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“For education leaders with a traditional K-12 perspective, collaboration often presents both new opportunities and new difficulties, from establishing relationships with early care providers to developing a shared definition of ‘school readiness.’ While implementing a pre-k program in partnership with community-based organizations may require more time and effort, this strategy ultimately benefits all stakeholders: public schools, private providers, families and children.”

- Beyond the School Yard: Pre-K Collaborations with Community-Based Partners
  The Pew Report, July 2009
Establishing the Need

K-16 system alignment starts with 0-5 alignment
The Texas Landscape
Source: Center for Public Policy Priorities: Texas Kids Count Project 2015 report

Percentage of Children Living in Poverty, 2013

- 9.0% to 19.4%
- 19.7% to 27.3%
- 27.4% to 36%
- 36.6% to 52.2%
Percentage of Kids Living in Poverty by Race/Ethnicity in 2013

- Asian & Pacific Islander: 11%
- Black or African American: 34%
- Hispanic or Latino: 34%
- Non-Hispanic White: 11%
- Two or More Races: 21%
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS 2013-14

60.3% 3,096,050 Students  Increased 58.9% 2009-10

PUBLIC PRE-K ENROLLMENT FOR 4-YEAR-OLDS 2012-13

52.3% 205,056 Students  Increased 48.4% 2008-09
Texas accounted for 53.2% of the growth in the early childhood and school-age population (0-12) in the US between 2000 and 2010.
Population Change

As of 2010, Hispanics accounted for 49.3% of Texas children 0-12

Changes in Composition of the Child Population (Ages 0-12) in Texas Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NH White</th>
<th>NH Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>NH Asian &amp; Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population Change

Harris County has the largest child population 0-12: nearly 850,000 children in 2010

Percent of Change in Early Childhood and School Age Population 2000-2010

- Less than 100 children in 2000
- Population decline (118)
- No change or less than 10% (69)
- At least 10% but less than State Growth of 17.2% (26)
- Greater or equal to State Growth of 17.2% (38)
Growth in the child population between 2010 and 2015 will be concentrated in metropolitan areas of Houston, Dallas, San Antonio, Austin, McAllen, and El Paso.

### Metropolitan Statistical Areas’ Shares of Total Statewide Change in the Early Childhood Population, 2000-2010 and 2010-2015

**2000-2010**
- Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington: 31%
- Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown: 29%
- San Antonio-New Braunfels: 12%
- Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos: 7%
- McAllen-Edinburg-Mission: 6%
- Non-MSA: 1%
- All Others: 9%

**2010-2015**
- Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington: 25%
- Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown: 28%
- San Antonio-New Braunfels: 15%
- Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos: 15%
- McAllen-Edinburg-Mission: 7%
- Non-MSA: 7%
- All Others: 11%
Population Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Total</strong></td>
<td>4,995,269</td>
<td>1,245,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>842,917</td>
<td>223,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>481,468</td>
<td>139,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>196,524</td>
<td>94,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexar</td>
<td>337,913</td>
<td>87,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>371,121</td>
<td>79,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>170,952</td>
<td>64,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>97,073</td>
<td>47,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>185,011</td>
<td>43,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb</td>
<td>64,148</td>
<td>27,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueces</td>
<td>63,711</td>
<td>19,436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- An estimated 24.9% of Texas children 0-12 lived in poverty households in 2010, projected to 25.4% (1.3 million children) in 2015
- In Harris County, 26.5% of children birth-age 12 live in poverty
Population Change

- The chart to the left show the child population estimates for 2010 and projections for 2015 and 2040 for the 20 Most Populous Counties.

- In 2040, there will be more than 6 million children from birth to age 12 in the top 20 counties.
Supply of ECE and School-Age Care Services and Programs

More than 23,000 unique Texas operators (licensed child care centers, family homes, public pre-k, and military child development centers), Head Start programs, and private school pre-k provided more than 800,000 unduplicated slots in 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Care</th>
<th>Providers</th>
<th>Slots</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23,465</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>867,628</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Centers</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>586,923</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Homes</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Homes</td>
<td>6,330</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30,557</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Homes</td>
<td>4,037</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10,155</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Pre-K</td>
<td>3,154</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>224,287</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military CDCs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.07%</td>
<td>3,106</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supply of ECE and School-Age Care Services and Programs

The distribution of early childhood providers in Texas is not necessarily representative of the number of children birth-5 who need care in each county.

