, or other medium, the importance of preschool for all children in preparing them for school | Mayor's reputes and efforts  
Funds for public relations | | |
| 9. Regular Discussions with All Stakeholders | Bring all interested parties together to discuss how best to support city's effort for universal preschool  
Representatives of these entities should meet on a regular basis to discuss their own perspectives on the issue, the city’s priorities, and how they can combine forces to best address universal preschool. | CDD, CRA, Housing Authority, Housing Department, the CCYF, and City Council members  
Mayor's staff's time and energy to convene the meetings | | LACOE, First Five LA, preschool providers, elementary school teachers, and non-profit and funding organizations |
| 10. Create an Interagency Preschool Committee | Create an interagency preschool committee within the city | CDD, CRA, Housing Authority, Housing Department, the CCYF, and the City Council | | |
| 11. City Council's Role | Utilize the City Council members' voice for universal preschool  
Make interagency committee mentioned above report to the Council so that consensus can be built around strategy and policy | The City Council | | |
| 12. Use Neighborhood Councils for Outreach and Funding Efforts | Neighborhood Councils can use their resources to publicize early care and education efforts and have community partnerships with government agencies | The city council and various department agencies | Funding and space | Nonprofits, LA city representatives, and the US Dept. of Health and Human resources |
Conclusion

We realize that increasing a service of any kind, particularly one that requires high quality staff, quality infrastructure, and other costly inputs, without the dollars to fund it, is a formidable challenge, one that is likely facing many strapped cities around the country. However, we also believe that the city of Los Angeles has a critical role to play in a universal preschool initiative. The mayor’s office can implement the recommended options above with little or no cost to the city government while increasing the capacity, quality, and affordability of preschools in the city. However, these efforts will require a great deal of initiative on the city’s part and an enthusiastic effort to make preschool a city priority.

Furthermore, if the city is able to coordinate its efforts and partner with some key organizations, it can overcome many of the barriers that prevent them from implementing more ambitious and costly options. For example, coordination would allow the city to identify and utilize vacant building and use the Housing Authority to create child care space. And partnerships may bring additional funding to the city’s preschool efforts that it cannot provide on its own. The city’s relationship with First Five LA is vital to the city’s own preschool provision because of First Five’s current push for universal preschool. But First Five funds are limited, and we expect other legislation will be enacted in the future to further fund universal preschool. Los Angeles itself must maintain preschool as a priority and ensure that it is prepared to take advantage of whatever opportunities are presented.
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APPENDIX A:
FIRST 5 LOS ANGELES FIVE-STAR QUALITY RATING SCALE

Please see First 5 LA’s Website for the First 5 Los Angeles Five-Star Quality Rating Scale in their Master Plan at www.prop10.org
APPENDIX B:
CITY DEPARTMENTS & AGENCIES

The Community Redevelopment Agency
The CRA’s mission is to redevelop communities with the intent on eliminating blight, restoring economic vitality and ensuring communal health. The CRA has a philosophy of child care development in their evaluations. There are several housing developments that include early education sites. One example is the Mercy Housing Child Care facility located in downtown LA. The CRA encourages the funding of child care in its development projects when feasible. Large and mixed use developments give priority to those plans that will dedicate 50% of spaces to low and moderate income families. Since CRA funding can help to build, but not run, the child care facilities, the challenge for the CRA is the maintenance of such developments. That is, who will run them, who will continue to fund them, and who will be responsible for upkeep, especially as a subsidy for low income populations. The CRA has been very active in the process to develop such affordable child care facilities. For example, the CRA was instrumental in establishing LA Posada Project, a five story, beautiful building for teen mothers - opened in the 1990's. Now, according to the CRA, many city departments and all the housing programs want service-enriched housing.

The Community Development Department
The Community Development Department (CDD) has the ability to develop partnerships using CDBG grants. The department also develops a funding process for the low and moderate income populations of the city, characterized as the working poor. The CDD, through its youth and family centers, enables residents to participate in ECE related activities through its child development workshops, its childcare licensing seminars, and its continued use program in which it allows complimentary use of its facilities in return for non-profits running child care services.

Housing Department
The Housing Department is instrumental in developing partnerships with HUD. Through HUD,
the Housing Department can match or fully fund programs related to child care throughout the city. The Housing Department can also access Proposition 46 funding - 2.1 billion dollars statewide, of which a quarter of a billion is available to local governments. There is also a 100 million dollar trust fund that is available to the city.

**Housing Authority**

The Housing Authority looks for opportunities to expand its housing base by including child care components. The Housing Authority recognizes that it is good public policy to provide the opportunity for low income dwellers to have to access child care, so that residents can have a permanent full time job.

**Commission for Children, Youth and Their Families**

The commission is charged with the coordination and facilitation of developing ECE and child care programs within the city.

