



RESEARCH REPORT

Barriers to Preschool Participation for Low-Income Children of Immigrants in Silicon Valley

Part II

Erica Greenberg
January 2016

Gina Adams

Molly Michie



ABOUT THE URBAN INSTITUTE

The nonprofit Urban Institute is dedicated to elevating the debate on social and economic policy. For nearly five decades, Urban scholars have conducted research and offered evidence-based solutions that improve lives and strengthen communities across a rapidly urbanizing world. Their objective research helps expand opportunities for all, reduce hardship among the most vulnerable, and strengthen the effectiveness of the public sector.



HEISING - SIMONS
FOUNDATION

ABOUT THE HEISING-SIMONS FOUNDATION

Established in 2007 by Mark Heising and Elizabeth Simons, the Heising-Simons Foundation is dedicated to advancing sustainable solutions in the environment, supporting groundbreaking research in science, and enhancing the education of our youngest learners. Learn more at heisingsimons.org.

Contents

Acknowledgments	iv
Executive Summary	v
Introduction	1
Research Questions	4
Structure of the Report	4
Barriers to Higher-Quality Preschool Participation for All Low-Income Families	5
The Unusually High Cost of Living in Silicon Valley	6
Parental Knowledge of Early Care and Education Programs	7
Program Cost and Affordability	12
Eligibility and Enrollment	14
Supply and Capacity	17
Location and Transportation	19
Hours and Schedules	21
Additional Barriers to Participation for Low-Income <i>Immigrant</i> Families	24
Distrust of Government Institutions	24
Parental Preferences for Early Care and Education	26
Cultural and Linguistic Sensitivity	29
Conclusion	34
Appendix A. Study Methodology	35
Appendix B. Strategies from Prior Research	37
Notes	41
References	42
About the Authors	44
Statement of Independence	46

Acknowledgments

We thank the Heising-Simons Foundation for sponsoring the research on which this report is based. We are grateful to them and to all our funders, who make it possible for Urban to advance its mission.

The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Funders do not determine research findings or influence scholars' conclusions. Further information on the Urban Institute's funding principles is available at www.urban.org/support.

We are grateful to Chhandasi Pandya Patel for her insights and support, as well as to Julia Gelatt, Lisa Kaufman, Camille Llanes-Fontanilla, Jessica Mihaly, and the other members of our project team—Heather Koball and Devlin Hanson—for their thoughtful comments on earlier versions of this paper. We would also like to thank the key stakeholders and experts in early care and education, immigration, and social service provision in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, who shared the insights at the heart of this report through our interviews and participated in our initial meeting in December 2014. We are grateful for their time and reflections.

Thank you also to our colleagues at the Urban Institute who provided graphics and editorial support: Fiona Blackshaw, Elizabeth Forney, Scott Forrey, Tim Meko, and Devlan O'Connor.

Executive Summary

Researchers and policymakers agree: access to high-quality early care and education is central to children's readiness for school and success later in life. A growing body of evidence suggests this is particularly true for children from low-income families, who may face obstacles related to poverty, geographic and social isolation, insufficient home resources, and instability. Yet, these children enroll in high-quality preschool programs at significantly lower rates than other children nationwide—and in Silicon Valley, specifically. As documented in our companion report, for example, more than three-quarters of low-income 3-year-olds and about two-fifths of low-income 4-year-olds in Silicon Valley are not enrolled in preschool (Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016). Research from other areas of the country reveals a wide array of explanations, ranging from limited information on available programs to transportation challenges to unaffordability. Yet, this research also suggests that barriers to access, as well as strategies for overcoming them, vary substantially between localities.

The Urban Institute has explored the unique barriers to preschool participation for low-income children in Silicon Valley in two reports. The first provides a demographic profile of low-income preschool-age children in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties (Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016). One of its most important findings is that nearly three-quarters of all low-income children from birth to age 5 in Silicon Valley are the children of immigrants—persons born outside the United States and its territories, including naturalized citizens, legal permanent residents (green card holders), temporary workers (H1B visa holders), and undocumented residents. Although most of these children have parents from Mexico and Central America, a significant minority have parents from other countries. These patterns suggest that any effort to understand preschool participation among low-income families in Silicon Valley must account for barriers facing immigrant families, as well as the challenges of linguistic diversity, immigrant isolation, and resource requirements for culturally sensitive programming. While Silicon Valley has an unusually large low-income immigrant population, other parts of the country experiencing significant increases in the size and diversity of their low-income immigrant populations can gain insight from this research.

This second report explores the particular barriers to preschool participation faced by low-income immigrant families in Silicon Valley. We rely upon interviews and meetings with experts and stakeholders from early childhood and immigrant-serving organizations in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, as well as a systematic review of existing reports and data. While we were not able to collect information directly from immigrant parents, we did talk to individuals who work closely with them. Nonetheless, parents' perspectives would be useful to include in future analyses.

This study identifies a wide array of barriers low-income immigrant families face in Silicon Valley. Even though we present the barriers separately, they often function simultaneously and interact to shape the low participation patterns found in our companion report. This study also provides context for stakeholders interested in strategies that support preschool enrollment and attendance. Both barriers and strategies to overcome them are set against a complex backdrop that includes (1) the area's diversity of immigrant populations, with implications for outreach and service delivery, and (2) its unusually high cost of living, which makes affording care even harder. Cost of living seems to be forcing some low-income families to migrate out of the area and contributes to high operating costs for providers.

Several of the barriers facing low-income immigrant families are common among low-income families more broadly:

- **Parents' knowledge of early care and education options in their community**, which may be limited by insufficient outreach and information provision, as well as by the complex way preschool programs are funded, organized, and delivered in the United States.
- **Cost and affordability** issues that make even some publicly funded programs unattainable for struggling families. Definitions of *low-income* that set eligibility for public programs diverge from the true cost of living in Silicon Valley, and fees are required for certain types of early care and education.
- **Supply and capacity** constraints that leave many programs with long waiting lists and others searching to fill slots in the wake of gentrification and increasing operational and service provision costs.
- **Eligibility and enrollment processes** marked by burdensome paperwork and eligibility criteria for proof of income, home addresses, and, in some cases, parental employment status or enrollment in education and training programs. Respondents noted that these requirements are difficult for many low-income parents to meet. In addition, such requirements focus on adult needs rather than child development goals.
- **Location and transportation** challenges stemming from the large geographic size of Silicon Valley and its underdeveloped public transportation infrastructure.
- **Hours and schedules** that are not flexible enough to meet many low-income families' needs.

Respondents also identified several additional barriers that pose unique challenges to low-income immigrant families:

- **Distrust of government institutions** among undocumented and mixed-status immigrant families, which can deter enrollment in publicly funded preschool programs or use of public subsidies.
- **Parental preferences for early care and education**, which may be shaped by both unfamiliarity with American approaches to preschool and limited trust in existing programs.
- **Cultural and linguistic sensitivities** that make programs more welcoming for families from more common linguistic and cultural groups but less responsive to families from less common groups.

Respondents suggested a wide range of strategies to overcome these barriers:

- **A new push for affordability** that expands low-cost or free services. Such affordable programs would account for the unusually high cost of living in Silicon Valley through higher eligibility thresholds, increased reimbursement rates, and decreased family fees.
- **Improved outreach**, by leveraging networks of enrolled parents, adding more informational workshops and public messaging campaigns, enhancing multilingual translation efforts, and using technology to reach families directly.
- **Simplified early care and education enrollment requirements and additional support for eligibility determination and enrollment** tailored to the linguistic and literacy needs of diverse low-income immigrant families.
- **Targeted investments in supply** that serve stable communities of low-income immigrant families. Funding could cover facilities costs for qualified providers, partnerships with local organizations to provide rent-free space, or scholarships to increase the supply of well-trained instructional staff. These investments may be complemented by investments in public school buses or other transportation.
- **Enhanced professional development offerings** about cultural and linguistic sensitivity, reflecting the diversity of immigrant families.

Respondents also suggested various partners for these efforts, such as health providers, churches, legal services organizations, WIC offices, neighborhood and community organizations, institutions of

higher education, workforce development programs, and the rich set of early care and education organizations that already serve many families with young children. Together, these organizations and their staff members may help expand access to and participation in higher-quality early learning opportunities, so that all children from low-income immigrant families have the opportunity for a strong start in life.

In conclusion, these findings suggest that while low-income immigrant families in Silicon Valley face significant barriers to enrolling their children in preschool, steps could be taken to support their participation. These suggested strategies and partnerships with early care and education organizations, other child- and family-serving organizations, and immigrant-serving organizations provide insight for Silicon Valley—and for communities across the country wrestling with how to support a strong start for all children in the context of demographic change.

Introduction

Decades of research document the positive effect of high-quality early care and education on children's success in school and beyond (Shonkoff and Phillips 2000; Yoshikawa et al. 2013). More recent studies suggest that children of low-income immigrant parents, as well as Latino children and children whose first language is not English, may benefit from early learning experiences even more than other children (Crosnoe 2007; Currie and Thomas 1999; Loeb et al. 2007; Magnuson, Lahaie, and Waldfogel 2006). Yet, low-income immigrant families remain underenrolled in early care and education (ECE) nationwide—and within Silicon Valley, more than three-quarters of 3-year-olds and two-fifths of 4-year-olds from low-income families (the vast majority children of immigrants) do not participate in preschool at all (Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016). Within these broad patterns, little is known about how enrollment varies across program types, funding streams, immigrant subgroups, and child and family characteristics.

Existing research suggests that many barriers to access and participation faced by low-income immigrant families are common among low-income families generally. Barriers include lack of information about care, a limited supply of high-quality care, program cost, inconvenient locations, and mismatching and inflexible schedules. However, evidence suggests immigrant families can face additional challenges, such as language barriers and fear of or unfamiliarity with government institutions (Adams and McDaniel 2012a; Gelatt, Adams, and Huerta 2014). While lower preschool enrollment rates among immigrant families were once attributed to cultural preferences for home-based care, recent studies find that other factors—namely parental education and income—play a much larger role (Hernandez, Denton, and Macartney 2011; Karoly and Gonzalez 2011; Valencia, Pérez, and Echeveste and Tomás Rivera Policy Institute 2006; Zucker, Howes, and Garza-Mourino 2007).

A growing body of literature suggests that low-income immigrant families do not experience these barriers uniformly. For example, one study in Chicago demonstrates that these issues can play out differently in different communities, for families with different characteristics, and for different immigrant subgroups (Adams and McDaniel 2012a). As a result, efforts to support participation among low-income immigrant families in Silicon Valley are likely to be more effective if they are based on a careful needs assessment that examines local participation patterns and explores which barriers are at play for which populations. This information will ensure that efforts to address participation gaps are designed appropriately and target the right barriers.

This report is the second of two studies conducted by the Urban Institute to better understand barriers to low-income children of immigrants participating in higher-quality preschool programs in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties (which make up most of Silicon Valley). The first study (Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016) provides both context and motivation for the data analyzed here. It examines the demographic characteristics and preschool participation of children from low-income families in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, using data from the 2008–2012 American Community Survey. As summarized in box 1, the report highlights discrepancies in preschool enrollment between lower- and higher-income children in Silicon Valley and describes the high proportion of low-income children whose parents are immigrants. It also provides insights into these families' characteristics and residential patterns. Findings from the companion report lay the groundwork for this study, which focuses on the particular barriers to preschool participation facing low-income immigrant families.

