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Why Implement Mixed-Delivery?

- **Problem:** Chronic underutilization of VPI due to challenges with the funding formula and structure, leaving thousands of eligible children unserved

- **Potential Solution:** Support local capacity to design preschool systems that build on their unique assets and address their unique barriers
Mixed-Delivery Preschool Grants

An opportunity for communities to think entrepreneurially (“no strings attached”) about how to address unique challenges and common barriers that can prevent access to high-quality preschool

- HB 47 (2016 Session) created Mixed-Delivery Preschool Fund
- $1.5 million/year in budget (FY17-20)
Mixed-Delivery Preschool Grants

Competitive grants for local communities to design and model flexible preschool systems that work for their families

– Field test innovations, within a time-limited pilot initiative, for robust mixed-delivery preschool systems, utilizing partnerships between public schools and private child care centers

- Local decision-making and accountability strategies
Mixed-Delivery Preschool Grantee Cohorts

*Cohort 1*
- Albemarle County*
- Charlottesville*
- Harrisonburg*
- City of Roanoke*
- Spotsylvania County
- Stafford County
- Wythe County

*Cohort 2*
- Bristol
- Carroll County
- Chesterfield County
- Craig County
- Fairfax County
- Fauquier County
- Russell County
- Tazewell County

*Cohort 3*
- Alexandria
- Botetourt County
- Floyd County
- Franklin County
- Giles County
- Montgomery County
- Pulaski County
- Rappahannock County
- Roanoke County
- Rockingham County
- Salem

*Cohort 4*
- Buchanan County
- Gloucester County
- Hampton
- Henrico County
- Lynchburg
- Norton
- Page County
- Shenandoah County

*These localities participated in both Cohort 1 and Cohort 3*
Benefits of Mixed-Delivery

• Options that meet the needs and priorities of working families, including full working day, full-year services and services in community-based child care sites that also enroll younger siblings

• Professional development and other quality improvement supports for community-based child care

• Opportunities for communities to braid funding streams (such as parent tuition, VPI, Head Start, child care subsidy) to more adequately fund high-quality care and education
Mixed-Delivery Progress

- **2015**: Joint Subcommittee on VPI begins work
- **2016**: HB 47 enacted
- **2017**: VA Chamber Releases Blueprint 2025
- **2018**: MD Evaluation Report Released (Cohorts 1 & 2)
- **2019**: VA Earns PDG B5 Grant ~$10M
- **2020**: VA Applies for PDG B5 Renewal ~$38M

1st Round MD Grants Released
2nd Round MD Grants Released
3rd Round MD Grants Released
4th Round MD Grants Released
1. What are the language, literacy, numeracy, and self-regulation outcomes of children who attended programs that participated in the Mixed Delivery Preschool Pilot Program and how do those outcomes compare to outcomes achieved by students in public school VPI classrooms?

2. What is the relationship between teacher qualifications and child developmental outcomes among preschool children in mixed delivery and public school classrooms?

3. What are the program quality and teaching practice outcomes for programs participating in the Mixed Delivery Preschool Pilot Program?

4. What were the experiences of grantees that implemented the Mixed Delivery Preschool Pilot Program?
KEY FINDINGS

CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL OUTCOMES
Children in Cohort 1 mixed delivery classrooms showed substantial growth in literacy skills during their preschool year and had PALS-PreK scores that met or surpassed developmental milestones at the end of preschool.

**FIGURE 3: PALS-PreK Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 Subtest Scores in Cohort 1 Mixed Delivery Classrooms, with Developmental Levels**
The majority of children in both mixed delivery and public school VPI classrooms had language, literacy, and math scores that met or exceeded typical scores for their age group in the spring of their preschool year.

**FIGURE 4:** Percentage of Children in Mixed Delivery and Public School VPI Classrooms Who Met or Exceeded Typical Scores for Their Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Mixed Delivery classrooms (n=64 children)</th>
<th>Public School VPI classrooms (n=64 children)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The percentage of children who met or exceeded typical scores for their age group was determined by Woodcock Johnson Relative Proficiency Index classifications.
KEY FINDING 3

Matched children in mixed delivery and public school VPI classrooms had similar spring scores, on average, in math, literacy, language, and self-regulation.