**Dept of Recreation and Parks**

Parks and Recreation has about 19 facilities devoted to child care and child development. These sites are often devoted to city employees, but they accommodate residents as well.
APPENDIX C

City of Los Angeles Empowerment Zone
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## APPENDIX D:
### FIRST 5 LA HOT ZONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hot Zone Neighborhood</th>
<th>Zip Code(s)</th>
<th>Spaces Needed**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Central City</td>
<td>90001*, 90011*</td>
<td>1,181 + 1,590 = 2,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bell</td>
<td>90201</td>
<td>1,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Hawthorne</td>
<td>90250</td>
<td>1,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Huntington Park</td>
<td>90255</td>
<td>1,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Lynwood</td>
<td>90262</td>
<td>1,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 South Gate</td>
<td>90280</td>
<td>1,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Norwalk</td>
<td>90650</td>
<td>1,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Bellflower</td>
<td>90706</td>
<td>1,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Long Beach</td>
<td>90805, 90813</td>
<td>1,067 + 1,032 = 2,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Panorama City</td>
<td>91402*</td>
<td>1,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Baldwin Park</td>
<td>91706</td>
<td>1,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 La Puente</td>
<td>91744</td>
<td>1,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Pomona</td>
<td>91766</td>
<td>1,047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Zip codes within LA City (only part of 90001)
** Spaces Needed for 4-year olds only
APPENDIX E:
FIRST 5 LA MEMO

TO: The Universal Access to Preschool Advisory and Content Committees, Other Interested Persons

FROM: Nancy Daly Riordan and Robert M. Hertzberg
Co-Chairs, Universal Preschool Planning Process

DATE: March 8, 2004
Subject: Nomination Process: New Board of Directors

Please see First 5 LA’s Website for the First 5 LA Memo at www.prop10.org. The Los Angeles Universal Preschool Board of Directors Nomination Form follows on pages E-2 to E-4.
Los Angeles Universal Preschool Board of Directors

LOS ANGELES UNIVERSAL PRESCHOOL BOARD OF DIRECTORS NOMINATION FORM

The Los Angeles Universal Preschool project, a groundbreaking initiative funded by First 5 LA, seeks highly-qualified and motivated individuals to serve on the Board of Directors of an independent non-profit entity (hereafter referred to as LA UP) that will provide universal access to a high quality preschool program for all four year olds in LA County. As part of our search process, we are requesting nominations of individuals who have the expertise and experience necessary to fulfill the functions and duties of the Board of Directors (see attached cover letter).

Please submit the nomination form to the address below no later than April 2, 2004.

Joseph Byrne, Attorney
Mayer, Brown, Rowe and Maw
350 S. Grand Avenue 25th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071

Attention: Universal Access to Preschool BOARD OF DIRECTORS NOMINATION

ALL SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED OR POSTMARKED BY 5:00 P.M., April 2, 2004. NO FAXED OR EMAIL SUBMISSIONS WILL BE ACCEPTED.

For additional information or further questions, please contact Mr. Byrne at 213-229-5186, or email: jbyrne@mayerbrownrowe.com.

Thank you for your dedication to children and families and for supporting the vision and mission of a universal preschool program for LA County.

CANDIDATE INFORMATION

| Full Name | | |
| Job Title | Organization/Institution | |
| Address | City | Zip Code |
| Office Telephone | Other Telephone | E-mail Address |

Is the nominee aware of the duties and responsibilities and willing to serve on such a Board if selected?
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not Sure
The following list serves to illustrate the types of expertise that will be needed for the Board of Directors. Please check those that apply to your/candidate’s expertise. Please check all that apply and provide a supporting paragraph or résumé that describes the candidate’s experience and abilities in this area.

- System Financing and Sustainability
- Business Acumen, expertise in managing a $400M+ organization
- Real Estate and Facilities Development
- Marketing, Communications, & Consumer Outreach
- Information Technology
- Early Education and Care
- K-12 Education
- Philanthropy & Foundations
- Higher Education & Professional Development
- Community Awareness and Connections
- Governmental Affairs

What is the nominee’s experience with leadership or non-profit Board Experience in the Los Angeles Community?

What is nominee’s experience with public and/or community service in Los Angeles or in the State of California?

What is nominee’s experience with fund-raising, development, finance or community economic development?
In addition to completing the above form, please provide any additional narrative that explains the contribution the nominee brings to the Board and the new organization in the space below. For further information on the plan, you can preview the latest draft at www.first5.org.

**NOMINATOR INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominator</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Yes, I have enclosed the completed form and an explanation of my candidate’s relevant experience and background for this position.

☐ I have enclosed a resume or biographical sketch on the nominee.

Additional Narrative:

______________________________  ______________________________
Signature        Date
APPENDIX F:
INTERVIEWS

22 Child Care Centers in Los Angeles
California Community Licensing Division, Los Angeles Northwest Regional Office
Children Now
First Five Los Angeles Commission
First Five San Francisco Commission
First Five San Mateo Commission
Head Start Bureau, Region IX Office
Karen Hill-Scott & Company
Los Angeles City Council, Various Offices
Los Angeles Commission for Children, Youth, & Their Families
Los Angeles Community Development Department
Los Angeles Department of Planning
Los Angeles Housing Authority
Los Angeles Housing Department
San Francisco Department of Children, Youth & Families
San Francisco Department of Human Services
San Jose Office on Early Care & Education Services
Santa Monica Department of Human Services
UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families, and Communities
Urban Education Partnership
APPENDIX G:
CITY OF LOS ANGELES- MAP BY NEIGHBORHOODS

CITY of LOS ANGELES

CITY PLANNING AREAS (35+2)
APPENDIX H:
CITY OF LOS ANGELES- MAP BY ZIP CODES

Please see the Los Angeles Department of City Planning’s Website for the City of Los Angeles-Map by Zip Codes at http://www.ci.la.ca.us/PLN/