Together with our companion report, this study is designed to shed light on preschool participation among low-income immigrant families in Silicon Valley. We examine a broad range of barriers to access and participation, including those related to information, the logistical aspects of enrollment, supply and capacity, preferences for preschool, and issues of cultural and linguistic sensitivity that make programs more or less welcoming to immigrant families. We also asked respondents to identify possible strategies for addressing these barriers, as well as organizations that might be well positioned to pursue these strategies. Because the challenges faced in Silicon Valley are common to other communities experiencing demographic change, the insights from this report are also relevant to many communities across the country.

The analyses in this report are based on three types of data. First, we held meetings with various experts and stakeholders in Silicon Valley in December 2014. Second, we conducted in-depth interviews with 23 experts and stakeholders from ECE and immigrant-serving organizations throughout San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties in summer 2015. Third, we included information from our review of research studies and administrative reports (e.g., Diaz et al. 2014; San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council 2010; Santa Clara County Office of Education 2013). (For additional information on our data collection and study methodology, please see appendix A.) This study is limited in that we were not able to gather information systematically or directly from low-income immigrant families. Nonetheless, leaders in ECE and immigrant-serving organizations provided key insights on the barriers to preschool participation these families face, and strategies for overcoming them.

BOX 1

Key Demographic Findings on Low-Income Children and Low-Income Children of Immigrants in Silicon Valley

- San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties are home to large populations of young children. San Mateo County has 56,000 children ages 5 and under, 13,000 of whom live in low-income families. Santa Clara County has 152,000 children ages 5 and younger, 38,000 living in low-income families.
- Low-income 3- and 4-year-old children are much less likely to be enrolled in preschool than are higher-income 3- and 4-year-olds. Specifically, only 26 percent of 3-year-olds and 61 percent of 4-year-olds from low-income families are enrolled in preschool. In contrast, among higher-income children, 52 percent of 3-year-olds and 74 percent of 4-year-olds are enrolled. While the rate of enrollment for higher-income children is the same across the two counties, the rate of enrollment for low-income children is much lower in Santa Clara County than in San Mateo County: 23 percent versus 34 percent of low-income 3-year-olds and 59 percent versus 68 percent of 4-year-olds are enrolled in each county, respectively.
- Children in low-income families are disproportionately children of immigrants. Children of immigrants make up 76 percent and 70 percent of all low-income children birth to age 5, in San Mateo County and Santa Clara County, respectively.
- Most children in low-income families have parents from Mexico or Central America. However, a significant minority of low-income children—16 percent in San Mateo County and 21 percent in Santa Clara County—have parents from other countries.
- Majorities of low-income children ages 5 and younger have parents with little formal education (58 percent with a high school diploma or less), at least one parent with limited English proficiency (60 percent, most of whom speak Spanish but a significant minority speak other languages), and two-parent households (70 percent) with one parent home full time (53 percent).
- While nearly all low-income children are native-born US citizens (97 percent), almost half (47 percent) have noncitizen parents who may or may not have legal status to reside in the United States. Most low-income children of immigrants will be legally eligible for programs and services; however, their noncitizen parents may find it more challenging to access public services and institutions.

Source: Hanson, Adams, and Koball (2016).

Notes: *Immigrants* are persons born outside the United States and its territories, including naturalized citizens, legal permanent residents (green card holders), temporary workers (H1B visa holders), and undocumented residents. *Children of immigrants* are those with at least one immigrant parent in the household. *Low-income families* are those with income below 200 percent of the federal poverty level (e.g., \$47,100 for a family of four in 2013). Adults with *limited English proficiency* are those who responded to the American Community Survey that they speak a language other than English at home and that they speak English less than “very well.”

Research Questions

This study seeks to answer four key questions:

1. To what extent do low-income immigrant families face barriers to higher-quality early care and education participation?
2. What is the nature of existing barriers?
3. Are barriers different across subgroups of families (i.e., families from different immigrant groups, families living in rural or urban areas, linguistically isolated families, etc.) or across early care and education program types?
4. What are the most promising strategies to help low-income immigrant families overcome barriers or navigate around them?

To answer these questions, we synthesized key themes and insights from across stakeholder interviews. Then, we probed differences between San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties resulting from their varying policy contexts and demographic composition.

Structure of the Report

This report is divided into two main sections. The first presents findings on the barriers to higher-quality preschool participation faced by all low-income families in Silicon Valley, while the second focuses on barriers to participation faced by low-income immigrant families in particular. We describe each barrier in depth before presenting strategies for overcoming that barrier based on insights from Silicon Valley stakeholders and nationwide experts (see appendix B for additional information). The report concludes with a brief overview of findings, additional lessons from our companion study (Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016), and implications for communities around the country seeking to expand preschool participation among low-income immigrant families.

Barriers to Higher-Quality Preschool Participation for All Low- Income Families

Low-income immigrant families face a broad array of barriers to enrolling their 3- and 4-year-old children in higher-quality early care and education (box 2). Some barriers apply to low-income families in general, with acute or nuanced implications for low-income immigrant families, while others apply to low-income immigrant families in particular. This section focuses on the first set of barriers—those that affect low-income families in general: parents’ lack of knowledge about programs; unaffordability; challenging eligibility and enrollment processes; insufficient supply and capacity; and inconvenient locations, hours, and schedules. We begin by describing the economic context that shapes ECE provision and family decisionmaking in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. We then discuss each barrier in turn, focusing on perspectives shared across stakeholders while illuminating any differences across counties, immigrant subgroups, program types, or other factors that emerged from our interviews.

Although we present each barrier separately, they often operate simultaneously and likely interact to shape the low participation patterns found in our companion report. In turn, interactions between and among barriers can compound the difficulties facing low-income immigrant families. Stakeholders interested in strategies to support preschool enrollment and attendance should be aware of this context.

BOX 2

What Is Higher-Quality Early Care and Education?

Early care and education quality is a topic of wide debate and little consensus across communities of research, policy, and practice. Throughout both our interviews with stakeholders and this report, we define higher-quality early care and education broadly, as center-based programs meeting standards higher than state licensing, with Head Start, California State Preschool, and accredited private programs as examples. We adopt this definition for clarity and inclusiveness and acknowledge that, while the experts and stakeholders included in this study understood it, many equally valid alternatives exist.

The Unusually High Cost of Living in Silicon Valley

Silicon Valley is a place of extraordinary wealth, economic growth, and, in some areas, rapid gentrification. These forces create the economic context in which families make decisions about early care and education, with particular constraints on low-income families. As one respondent noted, “I would think that that has got to be one of the biggest problems any low-income family has now, is simply putting a roof over your head, let alone trying to get preschool.” Analyses of American Community Survey data from 2008 through 2012 corroborate this point. During that period, the cost of living in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties was more than twice the national average, largely because housing costs were more than four times higher than the US average (Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016). Increases in average wages since 2012 (Joint Venture 2015) may have driven costs of living even higher. MIT’s Living Wage Calculator estimates self-sufficiency income—the amount required by a family of four to meet the basic needs of housing, food, health care, child care, and taxes without support from public sources or private donations—to be \$30.31 an hour in San Mateo County and \$28.30 an hour in Santa Clara County in 2014.¹ These rates translate to annual pay of \$63,044 and \$58,864 in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, respectively.

Stakeholders linked cost of living to the migration of low- and middle-income families out of Silicon Valley. They listed neighboring San Benito and Santa Cruz Counties, to the south, as popular destinations for low-income immigrant families. Although stakeholders noted that rents are lower in those regions, they also noted that parents who move may be farther from their jobs and have little opportunity for local employment or higher-quality early care and education. For families who stay in Silicon Valley, the state has adjusted some social service policies to account for high costs of living. For example, California passed Assembly Bill 1326 in 2003, which secured San Mateo County’s approval to launch a countywide child care subsidy pilot in 2004–05. The pilot allows families receiving subsidies to continue receiving them until their income reaches 80 percent of the state median income (SMI); this raises the eligibility exit threshold from \$3,908 per month (70 percent of the 2005 SMI) to \$5,314 per month (80 percent of the 2010–11 SMI) for a family of four (California Department of Education 2014). Still, the threshold is well below economic self-sufficiency in San Mateo County.²

Our interviews revealed that the high cost of living and the related movement out of Silicon Valley has posed challenges for social service program participation, as well as for program finances. According to several experts, some ECE programs with income eligibility requirements have had difficulty filling classrooms because qualifying families have moved in search of affordable housing. This has resulted in uneven supply, with some programs full and reliant on waiting lists and others struggling to meet

capacity. (See our companion report [Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016] for more detail on the location of ECE settings in relation to enrollment patterns. We also discuss supply and capacity in greater detail below.) In all, Silicon Valley's changing economy has had deep implications for higher-quality preschool provision, as well as for social service delivery more broadly.

Parental Knowledge of Early Care and Education Programs

For families to participate in higher-quality early care and education, they must know the programs exist. For some low-income families, however, unfamiliarity with social service programs and early educational opportunities leaves them largely unaware of available options. This barrier may be particularly salient for low-income immigrant families, some of whose home countries may lack established investments in early care and education.³ Nearly all stakeholders agreed that immigrant families have limited knowledge about ECE options and that this is a substantial barrier to access in Silicon Valley.

Stakeholders posit that parents' limited knowledge may be related to difficulty encountering, trusting, and understanding information about ECE programs. Sources of information on providers and program quality are largely decentralized and may not be readily available. Because low-income immigrant communities may be geographically or socially isolated, their access to information can be particularly limited. Further, language and translation issues may make information unusable, particularly for parents with low levels of literacy or from smaller linguistic communities (i.e., those who speak languages other than English or Spanish). Trust also emerged as a factor in parents' openness to information about ECE. Particularly for families new to the United States, trust in local sources may be crucial for their developing knowledge of enrollment and participation.

Other stakeholders recognized the complicated nature of ECE programs, their eligibility requirements, and programmatic details. Especially for parents unfamiliar with preschool, American offerings—including multiple funding streams and program types—may be highly complex. This complexity may, in turn, pose a significant barrier for low-income families facing pressing challenges. One ECE expert described this reality in terms of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs: "Without being able to address housing and food security, health care, transportation—the parents simply aren't going to be able to prioritize and engage in early learning experiences for their children if they're dealing with much

more fundamental sorts of survival issues...They're not thinking about quality settings for the child, not because they don't want to, but because these other things are the priority."

A few stakeholders described information and knowledge varying somewhat by child and family characteristics. Specifically, newer, more isolated, and less educated immigrants, as well as parents of younger preschoolers, may be less likely to know about existing programs. Child and family characteristics may also affect families' understanding of ECE. For example, one stakeholder suggested that parents with little formal education may be unfamiliar with concepts of brain development; therefore, traditional arguments that ECE supports cognitive and social-emotional development may be confusing or unappealing. (We discuss several similar barriers to messaging and parental knowledge in the Parental Preferences for Early Care and Education section).

In addition, some respondents distinguished better-known program types from those less familiar to low-income immigrant families. (See box 3 for more information on program types available in Silicon Valley.) Several respondents suggested that among these families, Head Start and its delegate agencies was the best-known type of higher-quality early care and education. Specific facets of the Head Start model were described as key to its broader popularity. First, stakeholders noted substantial advertising, outreach, and messaging in both English and Spanish. (Conversely, one stakeholder noted substantially less outreach to other linguistic groups, even those with sizable populations.) Second, respondents suggested that Head Start locations were convenient for immigrant communities. However, availability does appear to vary across Silicon Valley. In some areas, only Head Start or only California State Preschool programs are available; in others, particularly major cities like San Jose, more choices are available. Unevenness in program location and accessibility shapes higher-quality preschool participation, especially for families unwilling or unable to leave their communities. (For maps comparing where higher-quality programs are located to where unenrolled children live, see our companion report, Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016).

