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**ACRONYM GUIDE**

The nation’s early childhood system, and the administration of federal funding at the state level, consists of intersecting relationships among multiple programs. For reference, throughout the document, the following acronyms are used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CACFP</td>
<td>Child and Adult Care Food Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCAMPIS</td>
<td>Child Care Access Means Parents in School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCDBG</td>
<td>Child Care and Development Block Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCDF</td>
<td>Child Care and Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>Early Care and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECIDS</td>
<td>Early Childhood Integrated Data System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHS-CCP</td>
<td>Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACE</td>
<td>Family and Child Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO</td>
<td>Government Accountability Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>Department of Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Part B, Section 619</td>
<td>Preschool Grants for Children with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Part C</td>
<td>Early Intervention Program for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPB</td>
<td>Federal Early Learning Interagency Policy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAs</td>
<td>Local Educational Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDG</td>
<td>Preschool Development Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QRIS</td>
<td>Quality Rating Improvement System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT-ELC</td>
<td>Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>Early Childhood State Advisory Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLDS</td>
<td>State Longitudinal Data Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANF</td>
<td>Temporary Assistance for Needy Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center set out to examine state management of federal early childhood programs with an eye on maximizing the use of public funds and responding to Congressional concerns that more children and families could be served if the states were just more efficient. At the same time, state officials complained that Washington, DC, and the federal government were the source of the inefficiencies and pointed to over-regulation as the source of the problem.

Our work was spurred on by a 2017 GAO report that responded to a Congressional concern about the “duplication, fragmentation and lack of coordination” of early care and education programs and the underlying belief that there were sufficient funds to serve the children and the long waiting lists were due primarily to inefficiencies. BPC’s goal in doing this work was to better understand whether or not there were efficiencies to be gained and where. At the same time, we began our examination of the actual need for, and corresponding supply of, child care across the country.

We began by identifying the primary federal funding sources that support actual slots for children. These included CCDBG, CACFP, Head Start, IDEA – Part B and C, TANF and the Preschool Development Grants. We also looked at the State Advisory Councils, and within which state agency the Head Start Collaboration Offices, state licensing offices and the state’s QRIS systems resided. In examining where programs were administered within State governments, we considered whether any requirements existed, by either Congress or federal regulations, that influenced where programs must or should be housed. We found only one (Part B of IDEA) that is Congressionally mandated to be in the state’s corresponding Department of Education.

What we found instead was, with one exception, states have complete discretion over the organization and management of the federal funds, thus dispelling the myth in many states that either Congress or federal agencies are responsible for where programs are located. Moreover, our primary focus was on the biggest programs, child care, Head Start, Pre-K and the food program and the degree to which they are housed together. We awarded points for co-location and oversight of programs and then ranked them accordingly. As could be expected, we found wide variation in the state governance structures.

---

Fast forward to 2020. As the pandemic unfolded and impacted nearly every aspect of our lives, child care moved to the forefront of federal and state policy discussions. In a few short months, a program that had already been challenging for parents became a national crisis as essential workers needed to go to work, but child care was shuttering caused by loss of enrollment and lack of stable funding. As programs began to slowly reopen, new health and safety measures were required, adult to child ratios were reduced and mandated closures became a routine way of life. These measures took a deep toll on our nation’s early care and education system as programs scrambled to continue services while absorbing additional health and safety costs.

The federal government responded to the pandemic’s impact with three successive relief packages totaling over $50 billion dollars for child care alone. The state’s management of these funds proved challenging at best, and their governance structures were severely tested. Despite this fact—and possibly because of it—many states continued their work to improve their governance and oversight of child care funding.

Now, as we emerge from the pandemic, BPC has revisited the 2018 report. Several states deserve a special shout out for their work. They are Maine, Virginia, Florida, North Dakota, and Missouri. Michigan improved its score significantly by drawing down all available federal funds. Arkansas also gained points because they became a state-level Early Head Start/Child Care Partnership grantee. New Mexico, while a top scorer in the 2018 report, continued to advance its system with the creation of a cabinet-level position. Finally, Colorado has passed significant legislation that will be implemented this year, but we were not able to evaluate it during this review period.

We have heard from state officials that their governance structures were important as they worked to execute federal COVID-19 relief funds. Now, as we continue to advance the delivery of child care and early learning programs, it is our hope that this report will help states as they continue to improve services to our families and children.

**Linda K. Smith**
Introduction

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center released the seminal report *Creating an Integrated Efficient Early Care and Education System to Support Children and Families: A State-by-State Analysis*. Analyzing the governance structure of every state’s early care and education system offered a window into the opportunities—and challenges—in administering comprehensive Early Care and Education (ECE) systems.

Prior to COVID-19, the federal government invested billions of dollars each year in programs designed to support early learning and positive development opportunities for children under age 5. The majority of these funds flow through programs managed by federal agencies—principally the Department of Education (ED) and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)—to the states, which have discretion regarding how these funds are administered. Additionally, many states fund pre-kindergarten (pre-K) programs and preschool programs using their own state resources.

As the pandemic unfolded and impacted every aspect of our nation’s social and economic fabric, ECE programs moved to the forefront of federal and state policy discussions as an essential service. Health and safety measures implemented to prevent the spread of COVID-19 included mandated closures, restricted in-person interactions, and limited adult-to-child ratios. These measures took a deep toll on the financial viability of our nation’s ECE system, as programs scrambled to replace lost revenues while investing in safe methods to provide ECE service delivery.

In 2020, the federal government responded to the pandemic’s impact on early childhood programs with three successive federal relief packages. Collectively, these packages invested approximately $52.5 billion in the nation’s child care system—funding intended to stabilize programs as parents returned to work. This significant increase in funding heightened the awareness of state administrative structures and the understanding that states must be well-positioned to efficiently and effectively distribute this increase of federal funding.

Given how critical the state-federal partnership in ECE is, the Bipartisan Policy Center revisited the 2018 state administration study to explore whether states have made significant progress in the governance of ECE programs. This issue continues to be important for the two reasons established in the initial report.

First, support for early childhood programs can only be sustained if the programs are viewed as effective and efficient in their use of public funds. At a time when demand for ECE services continues to far outpace available resources—in many states, thousands of families who are eligible for Head Start or child care assistance cannot access these programs—the case for continued and expanded investment must be accompanied by a commitment to efficiency, good governance, and a consistent focus on quality assurance and results.

Second, and equally important, fragmentation, bureaucratic inefficiency, and lack of coordination in the administration of ECE programs create real obstacles to access. Sadly, this often results in many children—including those who are already most vulnerable—missing out on the support they need. When families must apply to multiple programs, housed across multiple agencies, often with duplicative paperwork requirements and inconsistent eligibility criteria, many give up or receive fewer services than their family would benefit from. Thus, the focus on integration and alignment should not be viewed as an exercise designed to satisfy abstract notions of organizational efficiency. Rather, these issues matter on the ground, in the everyday lives of families with young children who too often have trouble determining what services they might be eligible for, let alone how to go about accessing them.
As part of this review, BPC updated information about each state’s specific approaches to organizing, administering, and coordinating ECE programs. Specifically, BPC analyzed:

- The number of state agencies and divisions within state agencies involved in administering ECE programs
- The institutional “housing” of related programs and the level of coordination and collaboration that takes place across programs
- Whether the state has a functioning early learning state advisory council and where that council is housed, if it exists, and, similarly, where the Head Start Collaboration Office is housed
- The integration of early childhood data across programs and implementation of quality rating and improvement systems at the state level

BPC used a scoring system developed in 2018 that incorporates several measures of programmatic governance and integration. Parameters considered in the scoring system include the number of state agencies involved in administering core ECE programs; whether some funding streams were split across these agencies; and the institutional placement of key offices such as the Head Start Collaboration Office. BPC’s scoring system also considered factors such as the presence of an Early Childhood State Advisory Counsel (SAC) to provide guidance on ECE issues and efforts to integrate quality metrics, such as a Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS), with state child care subsidy programs. Finally, our system awarded bonus points if states supplemented federal ECE resources with their own funding; for example, to expand Head Start. Conversely states lost points in our scoring system if they failed to fully draw down federal ECE funds. Previously, BPC also examined the total of state and federal dollars spent on ECE programs.

States were reassessed for their progress across these same categories for this report. In recognition of this movement, the states that ranked in the highest 10 spots in 2021 using BPC’s scoring system, and the 10 states that scored lowest, are summarized in Table 1. As in the 2018 report, BPC’s analysis is grounded in the theory that better program alignment and coordination matters to outcomes because it: a) affects how readily families can access services; b) maximizes ECE benefits by leveraging scarce public resources more efficiently; and c) promotes better monitoring and oversight to identify service gaps and target continued improvements in program design and delivery.

Table 1. Results of BPC Scoring System for State Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATES RANKED IN TOP 10</th>
<th>STATES RANKED IN BOTTOM 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Maryland</td>
<td>41. New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Arkansas</td>
<td>42. Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Washington, DC</td>
<td>42. Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Michigan</td>
<td>42. Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. New Mexico</td>
<td>45. Hawai‘i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Georgia</td>
<td>46. Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Washington</td>
<td>47. Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. North Carolina</td>
<td>49. Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As before, there continues to be considerable variation in states’ approaches to organizing ECE programs. In most or all of the top 10 scoring states, a single agency administered funds from the largest federal programs, including the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP), and the state’s pre-K programs. Nearly all of these states also housed their Head Start Collaboration Office in the same agency. Overwhelmingly, we found states largely progress in a positive direction, moving their ECE systems to more consolidated structures that increase efficiency and potential to reduce duplication across services for children and families.

### State-by-State Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2021 Rank</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Base Score (Out of 50)</th>
<th>Bonus Score (Out of 15)</th>
<th>2018 Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Performance Index</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>ED-Watermark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai’i</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*bolded and italicized states indicate those that have improved in their ranking since 2018

---

Colorado’s governor approved landmark legislation in 2021 to create a new agency-level early childhood department. The department will be fully implemented in 2022, and department structure is currently under consideration. For this reason, BPC was unable to score the new department structure at the time of publication.
Federal agencies oversee multiple ECE programs providing direct funding to states, and in the case of Head Start, directly to local organizations. The following overview provides a review of the most significant early childhood federal programs.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) is administered by the Office of Child Care within Department of Health and Human Services’ Office of the Administration for Children & Families (ACF). Child Care and Development Fund grants funding to states to subsidize child care expenses for low-income families and increase the quality of child care.

Head Start, including Early Head Start and Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships, is administered by ACF’s Office of Head Start. Grants go to local organizations to implement Head Start for 3- and 4-year-old children and Early Head Start for infants and toddlers. Grants to form Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships for infants and toddlers are awarded to local community organizations and states.

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) is administered by ACF’s Office of Family Assistance. TANF provides state grants to help meet the needs of low-income families. States can transfer up to 30% of TANF funding to CCDF and can spend an unlimited amount of TANF funding directly to help low-income families cover child care expenses.

U.S. Department of Education

Early Intervention for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities was established under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). It is administered by the Department of Education’s Office of Special Education Programs and provides funds to states to support early intervention services for infants and toddlers with developmental delays or disabilities.

Preschool Grants for Children with Disabilities is a program established under IDEA Part B, Section 619. It is also administered by the Office of Special Education Programs and provides grants to states to meet the needs of preschool-age children with disabilities.

U.S. Department of Agriculture:

The Child and Adult Care Food Program is administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)’s Food and Nutrition Service. It provides funds to states to support nutritious meals and snacks for low-income children in early care and education programs.
Competitive Grant Programs
Since the release of BPC’s prior report, Congress increased funding for a number of competitive grant programs that increase access, improve quality, and create efficiencies for early learning programs. Grants are awarded to states, organizations, universities, and communities. The current competitive grant programs with an ECE focus include:

1. Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership (EHS-CCP) grants, administered by HHS
2. Child Care Access Means Parents in School (CCAMPIS), administered by ED
3. Preschool Development Grants (PDG) Birth through Five, or PDG B-5, administered by HHS

Aspects of State ECE Systems
States have far-reaching abilities to administer federal funds, yet specific aspects of state systems demonstrate commonalities, such as state-funded pre-K programs. Here we provide an overview of the recognized features of state early childhood systems.

State Advisory Councils
Authority to create or designate a SAC to support high quality child care is included in the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-134). The responsibilities of a state SAC under the Head Start statute include conducting a periodic statewide needs assessment and identifying opportunities for coordination among federally funded and state-funded ECE programs and services.

State Pre-K Programs
In the 2019-2020 school year, 44 states funded pre-K programs. Only six states did not report any such spending—Idaho, Indiana, Montana, New Hampshire, South Dakota, and Wyoming. While Indiana did not report any state spending in 2019, the state does operate a grant program that provides preschool slots in high quality ECE programs for low-income 4-year-old children.