Proportion of Unduplicated Formal ECE Slots by County per 100 children Under Age 5

- < 25 (24)
- 25-44.7 (144)
- 44.8-49.9 (31)
- 50.0-64.9 (49)
- 65.0 or more (6)


**Gap Analysis**

- The chart to the left shows Actual vs. Predicted Early Care and Education Slots in 2010 for Children Ages 0-4 in the 20 Most Populous Texas Counties.

- In 2010, the unduplicated supply of formal ECE programs could have potentially served 45% of Texas children ages 0-4 and 78% of the estimated need for child care among working families.
Gap Analysis

The number of children income-eligible for public school pre-k and are not served will grow

![Bar chart showing the gap between income eligible and served 4 year olds for 2010 and projected gap for 2015 and 2040.

- **2010**: 15302 children eligible but not serviced, 176078 children enrolled in Pre-K (income eligible only), 191380 children living in households below 185% FPG.
- **2015**: 15975 children eligible but not serviced, 183709 children enrolled in Pre-K (income eligible only), 199684 children living in households below 185% FPG.
- **2040**: 24625 children eligible but not serviced, 283190 children enrolled in Pre-K (income eligible only), 307815 children living in households below 185% FPG.

---

*Texas Education Agency*
Gap Analysis

In 2010, Head Start/Early Head Start served:
• 5% of eligible children 0-2
• 31% of eligible 3-year-olds
• 39% of eligible 4-year-olds

This service gap will remain through 2015 and 2040.
• “A young child growing up in a working family is not completely shielded from the economic distress of inadequate income.”

• “For the youngest children in Texas, poverty acts as a significant barrier to quality education and learning.”

What is school ready?
Defining School Readiness as Cited in NAEYC Position Statement

“School readiness involves more than just children. School readiness, in the broadest sense, is about children, families, early environments, schools, and communities. Children are not innately ‘ready’ or ‘not ready’ for school. Their skills and development are strongly influenced by their families and through their interactions with other people and environments before coming to school.” (Maxwell & Clifford, 2004, p. 42)
Dimensions of School Readiness

- Physical Well-being and Motor Development
- Socio-emotional Development
- Approaches to Learning
- Language Development
- Cognition and Early Knowledge

- Source: The National Education Goals Panel
The School Readiness Equation

Ready Families  
+  
Ready Communities  
+  
Ready Services  
+  
Ready Schools  
=  

Children Ready for School
What is a Community-Based School Readiness Integration Partnership?
Fusing the Entities

Diverse organizations work with the same population of at-risk children; however, each contributes through different emphasis on the child’s development. The collaboration allows each entity to capitalize on each other’s strengths to provide a seamless, holistic education for each child in the program.
Cooperative Strategies for Sharing Resources – Texas Education Code, Section 29.1533

• Sharing certified or highly qualified teachers;
• Developing a comprehensive instructional frameworks based on the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines, consisting of common performance goals;
• Sharing physical space if one organization lacks capacity;
• Conducting joint professional development that focuses on proven school readiness components; and
• Adopting similar approaches to student progress monitoring to inform classroom instruction.
Public School Pre-Kindergarten

- Collaboration with other programs may allow expansion to full day programs
- Could share a teacher assistant
- Save district dollars sharing off-campus facility space
- Enhance services such as reduced ratios with co-teachers
Child Care

- Enhance quality with TEA certified teachers
- Save dollars by sharing resources such as Teacher Assistants, facilities, and teaching curriculum/materials
- Provide wrap around child care services
Head Start

• Partner with Pre-K Public School or Child Care program or both and expand a half-day Head Start to full day of care and education

• Save dollars by sharing resources such as Teacher Assistants, facilities, and teaching curriculum/materials
Collaborative integrated partnerships

Co-existence
Communication
Cooperation
Coordination
Collaboration
Forming a Partnership: 8 Steps Process for Collaboration

Step One: Accessing Community Needs

Step Two: Identify & Recruit Partners
- Highly Effective Staff
- Research-based Curricula in: Language, Literacy, Mathematics, and Social/Emotional Development
- Responsive Teaching
- Child Progress Monitoring
- Professional Development
- Mentoring
- Appropriate Classroom Environments
- Parents as Partners
- Information Frequently Shared
- Comprehensive Services

Step Three: Build Trust & Relationships

Step Four: Develop Common Vision & Goals

Step Five: Finance the Partnership

Step Six: Delineate Roles & Responsibilities

Step Seven: Ensure Quality

Step Eight: Sustain the Partnership
Step One: Assess Community Needs

- Identify community needs and collect key information
- Conduct a site visit
- Create timeline
Step Two: Identify and Recruit Partners