Compared to Head Start and California State Preschool, subsidized child care emerged as the least-known early care and education option. At least two interviews revealed that immigrant-serving organizations in Silicon Valley do not know that subsidies are available through the California state assistance programs Alternative Payment (AP) and California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs). Said one: "You know what, that's actually information that people don't have. They don't even know that those kind of vouchers exist ...I'm totally 100 percent [sure] that a lot of people don't know that, what you just mentioned."

Strategies for Overcoming the Parental Knowledge Barrier

Stakeholders proposed several strategies for increasing parents' knowledge of higher-quality ECE programs. Although the parental knowledge barrier affects many low-income (and even higher-income) families, these strategies are tailored to the specific needs of low-income immigrant families. Some of these strategies reflect similar efforts taking place in other communities across the country, which the authors have documented in previous research. For a summary of some of the main findings, including lessons from Chicago and nationwide, see appendix B. Synthesizing these state and local perspectives yields the following possible strategies for overcoming the parental knowledge barrier in Silicon Valley:

- Improve outreach to low-income immigrant families.
 - » Work with currently participating parents to conduct outreach in their own communities, perhaps through a formally organized network or through more local efforts.
 - » Across outreach efforts, plan multiple contacts with families to maximize opportunities when they are most receptive. Connect these efforts to strategies to help parents navigate enrollment and paperwork (see the Eligibility and Enrollment section).
 - » Conduct more informational workshops and messaging campaigns via trusted community organizations, including the legal services, medical, faith, and school communities. For example, expand the use of well-placed flyers, radio and television advertisements, booths at resource and legal services fairs, and community gatherings; and enlist trusted community leaders to help get the message out to parents.
 - » Enhance translation efforts and multilingual outreach, tailoring oral and written materials to the needs and expectations of both Spanish speakers and speakers of less common languages. Ensure that all outreach materials and approaches account for low levels of formal education and literacy (see box 1).
 - » Use smartphones, mobile applications, and social media to communicate with families and allow them to review programs (as in Yelp).
 - » Conduct outreach specifically on subsidies (including AP and CalWORKs), given the lack of familiarity with subsidies as a way for low-income immigrant families to afford higher-quality preschool.
- Break down agency silos and increase interagency capacity—among early care and education organizations, and between ECE stakeholders and immigrant-serving organizations—to coordinate ECE access and participation for immigrant families.
 - » Align the efforts of agencies focused on serving low-income immigrant families with preschool-age children. Specifically, address the widely recognized problem of “fragmented

systems,” whereby ECE and other social service organizations do not coordinate on access and participation.

- » Explore collocating preschool programs and other social service agencies for ease of access, as is done in many communities nationwide.
- » Improve coordination with housing agencies, especially as affordable housing supplies shrink in Silicon Valley.

Stakeholders generated a comprehensive list of organizations and community entities that might be considered as partners in reaching parents. Health providers, including hospitals, clinics, emergency rooms, and mental health professionals, are the first institutional stops for many families with young children. In particular, public health nurses and *promotores* emerged as potentially valuable partners. One ECE expert even suggested that a pediatric pilot program offer “prescriptions for school-readiness activities.” In addition, churches, including both large Catholic and smaller Evangelical churches, are central institutions in many low-income immigrant communities and garner trust in Silicon Valley and beyond. Legal services organizations were also suggested as promising and trusted avenues for providing information on public benefits and addressing documentation and eligibility concerns; their efforts might be expanded from areas like health care to early care and education. Institutions of higher education, including community colleges, local universities, and workforce development programs, may also offer contact with parents, both directly and through broader social service delivery. Finally, some stakeholders mentioned WIC offices and infant/toddler programs (including home visiting) as ideal starting points for reaching out to families of young children.

Numerous organizations that already work on improving parents’ knowledge of ECE might complement these efforts. These organizations include neighborhood and community organizations, family resource centers, libraries, and a wide array of ECE organizations such as Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, First 5 early childhood education funding agencies, county offices of education, and elementary schools. Stakeholders in Silicon Valley, Chicago, and other communities nationwide suggest that a mix of more and less traditional organizations must coordinate to increase knowledge of early care and education among low-income immigrant families.

BOX 3

Public Early Care and Education Programs in Silicon Valley

This study focuses on higher-quality center-based preschool programs, including Head Start, California State Preschool, and accredited child care. In table B.3.1, we summarize these options in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, focusing on their eligibility and enrollment practices while highlighting aspects of the local policy context that may pose barriers to participation among low-income immigrant families.

TABLE B.3.1

Public Early Care and Education Programs in Silicon Valley

Eligibility and enrollment practices

	San Mateo County	Santa Clara County
Head Start		
Eligibility criteria	Family income at or below the federal poverty level or categorical factors (foster care involvement, CalWORKs benefits receipt, household member receiving Supplemental Security Income, homelessness); 10 percent of children may qualify based on diagnosed disabilities. For full-day services, parents must verify full-time employment (30+ hours/week) or enrollment in school or training programs.	Family income at or below the federal poverty level or categorical factors (foster care involvement, CalWORKs benefits receipt, household member receiving Supplemental Security Income, homelessness); 10 percent of children may qualify based on diagnosed disabilities. For full-day services, parents must verify full-time employment (30+ hours/week) or enrollment in school or training programs.
Language(s) of application	English and Spanish	English, Spanish, and Vietnamese
Copays or family fees	Yes, for full-day services	Yes, for full-day services
California State Preschool		
Eligibility criteria	Priority is given to children receiving Child Protective Services or at risk of abuse/neglect, regardless of income. For all other children, the eligible yearly income is \$46,896 for a family of four. Up to 10 percent of families may exceed the income ceilings by 15 percent or less. Parents choosing full-day programs face employment and educational eligibility requirements.	Priority is given to children receiving Child Protective Services or at risk of abuse/neglect, regardless of income. For all other children, the eligible yearly income is 70 percent of state median income (SMI) for a family of four. Up to 10 percent of families may exceed the income ceilings by 15 percent or less. Parents choosing full-day programs face employment and educational eligibility requirements.
Language(s) of application	Varies by program site	English and Spanish
Copays or family fees	Yes, for full-day services	Yes, for full-day services

	San Mateo County	Santa Clara County
Subsidized child care: Alternative Payment and CalWORKs		
Eligibility criteria	The San Mateo County subsidy pilot allows families to receive subsidies up to 80 percent SMI. This raises the eligibility threshold by \$1,406 per month for a family of four. CalWORKs is only available to US citizens or “lawful immigrants.”	Available to families earning \$3,908 per month or less (70 percent of the 2005 SMI for a family of four). CalWORKs is only available to US citizens or “lawful immigrants.”
Language(s) of application	English	English
Copays or family fees	Yes	Yes
Transitional Kindergarten		
Eligibility criteria	Fourth birthday between September 1 and December 2 of each school year	Fourth birthday between September 1 and December 2 of each school year
Language(s) of application	Varies by school district	Varies by school district
Copays or family fees	No	No

Program Cost and Affordability

In interview after interview, stakeholders shared that any cost of early care and education may be prohibitive for low-income families. That is, private child care (without a subsidy) is simply out of reach for low- or even middle-income parents of 3- and 4-year-old children. One immigrant expert put parents’ tenuous financial situations in context with an example of the costs of informal care: “Well, I know that in this neighborhood [in San Jose] people take \$2 an hour to take care of a child. I’ve heard \$10 a day...maybe \$20.... For the person that’s employed and paying for somebody to take care of their child, \$100 a week is still a lot of money when you make \$300 to \$400 a week.” To contextualize these figures, the 2014 Child Care Regional Market Rate Survey estimated the average weekly cost of full-time preschool care in Silicon Valley to be about \$240 in a child care center and \$214 in a licensed family child care home (California Child Care Resource & Referral Network 2015). Cost considerations explain why some families may use parental or unpaid relative care rather than either center- or home-based early care and education.

Public preschool programs or subsidies can help families deal with the cost of care, but even these may pose financial burdens—real or perceived. One stakeholder noted that many families perceive higher-quality ECE to impose tuition or hidden costs; even the idea of these costs can deter families

from gathering information and, ultimately, from program participation. Alternatively, public programs may not, in fact, be completely free. AP or CalWORKs subsidies require parent copays (though families receiving aid through Temporary Assistance for Needy Families are exempt). Families participating in full-day California State Preschool pay fees that follow the same sliding scale as child care subsidies (with programs in San Mateo County adopting the county subsidy pilot fee schedule). Those enrolled in part-day programs between 2012 and July 2014 paid similar fees following budget cuts caused by the Great Recession, but those fees have since been terminated. Noted one ECE leader: “Even nominal fees that have been added on to state preschools can be insurmountable for immigrant families.” Fees vary depending on family income and family size—for a family of four, full-time child care would range from \$42 to \$530 a month depending on the family’s income (California Department of Education 2014). Such fees, therefore, may hinder families from enrolling; families whose incomes fluctuate may cycle in and out of programs or drop out entirely. She continued: “The cost to provide quality care is simply—it is higher than families, particularly low-income immigrant families, can afford. I mean it’s higher than middle income families in [this county] can afford.”

Across several interviews, relative poverty emerged as central to the consideration of child care costs and affordability. Many families are over the eligibility threshold for public programs but still relatively poor given the extremely high cost of living in Silicon Valley. Accordingly, if families stay in San Mateo or Santa Clara Counties, they may be unable to qualify for free or low-cost programs and unable to afford private care on their own. If they relocate to counties with lower costs of living, they may have more disposable income to spend on early care and education, but may find fewer options (especially in neighboring rural areas).

Strategies for Overcoming the Cost and Affordability Barrier

Many issues around the cost of care reflect overall funding for public programs and hinge on state or federal allocations. As a result, the cost of care is not easily resolved within Silicon Valley. However, some local policy initiatives do seem promising. For example, the San Mateo County subsidy initiative and sliding scale fee payments are growing, which may help with affordability barriers. Additional fee schedule waivers, local efforts to supplement state program funding, or family fee reimbursement plans may help alleviate the high cost of living in Silicon Valley. In addition, stakeholders referenced the San Mateo County Big Lift initiative to increase the number and quality of slots in the county, as well as Santa Clara County’s Strong Start, which is also working to expand access to quality early education (box 4). According to several stakeholders, preliminary conversations have considered local ballot

measures to raise funds in the short term and free universal preschool in the longer term. Affordability barriers can also be addressed by streamlining and simplifying enrollment processes for publicly funded programs. In addition, stakeholders may work with the state to address the cost challenges that discourage parents from enrolling children in these programs.

BOX 4

New Early Care and Education Policy Initiatives: The Big Lift and Strong Start

Two new initiatives in Silicon Valley aim to transform the landscape of early care and education: the Big Lift in San Mateo County and Strong Start in Santa Clara County. The Big Lift is led by the Silicon Valley Community Foundation, the San Mateo County Office of Education, and the County of San Mateo, in partnership with dozens of county leaders and community-based organizations. This initiative aims to close the achievement gap and improve third-grade reading proficiency. Guiding pillars include adding more slots and improving the quality of existing slots. The Big Lift eligibility standard for low-income families is 80 percent of county median income, significantly higher than that of California State Preschool or Head Start. (This criterion can only be implemented in ECE programs not also subsidized with public funds.) The Big Lift was developed from 2012 through 2014 and launched in four pilot communities in 2015.

Strong Start aims to expand access to high-quality early learning opportunities for all children from birth through age 8, under the leadership of the Santa Clara County Office of Education and its partners. This initiative is considering a local tax measure to raise revenue for ECE, while leading a public information campaign throughout the county. Strong Start began with convenings in 2012 and launched its official activities in 2015.