Head Start Collaboration Offices
Under the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, state Head Start Collaboration Offices are charged with assisting, coordinating, and adopting approaches that address the needs of a state’s Head Start agencies. These offices are also tasked with promoting partnerships between Head Start agencies, state and local governments, and the private sector to help ensure that Head Start children...
are receiving comprehensive services to prepare them for elementary school.

**Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships**
HHS competitively awards Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership grants to states and local organizations to support high quality early learning programs for infants and toddlers. Six states—Alabama, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Georgia, and Pennsylvania receive funding to administer Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership grants at the state level.

**Child Care Licensing and Quality Rating Improvement Systems**
The enforcement of health and safety standards, as required by CCDF, is managed through a state’s child care licensing systems. Licensing may be connected to systems that support continuous quality improvement known as QRIS. QRIS provides program-level standards that promote developmentally appropriate settings that, when added to health and safety standards, rate the quality of child care programs. In some states, providers must participate in QRIS to be eligible for child care subsidies. QRIS ratings can be a source of information for parents and create incentives for providers for continued quality improvement.

**Data Systems**
Congress has provided federal funds to help states develop and integrate ECE data systems. For example, 28 states have received federal funding to incorporate ECE data into their State Longitudinal Data Systems database or to enhance their early childhood data systems. Currently, 28 states have been awarded implementation grants through the Preschool Development Grant Birth through Five program. States can target these dollars to improve and integrate data systems across multiple early childhood programs.

**Programs for Young Children with Special Needs**
The Individuals with Disabilities and Education Act provides early intervention services to infants and toddlers with disabilities, birth to age 3, through Part C. IDEA Part B, Section 619 provides special education services to preschool-age children with disabilities. Funding for Part B, Section 619 is required by statute to be administered by state education agencies and distributed across local educational agencies (LEAs).

These programs are flexible, and state policies are not uniform regarding IDEA administration. Part B, Section 619 and Part C may be administered by separate agencies at the state level and are not necessarily aligned with early childhood programs. This misalignment can create significant challenges for families. For example, infants and toddlers may receive services under Part C but must requalify when they turn 3 as part of the Part B, Section 619 program.
Revisiting State Governance of Early Childhood Programs

As BPC established in our prior report, there are a variety of state agencies and administrative configurations responsible for administering various ECE funding streams and programs. The structure, relationship, and potential to collaborate across programs and services—that may reach the same family—have real implications.

When programs have differing eligibility, monitoring, and quality requirements, a unified agency structure under consolidated leadership more easily supports efficiency. Aligning program standards and monitoring can reduce costs for the state, and decrease the administrative burden for small early learning programs and community organizations providing the services. BPC revisited publicly available data sources, and worked with individual states to update information in the following areas:

- The total amount of federal and state funds spent on early childhood development programs
- How states are responding to federal requirements, including the coordination requirements set forth in various authorizing statutes
- The number of state agencies, and divisions within state agencies, involved in administering early childhood development programs
- The institutional “housing” of related programs and the level of coordination and collaboration that takes place across programs
- Whether the state has a functioning advisory council, where the council is housed, if it exists, and similarly, where the Head Start Collaboration Office is housed
- The integration of early childhood data across programs and implementation of QRIS at the state level

In revisiting the 2018 data, BPC found that more than half—29 states—implemented a more efficient structure or strategy since BPC’s 2018 report was issued. While the following report details examples of where states have created positive movement, particular highlights include:

- Two states—Missouri and New Mexico—implemented a consolidated governance structure that decreased the number of agencies responsible for coordinating early childhood programs
- Three states—Missouri, North Dakota, and Virginia—combined oversight of two or more programs inclusive of CCDF, Child and Adult Care Food Program, and state pre-K programs, increasing the potential to reduce administrative and monitoring burden at the community level
- Four states—Florida, Idaho, Kansas, and Texas—implemented an early childhood SAC
- Twelve states—Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin—now use licensing health and safety standards as the foundation of their state's QRIS, ensuring inclusion of all early learning programs in quality standards
- Nearly half, or 24 states, increased the amount of the TANF funding transferred to the state's CCDF program, reducing the potential for administrative redundancy

BPC also found wide variations in the level of ECE program integration at the state level. Some states have implemented highly integrated and functional systems to administer these programs, while administration in other states remains quite fragmented. Governors, despite having substantial discretion in terms of assigning programs to state agencies, may not be aware how much leeway they have to make institutional changes that would help better align and coordinate ECE services. Thus,
one of the chief recommendations to emerge from this report is that governors should appoint an independent review board to conduct a complete business analysis of state administration and governance of ECE programs.

**NUMBER OF AGENCIES INVOLVED IN ECE AND CLUSTERING OF ECE PROGRAMS IN AGENCIES**

Since BPC first reviewed the number of agencies involved in administering ECE funding within each state as a measure of organizational integration, some states have moved in the direction of further integration within agencies. As before, most states—30 out of 50—have at least three state agencies involved in administering ECE funding. Since 2018, Missouri and New Mexico created a department focused on early childhood education and consolidated the number of administering agencies. This year, Colorado enacted landmark legislation to create a consolidated department of early childhood.\(^{12}\) The legislation created a working group to determine the administrative structure of the department, which will be implemented in 2022. At the time of the report’s publication, Colorado was operating under the same structure and was overseeing transition planning for the department’s full implementation in the next fiscal year.

As previously noted, governors generally have wide latitude when assigning ECE funding and program responsibility to different state agencies. The one notable exception is IDEA, Part B, Section 619 funding, which is required by statute to be administered by state departments of education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Number of Agencies Administering ECE Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Agencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO agencies or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREE agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUR agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIVE agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The potential for collaboration and coordination is expected to increase across programs located in the same agency. However, since 2018, some states did make changes that decreased the number of programs within a single agency. Notably, Tennessee now houses IDEA Part C in the Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, while IDEA Part B, Section 619 was retained in the Department of Education, as federally required.\(^{13}\) California also enacted legislation that directed its state’s pre-K programs to be housed within its state department of education, while CCDF and other early childhood programs were separated into another agency.\(^{14}\)

In other instances, program-level changes within state agencies appear to support greater consolidation. Montana’s new Early Childhood and Family Support
Division in the Department of Public Health and Human Services brings together CCDF, IDEA Part C, CACFP, the state Head Start Collaboration Office, and the state’s early learning advisory council.\(^{15}\) North Dakota’s Department of Human Services’ Early Childhood Division, created in 2021, brings together the administrative functions of CCDF and the state’s two pre-K approval process, along with the state’s QRIS and early childhood data systems.\(^6\)

Our findings are shown in Table 3. It remains common to have four programs administered by a single agency—21 states. In some states, five or six programs were administered by a single agency.

Table 3: Concentration of ECE Programs Administered by State Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies and Number of Programs Administered</th>
<th># of States</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THREE PROGRAMS administered by ONE AGENCY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>KS, MA, MO, MS, NJ, UT, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUR PROGRAMS administered by ONE AGENCY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, ID, IL, ME, NH, ND, NM, OH, OK, RI, SC, SD, TN, VT, WA, WI, WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIVE PROGRAMS administered by ONE AGENCY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>DE, IA, IN, LA, MN, MT, NC, NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIX PROGRAMS administered by ONE AGENCY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>AR, DC, MD, MI, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO PROGRAMS administered by THREE AGENCIES each</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>AL, HI, TX, WY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL PROGRAMS co-lead by TWO AGENCIES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREE PROGRAMS administered by TWO agencies each</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>AK, AZ, KY, NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO PROGRAMS administered by TWO AGENCIES each</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education departments—either alone or in combination with one or more other agencies—continue to be the most prevalent agency responsible for administering the largest share of ECE programs in states. Other state entities that are frequently involved in ECE programs are health and human services agencies, including family and workforce services.
Table 4: State Agencies Administering the Greatest Number of ECE Programs in each State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Agency</th>
<th># of States</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>DC, DE, FL, IA, KS, LA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MS, NE, NJ, OH, OK, OR, RI, SD, TN, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Care and Education specific</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>CT, GA, MA, NM, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Services related</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>CA, AR, CO, ID, IL, MT, NC, ND, NH, WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Social Services related</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>IN, SC, UT, VA, VT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education AND other agency/agencies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>AK, AL, AZ, HI, KY, NV, NY, PA, TX, WY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Placement of State Advisory Councils and Head Start Collaboration Offices

BPC also looked at the placement of SACs and Head Start Collaboration Offices to better understand how these entities were integrated within state ECE efforts.

- We found that while Head Start Collaboration Offices coordinate and collaborate on Head Start, child care, and state pre-K, these offices were not always housed with both CCDF and state pre-K programs.
- The Head Start Collaboration Office was housed with both CCDF and state pre-K programs in 17 states—Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, Virginia, and Washington.
- In 11 other states, the Head Start Collaboration Office was housed with CCDF but not state pre-K—California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin, and in 11 other states, it was housed with state pre-K but not CCDF—Alabama, Hawai‘i, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, Nevada, Ohio, and Tennessee.

On the issue of SACs to provide guidance on ECE programs, we found that nearly all states (49) and the District of Columbia have established an ECE council based on fiscal year 2019-2021 CCDF state plans submitted to HHS. South Dakota has not implemented a SAC.

Use of Quality Rating Systems

Perhaps the most significant movement within state administrative systems since 2018 is the integration of quality ratings as part of state ECE systems. Previously, we found only three states—Colorado, North Carolina, and Oklahoma—had fully integrated QRIS in the statewide ECE system. Currently, 12 states have embedded their quality systems within their state’s licensing system to create a seamless approach...
of continuous quality improvement. There is further movement in states requiring early learning programs receiving child care subsidies, with 13 states requiring subsidized providers to participate in QRIS.

This movement may be related to federal grants that encouraged systems integration, including the now-defunct Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Grant and the current Preschool Development Grant Birth through Five. These grant programs targeted comprehensive and collaborative systems reforms, including the integration of health and safety standards with QRIS.

**Table 5: State Quality Rating and Improvement Systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of QRIS</th>
<th># of States</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rated License/Require All Programs to be in QRIS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>CO, IL, IA, ME, NC, NY, OH, OK, PA, VT, WA, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require Providers Receiving Subsidy to participate in QRIS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>AR, DC, FL, GA, KY, LA, MA, MD, NE, NV, RI, SC, UT, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Participation in QRIS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>AK, AL, AZ, CA, DE, ID, IN, MI, MN, MT, MS, ND, NH, NJ, NM, OR, TN, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QRIS Pilot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>CT, KS, WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>HI, MS, SD, WY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

With the pandemic still impacting local economies and household functions, the profile of early care and education as an essential service has only risen in Congress and state legislatures. States and the federal government are currently overseeing vast resources that are targeted to ensure the stability of early care and education programs. It is more important than ever for states to be well-positioned to meet the needs of children and parents with efficiency and fidelity. Reducing administrative burdens, eliminating duplication, and easing families’ entry into multiple programs serves to increase reaching those that need early care and education services the most.

State policymakers should focus efforts on the governance of early care and education to create an accessible system for families, while maintaining processes that uphold accountability. Federal funds issued under the Preschool Development Grant Birth through Five program can support initiatives to improve state governance structures, as can the administrative set aside in federal programs, such as CCDF and Head Start.

In the past few years, state administrations have made progress in decreasing the fragmentation of their ECE systems. Governors have considerable discretion to determine how federal and state funds will be administered within their jurisdictions, and it is clear many are using their authority to move toward a more seamless integration of services for families with young children.
Recommendations

Our review identified distinct coordination challenges at different levels (and branches) of government. For that reason, our recommendations are grouped by actions that can be undertaken by states, by Congress, and by federal agencies.

FOR GOVERNORS

- Create a family stakeholder group to provide consistent feedback on barriers to services.
- Using allowable set-aside funding from federal resources to support state administration, commission an independent review board that develops concrete recommendations for improving ECE program administration and governance.
- Support or create an early childhood integrated data system.
- Review the placement of and requirements for the State Head Start Collaboration Office to ensure maximum alignment of Head Start services with other state ECE efforts.
- Ensure that licensing is the foundation for the state quality rating improvement system.
- Ensure that monitoring efforts are coordinated between the child care licensing agencies, Child and Adult Care Food Programs, and QRIS systems.
- Ensure that the SAC for early education and care is conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.