FIGURE 6: Average Math, Literacy, and Language Scores in Mixed Delivery and Public School VPI Classrooms, Spring 2018

- **MATH**: Mixed Delivery classrooms (n=64 children) = 415.1, Public School VPI classrooms (n=64 children) = 417.7
- **LITERACY**: Mixed Delivery classrooms (n=64 children) = 344.6, Public School VPI classrooms (n=64 children) = 350.9
- **LANGUAGE**: Mixed Delivery classrooms (n=64 children) = 467.2, Public School VPI classrooms (n=64 children) = 470.7
KEY FINDINGS

TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS
Teacher qualifications varied across mixed delivery classrooms and public school VPI classrooms, yet children achieved similar outcomes across the different settings.

**FIGURE 7: Teacher Degree Level in Mixed Delivery and VPI Classrooms in 2017–18, Matched Analysis Sample**

- **Mixed Delivery Classrooms (n=14)**
  - Master's Degree or Higher: 21%
  - Bachelor's Degree: 29%
  - Some College: 36%
  - HS Diploma or GED: 14%

- **Public School Classrooms (n=28)**
  - Master's Degree or Higher: 57%
  - Bachelor's Degree: 43%
KEY FINDING 5

Lead teacher qualifications were not significantly related to children’s literacy, language, or self-regulation outcomes, though they were positively associated with children’s math outcomes.
Where do we go from here?

• What did we learn?
• What can we do differently and better?

• Importance and feasibility of locally-driven public/private partnership and innovation to help expand high quality ECCE options for working families and vulnerable children
• Paved the way for PDG-B5 Pilot success
School Readiness Committee

Guiding:

• Implementation of 2+2 Articulation - Higher Education Pathway for Early Childhood Educators

• Implementation of PDG B-5 grant, including Impact Workgroup Subcommittee
  – Needs Assessment
  – Strategic Plan
Preschool Development Grant
Birth Through Five (PDG B-5)

Required Statewide Needs Assessment:

• To what extent are Virginia’s publicly funded ECCE programs serving families in Virginia with children ages 0 to 5?

• What are the strengths and weaknesses of Virginia’s infrastructure supporting publicly-funded ECCE programs?

• What are opportunities for improvement?
Virginia’s Opportunities for Children

1. Obtain an **accurate count** of the supply, enrollment, and availability of publicly-funded care for children ages 0-5.

2. Create an **integrated data system**.

3. **Expand capacity** to serve children during early years (ages 0-3).

4. Target public resources **to geographic areas with capacity gaps**.

5. Increase the **participation of families in guiding policies and practices** at the program, community, and state levels.
Virginia’s Opportunities for Public Programs

6. Support increased awareness about ECCE options and their value to children.

7. Support efforts to share information about quality and access with programs and parents.

8. Coordinate Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) administrative processes.

9. Advocate for competitive wages and training supports for staff and educators.

10. Incentivize participation in Virginia Quality and support use of contracts and other means to reward and promote quality care.
Virginia’s Opportunities to Develop a System

11. Design an early childhood governance system with identified leadership, oversight, and accountability measures.

12. Adjust funding and reimbursement models to account for costs and quality.

13. Provide technical assistance to local school divisions and other public and private providers to braid, or integrate, diverse funding streams.

14. Engage the private sector.

15. Coordinate interpretation and implementation of policies.
Vision

• All children in the Commonwealth of Virginia will thrive with the support of accessible, quality, and affordable early care and education delivered in safe and nurturing environments.
Values

1. **Equitable.** All children have access to opportunities in inclusive schools, centers, and homes that provide the care and education they need, regardless of age, income, ethnicity, race, zip code, or ability.

2. **Family Focused.** Families are engaged in guiding the policies and practices of early care and education, and programs and policy makers are accountable to families and welcome their involvement.

3. **High Quality.** Children are supported in their development and learning in safe, high quality environments by a skilled workforce receiving adequate wages and professional supports.

4. **Strategic.** Funding, policies, shared data, and standards are coordinated among programs, agencies, and schools to better invest in and serve children and their families.

5. **Innovative.** Successful local initiatives and policies are incubated, piloted, supported, and scaled through a dynamic state and local partnership, resulting in effective practices.
Questions?

Contact:

Kathy Glazer
Virginia Early Childhood Foundation
kathy@vecf.org
804-358-8323