Eligibility and Enrollment

In Silicon Valley, most low-income families who desire participation in higher-quality preschool are likely seeking enrollment in publicly funded programs such as Head Start, California State Preschool, and child care subsidies. However, stakeholders report that the volume of paperwork alone can deter families from enrolling. According to one ECE expert: “There are so many requirements that they can get overwhelmed and give up. It’s just too much.” Many ECE stakeholders shared that their organizations did not have the capacity to help immigrant parents with enrollment, but that community and neighborhood organizations may fill this role. Respondents also noted the additional barriers stemming from language and literacy challenges, especially for parents with little formal education or

those who read languages other than English, Spanish, or (in Santa Clara County) Vietnamese (see box 1 and table 2).

According to several stakeholders, though, the greatest barrier to enrollment may be proving eligibility—at both initial enrollment and redetermination periods. Specifically, stakeholders reported that some parents are unable to provide documentation that proves eligibility for Head Start, California State Preschool, and subsidy programs, which only serve children from low-income families. Several factors may complicate documentation provision: parents may find documenting self-employment to be a challenge, or they might not want to share names of undocumented or mixed-status family members. Additional requirements around reporting home address can also prove challenging, particularly for homeless or itinerant immigrants. In addition, full-day Head Start, full-day California State Preschool programs, and subsidies for private child care require additional information documenting parents' employment or enrollment in education or training programs. This, too, can be difficult to secure. Given the size of most waiting lists, one stakeholder reports, parents unable or unwilling to prove eligibility may not enroll at all.

Eligibility redetermination only compounds these challenges. One ECE stakeholder describes redetermination for California families enrolled in full-day Head Start, full-day State Preschool, and subsidy programs as follows: “It often comes with other things that make it a little more difficult—family fees, monitoring the family’s work eligibility, not just their income eligibility. There are some movements afoot, you know, at the state level, I think, to simplify that process a bit. Maybe if the family is eligible then they’re able to retain eligibility regardless of their work status—to demonstrate eligibility that they can stay for a year. They only renew that on an annual basis rather than every time something changes. We have to remember, why are we doing this? It’s about children; it’s not about the rules.” This stakeholder alluded to California requirements that full-day Head Start and State Preschool be contingent on parents’ employment, education, or training status. As a result, children may be removed from these programs if their parents are unemployed or unenrolled for 60 days. Part-day programs lack these requirements and eligibility lasts a full 12 months, but they may be substantially less convenient for working families, as we explore later in the Hours and Schedules section. In all, eligibility and enrollment may pose meaningful barriers to preschool participation in Silicon Valley.

Strategies for Overcoming the Eligibility and Enrollment Barrier

Stakeholders suggested steps that could make enrolling, and staying in, preschool programs simpler. Other localities have also focused on easing and simplifying enrollment in early care and education for

immigrant parents. Some promising strategies include public-private partnerships to provide family assistance and more flexible documentation requirements. (See appendix B for more detail, and see Adams and McDaniel [2012b] for more information about partnering with community-based organizations.) Synthesizing insights from Silicon Valley and beyond, stakeholders offered strategies for overcoming the eligibility and enrollment barrier:

- Streamlining paperwork requirements by simplifying eligibility, documentation and verification requirements (as in Adams and Matthews 2013). As one stakeholder recommended: “Just simplify the forms if possible, have bigger space to actually write in them, have better copies... I always dreamed that some of the forms would come already filled out... I wish they pre-generated.” These changes would alleviate practical barriers to preschool enrollment.
- Other stakeholders suggested developing eligibility determination processes that are more sensitive to the income and documentation challenges faced by low-income immigrant families. If higher-quality preschool programs could accept nontraditional evidence of employment, for example, more families would qualify. But, because major changes to enrollment may require state or federal action, stakeholders saw limited potential for San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties to address these barriers on their own.
- Several ECE experts suggested expanding the use of centralized eligibility lists, noting their past efficacy throughout California.
- Stakeholders in Silicon Valley and many other communities have advocated for universal preschool at the county or state levels, to circumvent eligibility determination altogether.
- Enhanced support for navigating eligibility and enrollment processes may offer a more immediate strategy for overcoming barriers related to preschool participation. Respondents had a range of suggestions here, including support for existing organizations that facilitate program enrollment, such as neighborhood and community organizations, family resource centers, child care councils, and other ECE organizations. Increasing the staff and resources dedicated to navigating these processes could be helpful. Churches, health care providers, and legal services organizations may provide support as well.

In addition to these strategies, the federal Child Care and Development Fund, which finances the state subsidized child care program, was reauthorized in 2014. The new law requires states to establish 12-month eligibility redetermination periods for child care subsidies and encourages states to create family-friendly enrollment redetermination processes. These changes could simplify subsidy access and

retention, while improving eligibility and enrollment processes for other higher-quality preschool programs.

In all, stakeholders suggested that a coordinated effort across multiple service sectors would be most effective at reaching low-income immigrant families and guiding them to successful enrollment in higher-quality ECE programs.

Supply and Capacity

Across Silicon Valley, low-income communities appear to have fewer high-quality ECE options than higher-income communities (Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016). Because of the cost and knowledge barriers described earlier in this report, respondents suggested that many families focus their search on Head Start and California State Preschool. Nearly all stakeholders agreed that the supply of these programs is insufficient to meet demand—but also that supply and demand are unevenly matched given recent mobility among low-income communities. On the first point, several stakeholders noted that Head Start has lost capacity, as well as subsidy program slots, due to a combination of programmatic and other factors. Even where supply is sufficient, one stakeholder said, perception can matter more than reality: “Even if there are open spaces, the perception is that there’s not. Because there’s—they’re scattered throughout the county, first of all, they’re not very large facilities, and there’s a lot of low income... the need is so much greater than the possibilities that exist. Perception is one thing: ‘there’s not enough spaces for my child, anyways’.”

Some experts shared a more localized picture of uneven supply and capacity shaped by the high cost of living in Silicon Valley. (See the maps in Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016 for additional geographic detail.) Specifically, stakeholders explained that uneven supply had led to waiting lists in some regions and unfilled slots in others. Shared one ECE expert: “If you’re talking about programs that have state or federal funding to support low-income families, then I think that depends in part on the individual contractor. We see that in some communities there are very long waiting lists. In other communities other factors might be at play, like, cost of housing in that neighborhood has skyrocketed so families have moved out, and they have a contract and are struggling to enroll.” Compounding these challenges is the localized usage of early care and education. Several interviews revealed that—as is true for many families across the country—low-income immigrant families may be unable or unwilling to attend programs outside their immediate communities, a phenomenon on which we elaborate later in this report.

Respondents suggested that programs have adapted to these circumstances by trying to fill their slots through policy changes. One respondent mentioned the conversion of Head Start slots to Early Head Start in Santa Clara County, given difficulty finding enough income-eligible Head Start children to fill classrooms. Another respondent noted that California State Preschool in San Mateo County was able to swap slots among programs, thereby resolving unevenness in participation across the county.

The long-term implications of residential mobility and population change may not be resolved by these small-scale policy changes, however. Several experts described the lack of facilities appropriate for early care and education in Silicon Valley—and the even-smaller number of facilities affordable to potential providers. Low reimbursement rates relative to facilities costs may lead some providers to turn down public expansion funds or serve fewer low-income families subsidized through public programs, further limiting supply. In fact, respondents suggested that public school buildings may be one of the only viable settings for expanded capacity in either county. Similarly, stakeholders noted the dwindling population of qualified teachers who could afford to live in the area. Here, the high cost of living poses serious challenges for staffing and maintaining higher-quality programs. With housing costs showing no signs of stabilizing, insufficient and uneven supply may remain barriers to enrollment for low-income families for the foreseeable future.

Strategies for Overcoming the Supply and Capacity Barrier

Increasing the supply of higher-quality early care and education entails both short- and long-term investments in infrastructure, materials, and staff, as well as the coordination of federal, state, and local resources. Several ideas have emerged from Silicon Valley and from past research in other areas of the country (see appendix B):

- A strategy to track recent patterns of residential mobility throughout Silicon Valley, develop forecasting models to predict the changing economic composition of San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, and document more- or less-stable areas.
- Findings about low-income families' mobility suggest that a deeper assessment of areas with supply shortages, versus areas with sufficient supply, could be useful. This assessment, along with information about how many families are moving out of particular areas, could inform supply-building strategies.
- Infrastructure could be provided to expand higher-quality preschool options in stable communities with limited supply. For example, funding could be made available to qualified

providers searching for facilities in low-income immigrant communities, or to partnerships among local organizations that can provide rent-free space. Collocation with existing social service programs may be particularly promising. Or, as in several states and cities nationwide, higher-quality preschool programs may be integrated with K–12 education and funded through local and state taxes, bonds, and other instruments.

- Another strategy could be to review ECE teacher preparation programs in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, to assess how scholarships or other incentives may increase the supply of well-trained instructional staff, especially staff able to meet the needs of immigrant families and children.

As mentioned above, public elementary schools may be promising partners for increasing the supply of higher-quality preschool in Silicon Valley. Churches and community organizations with available space may be appropriate partners as well. One respondent mentioned that in 2016, San Mateo County launched an early learning facilities task force to develop a local community infrastructure focused on developing and financing ECE facilities. Together, investments in facilities and teachers—particularly in areas with waiting lists—may help low-income immigrant families overcome existing supply and capacity barriers to enrolling in higher-quality early care and education.

Location and Transportation

Silicon Valley is a geographically large suburban region. It contains both concentrated population centers and isolated rural areas. San Mateo County is divided by the Santa Cruz Mountains, which run the length of the county from north to south, while southern Santa Clara County is predominantly farmland. As is typical in California, public transportation is limited and traffic poses substantial challenges. According to numerous stakeholders, these counties' size and lack of transportation options pose substantial barriers to enrollment and regular attendance.

Stakeholders noted that most families want their children to attend preschool close to where they live, rather than where they work. For many families, programs must be walkable. While 81 percent of low-income immigrant families in Silicon Valley have cars,⁴ experts suggested that men often use the cars to get to work. Thus, many immigrant women do not have access to a car, and many do not drive at all. As a result, families may be unable to enroll in higher-quality preschool programs outside their neighborhoods—even if the programs are nearby. Long travel times pose a special barrier to

participation in half-day programs: commutes may take up much of the program day, providing significant disincentives to participation.

With these considerations in mind, most stakeholders suggested that, while supply is generally insufficient, existing programs are well located for low-income immigrant families who can access them. Further, families may be familiar with program facilities near elementary schools or other social services. Challenges arise when local programs are full and spaces are only available in neighboring communities, or when families live outside dense, low-income enclaves in underserved areas. For these families, program location and transportation can pose meaningful barriers to enrollment and continued participation in higher-quality early care and education. Future research directly with parents would help expand and refine these insights from experts and stakeholders.

Strategies for Overcoming the Location and Transportation Barrier

For low-income immigrant families who do not live close to higher-quality preschools with available openings, stakeholders questioned how expanded investments in transportation and infrastructure might increase enrollment and participation. This has been a topic of serious consideration in Head Start and state preschool programs around the country (see appendix B), resulting in several suggestions:

- Public school buses or other transportation can help take children to and from preschool. Given that buses are a central part of Head Start operating budgets in some rural areas, representatives from both ECE and immigrant-serving organizations suggested they may be of use in Silicon Valley. In addition, school district-funded transportation options may be expanded to serve preschool-age children. Stakeholders, however, found considerations of broader transportation improvements infeasible given fiscal and political constraints.
- Stakeholders also recommended ECE providers choose locations for any new programs with low-income immigrant communities in mind. Strategic expansion may remedy some location and transportation barriers, especially if walkability is a goal.