FOR CONGRESS

- Align eligibility requirements by defining consistent income ranges and by requiring states to serve those with the highest need first, while still giving states latitude to serve children in low-wage families.
- Conduct hearings on current programs that serve infants, toddlers and preschool children with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Parts B and C to identify barriers that families transitioning from one program to another are facing, and consider a birth-to-age-5 alignment whereby families with young children can maintain eligibility until school entry.
- Allow governors the flexibility to move the administration of IDEA Part B Section 619 to align with other early education programs to create a more seamless system.
- Require all funds spent on child care under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program—whether the funds are direct or transferred—to meet Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) requirements, including requirements for data reporting.
- As part of Head Start reauthorization, conduct hearings on the effectiveness of the Head Start Collaboration Offices and on how these offices can help better align Head Start with other state ECE programs.
- Request a Government Accountability Office (GAO) study of activities undertaken by SACs, including a review of whether these councils are meeting their statutorily defined objectives, and offer recommendations about ways to improve SAC effectiveness.

FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES

- Encourage states to fully allocate the maximum allowable set aside for administration in CCDF.
- Identify lessons learned from the Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership grants that were awarded to states, and issue a report identifying barriers to better alignment of federal and state efforts.
- Evaluate the Preschool Development Grant Birth through Five program to assess both its impact on state administration and the extent to which states sustained the work as indicated in their grant applications.
Appendix A: Scoring Methodology

The following summarizes the scoring metric used by BPC to compare ECE integration across states.

**Base Score**

BPC scored and ranked how effectively each state aligned programs serving children to create an integrated ECE system. States can receive a maximum of 50 points for their base score.

To determine the base score, BPC looked at the following:

1. The number of agencies involved in administering the major federal programs—CCDF; Head Start; TANF; IDEA Part C; IDEA Part B, Section 619; and CACFP—and state preschool programs
   a. Because the governor cannot choose where to place Part B, Section 619 of IDEA, the agency score was adjusted if an additional agency was involved solely for administration of Part B (i.e. the major federal programs and state pre-K were spread across three agencies in a state and Part B, Section 619 was located in a fourth agency, the state would be scored as having three agencies involved in administration.
   b. Because TANF does not have an exclusive focus on ECE, the agency score was adjusted if an additional agency was involved solely for administration of TANF.
   c. While states were scored on whether or not they had functioning State Advisory Councils, SACs were not included in the agency count, as they are not a funding stream.

2. If CCDF, CACFP, and state pre-K programs are under the same agency or are split across agencies

3. If the Head Start Collaboration Office is located in the same agency as CCDF

4. If the Head Start Collaboration Office is located in the same agency as the pre-K program

5. If the state has a Quality Rating Improvement System

6. If the state has a functioning State Advisory Council

BPC deducted points from the base score for states that split CCDF subsidy and quality across agencies.

**Bonus Score**

BPC also reviewed how states do or do not contribute state dollars to ECE programs. States could receive a maximum of 20 bonus points.

To determine the bonus score, BPC considered the following:

1. If the state spent its own money on preschool programs

2. If the state spent its own money on Early Head Start or Head Start programs

3. If the state applied for and received a state-level Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership grant

4. If the state transferred TANF money to its CCDF program

BPC deducted points from the bonus score of states that did not draw down all federal child care dollars.
### Appendix B: State-by-State Scores

#### By Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2021 Rank</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Base Score (Out of 50)</th>
<th>Bonus Score (Out of 15)</th>
<th>2018 Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>b</sup> Colorado’s governor approved landmark legislation in 2021 to create a new agency-level early childhood department. The department will be fully implemented in 2022, and department structure is currently under consideration. For this reason, BPC was unable to score the new department structure at the time of publication.
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System:
State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Alabama.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

#35 Alabama

**AL Score: 31.5**

**Average score: 35**

**STRENGTHS OF ALABAMA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Alabama was awarded an Early Head Start - Child Care Partnership grant, which integrates Early Head Start services and resources into child care settings, aligns child care standards with Early Head Start Performance Standards, and creates opportunities for improving outcomes for children and families.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ALABAMA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with state Pre-K and the Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state Quality Rating and Improvement System to ensure program quality.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Alabama

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
Alabama Quality Stars has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC) provides input on the CCDF state plan. ECAC is part of the Children's Policy Council.

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership • Grants to local organizations
- Local Head Start Programs

**Office of the Governor**
- State Children's Policy Council • SAC
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services • Part B, Section 619 • Part C
- Office of Postsecondary Education • CCAMPIS

**Department of Human Resources**
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care • CCDF
- Office of Family Assistance • TANF
- Office of Child Care Subsidy - Child Care Subsidy and Quality STARS, Quality Rating and Improvement System
- Office of Child Care Licensing
- Family Resources
  - Division of Child Care Services • CCDF • Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership

**Department of Education**
- Department of Agriculture
- Department of Early Childhood Education
- Department of Rehabilitation Services
- Office of School-Readiness
  - State Pre-K
- Special Education Services • Part B, Section 619
- Office of LEA Support, Child Nutrition Programs • CACFP
- Office of Postsecondary Education • CCAMPIS
- Office of Early Intervention • Part C
- To Institutions of Higher Education in the State

**Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System:
State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Alaska.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

STRENGTHS OF ALASKA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Alaska’s state Pre-K program is administered by the same agency that oversees the Child and Adult Care Food Program, which can increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ALASKA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Further increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with state Pre-K and the Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state Quality Rating and Improvement System to ensure program quality.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Alaska

KEY:
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding
- Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care Assistance
  - CCDF
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF

**Department of Agriculture**
- Food & Nutrition Service
  - CACFP

**Department of Education**
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C

**Office of the Governor**
- Alaska Early Childhood Coordinating Council
  - SAC
- Division of Senior and Disabilities Services
  - Part C
- Division of Public Assistance
  - Child Care Program Office - Licensing, Subsidy and Quality Improvement
    - CCDF
  - Temporary Assistance Program
    - TANF

**Head Start Collaboration Office**
- Alaska Early Childhood Coordinating Council
  - SAC
- Learn & Grow
  - Child Care Quality Recognition and Improvement System
- Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations
- Local Head Start Programs

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Alaska Early Childhood Coordinating Council (AECCC) is responsible for coordination of state systems to provide efficient, effective, and accessible services for children. It includes representatives from the public and private sectors and generally meets quarterly.

**State Board of Education and Early Development**
- Special Education
  - Part B, Section 619
- Child Nutrition Programs
  - CACFP
- State Pre-K

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations
- Local Head Start Programs
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Arizona.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at [https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/](https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/).
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Arizona

**KEY:**
- ➤ Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- ➤ Funding provided directly to local organizations
- ○ State does not receive funding

**Arizona Office of the Governor**

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care
  - CCDF
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF

**Department of Agriculture**
- Food and Nutrition Service
  - CACFP

**Department of Education**
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C

**First Things First**
- SAC
- CCDF - Quality Improvement Rating System

**Department of Economic Security**
- Child Care
  - CCDF - Child Care Subsidies
- Early Intervention Program
  - Part C
- Family Assistance Administration
  - TANF

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Early Childhood Development and Health Board (ECDHB) is a statewide board that provides leadership, oversight and vision to First Things First, the agency that administers the state’s QRIS. It achieves the organization’s mission through a comprehensive early childhood system that values children as Arizona’s greatest asset and recognizes families and communities at the center of decision-making.

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
Quality First has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations
- Local Head Start Programs

**Local Institutions**
- Department of Health Services, Child Care Licensing
  - CCDF - Child Care Licensing
- Department of Agriculture
  - Food and Nutrition Service
    - CACFP
- Department of Education
  - Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
    - Part B, Section 619
    - Part C
- Department of Economic Security
  - Child Care
    - CCDF - Child Care Subsidies
  - Early Intervention Program
    - Part C
  - Family Assistance Administration
    - TANF
- State Pre-K
- First Things First
  - SAC
  - CCDF - Quality Improvement Rating System
- Local Institutions
  - Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
    - Grants to local organizations
  - Local Head Start Programs
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System:  
State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding.

The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Arkansas.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

STRENGTHS OF ARKANSAS’ EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Arkansas administers five programs serving children—Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), Head Start Collaboration Office, IDEA Part C; Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP); Temporary Assistance for Needy Families—under one agency, which improves efficiency and allows for better alignment of eligibility and monitoring requirements and quality improvement activities.

- CACFP is administered through the same agency as CCDF, which improves efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight.

- Arkansas was awarded an Early Head Start - Child Care Partnership grant, which integrates Early Head Start services and resources into child care settings, aligns child care standards with Early Head Start Performance Standards, and creates opportunities for improving outcomes for children and families.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ARKANSAS’ EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).

- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.

- Include licensing as the entry level for state QRIS to ensure program quality.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Arkansas

**KEY:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations

### Arkansas Office of the Governor

#### Department of Health and Human Services
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care
- Office of Family Assistance

#### Department of Agriculture
- Food & Nutrition Service
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

#### Department of Education
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
- Office of Postsecondary Education

#### Department of Human Services
- Division of Child Care and Early Childhood Education
- Developmental Disabilities Services
- Division of County Operations, Transitional Assistance Program

#### Office of the Governor

#### Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)
Better Beginnings has three levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.

#### State Advisory Council (SAC)
The Early Childhood Commission (ECC) facilitates communication among state agencies providing early childhood programs to promote nonduplication and coordination of services. It also advises the agencies and assists in designing training programs and developing a plan for expansion, development and implementation of early childhood programs.

#### Local Institutions
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
- Grants to local organizations

#### To Institutions of Higher Education in the State
- CCAMPIS

#### Local Head Start Programs
- Better Beginnings (Quality Rating and Improvement System)
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding.

The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for California.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

### STRENGTHS OF CALIFORNIA'S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- California administers four programs serving children—Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF); Head Start Collaboration Office; Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP); IDEA Part B, Section 619—under one agency, which improves efficiency and allows for better alignment of eligibility, monitoring requirements, and quality improvement activities.

- CACFP is administered through the same agency as CCDF, which improves efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight.

- California was awarded an Early Head Start - Child Care Partnership grant, which integrates Early Head Start services and resources into child care settings, aligns child care standards with Early Head Start Performance Standards, and creates opportunities for improving outcomes for children and families.

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CALIFORNIA'S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.

- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.

- Include licensing as the entry level for state Quality Rating and Improvement System to ensure program quality.
Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
• Grants to local organizations

Local Institutions

Child Care and Development Division
• CCDF
• SAC
• Head Start Collaboration Office
• Early Head Start - Child Care Partnership
• CACFP
• QRIS

Benefits and Services
• TANF

Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)
California Quality Rating and Improvement System has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is operated by individual counties and participation is voluntary.

State Advisory Council (SAC)
California’s Early Childhood Policy Council is a governor-appointed leadership body that ensures statewide collaboration among early childhood programs that will help to define future policy for children, birth to kindergarten.

To Institutions of Higher Education in the State

Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
• Grants to local organizations

Local Head Start Programs

Early Learning and Care Division
• State Pre-K

Early Learning and Care Division
• Early Learning and Care Division

Special Education Division
• Part B, Section 619

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
• Part B, Section 619
• Part C

Department of Health and Human Services

Office of Head Start

Office of Child Care
• CCDF

Office of Family Assistance
• TANF

Office of Family Assistance
• TANF

Food & Nutrition Service
• CACFP

Department of Agriculture

Department of Social Services, Health and Human Services Agency

Department of Social Services, Health and Human Services Agency

Office of Head Start

Office of Child Care
• CCDF

Office of Family Assistance
• TANF

Teaching and Learning Branch

Office of Postsecondary Education
• CCAMPIS

Department of Education

Early Childhood: 50 State Report
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Colorado.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Colorado

**Key:***
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding

---

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care
- Office of Family Assistance

**Department of Agriculture**
- Food & Nutrition Service

**Department of Education**
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
- Office of Early Childhood
- Office of Postsecondary Education

**Department of Human Services**
- Office of Early Childhood
- Office of Economic Security
- Office of Child Care
- Office of Family Assistance

**Department of Public Health and Environment**
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care
- Office of Family Assistance

**Colorado Office of the Governor**

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Early Childhood Leadership Commission improves outcomes for young children birth to age eight and their families by advancing the alignment, coordination, and efficiency of programs and services. It assists public and private agencies in coordinating efforts to enhance alignment, advises the Office of Early Childhood, and develops strategies and monitors efforts to increase the access, quality and equity of services and supports.

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
Colorado Shines Quality Rating and Improvement System has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and licensing is the first level of the system. Providers are not required to attain higher than the first level.

