

**The Transfer of Child Care Worker Education
and Compensation Policy Across States:
The T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® Model**

**By Janelle Kerlin
With Elizabeth Reid and Jennifer Auer
Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy
The Urban Institute**

October 2003

Report Prepared for The Foundation for Child Development

The authors wish to thank Sue Russell and Edith Locke of Child Care Services Association for providing invaluable information and feedback for this report, as well as the many individuals interviewed in connection with the T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® Project in Florida, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Washington. Funding for this research was provided by the Foundation for Child Development.

The Urban Institute
2100 M Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20037

Executive Summary

In 1990, the nonprofit Child Care Services Association in North Carolina began an education and compensation scholarship program for 21 child care workers in three counties. As of August 2003, the program, now known as the T.E.A.C.H. (Teacher Education and Compensation Helps) Early Childhood[®] Project, had spread to 23 states and is annually providing more than 15,000 scholarships. This report analyzes how a program started by a nonprofit in one state gets transferred to a nonprofit in another state. Specifically, it examines factors that supported, promoted, and challenged the transfer of the T.E.A.C.H. model to four states. In contrast to other literature on the diffusion of public policy innovation, this research shows that effective policy diffusion from nonprofit to nonprofit consists of multiple stages and often involves more than one policy advocate.

The study was conducted in Florida, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Washington. These states were selected to reflect the variety of situations in which the transfer of T.E.A.C.H. has taken place. States were chosen based on when T.E.A.C.H. was adopted, the type of group that initiated the process, the type of organization that implemented the program, funding sources, and the political environment. In the four states, on-site and telephone in-depth interviews were conducted with 74 leading figures in the transfer, development, funding, and implementation of T.E.A.C.H. Interviewees included nonprofit child care administrators, child care providers, state and city agency administrators, legislators, governors' and legislative assistants, business leaders, foundation officials, and early childhood educators and advocates. The report is intended for a broad audience of practitioners, policymakers, and funders in the early childhood community.

Child care advocates seeking to replicate nonprofit child care programs across states can learn a number of lessons from the experience of transferring the T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood[®] Project to Florida, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Washington. The following is a summary of specific lessons learned according to the stages of nonprofit policy diffusion:

I. Diffusing the policy idea to a state:

- 1) A policy idea must be perceived as “good” (i.e., evidence provided must foster the view that the idea is effective) for it to travel to and be accepted by other states.
- 2) Networks of national professional organizations help facilitate the broad diffusion of an idea.
- 3) Groups seeking and initiating new policy arise out of state environments that are primed for a particular child care issue.
- 4) Public-private partnerships are helpful in initiating a new policy idea in a state.

II. Replicating the policy model:

- 5) Training and technical assistance provided by the originating nonprofit facilitate effective replication of the policy model in another state.
- 6) Groups initiating policy transfer within a state can subsequently act as supportive mediators for the implementing nonprofit.

- 7) Positive outcomes of the originating nonprofit are more likely to be replicated if the model that is transferred is flexible enough to be adapted to a new environment yet fixed enough in key areas to maintain program integrity.

III. Achieving broad funding:

- 8) Appropriate framing of a new initiative is important to gain the support of different groups (including potential funders).
- 9) Existing state and federal policy may provide reasons for why a new initiative should be supported (i.e., T.E.A.C.H. scholarships help child care providers meet state-mandated child development associate [CDA] credential requirements) and may be an important source of public funding.
- 10) The structure of the state government system influences ways of targeting advocacy efforts in a given state.
- 11) After the program has been initiated, participants in the new program are valuable advocates for generating support for additional public or private funding.

IV. Taking the program statewide:

- 12) The ease of statewide implementation depends on existing service provider systems (such as community colleges in the case of T.E.A.C.H.).
- 13) In-state professional and other networks are important vehicles for marketing the program within the state.
- 14) Lead staff with appropriate management skills and the expansion of the implementing nonprofit are important factors in expanding administrative capacity to take the program statewide.
- 15) Ongoing training, technical assistance, and monitoring by the originating nonprofit can provide a level of assurance that the transferred program maintains its integrity over time.