Strategies that address multiple logistical barriers to participation are key to enhancing participation in higher-quality preschool among low-income immigrant families.

Hours and Schedules

In Silicon Valley, respondents identified two issues around program hours and schedules. First, most stakeholders identified an insufficient supply of ECE programs offering nontraditional and flexible hours. This need mirrors national patterns in which more than 90 percent of ECE centers are only open standard hours (7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.; Greenberg, Healy, and Derrick-Mills forthcoming). The need for nonstandard hours of care may be particularly acute among low-income immigrant parents—a substantial share have work schedules that do not run from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., or are not predictable from week to week (Enchautegui 2013; Enchautegui, Johnson, and Gelatt 2015). Flexibility, in particular, arose as a key factor in explaining some parents' use of informal or relative care: whereas home-based providers might adapt to changing work schedules, accept children in pajamas on early mornings, or forgive parents caught in evening traffic, center-based programs may have stricter standards and less accommodating staff. Inflexibility in hours and schedules then poses a major barrier to low-income immigrant families seeking to enroll their 3- and 4-year-olds in higher-quality preschool.

Second, stakeholders in both ECE and immigrant-serving organizations discussed how well part-day programs met the needs of immigrant families. There are two ways of looking at this question.

First, do part-day programs work for immigrant parents given their schedules and need for care? The experts we interviewed suggested that the answer hinges on family structure. For children with one parent at home full time, half-day programs may be sufficient. These children make up roughly half of all low-income children in Silicon Valley (from birth to age 5, 54 percent of those from low-income families and 58 percent of those from low-income immigrant families; Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016). However, for single-parent families or those with both parents working, it is difficult to assess whether current program hours and schedules meet demand. For example, full-day Head Start and California State Preschool programs have parental employment and school or training requirements; it is unclear whether all families interested in those programs actually submit applications, or whether some are deterred by eligibility and enrollment barriers. Accordingly, when stakeholders reported insufficient demand for full-day care—in some cases leading to the conversion of full- to half-day spaces—they were careful to note that perceived demand may not reflect the needs of working families, but instead the challenges families have trying to access services.

Second, do part-day programs maximize learning opportunities for children? A different way of examining this question is to look at whether part-day preschool programs are the right approach to supporting child development and school readiness. The answer is, a fairly robust body of literature demonstrates that full-day programs (i.e., a full school day) produce greater impacts on math and

reading outcomes than do part-day programs, though the evidence is mixed regarding effects on social-emotional development. (See, for example, Lee et al. 2006; Loeb et al. 2007; Reynolds et al. 2014; and Robin, Frede, and Barnett 2006.)

Several stakeholders did note movements to expand the hours of care per day and to provide wraparound services (often funded by subsidies). In particular, the Big Lift initiative in San Mateo County maintains this goal (see box 4). Two stakeholders also noted an exception to the need for longer and more convenient hours and more flexible schedules: the coastal areas of San Mateo County. There, experts reported that families were able to access full-day care plus five weeks of summer school through new initiatives. Accordingly, hours and schedules may pose barriers for some but not all low-income immigrant families in Silicon Valley.

Strategies for Overcoming the Hours and Schedules Barrier

For families whose needs are not met by the hours and schedules of existing care options, stakeholders have few recommendations beyond additional investments. Some possibilities, however, include the following:

- One approach would be to replicate efforts under way in the coastal areas of San Mateo County and see whether they can work in other parts of Silicon Valley. These efforts involve coordination across public agencies and nonprofit organizations, investments of private foundation resources, and the identification of high-quality available program space and staff able to work flexible hours.
- Another approach is to centralize eligibility determination across programs, which could qualify children for support from multiple funding streams and link them to a package of supports that work for their needs and eligibility. As noted above, eligibility and enrollment should be conducted in ways sensitive to the needs of low-income immigrant families.
- Another strategy noted nationwide is braided funding. For example, AP and CalWORKs subsidies might fund before- and aftercare delivered at the same sites as Head Start and California State Preschool, giving families access to higher-quality, full-day, flexible care in safe, comfortable places. Greater coordination among programs and funding streams may therefore best support children's growth and development while serving the needs of working families. This approach is taken by the District of Columbia and elsewhere, by combining Head Start, prekindergarten, and before- and aftercare subsidy funding. See appendix B for additional insights from beyond Silicon Valley.

- Nontraditional-hour care is particularly challenging, given that so few centers are willing to open during these times. As a result, efforts to expand access to care during nontraditional hours may need to rely upon family child care or care by family, friends, and neighbors. Such efforts should ensure that children also have access to high-quality early education settings during traditional hours, given that high-quality care is less available during evening, weekend, and overnight hours (Adams and Katz 2015).

Additional Barriers to Participation for Low-Income *Immigrant* Families

While the barriers to higher-quality preschool participation described in the preceding section affect all low-income families, respondents described other barriers felt by low-income immigrant families alone. These barriers include unfamiliarity with or distrust of government institutions, what respondents perceived as parental preferences shaped by culture, and the cultural or linguistic sensitivity of some existing programs. We discuss each barrier in turn, describing differences between immigrant subgroups, program types, and other factors central to program participation. In doing so, we note that stakeholders' understandings of immigrant-specific barriers rely on definitions of "immigrant" that vary widely, and that many found it difficult to generalize across all low-income immigrant families. We also note, as above, that families may experience multiple barriers at the same time, and that these barriers can produce compounding effects on access and participation. Nevertheless, interviews revealed common recognition of these barriers—to different degrees and in different contexts—across Silicon Valley.

Distrust of Government Institutions

Fear and distrust of government institutions emerged as a key theme in several interviews. Both direct questioning and follow-up on respondents' pregnant pauses led to in-depth discussion of documentation issues. Stakeholders explained that distrust of government institutions may affect undocumented and mixed-status families alike. While most early education programs in Silicon Valley are available to families regardless of parents' documentation status, parents who do not have legal documents to be in the United States may fear interaction with public agencies, and even those here legally may be concerned about jeopardizing undocumented family members or friends (Gelatt and Koball 2014; Matthews and Jang 2007). Concerns can include fears of deportation and the possibility of endangering future citizenship.

Stakeholders described overt and nuanced ways in which distrust might pose a barrier to participation in public ECE programs or keep families from taking advantage of financial assistance through public subsidies.

First, families may fear being on government lists or believe that receiving any government services will render them a "public charge," negatively affecting later attempts to gain legal status. Stakeholders

suggested that these fears were particularly pronounced for AP and CalWORKs subsidies. Parents may place greater trust in Head Start and California State Preschool, because they do not necessarily realize these programs are publicly funded or think about their funding mechanisms the same way. In fact, receipt of CalWORKs and other cash subsidies may affect legal status, but only in limited circumstances (e.g., when CalWORKs is a family's only source of income at the time of application for citizenship or it appears likely that the family will rely on government case assistance in the future; see Human Services Agency of San Francisco 2010). Otherwise, receipt of noncash public benefits does not affect legal status.⁵ As a result, while fear of preschool enrollment may be common among some undocumented or mixed-status families, better information from trusted sources may likely be able to help overcome this barrier. Second, means testing may cause concern among families who are uncertain they have the proper documentation to enroll in public preschool programs. Some may be unwilling or unable to show alternate forms of documentation or income.

Third, low-income immigrant parents may want to volunteer in preschool classrooms, but the formal requirements, combined with distrust of public institutions, may deter them from doing so. Specifically, some schools and programs require fingerprints or background checks for adults who work in preschool classrooms, even if their work is unpaid. These requirements pose a direct barrier to enrollment for families who fear being entered into government databases.

Of course, the changing nature of US immigration and naturalization policy largely determines how low-income immigrant families relate to government institutions. For example, according to one stakeholder, recent federal immigration policy changes (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals and Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents)⁶ may have enhanced feelings of fear and uncertainty rather than ameliorated them. As the implementation and scope of these policies remains in flux, families may feel less secure than ever—unsure of when and how they can come out of the shadows, and whether doing so may ultimately have negative consequences.

Against this backdrop, however, some immigrant experts noted that Silicon Valley is unique when compared to other areas of the United States. For example, respondents reported that leaders in both San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties voiced objections to the federal Secure Communities program⁷ “so there's not as much fear over putting your name on a piece of paper, writing down your address,” said one immigrant expert. “This county feels relatively safe for the undocumented community, so we do have an immigrant-family-friendly community. So I think that has kind of helped set the tone here and in San Francisco, it feels a little different than in other places.” In addition, California passed Assembly Bill 60 in 2013, allowing undocumented immigrants to obtain drivers' licenses. Together, these political and

legal actions shape a context in which additional outreach and clarification of eligibility may somewhat reduce distrust of government institutions and its effect on enrollment in early care and education.

Strategies for Overcoming the Distrust of Government Institutions Barrier

Based on recommendations from Silicon Valley and several other communities nationwide (see appendix B), increasing trust in government institutions will likely involve outreach by individuals and organizations low-income immigrant families already trust.

- Formal and informal networks of parents already participating in higher-quality early care and education, who may be uniquely suited to reach out to immigrant communities and ease the fears of parents whose children are not yet enrolled.
- Legal services providers, if trained on the details of ECE programs, may be well positioned to talk with families about the policies and requirements of federal, state, and local ECE programs and how they relate to current and future documentation status.
- Medical providers, churches, and secular community organizations, too, may be ideal venues for helping address low-income immigrant families' distrust of public institutions.

By providing a supportive referral to agencies better positioned to guide families through preschool eligibility and enrollment, these organizations may be able to help overcome distrust of government institutions. Greater trust will help all families take advantage of higher-quality early care and education for 3- and 4-year-old children.

In addition, ECE institutions can take steps to build trust. For example, removing Social Security numbers from applications and other paperwork can help maintain families' trust as their children begin preschool. Institutions can also work to build sensitivity to the needs and fears of undocumented and mixed-status families—during both initial contact and ongoing service delivery—and can thereby mitigate distrust of government institutions.

Parental Preferences for Early Care and Education

Stakeholder interviews revealed a mix of perspectives on whether the affordable, higher-quality preschool options in Silicon Valley—Head Start, California State Preschool, subsidized child care, and

transitional kindergarten—appealed to low-income immigrant families. On one hand, experts in early care and education generally found that immigrant parents’ preferences and values did not pose a barrier to preschool participation. Instead, their experiences with immigrant parents who knew their options suggested that cost, logistical barriers, low program quality, and insufficient cultural sensitivities arose as more common reasons for families’ inability or unwillingness to participate. On the other hand, we heard different perspectives from stakeholders in immigrant-serving and broad social service organizations.

Representatives from immigrant-serving organizations emphasized that parents may not always understand what early care and education entails. For example, parents from countries without established public preschool systems may be unfamiliar with the nature and content of American early care and education. One representative from an immigrant-serving organization (herself an immigrant) described the problem of using the Spanish verb *educar* when referring to 3- and 4-year-old children: “You’re not really speaking to the benefits of that early education, because from the very beginning you’re turning parents off, because you’re saying, ‘educate’ your child. In Spanish [*educar* signifies], ‘you need to teach your child manners early on,’ which is great but at the same time it’s making it seem like parents aren’t making sure their kids are learning manners...We’ve started to really explain what education in this case really means. It doesn’t necessarily mean teaching the child manners. It’s more the ABCs, colors, letters—a very different message.” Although we did not hear this perspective from other stakeholders, it does suggest that translation challenges, messaging, and parents’ established knowledge of early care and education could be barriers to enrollment.