---

**To Institutions of Higher Education in the State**

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
- Grants to local organizations

---

**Early Childhood: 50 State Report**
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Connecticut.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONNECTICUT’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning administration of the Child Care and Development Fund with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state Quality Rating and Improvement System to ensure program quality.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Connecticut

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**
- Office of Head Start
  - CCDF
- Office of Child Care Services
  - TANF
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**
- Food & Nutrition Service
  - CACFP

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**
- Office of Postsecondary Education
  - CCAMPIS
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C
- Early Childhood Special Education
  - SAC
- Division of Licensing - Child Care Licensing
  - CCDF
- Division of Quality Improvement - Child Care Quality Rating Improvement System
  - CCDF
  - Head Start Collaboration Office
- Division of Family Support, Birth to Three
  - Part C
- Division of Early Care and Education - Child Care Subsidy
  - CCDF

**DEPARTMENT OF AGING**
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF

**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES, CHILDREN, FAMILY AND OLDER ADULTS**
- Office of Head Start
  - CCDF
- Office of Child Care Services
  - TANF
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF

**STATE COMMISSIONERS**
- Connecticut Office of the Governor
- Connecticut Early Childhood Education Cabinet
  - SAC

**LOCAL INSTITUTIONS**
- Connecticut Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations

**KEY:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding

**QUALITY RATING IMPROVEMENT SYSTEM (QRIS)**
The state’s QRIS is being piloted.

**STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL (SAC)**
The Early Childhood Cabinet (ECC) helped develop a high-quality, comprehensive system of ECE across early childhood programs in the state and advanced the integration of services to young children and families.

**FLOW OF FEDERAL EARLY CHILDHOOD FUNDS: CONNECTICUT**
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System:
State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Delaware.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisancolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

STRENGTHS OF DELAWARE'S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Delaware administers five programs serving children—Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF); Head Start Collaboration Office; state Pre-K; Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP); IDEA Part B, Section 619—under one agency, which improves efficiency and allows for better alignment of eligibility and monitoring requirements and quality improvement activities.
- Delaware combined the administration of CCDF Licensing and Quality Rating and Improvement System to ensure program quality.
- CACFP is administered through the same agency as state Pre-K, which improves efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight.
- Delaware was awarded an Early Head Start - Child Care Partnership grant, which integrates Early Head Start services and resources into child care settings, aligns child care standards with Early Head Start Performance Standards, and creates opportunities for improving outcomes for children and families.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DELAWARE'S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state Quality Rating and Improvement System to ensure program quality.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Delaware

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Early Childhood Council is governor appointed and makes recommendations to the governor, the General Assembly, and the Interagency Resource Management Committee. Its mission is to promote the development of a comprehensive and coordinated early childhood system, birth to age eight, which provides the highest quality services and environment for the state’s children and families.

**Local Institutions**

- Local Head Start Programs

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
Delaware Stars for Early Success has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.

- Delaware First - Child Care Quality Improvement
  - CCDF
- Delaware Stars - Child Care Quality Rating Improvement System
  - Not CCDF-funded
- Early Childhood Special Education
  - Part B, Section 619
- Head Start Collaboration Office
- Nutrition Programs Office
  - CACFP
- Early Childhood Assistance Program
- State Pre-K
- Child Care Licensing
  - CCDF

**Local Head Start Programs**

**Funding mandated for State Departments of Education**

- Delaware Office of the Governor
- Department of Health and Human Services
  - Office of Head Start
  - Office of Child Care
    - CCDF
  - Office of Family Assistance
    - TANF
  - Department of Agriculture
    - Food & Nutrition Service
      - CACFP
  - Department of Education
    - Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
      - Part B, Section 619
      - Part C
    - Office of Postsecondary Education
      - CCAMPIS

**Funding provided directly to local organizations**

- Delaware Office of the Governor
  - Department of Health and Social Services, Division of Social Services
    - Child Care Services - Subsidy
      - CCDF
    - Temporary Assistance
      - TANF
    - Management Services, Birth to 3 Early Intervention System
      - Part C
  - Department of Education, Office of Early Learning
    - SAC
    - Early Head Start - Child Care Partnership
  - Delaware First - Child Care Quality Improvement
  - Delaware Stars - Child Care Quality Rating and Improvement System
    - Not CCDF-funded
  - Early Childhood Special Education
    - Part B, Section 619
  - Head Start Collaboration Office
  - Nutrition Programs Office
    - CACFP
  - Early Childhood Assistance Program
  - State Pre-K
  - Child Care Licensing
    - CCDF

**State does not receive funding**

- Office of Postsecondary Education
  - CCAMPIS

**Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Delaware**

**Key:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Florida.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

---

**Recommendations for Florida's Early Care and Education System**

- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with state Pre-K and the Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Reduce duplication of efforts by administering CCDF Licensing with CCDF Subsidy and Quality.
- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Provide support for the establishment of a new State Advisory Council (SAC) for Early Education and Care, as mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, and ensure the SAC is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state Quality Rating and Improvement System to ensure program quality.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Florida

**KEY:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding
- Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency

---

**Local Institutions**

- **Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership**
  - Grants to local organizations

---

**Department of Health and Human Services**

- Office of Head Start
  - CCDF
- Office of Child Care
  - TANF
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF
- Food & Nutrition Service
  - CACFP
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C

---

**Department of Agriculture**

- Department of Children and Families
  - Office of Child Care Regulations - Child Care Licensing
    - CCDF
  - Temporary Cash Assistance
    - TANF
- Department of Education
  - Office of Early Learning - Child Care Subsidy and Quality Improvement
    - CCDF
    - Head Start Collaboration Office
    - SAC
  - Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services
    - Part B, Section 619
  - Bureau of Early Steps and Newborn Screening
    - Part C
  - Child Care Food Program
    - CACFP

---

**Florida Office of the Governor**

- Office of Postsecondary Education
  - CCAMPIS

---

**Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services**

- 8-County Level Quality Rating Improvement Systems
  - County Level Only - No Statewide QRIS

---

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**

The QRIS is operated by individual counties and participation is voluntary. There are 8 local QRIS, and combined they do not cover the entire state.

---

**Office of Child Care**

- CCDF
- TANF

---

**Office of Early Learning - Child Care Subsidy and Quality Improvement**

- CCDF
- SAC
- Head Start Collaboration Office

---

**Office of Head Start**

- Grants to local organizations

---

**Office of Postsecondary Education**

- CCAMPIS

---

**Office of Family Assistance**

- TANF

---

**Office of Child Care Regulations - Child Care Licensing**

- CCDF
- TANF
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Georgia.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

#5 Georgia

**Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System:**

**State Early Childhood Administration**

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Georgia.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Georgia

KEY: → Funding mandated for State Departments of Education  
○ State does not receive funding  
→ Funding provided directly to local organizations

Department of Health and Human Services
   - Office of Head Start
   - Office of Child Care Services
   - Office of Family Assistance
   - Food & Nutrition Service
   - Office of Postsecondary Education

Department of Agriculture
   - Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Department of Education
   - Department of Early Care and Learning
   - Department of Education, Division of Special Education Services

Georgia Office of the Governor

Department of Human Services, Division of Family and Children Services
   - TANF

Department of Public Health, Division of Health Promotion
   - Part C

Department of Early Care and Learning
   - SAC
   - Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
   - Child Care Services - Child Care Licensing and Subsidy
   - CCDF
   - Quality Initiative - Child Care Quality Rating and Improvement System
   - CCDF

Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)
Quality Rated has three levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is required for providers who accept subsidy and voluntary for others.

State Advisory Council (SAC)
The Children’s Cabinet consists of all state agency heads that work with children as well as select community, philanthropic, education, and business stakeholders. The Cabinet coordinates policies and resources to improve outcomes for children and families. It provides unique leadership on child welfare and juvenile justice issues in Georgia by identifying state strategic priorities, then developing initiatives in response.

Local Institutions

Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
   - Grants to local organizations

Local Head Start Programs

Nutrition
   - CACFP

Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Georgia
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Hawai‘i.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Idaho.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

STRENGTHS OF IDAHO’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM
- SAC is overseen by the Idaho Association for the Education of Young Children

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IDAHO’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM
- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with the Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Provide support for the establishment of a new State Advisory Council (SAC) for Early Education and Care, as mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, and ensure the SAC is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state Quality Rating and Improvement System to ensure program quality.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Idaho

**KEY:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding
- Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care
  - CCDF
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF
- Food & Nutrition Service
  - CACFP

**Department of Agriculture**
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C
- Division of Welfare, Benefits Programs
- Division of Family and Community Services
  - Head Start Collaboration Office
- Division of Behavioral Health, Children’s Developmental Services
  - Part C

**Department of Education**
- Office of Postsecondary Education
  - CCAMPIS
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C
- Child Nutrition Programs
  - CACFP
- Office of Postsecondary Education
  - CCAMPIS
  - Head Start Collaboration Office
- Division of Welfare, Benefits Programs
- Division of Family and Community Services
  - Head Start Collaboration Office
- Division of Behavioral Health, Children’s Developmental Services
  - Part C

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations
- Local Head Start Programs

**Idaho Office of the Governor**

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
- IdahoSTARS
  - Child Care Quality Rating Improvement System

- No state Pre-K SAC is overseen by the Idaho Association for the Education of Young Children

**Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Idaho**

- Department of Health and Welfare
  - Division of Welfare, Benefits Programs
  - Child Care Assistance - Licensing and Subsidy
    - CCDF
  - Food / Cash / Assistance
    - TANF
  - Division of Family and Community Services
    - Head Start Collaboration Office
  - Division of Behavioral Health, Children’s Developmental Services
    - Part C

- Department of Agriculture
  - Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
    - Part B, Section 619
    - Part C
  - Child Nutrition Programs
    - CACFP

- Department of Education
  - Office of Postsecondary Education
    - CCAMPIS
  - Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
    - Part B, Section 619
    - Part C
  - Child Nutrition Programs
    - CACFP
  - Office of Postsecondary Education
    - CCAMPIS
    - Head Start Collaboration Office
  - Division of Welfare, Benefits Programs
  - Division of Family and Community Services
    - Head Start Collaboration Office
  - Division of Behavioral Health, Children’s Developmental Services
    - Part C

- Local Institutions
  - Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
    - Grants to local organizations
  - Local Head Start Programs

- IdahoSTARS
  - Child Care Quality Rating Improvement System

- No state Pre-K SAC is overseen by the Idaho Association for the Education of Young Children

**Idaho Office of the Governor**

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
- IdahoSTARS directs the state QRS, Steps to Quality. The QRS has six levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. It is statewide and participation is voluntary.
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System:
State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Illinois.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

STRENGTHS OF ILLINOIS’ EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM
- Illinois includes licensing as the entry level for its Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), which ensures quality for all programs serving children.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ILLINOIS’ EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM
- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with state Pre-K and Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Illinois

**Key:**
- ➔ Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- ➔ Funding provided directly to local organizations
- ⚫ Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency

**Illinois Office of the Governor**

- Department of Health and Human Services
  - Office of Head Start
  - Office of Child Care - Child Care Subsidy and Quality Improvement
    - CCDF
  - Office of Family Assistance - TANF
- Department of Agriculture
  - Food & Nutrition Service
    - CACFP
- Department of Education
  - Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
    - Part B, Section 619
    - Part C
- Office of Postsecondary Education
  - CCAMPIS

**Local Institutions**

- Bureau of Early Intervention
  - Part C
- Bureau of Child Care and Development, Office of Child Care - Child Care Subsidy and Quality Improvement
  - CCDF
- Bureau of Adult Services and Basic Support
  - TANF

**State Board of Education**

- Division of Early Childhood
  - Part B, Section 619
- Division of Nutrition and Wellness
  - CACFP
- Division of Early Childhood
  - State Pre-K

**Department of Human Services, Division of Family and Community Services**

- Bureau of Child Care and Development, Office of Child Care - Child Care Subsidy and Quality Improvement
  - CCDF
- Bureau of Adult Services and Basic Support
  - TANF
- Bureau of Early Intervention
  - Part C

**Department of Children and Family Services - Child Care Licensing**

- CCDF

**Governor’s Office of Early Childhood Development**

- Illinois Early Learning Council
  - SAC

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**

ExcelRate Illinois has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**

The Early Learning Council (ELC) is a public-private partnership which strengthens, coordinates, and expands programs and services for children birth to five throughout Illinois. Members include senior state officials and non-government stakeholders appointed by the governor. The ELC builds on current programs to ensure a comprehensive, statewide early learning system (preschool, child care, Head Start, health care and support programs for parents) to improve the lives of children and families.