The report also highlights the key roles of individuals found in the stages of nonprofit policy diffusion including:

- a. *policy originator*—originates and develops a solution to a problem into a viable program, disseminates information about it, and guides its replication;
- b. *researcher advocate*—seeks out and researches different program options to address specific problems and advocates for those deemed most appropriate;
- c. *program operationalizer*—responsible for the setup and day-to-day management of the replicated program, including taking it statewide;
- d. *state agency insider*—occupies an influential leadership position within a state agency and is supportive of the replicated program;
- e. *lobbyist advocate*—advocates for public funding of the replicated program in the state legislature and among other state government officials.

It was found that roles in the different stages were not always limited to one person. A role could be shared by more than one person, or one person could fill several roles. Therefore, the report identifies key roles rather than specific individuals.

This research shows that the transfer of a policy innovation from a nonprofit in one state to a nonprofit in another state differs from the diffusion of government policy in that it consists of multiple stages and a number of “policy advocate” roles. The report also highlights the importance of concurring events in the successful diffusion of nonprofit programs. In the case of T.E.A.C.H., a policy solution developed in North Carolina came together with a growing national awareness of the problem of poor quality in child care and federal funding opportunities such as the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). Groups of child care advocates formed in response to increasing awareness of the problem and seized on what appeared to be a proven “off-the-shelf” model to address it. The convergence of the problem of poor quality in child care, the T.E.A.C.H. project as a solution, and a favorable policy environment for funding created a “policy window” of the type discussed in Kingdon’s (1995) work on setting policy agendas.

I. Introduction

How does a child care policy—especially a policy idea started by a nonprofit— get transferred to other states? In 1990, the nonprofit Child Care Services Association (CCSA) in North Carolina began an education and compensation scholarship program for 21 child care workers in three counties. As of August 2003, the program, now known as the T.E.A.C.H. (Teacher Education and Compensation Helps) Early Childhood[®] Project, had spread to 23 states and is annually providing more than 15,000 scholarships. According to CCSA measures of its program goals, T.E.A.C.H. has improved the education, compensation, and retention of child care workers participating in the projects in these states.¹ This study examines factors that supported, promoted, and challenged the transfer of the T.E.A.C.H. model² to four states: Florida, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Washington. In contrast to other literature on the diffusion of policy innovation, this research shows that effective policy diffusion from nonprofit to nonprofit consists of multiple stages and often involves more than one policy advocate.

While the policy diffusion literature focuses on government-to-government policy transfer, this study examines the diffusion of policy ideas from a nonprofit in one state to nonprofits in other states. Examination of policy diffusion from this perspective finds similarities and differences with existing literature on the subject. Similarities with this research include the importance of the policy entrepreneur³ (Mintrom 1997) and the influence of interstate professional associations (Balla 2001) in the transfer of policy ideas. Other relevant literature on policy agenda setting examines the concept of policy windows and the coming together of a widespread problem, a policy solution, and ready political environment for an idea to take hold (Kingdon 1995). Though not discussing policy diffusion per se, Kingdon notes how state-level policy entrepreneurs are connected to national networks through which policy solutions travel. As the discussion will show, these key ideas from Kingdon’s policy window model hold true in the transfer of the T.E.A.C.H. project to another state.

This research also identifies several differences when studying diffusion between nonprofits. The literature on government-to-government policy diffusion limits the timeframe to the “travel” of the policy idea and its establishment as written state policy. This may be because when an idea is passed as *state* policy, the government authority behind the act generally ensures that the policy is funded and enacted statewide through government institutions and channels. In contrast, when nonprofits are the primary initiators and implementers of policy diffusion across states or within a state, the process is more complex. With no immediate government authority to implement and fund programs, channels for the transfer and funding of nonprofit programming to the statewide sphere can be murky and uncertain. Thus, diffusion from nonprofit to nonprofit consists of multiple stages and requires research that tracks the continuation of diffusion within the state. With the different stages come key roles that are

¹ In this study, effective diffusion of a policy idea is the replication and implementation of a program *to the extent that it meets its own program goals* in a new context. It should be noted that this study is not an evaluation of T.E.A.C.H. in terms of its overall effectiveness in improving child care worker education, retention, or compensation or increasing the quality of child care.

² In this report, T.E.A.C.H. is referred to as a policy idea, policy, model, project, and program to coincide with its various forms during the different stages of diffusion.