A few experts also suggested that some immigrant families may prefer home-based care, specifically relative care or, where possible, maternal care. One expert shared her perspective as a member of the immigrant community: “In the Latino population you have extended family or—and we have a lot of grandparents or aunties taking care of kids even when parents are working. So they could have the option of putting them in programs but they don’t because they’d rather have them be taken care of by someone who naturally loves them because they’re family.” Family members’ “natural love” for young children has implications for ECE teachers: “I think there’s a lot of reservations around leaving children with strangers,” said one stakeholder, summarizing a sentiment we heard from others as well. A growing body of literature finds this sentiment is neither the sole nor the most important motivating factor for most low-income immigrant families. But, evidence suggests it may play a role in some families’ ECE choices—though likely a much smaller role than economic considerations or adjudged preschool quality (Hernandez, Denton, and Macartney 2011; Karoly and Gonzalez 2011; Valencia, Pérez, and Echeveste and Tomás Rivera Policy Institute 2006; Zucker, Howes, and Garza-Mourino

2007). In addition, it is worth exploring whether these sentiments are stronger among parents of younger children, which may help explain the particularly low enrollment rates of low-income 3-year-olds in Silicon Valley.

Self-reliance came up several times during discussions of parental preferences. Respondents mentioned that some immigrant families may prefer to take care of their children themselves, either because trusting ECE programs and teaching staff with young children brought up safety concerns or because of broader distrust of government institutions. For other families, respondents explained, accepting public funds and public support through participation in higher-quality early care and education may conflict with values surrounding economic self-sufficiency. For these and other reasons, stakeholders suggested that some low-income immigrant families may prefer parental or family care over “dependence” on public options. Likewise, our companion report (Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016) suggests that many families are able to act on preferences for relative care because they include a stay-at-home parent.

Another issue raised by some respondents was that immigrant parents who had left children in their home countries may face particular challenges putting young children in nonparental care. For these parents, preschool may conflict with their desire for “more connection to these other children ...[they]...have in this country.” Continued one expert from an immigrant-serving organization: “I don’t know what percentage of the population that really effects, but I know there’s a little bit of that and that stems from values, personal experience, feeling like you abandoned children at home and not wanting to do the same thing here.”

Interviews suggested some variation in preschool preferences by program type, child age, and immigrant subgroup. Specifically, one stakeholder noted, parents value school readiness when considering higher-quality early care and education: “I think [California State] Preschool is more academic than Head Start and that’s what parents look for, more like—[they] think Head Start is more for art.” She described low-income immigrant parents perceiving traditional art projects like dried noodle necklaces as less valuable than early math and literacy activities, even though art projects may have hidden pedagogical purpose. This perception may resonate among some native-born low-income parents (and among middle- and higher-income families as well).

Stakeholders mentioned several additional factors that shaped parents’ preferences. For example, several stakeholders noted that parents may consider 3-year-olds too young for formal care, regardless of program orientation. A few stakeholders suggested that different immigrant subgroups had different goals for their children, and therefore different preferences for preschool. These differences may have

implications for outreach in early care and education, as well as education more broadly, and warrant further exploration.

Strategies for Overcoming the Parental Preferences Barrier

As with strategies for overcoming distrust of government institutions, trust is a crucial first step for reaching families who use informal care or who are reluctant to accept government support through public ECE programs. Parent networks, medical and legal providers, churches, and community organizations are well suited to convey messages about the importance of early care and education tailored to the linguistic needs and values of low-income immigrant families. Established ECE organizations can do this work, too, with outreach informed by experts in low-income immigrant communities, community leaders, and parents themselves. Together, outreach and enhanced exposure to higher-quality preschool programs, along with improved program capacity and affordability, are likely to make these programs more appealing to all families.

Cultural and Linguistic Sensitivity

Low-income immigrant families face barriers to preschool access shaped by the diverse demographic composition of Silicon Valley. More than half of low-income children in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties have parents who come from Mexico or Central America, while roughly one in five have parents from smaller immigrant subgroups. Stakeholders noted communities from Samoa, Tonga, Vietnam, South and Central Asia, China, the Philippines, Indonesia, Iran, East Africa and the Sudan (including small refugee populations), Eastern Europe, and the Balkans. Table 1 shows findings from our companion report (Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016) on families' countries of origin.

TABLE 1

Country or Region of Origin for Parents of Low-Income Children Ages 5 and Younger in Silicon Valley by County (percent)

	San Mateo	Santa Clara
United States	25.9	31.5
Latin America		
Mexico	48.5	43.5
Central America	9.2	4.5
South America	1.3	1.0
Southeast Asia		
Vietnam	0.2	7.9
Philippines	4.1	2.2
Other Southeast Asia	1.0	0.7
East Asia and Pacific	3.6	3.3
Middle East and South Asia	3.8	2.9
Africa and West Indies	0.2	1.1
Europe, Canada, and Australia	2.3	1.5

Source: Analyses of US Census Bureau, American Community Survey 2008–12, in Hanson, Adams, and Koball (2016).

Our companion study also showed that many low-income children in Silicon Valley come from families with language barriers. Specifically, 60 percent of low-income children living in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties have at least one parent with limited English proficiency (LEP). Across the two counties, almost half (49 percent) have only LEP parents and more than a third (37 percent) are linguistically isolated—meaning that all individuals 14 or older in the household are LEP. Further, while many LEP families in these counties speak Spanish, between 17 and 26 percent speak other languages (see table 2). These findings have implications for outreach and enrollment efforts, as well as for programs’ cultural and linguistic sensitivity.

TABLE 2

Primary Language Spoken by Limited English Proficient Parents of Low-Income Children Ages 5 and Younger in Silicon Valley by County (percent)

	San Mateo	Santa Clara
Spanish	83.1	73.5
Vietnamese	0.0	11.1
Chinese	2.1	2.3
Hindi and related	1.5	1.2
Filipino, Tagalog	1.3	1.1
Other	5.1	5.8
Missing	6.7	4.9

Source: Analyses of US Census Bureau, American Community Survey 2008–12, in Hanson, Adams, and Koball (2016).

During our interviews, one ECE expert described her county as “amazingly rich and beautifully diverse,” and many stakeholders shared this pride in serving multinational communities. Nevertheless, outreach and engagement efforts in Silicon Valley face unique linguistic challenges in reaching all families. While there were a few exceptions (discussed more below), many respondents believed that larger cultural and linguistic subgroups are more likely to encounter language-appropriate outreach and culturally sensitive programming, while programs are less welcoming to smaller immigrant subgroups. For example, interviews suggested that Spanish-speaking immigrant families are more likely to encounter Spanish language outreach, and that Spanish-speaking children are more likely to have bilingual teachers than children speaking other languages. Likewise, several organizations in Silicon Valley are run by and for the Latino community (e.g., Somos Mayfair, Grail Family Services, Puente de la Costa Sur). In Santa Clara County, at least some outreach and parental engagement occurs in Vietnamese, given the size and high concentration of Vietnamese immigrant families in San Jose. But generally, across Silicon Valley, respondents suggested that smaller language communities can encounter major barriers to communication. These communities may also lack advocacy, legal, and social services organizations akin to those serving Latino families.

Of course, families in smaller cultural and linguistic subgroups may not expect ECE programs to meet their needs fully. Even the best intentioned program staff may be unable to do so. Noted one stakeholder:

I think we’re doing better and better with our Spanish-speaking teachers. We’re not really meeting the needs when it comes to other languages and cultures. It gets much more challenging and trickier and not as representative on staff. However, we also talk about, when we do trainings, about the fact that it’s not realistic to expect that all languages and cultural groups will be represented in the classroom, but there are numerous strategies we can institute and support teachers with. They’ll stay engaged with the children and families even when there are barriers. It’s really about the intention and commitment to building those relationships even when there is a language barrier.

Several other ECE experts echoed this commitment to cultural and linguistic sensitivity despite obstacles to connecting with all families.

Only a few stakeholders suggested that programs were insensitive to low-income immigrant families. Two interviews revealed specific episodes of insensitive service provision in communities with few immigrant or linguistic-minority families. (See the maps in Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016 for additional geographic detail.) Stakeholders noted that even Spanish-speaking children and parents in English-dominant communities might encounter challenges to preschool enrollment and participation. These might range from communication barriers with teaching staff to outright threats involving immigration status and naturalization. Further, although programs across Silicon Valley were largely reported to be welcoming, one ECE expert stated that they may not go beyond surface-level acknowledgments of holidays or other aspects of culture. In addition, as mentioned above, programs may not be as welcoming to parents as they desire, given institutional requirements related to safety and security (such as fingerprint requirements).

Despite these areas of concern, several stakeholders noted that preschool providers had progressed in attracting bilingual, bicultural teaching staff, translators, and administrators who could effectively reach out to immigrant communities. Programs partnering with adult literacy or wraparound social service efforts were noted to be especially sensitive and inclusive. Stakeholders also noted the rise of bilingual education efforts and the growing embrace of Spanish literacy initiatives. Interviews revealed some variation by program type. For example, Head Start offers staff professional development time to facilitate cultural and linguistic sensitivity; Head Start programs also involve families through formalized policy councils and parent committees. In contrast, one stakeholder stated that California State Preschool has no funding for professional development, posing a significant structural barrier to participation; as a result, teachers must use their evenings and weekends to engage in training and technical assistance. Moreover, while State Preschool programs conduct parent-teacher conferences, they do not have rigorous parent engagement requirements. Several stakeholders linked Head Start's popularity among low-income families directly to its engagement strategies and sensitivity, noting that Head Start offered a model for other higher-quality ECE programs.

As noted earlier, however, our study did not allow us to do focus groups or interviews with immigrant parents. As a result, we are not able to confirm whether the perspectives identified here reflect the experiences of immigrant families in Silicon Valley.

Strategies for Overcoming the Cultural and Linguistic Sensitivity Barrier

Increasing programs' cultural and linguistic sensitivity requires investments of resources and time.

Experts in Silicon Valley and beyond suggest a wide array of strategies for targeting these investments.

- Offer staff professional development opportunities, and compensate them for taking advantage. Explicitly prioritize more welcoming approaches in longer-term recruitment and hiring practices for both instructional staff and program administrators.
- Develop outreach efforts in several languages, and with linguistically and culturally sensitive messaging. These efforts would benefit from tailoring to local populations; depending on the area of Silicon Valley, families may be homogenous in language and culture or highly heterogeneous. (See the maps in Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016 for additional geographic detail.)
- Practice sensitivity during outreach and initial preschool participation, and support continued family engagement.
 - » Specifically, experts recommended that all ECE programs, including private programs funded with child care subsidies, hire dedicated community and family engagement specialists. (This strategy has been employed in other communities; see Adams and McDaniel 2012b for more information.)
 - » Classroom teaching staff can also welcome interested parents by offering meaningful classroom volunteer roles. Adopting clearance processes more friendly to immigrant parents could create positive feedback loops by which ECE staff and administrators grow in sensitivity and responsiveness. (See appendix B for more information on strategies for engaging immigrant parents derived from research in other areas of the country.)

Finally, some respondents shared their concerns about the challenges facing low-income parents of children with special needs and their limited understanding of services guaranteed under equal protection policies. As one legal services expert shared, "I feel like a lot of families also didn't know that they could challenge or ask for things in addition to what they were told they could get. They might not know they can ask for accommodations or services; they felt like what the district told them is all they could get. They didn't really understand their right in challenging the system, or felt like they had the ability to do that." While these respondents were not speaking directly to the cultural and linguistic needs of immigrant families, their concerns are worth mentioning. This underscores that higher-quality preschool programs must make extra investments to meet the needs of all children of low-income immigrant families, including those with special needs.