**To Institutions of Higher Education in the State**

- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations
- Local Head Start Programs
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Indiana.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Indiana

**KEY:**
- **Funding mandated for State Departments of Education**
- **Funding provided directly to local organizations**
- **State does not receive funding**

**Indiana Office of the Governor**

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care
- Office of Family Assistance

**Department of Agriculture**
- Food & Nutrition Service
- Office of Postsecondary Education

**Department of Education**
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
- Office of School and Community Nutrition

**Family Social Services Administration**
- Office of Early Childhood and Out-of-School Learning, Child Care Licensing and Subsidy and Quality Rating Improvement System
- Head Start Collaboration Office

**State Pre-K**

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
- Grants to local organizations

**State Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership**

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC) is working to ensure that children ages birth to eight and their families have access to affordable, high-quality early childhood education programs that keep children healthy, safe and learning. The governor appoints ELAC committee members who offer guidance and input to the governor’s Office and Indiana General Assembly.

**Local Head Start Programs**

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
Paths to Quality has four levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding andaffording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Iowa.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at [https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/](https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/).

---

**STRENGTHS OF IOWA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Iowa manages five programs serving children—Head Start Collaboration Office; state Pre-K; Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP); IDEA Part C; IDEA Part B, Section 619—under one agency, which improves efficiency and allows for better alignment of eligibility and monitoring requirements and quality improvement activities.

- IDEA Part C and Part B, Section 619 are administered within the same agency, which supports a smooth transition for parents.

- Iowa includes licensing as the entry level for its Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), which ensures quality for all programs serving children.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IOWA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating administration of the Child Care and Development Fund with state Pre-K and the Head Start Collaboration Office.

- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Iowa

**Key:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
- Iowa’s Quality Rating System has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is operated at the state level and participation is voluntary.

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
- The Early Childhood Stakeholder Alliance is a confederation of stakeholders in early care, health and education systems that affect children birth to age five in the state. It oversees and advises the development of a comprehensive, integrated early childhood system; supports the Early Childhood Iowa State Board in addressing the systems that affect children birth to age five; and advises the governor, other public and private policy bodies, and service providers to coordinate activities and policies related to the early childhood system.

**Office of the Governor**

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care
- Office of Family Assistance

**Department of Agriculture**
- Department of Human Services
- Office of Family Assistance

**Department of Education**
- Department of Management
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
- Office of Postsecondary Education

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
- Grants to local organizations
- Local Head Start Programs

**To Institutions of Higher Education in the State**
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System:
State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Kansas.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

### Strengths of Kansas’ Early Care and Education System

- Kansas established a new State Advisory Council (SAC) for Early Education and Care, as mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007.

### Recommendations for Kansas’ Early Care and Education System

- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with state Pre-K and Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Provide support for the establishment of a new State Advisory Council (SAC) for Early Education and Care, as mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, and ensure the SAC is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state Quality Rating and Improvement System to ensure program quality.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Kansas

KEY:
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding

Kansas Office of the Governor

Department of Health and Human Services
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care Assistance
- Office of Family Assistance
- Food & Nutrition Service
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
- Office of Education

Department of Agriculture
- Office of Child Care
- TANF
- CACFP
- CCDF

Department of Education
- Division of Learning Services, Early Childhood Special Education and Title Services
- State Pre-K
- Child Nutrition and Wellness
- Children's Cabinet and Trust Fund
- SAC

Department for Children and Families, Economic & Employment Services, Child Care and Early Education
- Child Care Subsidy
- CACFP
- TANF
- Head Start Collaboration Office
- Successful Families Program

Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)
The state's QRIS is being piloted.

Local Institutions

Local Head Start Programs
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Kentucky.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.
**Kentucky Office of the Governor**

- **Governor’s Office of Early Childhood**
  - Head Start Collaboration Office

- **Department of Health and Human Services**
  - Office of Health and Family Services
    - CCDF
  - Office of Child Care
    - CCDF
  - Office of Family Support
    - TANF

- **Department of Agriculture**
  - Food & Nutrition Service
    - CACFP

- **Department of Education**
  - Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
    - Part B, Section 619
    - Part C
  - Cabinet of Education and Workforce Development
    - CCAMPIS

- **Office of Postsecondary Education**
  - State Pre-K

**Local Institutions**

- **State Advisory Council (SAC)**
  The Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC) helps develop a strategic plan on early childhood for the state and coordinate activities across state agencies.

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
Kentucky All STARS has four levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. Programs meeting state licensure requirements enter at a Level 1 and apply to move to higher quality by meeting a series of quality standards. Programs receiving public funding must participate in Kentucky All STARS.

**Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Kentucky**
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Louisiana.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.
Louisiana Office of the Governor

Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Louisiana

**KEY:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Early Childhood Care and Education Advisory Council provides guidance on matters related to all publicly funded early care and education programs and must meet four times a year.

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations

**Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education - Student Enhancement Block Grant Program**

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
Louisiana's Unified Statewide Early Childhood Quality Rating and Improvement System has four levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS, which entails rating each program using the CLASS instrument, is statewide. Participation is required for providers who accept subsidy payments.
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Maine.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.
Early Childhood: 50 State Report

Maine Office of the Governor

**KEY**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding

**Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Maine**

- **Children's Cabinet Early Childhood Advisory Council (CCECAC)**
- **Department of Health and Human Services**
  - Office of Head Start
  - Office of Child Care
    - CCDF
  - Office of Family Assistance
    - TANF
- **Department of Agriculture**
  - Food & Nutrition Service
    - CACFP
- **Department of Education**
  - Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
    - Part B, Section 619
    - Part C
  - Office of Postsecondary Education
    - CCAMPIS

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Children's Cabinet Early Childhood Advisory Council (CCECAC) was created by statute in 2008 as “the voice” of early childhood. The Council will adopt and update a long-term plan that will achieve sustainable social and financial investments in the healthy development of Maine’s young children and their families.

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
Quality for ME has four levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is required for providers who accept subsidy payments and voluntary for all others.

**Local Institutions**
- **Local Head Start Programs**
- **Local Institutions**
- **Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership**
  - Grants to local organizations

**Office of State Pre-K**
- State Pre-K
  - State Independent Evaluation Unit Child Development Services
    - Part C
    - Part B, Section 619
  - Public Preschool
  - Early Childhood
    - Head Start Collaboration Office
    - CACFP
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Maryland.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisancolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

STRENGTHS OF MARYLAND’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Maryland manages six programs serving children—Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF); Head Start Collaboration Office; state Pre-K; IDEA Part C; IDEA Part B, Section 619; Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)—under one agency, which improves efficiency and allows for better alignment of eligibility and monitoring requirements and quality improvement activities.
- CACFP is administered through the same agency as state Pre-K and CCDF, which improves efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight.
- IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds) are administered within the same agency, which can support a smooth transition for parents.
- Maryland’s Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) is mandatory for providers receiving subsidy, which can ensure quality of care for all children.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MARYLAND’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Ensure the State Advisory Council (SAC) for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state QRIS to ensure program quality.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Maryland

KEY:
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations

Maryland Office of the Governor

Department of Human Resources
- TANF

Department of Agriculture
- Food & Nutrition Service
  - CACFP
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C

Department of Education
- Office of the Deputy for Teaching and Learning
- Office of the Deputy for Finance
  - CACFP
- Division of Early Childhood
- Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services
  - Part C
  - Part B, Section 619
- Collaboration and Program Improvement Branch
  - SAC
  - Head Start Collaboration Office

Office of Head Start

Office of Child Care
- CCDF

Office of Family Assistance
- TANF

Office of Family Assistance
- TANF

Office of the Deputy for Teaching and Learning

Office of Deputy for Finance

Office of the Deputy for Finance

Office of Head Start

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Office of Postsecondary Education
- CCAMPIS

Office of the Governor

Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)
Maryland EXCELS has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.

State Advisory Council (SAC)
Through the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care, a broad range of state stakeholders, including local government, work to coordinate services across programs for low-income families with young children.

Local Institutions

Early Childhood-Child Care Partnership
- Grants to local organizations

To Institutions of Higher Education in the State

Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
- Grants to local organizations

Local Head Start Programs
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System:
State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Massachusetts.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisancounty.org/report/national-child-care/.
#3 Michigan

Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Michigan.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisancrlocy.org/report/national-child-care/.

STRENGTHS OF MICHIGAN’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Michigan administers six programs serving children—Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF); Head Start Collaboration Office; state Pre-K; IDEA Part C; IDEA Part B, Section 619; Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)—under one agency, which improves efficiency and allows for better alignment of eligibility and monitoring requirements and quality improvement activities.
- CACFP is administered through the same agency as state Pre-K and CCDF, which improves efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MICHIGAN’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state Quality Rating and Improvement System to ensure program quality. Include licensing as the entry level for state QRIS to ensure program quality.
Great Start to Quality has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Minnesota.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

STRENGTHS OF MINNESOTA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Minnesota manages five programs serving children—Head Start Collaboration Office; state Pre-K; Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP); IDEA Part C; IDEA Part B, Section 619—under one agency, which improves efficiency and allows for better alignment of eligibility and monitoring requirements and quality improvement activities.
- IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds) are administered within the same agency, which can support a smooth transition for parents.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MINNESOTA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Co-locate Head Start Collaboration Office and state Pre-K with CCDF, which can improve alignment and coordination of programs.
- Ensure the State Advisory Council (SAC) for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state Quality Rating and Improvement System to ensure program quality.
Minnesota
Office of the Governor

Department of Health and Human Services
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care
- Office of Family Assistance

Department of Agriculture
- Food & Nutrition Service
- CACFP

Department of Education
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
- Part B, Section 619
- Part C

Department of Human Services
- Licensing Division - Child Care Licensing
  - CCOF
- Child Care Services Division - Child Care Subsidy and Quality Improvement
  - CCOF
- Economic Assistance and Employment Supports Division
  - TANF

Children’s Cabinet
- SAC
- Parent Aware
  - Child Care Quality Rating Improvement System

Local Institutions
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations

State Advisory Council (SAC)
The governor’s Early Learning Council is appointed by the governor and its goal is to ensure that all children are school-ready by 2020. Council members make recommendations to the governor and legislature, including a proposal that will effectively create a high-quality early childhood system in Minnesota that will help improve educational outcomes for all children.

Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Minnesota

KEY:
→ Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
· State does not receive funding
→ Funding provided directly to local organizations
→ Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency

Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)
Parent Aware has four levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System:
State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Mississippi.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisandata.bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MISSISSIPPI’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP).
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with state Pre-K and Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Ensure the State Advisory Council (SAC) for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
The State Early Childhood Advisory Council (SECAC) provides counsel to the governor on issues related to young children and their families. SECAC is comprised of experts in education, health care, child welfare, and mental health and serves as the central meeting place for early childhood stakeholders in Mississippi’s early childhood system, including the workforce, parents, and the public.

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**

**Local Institutions**

- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations
- Local Head Start Programs

**No QRIS**
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Missouri.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

### STRENGTHS OF MISSOURI’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Missouri administers four programs serving children—Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), state Pre-K, IDEA Part B, Section 619, and IDEA Part C—under one agency, which improves efficiency and allows for better alignment of eligibility and monitoring requirements.
- IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds) are administered within the same agency, which can support a smooth transition for parents.

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MISSOURI’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.

---

#37 Missouri

![MO Score: 30](mo-score.png) 100% of federal child care funds

**Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System:**

**State Early Childhood Administration**

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Missouri.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Missouri

**Key:**
- → Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- ○ State does not receive funding
- → Funding provided directly to local organizations
- ← Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency

**University of Missouri**
- Head Start Collaboration Office

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Coordinating Board of Early Childhood is a public/private entity that coordinates a cohesive system of early childhood programs and services to support the healthy development and school readiness of all Missouri children from birth through age five.

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care
- Office of Family Assistance

**Department of Agriculture**
- Office of Family and Nutrition Service

**Department of Education**
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
- Office of Postsecondary Education

**Department of Social Services**
- Family Support Division

**Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Division of Learning Services**
- Office of Special Education
- Office of Early Childhood

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
- Grants to local organizations
- Early Intervention Services
- Part C
- Effective Practices Section
- Part B, Section 619
- State Pre-K

**Missouri Office of the Governor**
- Department of Health and Human Services
- Department of Agriculture
- Department of Education

---

**Early Childhood: 50 State Report**
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Montana.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

STRENGTHS OF MONTANA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM
- Montana administers four programs serving children—Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF); Head Start Collaboration Office; Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP); IDEA Part C—under one agency, which improves efficiency and allows for better alignment of eligibility and monitoring requirements and quality improvement activities.
- CACFP is administered through the same agency as CCDF, which improves efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight.
- There is strong cross-agency communication between agencies managing Preschool Development Grant Birth-5 and other programs serving children, which can improve alignment and reduce duplication of efforts.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MONTANA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) to ensure program quality.