“Both partners must ultimately choose one another.”
Step Three: Build Trust and Relationships

• Build trust and knowledge
• Identify the Benefits and Challenges
• Identify the core collaboration team
• Develop communication protocols
• Develop strategies to resolve conflicts
Step Four: Develop Common Vision and Goals
The Three R’s

Rules
Routines
Relationships
Step Five: Finance the Partnership
Share Resources and Expertise

• Each partner – whether a public school, child care center or Head Start program – brings a set of assets to the collaboration.

• Developing collaborative pre-k programs can help each party leverage these resources to enhance the array and quality of services offered to families.
Step Six: Delineate Roles and Responsibilities

“Agreements should articulate not only the purpose and objectives of the collaboration but also how partners will handle issues such as staffing, facilities, curriculum, assessment, program monitoring and evaluation, comprehensive services, and special populations like English language learners and special needs children.”

- Beyond the School Yard: Pre-K Collaborations with Community-Based Partners
  The Pew Report, July 2009
Step Six: Delineate Roles and Responsibilities

• Is it a Memorandum of Understanding? Or a partnership and association?
• Is it a cooperative partnership?
• Is the collaboration such that it is united and offered as a seamless service to parents, students, and the community?
Step Seven: Ensure Quality

• Partnership handbooks
• Streamlined enrollment
• Joint hiring of teachers
• Joint professional development
• Daily schedules and teacher planning
• Parent involvement and education
• Coordination of multiple curricula and assessments
• Program evaluation criteria
Step Eight: Sustain the Partnership
Types of Partnership Models

The Four Most Common Partnership Models are:

• Stacked or Flip/Flop Model
• Concurrent Model
• Wraparound Model
• Subcontracting Model
Stacked/Flip-Flop Model

The “stacked” or “stacking” model, also known as the “flip-flop” model, describes two programs offered sequentially in order to piece together a full day of early care and education.
Stacked/Flip-Flop Model

Model Benefits

- Enhanced services to children and families
- Full day of early care and education to meet the needs of working parents
- Increased number of staff to children
- Transportation and facility cost savings when services are offered in one stable location
- Smoother transition to Kindergarten
- Expanded training and professional development opportunities for teachers
Concurrent Model

The “concurrent” model is used when more than one program is offered simultaneously and each program provides different services to a group of children in order to enhance and expand services.
Concurrent Model

Model Benefits

• Comprehensive services to children and families
• Increased number of staff to children
• Cost saving to both programs
• Expanded training and professional development opportunities
• Smoother transition to Kindergarten
• New opportunities for learning and support among teachers and staff
Wraparound Model

The “wraparound” integrated model involves more than one program working together to provide both core and either before – or – after-school services or both.
Wraparound Model

Model Benefits

• Enhanced services for children and families
• Full day of early childhood services to help working parents
• Smoother transition to Kindergarten
• Transportation and facility cost savings
• New opportunities for learning and support among teachers
Subcontracting Model

In the subcontracting model, one program subcontracts with another to provide services to children.
Subcontracting Model

Model Benefits

• Comprehensive services to children and families
• Transportation and facility costs savings
• Expanded access to all Pre-K programs
• Smoother transition to Kindergarten
Meet Our Panel

• **Jill Goodrich** - Executive Director of Opportunity School in Amarillo

• **Dr. Connie Spence** – Principal of Kooken Education Center and Community Based PK, Arlington ISD

• **Ruth Castillo** – Early Childhood Consultant, ESC Region 2, Corpus Christi

• **Alison Bentley** – Program Manager of Success by 6, United Way of Greater Austin
Panel Questions

Please describe your current integration partnership model (5-8 minutes for each panel member). Include a description of your partners; when how and why a collaboration was started in your community.
Panel Questions

In the referenced PEW report: “two main types of barriers: attitudinal obstacles – those that have to do with beliefs and perceptions – and mechanical obstacles – those that have to do with logistics, regulations and requirements. What are some of the major barriers you have experienced and what have you done or recommend to resolve? (3 minutes each)
Panel Questions

What recommendations would you have for a community to get started? (2 minutes each)
Panel Questions

Tell us about one example of collaboration at its best! (3-5 minutes each)
Community Based School Readiness Partnerships Resource Manual

www.texasschoolready.org/collaboration