Conclusion

In this study, we identify a wide array of barriers to participation in higher-quality early care and education among low-income families in Silicon Valley. Some barriers are common among lower-income families in general, including limited parental knowledge of options, unaffordable costs, complicated eligibility and enrollment processes, insufficient and uneven supply and capacity, transportation challenges, and inflexible hours and schedules. Other barriers affect low-income immigrant families in particular, such as distrust of government institutions, alternate parental preferences and values, and culturally and linguistically insensitive programming. These barriers often operate simultaneously and interact to compound the challenges low-income immigrant families face.

In addition to identifying these barriers, our study respondents from early care and education and immigrant-serving organizations generated a comprehensive set of strategies to make programs more appealing, responsive, and attainable for all low-income families—and for low-income immigrant families in particular. Both the barriers and the strategies for overcoming them vary to some degree across program types, funding streams, immigrant subgroups, and child and family characteristics. However, a theme is emerging from across the strategies: efforts to support preschool enrollment among low-income immigrant families will benefit from a wide variety of partners, such as health providers, churches, legal services organizations, WIC offices, food banks, neighborhood and community organizations, family resource centers, libraries, institutions of higher education, workforce development programs, and the rich set of ECE organizations that already serve many families with young children.

Together, this report and our companion study (Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016) are designed to shed light on preschool participation among low-income immigrant families in Silicon Valley—as well as many communities in the United States facing rapid demographic change. The complex, interacting barriers faced by low-income immigrant parents suggest that efforts to address these problems must be multifaceted and involve a range of partners. With careful attention to local context and strategies generated by experts, such efforts could expand access and participation in higher-quality early learning opportunities, giving all children from low-income immigrant families the opportunity for a strong start in life.

Appendix A. Study Methodology

This study draws on three main sources of data. First, we analyze transcripts from two stakeholder convenings held in Silicon Valley in December 2014. The first convening included 13 experts from public and private nonprofit ECE organizations. The second included nine experts from immigrant-serving social service organizations. The convenings served as an opportunity to share preliminary findings from the companion report to this study (Hanson, Adams, and Koball 2016) and discuss key issues around preschool participation for low-income immigrant families in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.

Second, we analyze data from 16 semistructured interviews with 23 experts and stakeholders from ECE and immigrant-serving organizations throughout Silicon Valley. Six organizations were based in San Mateo County, while nine were based in Santa Clara County; one organization conducted relevant activities in both counties. The final sample included representatives from the public and private not-for-profit sectors; foundation, policy, legal advocacy, and direct service; and both Silicon Valley-specific organizations and local chapters of larger state or national organizations.

In partnership with the Heising-Simons Foundation, the research team used purposive sampling to select an initial interview group of 11 organizations with broad expertise in early care and education and with young children of low-income immigrant families. These interviews were conducted between May 22 and July 9, 2015. Initial interviews yielded an additional snowball sample: five organizations or individuals with related and complementary expertise were recommended. The second round of interviews was conducted between July 15 and August 28, 2015. All interviews the research team requested were completed within one month of initial outreach.

Each hour-long interview was conducted by telephone. Between one and three senior researchers led the interviews, with researchers matched to participating organizations based on expertise (early care and education or immigration). Interviews were guided by standard protocols, developed by the research team based on past experience in Silicon Valley and other areas with large immigrant populations (Adams and McDaniel 2012a; Gelatt, Adams, and Huerta 2014). Protocols began with a broad overview of the study and informed consent procedures. Researchers then proceeded through nine main questions, each with subquestions and points for probing, to gauge both broad and deep perspectives on barriers to higher-quality preschool participation for low-income immigrant families, as well as the strategies and opportunities for overcoming these barriers. In addition, researchers responded flexibly to interview participants' insights, often reordering the protocol, requesting clarification, or eliciting additional information. Accordingly, interviews were semistructured to best

and most efficiently use stakeholders' expertise. One junior researcher took verbatim notes on all interviews, which were cleaned after the calls. All notes were reviewed by senior researchers for fidelity and clarification of organizational and place names.

Our third and final source of data was a review of research studies and administrative reports relevant to our key research questions. Topics ranged from parents' perspectives on early care and education in Silicon Valley (Diaz et al. 2014) to recent county child care needs assessments (San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council 2010; Santa Clara County Office of Education 2013). We also reviewed administering agency websites, planning documents for new policy initiatives, and enrollment materials to understand the detailed eligibility, enrollment, and capacity issues referenced during convenings and interviews.

Data from all three sources were analyzed using NVivo 10 (QSR International, Inc.), a qualitative software program designed to help manage, structure, and analyze qualitative data through functions that support the classification, sorting, and comparing of text units. We imported all cleaned transcripts into NVivo, along with companion research studies and administrative reports, and coded all documents using an iteratively developed coding scheme matched to the protocols. When necessary, we reshaped or added codes to capture emergent themes in the interview data. In addition, many passages were classified under multiple codes to signify their relevance to more than one theme.

We then exported all coded notes by code for analysis. Senior researchers reviewed each code, tabulating responses and synthesizing shared perspectives and insights while identifying contextual factors specific to each county. The research team created an outline based on these analyses and discussed this outline both internally and with authors of our companion report (including Hanson and Koball). Their questions, points for clarification, and initial reactions guided the refinement of the draft outline and the preparation of this report. Experts both within and outside our study team shared insights on the initial version, spurring additional discussion and improvements.

One limitation of this study is that it does not systematically reflect the perspectives of low-income immigrant families. While a few ECE and immigrant stakeholders in our interview sample were, or had been, low-income immigrant parents of young children, most of our data reflect experiences in service delivery and policy. As a result, all findings represent the insights of stakeholders and experts. Companion work with parents (building on Diaz et al. 2014) remains an important area for future research.

Appendix B. Strategies from Prior Research

Many of this report's strategies for increasing preschool access among low-income immigrant children reflect ideas and efforts similar to those taking place in other communities. For example, Gelatt, Adams, and Huerta (2014) document various options for outreach and partnerships by reviewing best practices from across the country. Adams and McDaniel (2012a, 2012b) focus on lessons from Chicago, where they examined strategies for increasing access and participation among lower-incidence immigrant subgroups. We summarize findings from both reports here, noting that, while local context plays an important role in determining appropriate, successful strategies, lessons from diverse communities can inform the work of early care and education, immigrant-serving, and other stakeholders in Silicon Valley.

Strategies for Overcoming the Parental Knowledge Barrier

- Identifying which families most need outreach (as this report's companion study begins to do for Silicon Valley) by comparing the characteristics of younger children overall to those of children already enrolled in early care and education.
- Cultivating relationships and conducting outreach about program options and the importance of early care and education.
 - » Preschool programs and Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies are well suited to do this work by building trust, cultural awareness, and communication with community organizations.
 - » Community, educational, and social service organizations may complement these efforts by including preschool in their outreach activities.
 - » Specific strategies include (1) flyers or information tables at community, educational, and social services organizations, including community events, grocery stores, doctor's offices, churches, immigrant-serving nonprofits, social service agencies (especially WIC offices), and classes teaching English as a second language; (2) parents recruiting other parents through door-to-door canvassing in targeted neighborhoods; and (3) mass media campaigns, especially in foreign-language media.

- Ensuring outreach efforts are sustainable by (1) hiring bilingual or bicultural outreach staff or training existing staff, (2) evaluating outreach strategies and investing in the most successful, and (3) funding outreach through Title I grants, Title II funds, or long-term resources available from private foundations.

Strategies for Overcoming the Eligibility and Enrollment Barrier

- Partnering with state and local agencies and non-profit community, educational, and social service agencies around
 - » centralizing eligibility screening for California State Preschool, Head Start, and child care subsidies such as Alternative Payment and CalWORKs;
 - » allowing these agencies to directly enroll families in these programs; and
 - » providing ongoing support to families through models such as trained peer mentoring.
- Easing enrollment by making requirements for proof of residence, child age, and income more flexible; increasing the number of modalities for completing enrollment forms (online, by phone, by mail, and in person, multiple times and days), and translating enrollment forms into a wider array of languages.
- Offering interpretation and enrollment assistance within preschool programs and community organizations

Strategies for Overcoming the Supply and Capacity Barrier

- Locating some preschool programs in community organizations well suited for direct service provision, based on their resources and their ability to target underserved communities.
 - » Specific examples of well-suited partner organizations include two-generational programs, such as parenting programs or English as a second language classes with a child care component.

Strategies for Overcoming the Location and Transportation Barrier

- Provisioning transportation directly through preschool programs.
 - » School-based programs may leverage district-funded buses and drivers, and state funding may also supplement support from federal and local sources.
 - » Head Start offers a promising model in its use of public school buses and other free transportation. Drivers extend the preschool day by leading educational activities, while serving children in need.
 - » One district organizes “walking trains” to gather groups of children and walk to preschool with adult supervision.

Strategies for Overcoming the Hours and Schedules Barrier

- Extending program hours to accommodate parents’ work schedules.
- Blending funding from multiple programs, including Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Head Start, state prekindergarten, and child care subsidies, to provide high-quality preschool opportunities with wraparound before- and aftercare services that meet all families’ needs.

Strategies for Overcoming the Distrust of Government Institutions Barrier

- Omitting Social Security numbers from preschool program applications.
- Conducting outreach through organizations trusted by the immigrant community, including health and legal services, religious organizations, and community-based service agencies.

Strategies for Overcoming the Cultural and Linguistic Sensitivity Barrier

- Training all preschool program staff on cultural sensitivity.
- Increasing parents' participation through orientations, parent-teacher conferences, open houses, and parent leadership and advisory roles (state reporting requirements or grant application guidelines might encourage this).
- Facilitating clear communication with parents by translating all written documents and by using interpretation telephone lines, in-person interpretation, or simultaneous interpretation by headset.

Notes

1. Amy Glasmeier, "Living Wage Calculator," Massachusetts Institute of Technology, accessed December 30, 2015, <http://livingwage.mit.edu/>.
2. The child care subsidy pilot was extended for an additional five years in 2008 through the passage of California Senate Bill 1304 and extended again for five years in 2013 through California State Assembly Bill 260. Through the 2015 budget, the sunset for the San Mateo and San Francisco pilots was removed, making the projects permanent. For additional information, see "Child Care Subsidy Pilot," San Mateo County Office of Education, accessed December 30, 2015, <http://www.smcoe.org/learning-and-leadership/early-learning/child-care-partnership-council/child-care-subsidy-pilot.html>.
3. Mexico, the most common country of origin for immigrant families in Silicon Valley, provides free universal public preschool and subsidizes center-based early care and education for 1- to 3-year-olds through its Estancias Infantiles para Apoyar a Madres Trabajadoras and Institute of Social Security programs (Calderón 2014; De la Cruz Toledo 2015).
4. Devlin Hanson, unpublished analyses of data from US Census Bureau, 2008–12 American Community Survey, September 2015.
5. "Public Charge Fact Sheet," US Citizenship and Immigration Services, last updated November 15, 2013, <http://www.uscis.gov/news/fact-sheets/public-charge-fact-sheet>.
6. The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program provided work permits and temporary (two-year) relief from deportation to certain unauthorized immigrants who entered the United States as children. This initiative began in August 2012. In November 2014, the Obama administration announced that the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA) program would include parents of US-citizen and legal permanent resident children. An estimated 3.7 million unauthorized immigrant parents of US-citizen and legal permanent resident children could be eligible (Migration Policy Institute, "MPI: As Many as 3.7 Million Unauthorized Immigrants Could Get Relief from Deportation under Anticipated New Deferred Action Program," November 19, 2014, <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/news/mpi-many-37-million-unauthorized-immigrants-could-get-relief-deportation-under-anticipated-new>). The administration planned to implement DAPA in May 2015 but in February 2015, a federal district court judge in Texas placed an injunction on DACA and DAPA expansion. Neither the expansion nor the new program can be implemented until federal courts resolve this case. The case had not been resolved at the time of publication (Marco C. Maglich, "Federal Immigration Authorities Suspend President's Two New Deferred Action Programs in Response to Federal Court Injunction," National Law Review, February 19, 2015, <http://www.natlawreview.com/article/federal-immigration-authorities-suspend-president-s-two-new-deferred-action-programs>).
7. The Secure Communities program used a fingerprint database to link criminal and immigration records. When people were booked into county jails and state prisons, Secure Communities automatically flagged those who had committed immigration violations or had previously been deported. Some individuals were transferred to Immigration and Customs Enforcement for deportation after completing their sentences, depending on state or local policies. Secure Communities was piloted in 2008 and has since been replaced by the Priority Enforcement Program, a similar program with narrower enforcement priorities.