MT drew down 100% of federal child care funds
MT Score: 46
Average score: 35
#13 Montana
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Montana

**KEY:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding

**Montana Office of the Governor**

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
  - CCDF
- Office of Child Care
  - CCDF
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF

**Department of Agriculture**
- Food & Nutrition Service
  - CACFP

**Department of Education**
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C
- Office of Postsecondary Education
  - CCAMPIS

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
Best Beginnings STARS to Quality has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations
- State Advisory Council (SAC)
The Best Beginnings Advisory Council serves as the comprehensive early childhood advisory council and the collaborating entity for the early childhood system. The council includes representation from interested constituency groups, governmental agencies, the public, child care providers, state and local government, and tribal communities.

**Intergovernmental Human Services Branch**
- TANF

**Intergovernmental Human Services Branch**
- Early Childhood and Family Support (ECFS) Division
  - CCDF
  - SAC
  - CACFP
  - Head Start Collaboration Office
  - Part C

**Office of Public Instruction**
- Office of Educational Opportunity and Equity
  - CCAMPIS
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: 
State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Nebraska.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

STRENGTHS OF NEBRASKA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Nebraska manages five programs serving children—Head Start Collaboration Office; state Pre-K; Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP); IDEA Part C; IDEA Part B, Section 619—under one agency, which improves efficiency and allows for better alignment of eligibility and monitoring requirements and quality improvement activities.
- CACFP is administered through the same agency as state Pre-K, which improves efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight.
- Nebraska’s Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) is mandatory for providers receiving $250,000 or more per year of subsidy, which ensures quality of care for subsidized children.
- Nebraska includes licensing as the entry level for its Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), which ensures quality for all programs serving children.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEBRASKA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Ensure children receiving CCDF subsidies receive quality care by combining CCDF Subsidy and Quality under one agency.
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Nebraska

**Key:**
- → Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- ○ State does not receive funding

**Nebraska Office of the Governor**

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
  - CACFP
- Office of Child Care
  - CCDF
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF

**Department of Agriculture**
- Food & Nutrition Service
  - CACFP

**Department of Education**
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C
- Office of Postsecondary Education
  - CCAMPIS

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
Step Up to Quality has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Council was established to advise and assist collaborating agencies in carrying out the provisions of state and federal statutes pertaining to early childhood care and education initiatives under state supervision.

**Child Care Programs - Child Care Licensing and Subsidy**
- CACFP

**Aid to Dependent Children Program**
- TANF

**Early Development Network**
- Part C

**Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership**
- Grants to local organizations

**Local Head Start Programs**

**Office of Postsecondary Education**
- CCAMPIS

**Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services**
- Part B, Section 619
- Part C

**Division of Children and Family Service**

**Division of Developmental Disabilities**

**Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Council**
- SAC

**Early Childhood Programs**
- State Pre-K

**Office of Special Education**
- Part B, Section 619

**Office of Nutrition Services**
- CACFP

**Office of Postsecondary Education**
- CCAMPIS

**To Institutions of Higher Education in the State**

* Based on state feedback, state Pre K, defined as programs for 3- and 4-year-olds, receives funding only from Dept. of Education and almost nothing from Department of Health and Human Services, and hence it is listed under Department of Education and not as co-led by the two departments.
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Nevada.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

---

**Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration**

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Nevada.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

---

**STRENGTHS OF NEVADA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Nevada includes licensing as the entry level for its Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), which ensures quality for all programs serving children.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEVADA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP).
- Ensure children receiving CCDF subsidies receive quality care by combining CCDF Subsidy and Quality under one agency.
- Ensure the State Advisory Council (SAC) for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) to ensure program quality.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Nevada

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Statewide Early Childhood Advisory Committee, appointed by the governor, works to strengthen state-level coordination and collaboration among the various sectors and settings of early childhood programs.

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
Nevada Silver State Stars QRIS has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is required for providers who accept subsidy payments and voluntary for all others.

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
- Grants to local organizations

**Office of the Governor**

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care
- Office of Family Assistance
- Child Care Development Program - Child Care Subsidy, Licensing, Quality
- CCDF
- TANF
- Division of Welfare and Supportive Services

**Department of Agriculture**
- Food & Nutrition Service
- CACFP
- Department of Agriculture, Food & Nutrition Service
- CACFP

**Department of Education**
- Office of Early Learning and Development - Child Care Quality Improvement
- Head Start Collaboration Office
- CCDF
- State Pre-K
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
- Office of Special Education
- Part B, Section 619
- Part C
- Office of Postsecondary Education
- CCAMPIS

**Early Childhood Advisory Council**
- SAC

**Local Institutions**
- Hospitals
- Child Care Centers
- Head Start
- Early Head Start
- Preschool
- Child Care Resource & Referral
- Parent Education
- Head Start Child Care Partnership
- Grants to local organizations
- Local Head Start Programs

**Key**:
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for New Hampshire.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: New Hampshire

**Key:***
- → Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- → Funding provided directly to local organizations
- ○ State does not receive funding

### New Hampshire Office of the Governor

#### Department of Health and Human Services
- Office of Head Start
  - CCFD
- Office of Child Care
  - TANF
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF

#### Department of Agriculture
- Food & Nutrition Service
  - CACFP

#### Department of Education
- Office of Postsecondary Education
  - CCAMPIS
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C

#### Local Institutions
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations

#### Spark NH
- State Advisory Council (SAC)
  - Spark NH is appointed by the governor and is tasked with providing leadership that promotes a comprehensive, coordinated, sustainable early childhood system that achieves positive outcomes for young children and families.

#### Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)
New Hampshire QRIS has three levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.

#### Local Head Start Programs
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for New Jersey.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEW JERSEY’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP).
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with state Pre-K and Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Ensure the State Advisory Council (SAC) for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) to ensure program quality.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: New Jersey

**KEY:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding

---

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
  - Child Care Subsidy: CCDF
  - Grow NJ Kids - Child Care Quality Improvement Rating System: CCDF
  - Services and Programs for Individuals and Families, WorkFirst NJ: TANF

**Department of Agriculture**
- Office of Child Care
  - Food & Nutrition Service: CACFP

**Department of Education**
- Office of Family Assistance
  - Part C
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619

**New Jersey Office of the Governor**
- State Advisory Council (SAC)
  - The Council for Young Children was created by Executive Order in 2010 to serve as the governor’s state advisory council for early care and education.

**Department of Pre-K**
- Division of Early Childhood Education and Family Engagement
  - SAC
  - Head Start Collaboration Office

**Office of Postsecondary Education**
- CCAMPIS

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations

---

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
Grow NJ Kids has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for New Mexico.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

### STRENGTHS OF NEW MEXICO’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- New Mexico administers the Child and Adult Care Food Program, the Child Care and Development Fund, and state Pre-K under one agency, which improves efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight.
- New Mexico’s Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS) is mandatory for providers receiving subsidy, which ensures quality care for all children.

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEW MEXICO’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B, Section 619.
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state QRIS to ensure program quality.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: New Mexico

**Flow Diagram:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding
- Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency

**State Advisory Council (SAC):**
The Early Learning Advisory Council, appointed by the governor, is tasked with creating a quality, sustainable, and seamless early care and learning system responsive to each child from birth to age five and their family by building partnerships, integrating systems, and making strategic, research-based and data-driven recommendations to policy makers and stakeholders.

**Key Funding Sources:**
- Department of Health and Human Services
  - Office of Head Start
  - Office of Child Care
    - CCDF
  - Office of Family Assistance
    - TANF
- Department of Agriculture
  - Food & Nutrition Service
    - CACFP
- Department of Education
  - Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
    - Part B, Section 619
    - Part C
- Department of Children, Youth and Families
  - Family Nutrition
    - CACFP
- Department of Public Education
  - Office of Postsecondary Education
    - COAMPIS
- Department of Human Services
  - TANF
- Early Childhood Education and Care Department
  - Head Start Collaboration Office
  - Division of Family Support and Early Intervention
    - CACFP
    - Part C
    - Part B, Section 619
- Early Learning Advisory Council
  - SAC
- State Pre-K
- State does not receive funding

**Local Institutions:**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations
- To Institutions of Higher Education in the State
- Local Head Start Programs

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS):**
FOCUS has four levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for New York.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

**STRENGTHS OF NEW YORK’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- New York includes licensing as the entry level for its Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), which ensures quality for all programs serving children.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEW YORK’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with state Pre-K and Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: New York

**Key:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations

**New York Office of the Governor**
- Department of Health and Human Services
  - Office of Head Start
  - Office of Child Care
    - CCDF
  - Office of Family Assistance
    - TANF
  - Food & Nutrition Service
    - CACFP
  - Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
    - Part B, Section 619
    - Part C
- Department of Agriculture
  - Food & Nutrition Service
    - CACFP
- Department of Education
  - Office of Pre-K
  - Office of Special Education
    - Part B, Section 619
  - Office of Early Learning
  - Office of Postsecondary Education
  - CCAMPIS
- Department of Health
  - Bureau of Early Intervention
    - Part C
  - Nutrition Programs
    - CACFP

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations
- To Institutions of Higher Education in the State
- Local Head Start Programs

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC), appointed by the governor, provides strategic direction and advice to the state on early childhood issues. By monitoring and guiding the implementation of a range of strategies, the ECAC supports New York in building a comprehensive and sustainable early childhood system that will ensure success for every young child.

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
QUALITYstarsNY has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary. The QRIS currently serves approximately 687 center-based programs, family-home providers, and public schools in targeted communities who applied and were selected to participate.
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for North Carolina.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

**STRENGTHS OF NORTH CAROLINA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- North Carolina administers the Child and Adult Care Food Program, the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), and state Pre-K under one agency, which improves efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight.
- North Carolina’s Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) is mandatory for providers receiving subsidy, which can ensure quality of care for all children.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NORTH CAROLINA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Increase efficiency by aligning Head Start Collaboration Office with CCDF and state Pre-K.
- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state QRIS to ensure program quality.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: North Carolina

**North Carolina Office of the Governor**

**Superintendent of Public Instruction**

**Department of Education**

**Department of Health and Human Services**

**Department of Agriculture**

**Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services**

**Office of Postsecondary Education**

Flow diagram showing the flow of federal early childhood funds in North Carolina, with several agencies and programs involved. The diagram includes State Advisory Council (SAC) and Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS) details.

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**

The Early Childhood Advisory Council is housed within the University of North Carolina. It is tasked with creating an action plan that aligns efforts to advance the state’s early childhood system, building awareness of the importance of high-quality early childhood experiences, and advocating for policies and funding that improve equitable access to early childhood services.

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**

Star Rated License System has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and licensing is the first level of the system. Providers are required to attain Level 3 in order to be able accept subsidy payments.
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System:
State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for North Dakota.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: North Dakota

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Early Childhood Education Council, appointed by the governor, provides a biennial report with findings and recommendations to the governor and the legislative assembly. The Council reviews availability and provision of early childhood services; identifies opportunities for public and private sector collaboration; and identifies ways to assist with the recruitment and retention of providers.

**Early Childhood Education Council**
- SAC

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care - CCDF

**Department of Agriculture**
- Office of Family Assistance - TANF

**Department of Education**
- Food & Nutrition Service - CACFP
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C
- Office of Postsecondary Education - CCAMPIS

**Department of Public Instruction**
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
- Office of Postsecondary Education - CCAMPIS

**Student Support and Innovation, Office of Early Learning**
- Head Start Collaboration Office
- Part B, Section 619

**Office of Family Assistance**
- TANF

**Office of Child Care**
- CCDF

**Office of Developmental Disabilities**
- Part C

**Bright & Early North Dakota**
- Has four levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
- Bright & Early
- Child Care Quality Rating Improvement System

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations

**North Dakota Office of the Governor**

**KEY:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding
- Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System:
State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Ohio.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Ohio

**Flowchart Description:***
- **Ohio Office of the Governor**: Central point of control and funding distribution.
  - **Department of Health and Human Services**: Includes Office of Head Start, Office of Child Care (CCDF), Office of Family Assistance (TANF).
  - **Department of Agriculture**: Includes Food & Nutrition Service (CACFP).
  - **Department of Education**: Includes Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (Part B, Section 619, Part C), Office of Pre-K Education.
  - **Department of Job and Family Services, Office of Family Assistance**: Includes Child Care Subsidy and Quality Improvement (CCDF, TANF).
- **State Advisory Council (SAC)**: The early childhood advisory council (ECAC), appointed by the governor, provides input and guidance to the governor's administration on early childhood programs. SAC membership includes stakeholders from early childhood programs, schools, health, social services, unions, philanthropy, and other groups.
- **Local Institutions**:
  - **Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership**: Grants to local organizations.
  - **Local Head Start Programs**: Local institutions of higher education in the state.

**Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds**:
- **Steps**:
  1. Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
  2. Funding provided directly to local organizations
  3. State does not receive funding
  4. Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**:
The QRIS is statewide and participation is mandatory for any program participating in Ohio's publicly funded child care program.
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Oklahoma.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

**STRENGTHS OF OKLAHOMA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**
- IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds) are administered within the same agency, which can support a smooth transition for parents.
- Oklahoma’s Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) is mandatory for providers receiving subsidy, which ensures quality of care for all children.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OKLAHOMA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**
- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with state Pre-K and the Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state QRIS to ensure program quality.
Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)
Reaching for the Stars has four levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation at higher levels is voluntary.

Local Institutions
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations
- Office of Head Start
  - Head Start Collaboration Office
- Office of Child Care Assistance
  - TANF
- Food & Nutrition Service
  - CCDF
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C
- Oklahoma Human Services
  - CCDF
  - Licensing
  - Quality Rating and Improvement System
  - TANF
  - CCDF
- Division of Child Nutrition
  - CACFP
- Division of Early Childhood and Family Education, Office of Curriculum and Instruction
  - State Pre-K
- Division of Special Education
  - Part C
  - Part B, Section 619

State Advisory Council (SAC)
The Oklahoma Partnership for School Readiness, appointed by the governor, serves in an advisory capacity to the governor on early childhood system issues relating to workforce, higher education, quality of early childhood programs and services, access to early childhood programs and services, professional development, and special populations.

Oklahoma Office of the Governor

Office of Postsecondary Education
- CCAMPIS

Office of the Governor
- Department of Commerce, Association of Community Action Agencies
  - Head Start Collaboration Office
  - SAC

Office of the Governor
- Department of Health and Human Services
  - Office of Head Start
  - Food & Nutrition Service
  - Licensing
  - Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF
  - Office of Family Assistance
  - CCDF
  - Office of Child Care Assistance
  - CACFP

Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Oklahoma

**KEY:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding
- Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency

Early Childhood: 50 State Report
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System:
State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Oregon.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

### STRENGTHS OF OREGON’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Oregon manages six programs serving children—Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF); Head Start Collaboration Office; state Pre-K; IDEA Part C; IDEA Part B, Section 619; Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)—under one agency, which improves efficiency and allows for better alignment of eligibility and monitoring requirements and quality improvement activities.

- IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5-year olds) are administered within the same agency, which can support a smooth transition for parents.

- CACFP is administered through the same agency as state Pre-K and CCDF, which improves efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight.

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OREGON’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Ensure children receiving CCDF subsidies receive quality care by combining CCDF Subsidy and Quality under one agency.

- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.

- Include licensing as the entry level for state Quality rating and Improvement System to ensure program quality.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Oregon

**KEY:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding

**Oregon Office of the Governor**

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care
- Office of Family Assistance
- Self-Sufficiency Programs
  - Employment Related Day Care Program
  - CCDF

**Department of Agriculture**
- Food & Nutrition Service
- TANF

**Department of Education**
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B: Section 619
  - Part C
- Early Learning Division - Child Care Licensing and Quality Rating Improvement System
- SAC
- State Pre-K
- Office of Postsecondary Education
  - CCAMPIS
- Office of Student Services
  - Child Nutrition Programs
    - CACFP
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C
- Deputy Superintendent

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations
- Early Intervention - Early Childhood Special Education
  - Part C
  - Part B, Section 619
- Local Head Start Programs
- To Institutions of Higher Education in the State

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
Spark has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary. It is currently under revision with an anticipated completion date in 2019.

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Early Learning Council guides efforts to streamline state programs, provides policy direction to meet early learning goals statewide, and provides oversight for services supporting children and families across Oregon.
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Pennsylvania.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisancolicy.org/report-national-child-care/.

**STRENGTHS OF PENNSYLVANIA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- In Pennsylvania, all programs serving children—Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF); Head Start Collaboration Office; state Pre-K; Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP); IDEA Part C, IDEA Part B, Section 619—are co-led by two agencies, which improves efficiency and allows for better alignment of eligibility and monitoring requirements and quality improvement activities.
- IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds) are administered within the same agency, which can support a smooth transition for parents.
- Pennsylvania was awarded an Early Head Start - Child Care Partnership grant, which integrates Early Head Start services and resources into child care settings, aligns child care standards with Early Head Start Performance Standards, and creates opportunities for improving outcomes for children and families.
- Pennsylvania includes licensing as the entry level for its Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), which ensures quality for all programs serving children.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PENNSYLVANIA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Pennsylvania

**Pennsylvania Office of the Governor**

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
  - CCDF
- Office of Child Care
  - CCDF
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF

**Department of Agriculture**
- Food & Nutrition Service
  - CACFP

**Department of Education**
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C
- Office of Postsecondary Education
  - CCAMPIS
- Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
  - CCDF
  - School-Based Pre-K
  - Ready to Learn Block Grant

**Early Learning Council**
- SAC
- Office of Child Development and Early Learning
  - CCDF
  - Pre-K Counts and Head Start State Supplemental Assistance Programs
  - State Pre-K
- Bureau of Budget and Fiscal Management, Division of Food and Nutrition
  - CACFP

**Department of Human Services**
- Office of Income Maintenance
  - TANF
- Pennsylvania Early Learning Council (SAC)
  - Head Start Collaboration Office

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
- Keystone STARS has four levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is required for all licensed child care programs.

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations
  - To Institutions of Higher Education in the State

**State Pre-K**
- Office of Early Intervention Services and Family Support Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C

**Office of the Governor**

**Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds**

- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding
- Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency

---

*State Advisory Council (SAC)*

The Early Learning Council (ELC), appointed by the governor, works to expand effective early learning and development services for children and their families and guide implementation. The ELC coordinates the delivery of federal and state programs designed to serve young children from birth to school entry and to ensure a smooth transition for those children into K-12 education and other programs.
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Rhode Island.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/. 

### Strengths of Rhode Island’s Early Care and Education System
- Rhode Island’s Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) is mandatory for providers receiving subsidy, which ensures quality of care for all children.

### Recommendations for Rhode Island’s Early Care and Education System
- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with state Pre-K and the Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state QRIS to ensure program quality.

[RI Score: 37](#)
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Rhode Island

**Key:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding
- Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency

**Rhode Island Office of the Governor**

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
  - CCDF

**Department of Agriculture**
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF
- Food & Nutrition Service
  - CACFP

**Department of Education**
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C
- Office of Postsecondary Education
  - CCAMPIS

**Early Learning Council**
- State Advisory Council (SAC)

**Executive Office of Health and Human Services, Early Intervention Program**
- BrightStars
  - Child Care/Early Learning Quality Rating Improvement System
  - Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
BrightStars has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is required for providers who accept subsidy payments and voluntary for all others.

**Office of Student, Community and Academic Supports**
- Part B, Section 619

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations

**State Pre-K**
- Office of Instruction, Assessment and Curriculum

**Local Head Start Programs**
- Head Start Collaboration Office
  - CCDF
- Child Care Licensing
  - CCDF
- Child Care Assistance Program - Subsidy
  - CCDF
- RIWorks
  - TANF
- BrightStars
  - Child Care/Early Learning Quality Rating Improvement System

The Early Learning Council (ELC), appointed by the governor, facilitates the development of high-quality systems of early childhood education and care from birth to age eight to improve school readiness and success. ELC has developed a state plan to improve access to these services and to improve coordination and collaboration among agencies, organizations, and programs.
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System:
State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for South Carolina.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

**STRENGTHS OF SOUTH CAROLINA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- South Carolina’s Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) is mandatory for providers receiving subsidy, which ensures quality of care for all children.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SOUTH CAROLINA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with state Pre-K and the Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state QRIS to ensure program quality.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: South Carolina

KEY:
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding

Department of Health and Human Services
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care
  - CCDF
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF
- Division of Economic Services
  - TANF

Department of Agriculture
- Food & Nutrition Service
  - CACFP

Department of Education
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C
- Office of Postsecondary Education
  - CCAMPIS

South Carolina Office of the Governor

Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)
ABC Quality has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.

Local Institutions
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations

State Advisory Council (SAC)
The Early Childhood Advisory Council is coordinated by First Steps to School Readiness, a public-private partnership developed through legislation. It is charged with conducting a period needs assessment of ECE; identifying opportunities and barriers to collaboration and coordination among education programs and services; making informed recommendations on ECE policies; and performing functions to improve coordination and delivery of ECE in the state.
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for South Dakota.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

### STRENGTHS OF SOUTH DAKOTA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM
- IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds) are administered within the same agency, which can support a smooth transition for parents.

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SOUTH DAKOTA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM
- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with the Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Provide support for the establishment of a new State Advisory Council (SAC) for Early Education and Care, as mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, and ensure the SAC is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: South Dakota

**KEY:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding
- Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency

**South Dakota Office of the Governor**

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
  - Head Start Collaboration Office
- Office of Child Care
  - Division of Child Care - Child Care Licensing, Subsidy and Quality Improvement
  - CCDF
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF
- Food & Nutrition Service
  - CACFP
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C
  - CCAMPIS

**Department of Agriculture**
- Division of Economic Assistance
  - TANF
- Food & Nutrition Service
  - CACFP

**Department of Education**
- Head Start Collaboration Office
  - Birth to Three
    - Part C
- Office of Special Education
  - Part B, Section 619
- Office of Child and Adult Nutrition Services
  - CACFP

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations
- Local Head Start Programs

**Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds:**
- **South Dakota Office of the Governor**
  - Department of Health and Human Services
    - Office of Head Start
    - Office of Child Care
    - Office of Family Assistance
    - Food & Nutrition Service
    - Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Department of Agriculture
    - Division of Economic Assistance
    - Food & Nutrition Service
  - Department of Education
    - Head Start Collaboration Office
    - Office of Special Education
    - Office of Child and Adult Nutrition Services

**No state pre-k**
**No SAC**
**No QRIS**

*Early Childhood: 50 State Report*
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding.

The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Tennessee.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TENNESSEE’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with state Pre-K and the Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state Quality Rating and Improvement System to ensure program quality.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Tennessee

**KEY:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding

**Tennessee Office of the Governor**

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care
  - CCDF
- Office of Family Assistance and Child Support
  - TANF
- Division of Community and Social Services - Child Care Licensing, Subsidy and Quality Rating Improvement System
  - CCDF
  - CACFP

**Department of Agriculture**
- Office of Food and Nutrition Service
  - CACFP

**Department of Education**
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C
- Office of Postsecondary Education
  - CCAMPIS
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF
- Office of Child Care
  - CCDF
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C
- Early Childhood Education Division, Office of Academics
- Division of Special Populations, Early Childhood Special Education
  - Part B, Section 619
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF
- Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)
  - Report Card and Rated Licensing System has three levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary.
- Earbly Childhood Quality and Supports Office
- Head Start Collaboration Office
- Voluntary Pre-K Program
  - SAC

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Early Childhood Advisory Council advises the state on unmet needs, initiatives of the Council, and consults with the governor and other state leaders.

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations
- Early Head Start-Child Care Program
- Local Head Start Programs

To Institutions of Higher Education in the State
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System:
State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Texas.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Texas

**Key:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding
- Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care
  - CCDF
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF

**Department of Agriculture**
- Food & Nutrition Service
  - CACFP

**Department of Education**
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C
- Office of Postsecondary Education
  - CCAMPIS

**Workforce Commission, Child Care and Early Learning Division**
- Child Care Services Program - CNM Care Subsidy
  - CCDF
- Texas Rising Star - Quality Rating Improvement System
  - CCDF
- Self Sufficiency Fund Program
  - TANF

**University of Texas, Health Science Center, Children’s Learning Institute**
- Head Start Collaboration Office
- SAC – Texas Early Learning Council

**Health and Human Services Commission**
- Regulatory Services Division, Child Care Regulation
  - CCDF
- Early Intervention Services
  - Part C

**Education Agency, Deputy Commissioner of Academics**
- Special Populations, Special Education
  - Part B, Section 619
- School Programs, Early Childhood Education
  - State Pre-K

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
Texas Rising Star has three levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. Participation is voluntary.

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to State agencies and local organization
- Local Head Start Programs
- To Institutions of Higher Education in the State

**Texas Office of the Governor**
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Utah.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

STRENGTHS OF UTAH’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Utah includes licensing as the entry level for its Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), which ensures quality for all programs serving children.
- CCDF, Pre-K, and Head Start Collaboration Office are co-located which may improve program alignment and efficiency.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UTAH’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Reduce duplication of efforts by administering Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Licensing with CCDF Subsidy and Quality.
- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning CCDF with state Pre-K and Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP).
- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Ensure the State Advisory Council (SAC) for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
Utah Office of the Governor

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Early Childhood Utah Committee (ECUC) consists of leaders from the fields of children’s health and mental health, early care and education, and parent resource programs. ECUC helps ensure all children receive ongoing developmental screenings with a valid reliable tool and receive appropriate care and educational services to meet their developmental needs.

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
Child Care Quality System has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS was being redesigned with the intention of relaunching in 2019.

**Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Utah**

**KEY:**
- **Funding mandated for State Departments of Education**
- **Funding provided directly to local organizations**
- **State does not receive funding**
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Vermont.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

STRENGTHS OF VERMONT’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Vermont includes licensing as the entry level for its Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), which ensures quality for all programs serving children.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VERMONT’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF and Head Start Collaboration Office with state Pre-K.
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Virginia.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisancolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

---

STRENGTHS OF VIRGINIA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Virginia manages four programs serving children -- Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), the Head Start Collaboration Office, state Pre-K, and IDEA Part B, Section 619 -- under one agency, which improves efficiency and allows for better alignment of eligibility and monitoring requirements and quality improvement activities.

- Virginia’s Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) is mandatory for licensed providers receiving subsidy, which ensures quality of care of subsidized children.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VIRGINIA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).

- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) and state Pre-K with the Child and Adult Care Food Program.

- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Virginia

State Advisory Council (SAC)
Virginia launched its inaugural Early Childhood Advisory Committee in 2021. The Committee is responsible for advising the Board of Education on all matters related to Virginia’s unified early childhood system and serves as the state’s official advisory council.

Local Institutions

Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
• Grants to local organizations

Local Head Start Programs

Virginia Early Childhood Foundation
• Mixed Delivery preschool grant program

Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS)
By the fall of 2023, all publicly funded providers are required to participate in the new uniform measurement and improvement system. Higher ratings are associated with higher quality teacher-child interactions.

Department of Health & Human Services
• CACFP
  • Office of Child Care
  • Part C

Department of Agriculture
• Food & Nutrition Service
• CACFP

Department of Education
• Office of Early Childhood
  • Part B, Section 619
  • Head Start State Collaboration Office
  • Virginia Preschool Initiative (state Pre-K)
  • CCDF

Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services
• Part C

Department of Social Services
• Division of Benefit Programs
  • TANF

Virginia Office of the Governor

Office of the Governor

Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Virginia

KEY:
→ Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
→ Funding provided directly to local organizations
• State does not receive funding
→ Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency

Office of the Governor

Virginia Office of the Governor
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Washington.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

STRENGTHS OF WASHINGTON’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Washington includes licensing as the entry level for its Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), which ensures quality for all programs serving children.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WASHINGTON’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM

- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning Child Care and Development Fund with state Pre-K and Child and Adult Care Food Program.

- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Washington

**Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds:**
- **Washington Office of the Governor**
  - **Department of Agriculture**
    - Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
      - Part B, Section 619
      - Part C
  - **Department of Education**
    - Office of Postsecondary Education
      - CCAMPIS
    - Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
  - **Department of Social and Health Services, Community Services Division**
    - Cash Assistance
      - TANF
    - Early Learning Programs Division
  - **Department of Government and Community Relations - Early Learning Advisory Council**
    - SAC
  - **Department of Children, Youth and Families**
    - Eligibility and Provider Supports Division - Early Achievers, Quality Rating and Improvement Systems
      - CCDF
    - Licensing Division - Child Care Licensing
      - CCDF
    - Family Support Programs Division, Early Supports for Infants and Toddlers
      - Part C
  - **Department of Health and Human Services**
    - Office of Head Start
    - Office of Child Care
      - CCDF
    - Office of Family Assistance
      - TANF
  - **Department of Health and Human Services - Eligibility and Provider Supports Division - Early Achievers, Quality Rating and Improvement Systems**
    - CCDF
  - **State Advisory Council (SAC)**
    - The Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC) meets regularly to provide input and recommendations on early learning so that strategies and actions are well-informed and broadly supported by parents, child care providers, health and safety experts, and interested members of the public.

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
- Early Achievers has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary for private pay providers. Providers who receive state funds through child care subsidies and/or state funded preschool must enroll and achieve specific participation and rating milestones.

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations
- Local Head Start Programs

---

**Eligibility and Provider Supports Division - Early Achievers, Quality Rating and Improvement Systems**
- CCDF

**Child Care Subsidy Policy and Audits**
- CCDF

---

**Early Childhood: 50 State Report**

---

**Office of Postsecondary Education**
- CCAMPIS

**Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction**
- Part B, Section 619
- Part C

**Department of Agriculture**
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
  - Part B, Section 619
  - Part C

---

**Department of Social and Health Services, Community Services Division**
- Cash Assistance
  - TANF
- Early Learning Programs Division

---

**Department of Health and Human Services**
- Office of Head Start
- Office of Child Care
  - CCDF
- Office of Family Assistance
  - TANF

---

**Department of Children, Youth and Families**
- Eligibility and Provider Supports Division - Early Achievers, Quality Rating and Improvement Systems
  - CCDF
- Licensing Division - Child Care Licensing
  - CCDF
- Family Support Programs Division, Early Supports for Infants and Toddlers
  - Part C

---

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
- The Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC) meets regularly to provide input and recommendations on early learning so that strategies and actions are well-informed and broadly supported by parents, child care providers, health and safety experts, and interested members of the public.

**Eligibility and Provider Supports Division - Early Achievers, Quality Rating and Improvement Systems**
- CCDF

**Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)**
- Early Achievers has five levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary for private pay providers. Providers who receive state funds through child care subsidies and/or state funded preschool must enroll and achieve specific participation and rating milestones.

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations
- Local Head Start Programs
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Washington, DC.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

**STRENGTHS OF WASHINGTON, DC’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Washington, DC administers six programs serving children—CCDF, Head Start Collaboration Office, state pre-k, IDEA Part C and Part B (Section 619), and CACFP—under one agency, which improves efficiency and allows for better alignment of eligibility and monitoring requirements and quality improvement activities.
- CACFP is administered through the same agency as state pre-k and CCDF, which improves efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight.
- IDEA Part C and Part B, Section 619 are administered within the same agency, which can support smooth transition for parents.
- Washington DC’s Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) is mandatory for providers receiving subsidy, which can ensure quality of care for all children.
- Washington, DC was awarded an Early Head Start - Child Care Partnership grant, which integrates Early Head Start services and resources into child care settings, aligns child care standards with Early Head Start Performance Standards, and creates opportunities for improving outcomes for children and families.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WASHINGTON, DC’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Ensure the SAC for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Washington, DC

Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)
Capital Quality has four levels with higher levels indicating higher levels of quality and serves as a tiered rate reimbursement system. Participation is mandatory for subsidy providers. Licensed non-subsidy providers may elect to participate. In Capital Quality, providers will be reimbursed based on four tiers of quality, with the highest level of quality receiving the highest reimbursement rate.

State Advisory Council (SAC)
The State Early Childhood Development Coordinating Council (SECDCC) improves collaboration and coordination among entities carrying out federally funded and D.C.-funded Pre-K and other early childhood programs.

Local Institutions
Creating a Coordinated, Integrated Early Care and Education System: State Early Childhood Administration

In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding.

The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for West Virginia.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WEST VIRGINIA’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with state Pre-K and Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
- Include licensing as the entry level for state Quality Rating and Improvement System to ensure program quality.
**Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: West Virginia**

**State Advisory Council (SAC)**
The Early Childhood Advisory Council, appointed by the governor, is tasked with creating a high-quality, coordinated system of services that support early childhood development. It seeks to ensure that a full array of high-quality early childhood services will be available to families throughout the state, that the state's early learning standards are used throughout the state, and that the ECE workforce has the knowledge and skills to meet the needs of young children and families. It provides families with knowledge of and access to resources regarding ECE, and ensures that the public and policymakers are knowledgeable and supporting of ECE.

**Local Institutions**
- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations

**Early Childhood: 50 State Report**
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Wisconsin.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

---

**STRENGTHS OF WISCONSIN’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Wisconsin includes licensing as the entry level for its Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), which ensures quality for all programs serving children.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WISCONSIN’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Facilitate cross-agency communication to ensure seamless coordination and transition for IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds).
- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning the administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with state Pre-K and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with state Pre-K and the Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
YoungStar has five levels. Entry level status is achieved through licensing. Higher levels of quality are reflected in the four subsequent levels. The QRIS is statewide and participation is voluntary, except for providers who accept subsidy payments.

The Early Childhood Advisory Council ensures children and families in Wisconsin have access to quality early childhood programs by conducting statewide needs assessments; identifying opportunities for, and barriers to, coordination among ECE programs; and developing recommendations to increase participation in ECE programs and support professional development for early childhood educators. The Council helps align early childhood programs across the two departments and is co-chaired by the Secretary of the Department of Children and Families and the State Superintendent at the Department of Public Instruction.
In 2018, the Bipartisan Policy Center examined how states oversee federal and state funding dedicated to early childhood education, or ECE, programs. Now in 2021, we revisit each state system to understand enacted improvements and emerging challenges in state governance.

As the country adjusts to a new reality of work and home life amid the pandemic, American families are faced with the challenge of finding and affording quality child care, now more than ever. Early learning operates within a fragile business model, in which services cost more than most families can afford to pay. For this reason, states must administer funding with efficiency and effectiveness to ensure families are able to access programs and to maximize the reach of federal and state investments.

States are now responsible to distributing recent COVID-19 relief funding for child care—allocated through three successive relief packages by Congress in 2020—in addition to established funding streams that support multiple early childhood programs. The relief packages are intended to stabilize the fragile system that challenged access to affordable, reliable care. State governments are tasked with coordinating and combining the many different ECE funding streams allocated to them.

For all but one federal program, governors have wide discretion with regard to the administration and coordination of early childhood funding. The Bipartisan Policy Center set out to re-examine the issues of state governance, coordination, and integration by reviewing how states are meeting requirements set by federal statutes and agencies, as well as how states are capitalizing on the opportunity to create efficiency through their governance structures.

With this in mind, BPC is making recommendations at the federal and state level with an eye towards further reducing duplication and improving results for families. These recommendations are summarized in the full report. The following summarizes the findings for Wyoming.

More state data, including funding levels and demographic information, can be found at https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/national-child-care/.

**STRENGTHS OF WYOMING’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- IDEA Part C (infants/toddlers) and Part B, Section 619 (3-5 year olds) are administered within the same agency, which can support a smooth transition for parents.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WYOMING’S EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SYSTEM**

- Increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness of monitoring and oversight by aligning administration of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) with the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Improve program alignment and efficiency by colocating CCDF with the Head Start Collaboration Office.
- Ensure the State Advisory Council for Early Education and Care, mandated by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, is fulfilling its required activities, including conducting a statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of early care and learning programs.
Flow of Federal Early Childhood Funds: Wyoming

**KEY:**
- Funding mandated for State Departments of Education
- Funding provided directly to local organizations
- State does not receive funding
- Partnership with funding provided by state department or agency

**Wyoming Office of the Governor**

- Department of Health and Human Services
  - Office of Head Start
  - Office of Child Care
    - CCDF
  - Office of Family Assistance
    - TANF

- Department of Agriculture
  - Food & Nutrition Service
    - CACFP

- Department of Education
  - Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
    - Part B, Section 619
    - Part C
  - Office of Postsecondary Education
    - CCAMPIS

**Local Institutions**

- WY Quality Counts, Early Childhood Advisory Council
  - SAC

- Department of Family Services, Family Assistance Division
  - Child Care and Early Childhood - Licensing, Subsidy and Quality Improvement
    - CCDF
  - Temporary Assistance to Needy Families
    - TANF

- Department of Workforce Services
  - Head Start Collaboration Office

- Department of Health, Behavioral Health Division, Developmental Disabilities Section
  - Part C
  - Part B, Section 619

- State Advisory Council (SAC)
  The Early Childhood State Advisory Council (ECSAC), appointed by the governor, consists of appointed members from the state’s private and public organizations. The ECSAC published the Early Learning Foundations for Children Ages 3-5 and Early Learning Guidelines for Children Ages 0-3 to help professionals, parents, and providers track the growth and development of Wyoming’s children.

- Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership
  - Grants to local organizations

- Local Head Start Programs

**No state pre-k**
**No QRIS**
Endnotes
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11 First Five Years Fund, "Preschool Development Grants Birth through Five (PDG B-5)," 2020. Available at: https://www.ffyf.org/issues/pdg/.
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