References

- Adams, Gina, and Michael Katz. 2015. *Balancing Quality Early Education and Parents' Workforce Success*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. <http://www.urban.org/research/publication/balancing-quality-early-education-and-parents-workforce-success>.
- Adams, Gina, and Hannah Matthews. 2013. *Confronting the Child Care Eligibility Maze: Simplifying and Aligning with Other Work Supports*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. <http://www.urban.org/research/publication/confronting-child-care-eligibility-maze>.
- Adams, Gina, and Marla McDaniel. 2012a. "Access to the Illinois Preschool for All Initiative: Insights from Five Lower-Incidence Immigrant Groups in Northern Cook County." Washington, DC: Urban Institute. <http://www.urban.org/research/publication/access-illinois-preschool-all-initiative-insights-five-lower-incidence>.
- . 2012b. "Untapped Potential: Partnering with Community-Based Organizations to Support Participation of Lower-Incidence Immigrant Communities in the Illinois Preschool for All Initiative." Washington, DC: Urban Institute. <http://www.urban.org/research/publication/untapped-potential-partnering-community-based-organizations-support>.
- Calderón, Gabriela. 2014. "The Effects of Child Care Provision in Mexico." Working Paper 2014-07. Ciudad de México: Banco de México. <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/100113>.
- California Child Care Resource & Referral Network. 2015. "2015 California Child Care Portfolio: 10th Biennial Edition." San Francisco: California Child Care Resource & Referral Network.
- California Department of Education. 2014. "Family Fee Schedule." Sacramento: California Department of Education. <http://www.smcoe.org/assets/files/learning-and-leadership/child-care-partnership-council/AB%201326%20Subsidy%20Pilot/Family%20Fee%20Schedule/Family%20Fee%20Schedule%20effective%20July%201,%202014.pdf>.
- Crosnoe, Robert. 2007. "Early Child Care and the School Readiness of Children from Mexican Immigrant Families." *International Migration Review* 41(1): 152–81.
- Currie, Janet, and Duncan Thomas. 1999. "Does Head Start Help Hispanic Children?" *Journal of Public Economics* 74(2): 235–62.
- De la Cruz Toledo, Elia. 2015. "Universal Preschool and Mothers' Employment." *Journal of Labor Economics* working paper. Chicago: Society of Labor Economists. <http://www.sole-jole.org/15157.pdf>.
- Díaz, Rebecca, Fernando Rodríguez, Ashley Boal, and Sara Miller. 2014. "The Silicon Valley Parent Story." San Francisco: WestEd.
- Enchautegui, María. 2013. "Nonstandard Work Schedules and the Well-Being of Low-Income Families." Washington, DC: Urban Institute. <http://www.urban.org/research/publication/nonstandard-work-schedules-and-well-being-low-income-families>.
- Enchautegui, María, Martha Johnson, and Julia Gelatt. 2015. *Who Minds the Kids When Mom Works a Nonstandard Schedule?* Washington, DC: Urban Institute. <http://www.urban.org/research/publication/who-minds-kids-when-mom-works-nonstandard-schedule>.
- Gelatt, Julia, and Heather Koball. 2014. *Immigrant Access to Health and Human Services: Final Report*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. <http://www.urban.org/research/publication/immigrant-access-health-and-human-services-final-report>.
- Gelatt, Julia, Gina Adams, and Sandra Huerta. 2014. "Supporting Immigrant Families' Access to Prekindergarten." Washington, DC: Urban Institute. <http://www.urban.org/research/publication/supporting-immigrant-families-access-prekindergarten>.
- Greenberg, Erica, Olivia Healy, and Teresa Derrick-Mills. Forthcoming. "Assessing Quality across the Center-Based Early Care and Education Workforce: Evidence from the National Survey of Early Care and Education." Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

- Hanson, Devlin, Gina Adams, and Heather Koball. 2016. *Preschool Participation for Low-Income Children and Low-Income Children of Immigrants in Silicon Valley: Part I, A Demographic Profile*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Hernandez, Donald J., Nancy A. Denton, and Suzanne Macartney. 2011. "Early Childhood Education Programs: Accounting for Low Enrollment in Immigrant and Minority Families." In *The Next Generation: Immigrant Youth in Comparative Perspective*, edited by Richard D. Alba and Mary C. Waters, 46–68. New York: New York University Press.
- Human Services Agency of San Francisco. 2010. "CalWORKs and Immigration." San Francisco: Human Services Agency of San Francisco. http://www.sfhsa.org/asset/BenefitsSFLITE/CalWORKs_and_Immigration.pdf.
- Joint Venture Silicon Valley and Silicon Valley Institute for Regional Studies. 2015. "2015 Silicon Valley Index: People, Economy, Society, Place, Governance." San Jose, CA: Joint Venture Silicon Valley and Silicon Valley Institute for Regional Studies.
- Karoly, Lynn A., and Gabriella C. Gonzalez. 2011. "Early Care and Education for Children in Immigrant Families." *Future of Children* 21 (1): 71–101.
- Lee, Valerie E., David T. Burkam, Douglas D. Ready, Joann Honigman, and Samuel J. Meisels. 2006. "Full-Day versus Half-Day Kindergarten: In Which Program Do Children Learn More?" *American Journal of Education* 112 (2): 163–208.
- Loeb, Susanna, Margaret Bridges, Daphna Bassok, Bruce Fuller, and Russell W. Rumberger. 2007. "How Much Is Too Much? The Influence of Preschool Centers on Children's Social and Cognitive Development." *Economics of Education Review* 26(1): 52–66.
- Magnuson, Katherine, Claudia Lahaie, and Jane Waldfogel. 2006. "Preschool and School Readiness of Children of Immigrants." *Social Science Quarterly* 87(5): 1241–62.
- Matthews, Hannah, and Deeanna Jang. 2007. "The Challenges of Change: Learning from the Child Care and Early Education Experiences of Immigrant Families." Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.
- Reynolds, Arthur J., Brandt A. Richardson, Momoko Hayakawa, Erin M. Lease, Mallory Warner-Richter, Michelle M. Englund, Suh-Ruu Ou, and Molly Sullivan. 2014. "Association of a Full-Day vs. Part-Day Preschool Intervention with School Readiness, Attendance, and Parent Involvement." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 312(20): 2126–34.
- Robin, Kenneth B., Ellen C. Frede, and William S. Barnett. 2006. "Is More Better? The Effects of Full-Day vs Half-Day Preschool on Early School Achievement." New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.
- San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council. 2010. "San Mateo County Child Care and Early Learning Needs Assessment." San Mateo, CA: San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council.
- Santa Clara County Office of Education. 2013. "2013 Santa Clara County Child Care Needs Assessment." Santa Clara, CA: Santa Clara County Office of Education.
- Shonkoff, Jack P., and Deborah A. Phillips, eds. 2000. *From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Valencia, Pérez, and Echeveste and Tomás Rivera Policy Institute. 2006. "Latino Public Opinion Survey of Pre-Kindergarten Programs: Knowledge, Preferences, and Public Support." Los Angeles: Valencia, Pérez, and Echeveste and Tomás Rivera Policy Institute.
- Yoshikawa, Hirokazu, Christina Weiland, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, Margaret R. Burchinal, Linda M. Espinosa, William T. Gormley, Jens Ludwig, Katherine A. Magnuson, Deborah Phillips, and Martha J. Zaslow. 2013. "Investing in Our Future: The Evidence Base on Preschool Education." New York: Society for Research in Child Development and Foundation for Child Development. <http://fcd-us.org/resources/evidence-base-preschool>.
- Zucker, Eleanor, Carollee Howes, and Rosa Garza-Mourino. 2007. "Research Report: Early Childhood Care and Education Preferences among Latino Families in Los Angeles." Los Angeles: UCLA Center for Improving Child Care Quality.

About the Authors



Erica Greenberg is a research associate in the Center on Labor, Human Services, and Population at the Urban Institute. Her research spans various early childhood programs and policies, including state prekindergarten, Head Start, subsidized child care, and home visiting. She also examines inequality in K-12 education and the ways in which early intervention can address it.

Greenberg's recent projects assess infant/toddler care and preschool using several large datasets, including the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth and Kindergarten Cohorts, and the National Survey of Early Care and Education, as well as qualitative interviews. She is also leading ongoing studies of universal preschool and its implications for educational equity.

Before joining Urban, Greenberg was a fellow in the Institute of Education Sciences Interdisciplinary Doctoral Training Program in Quantitative Education Policy Analysis; an intern in the US Department of Education Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development; and a prekindergarten teacher in Washington, DC.

Greenberg holds a BA from Yale University. She received both her MA in political science and her PhD in education policy from Stanford University.



Gina Adams, a senior fellow in the Center on Labor, Human Services, and Population at the Urban Institute, is a national expert on factors that shape the affordability, quality, and supply of child care/early education services, and the ability of low-income families to benefit from them. Since the mid-1980s, she has worked on a range of child care and early education programs, including child care subsidies, Head Start/Early Head Start, state prekindergarten, two-generation models, and quality initiatives. She led seminal research on how families, providers, and agency staff experience the subsidy system that supported state and federal efforts to create subsidy systems that are family-friendly and fair to providers.

Adams codirects Urban's Kids in Context initiative. Her current research interests include working across program silos to address challenges that instability and insecurity create for children's healthy development, helping states simplify their child care systems to align them with SNAP or Medicaid, examining the intersection between child care and workforce development strategies, exploring factors that affect whether children of immigrants participate in state prekindergarten programs,

examining absenteeism in early childhood programs, and assessing two-generational models. She has led major multistate or multisite qualitative studies and mixed-method studies. She also has extensive experience in public speaking, technical assistance, and publishing for a wide-ranging audience.

Before joining Urban in 1999, Adams directed child care research at the Children's Defense Fund and worked as a child care teacher for infants and as a home visitor for low-income Latino families.



Molly Michie is a research assistant in the Center on Labor, Human Services, and Population. Her research background and primary interest is in child care and early childhood education examined through the lenses of poverty and inequality. Michie has worked on projects assessing child care need and supply as well as on projects focusing on other vulnerable populations, such as those studying education and training programs for disconnected youth. She graduated from the College of William and Mary with a BA in English and government.

STATEMENT OF INDEPENDENCE

The Urban Institute strives to meet the highest standards of integrity and quality in its research and analyses and in the evidence-based policy recommendations offered by its researchers and experts. We believe that operating consistent with the values of independence, rigor, and transparency is essential to maintaining those standards. As an organization, the Urban Institute does not take positions on issues, but it does empower and support its experts in sharing their own evidence-based views and policy recommendations that have been shaped by scholarship. Funders do not determine our research findings or the insights and recommendations of our experts. Urban scholars and experts are expected to be objective and follow the evidence wherever it may lead.



2100 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20037

www.urban.org