³ A policy entrepreneur is a person who “seek[s] to initiate dynamic policy change” through “identifying problems, networking in policy circles, shaping the terms of policy debates, and building coalitions” (Mintrom 1997:739).

assumed or shared by different actors for successful completion of each stage. This is in contrast to the policy diffusion literature that generally identifies only one main policy entrepreneur for a policy innovation (Mintrom 1997; Mintrom and Vergari 1998).

Research on the transfer of the T.E.A.C.H. model found four overlapping stages of policy diffusion between nonprofits. The first two stages speak to the national transfer of the model to a state, while the last two speak to the wider spread of the idea within a state:

- diffusing the policy idea to a state;
- replicating the policy model;
- achieving broad funding;
- taking the project statewide.

This report addresses these four main stages and highlights the key roles of individuals in each stage. Key roles include the policy originator, researcher advocate, program operationalizer, state agency insider, and lobbyist advocate. Roles in the different stages were not always limited to one person. A role could be shared by more than one person, or one person could fill several roles. Therefore, this report focuses on key roles rather than specific individuals.

Box 1. Overview of T.E.A.C.H. States in the Study

	Type of Initiating Organization	Type of Implementing Organization	Year T.E.A.C.H. was Implemented	Route to Broad Funding
Florida	National Business Organization	Child Care Resource and Referral Agency	1995	State Legislature
Pennsylvania	Foundation Initiative	Child Care Professional Association	1998	State Agency w/ legislative approval
Indiana	Public/Private Partnership	State Association for the Education of Young Children	1999	State Agency
Washington	City Government	Child Care Resource and Referral Agency	2000	Foundation

The report is based on research conducted in four states where the T.E.A.C.H. project was implemented: Florida, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Washington. The four states were selected to reflect the variety of situations in which the transfer of T.E.A.C.H. has taken place. States were chosen based on when T.E.A.C.H. was adopted, the type of group that initiated the process, the type of organization that implemented the program, the funding sources, and the political

environment (see box 1). In the four selected states, on-site and telephone in-depth interviews were conducted with 74 leading figures in the transfer, development, funding, and implementation of T.E.A.C.H. Interviewees included nonprofit child care administrators, child care providers, state and city agency administrators, legislators, governors' and legislative assistants, business leaders, foundation officials, and early childhood educators and advocates. The report is intended for a broad audience of practitioners, policymakers, and funders in the early childhood community.

II. Diffusing the Policy Idea to a State

This section explores the diffusion of a policy idea to a state based on how information about the T.E.A.C.H. project spread to the four states in the study. This stage has five main components:

- 1) A policy idea with a proven track record;
- 2) National networks and forums;
- 3) A primed state environment;
- 4) Organizations seeking solutions;
- 5) Individuals in the roles of policy originator and researcher advocate.

Ultimately, the driving force behind any policy diffusion is the idea or perception that a given policy innovation works. From its earliest days, the T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood[®] Project, begun by CCSA in the early 1990s, provided program results that fostered a view among many in the child care community that it addressed some of the most urgent problems facing the child care industry nationwide. Such problems included low-paid and undereducated child care providers and turnover rates in some states reaching 40 percent annually--all contributing to low-quality child care for increasing numbers of children (CCSA 2000). Through scholarships for college credit, paid release time from work, a salary increase or bonus upon completion, and a teacher commitment to stay for a period of time in child care (see box 2), the T.E.A.C.H. project increased the pay and education of child care providers who participated in the program and reduced turnover (CCSA 2002). In North Carolina, the statewide turnover rate dropped from 42 percent in 1994 to 31 percent in 1999 (CCSA 2000). Documentation by CCSA on the education, compensation, and retention of child care providers in the T.E.A.C.H. project in North Carolina brought increasing outside attention to its apparent ability to affect the factors underlying low-quality child care.⁴

Formal and informal networks and forums were instrumental in spreading news of the apparent success of T.E.A.C.H. nationwide. Particularly important was the fact that the originator of the T.E.A.C.H. project, Sue Russell, was connected to the professional child care network on a national level through her involvement with the National Association for the Education of Young Children and the Children's Defense Fund Child Care Initiative. Informal conversations and formal presentations at annual conferences of these organizations eventually informed thousands of child care professionals about T.E.A.C.H. Word about T.E.A.C.H. also spread to other national professional organizations such as the National Governors Association, the

⁴ The statistics on T.E.A.C.H. in this report are based on the T.E.A.C.H. project's own assessment of its activities. As of this writing, no comprehensive outside study on the effectiveness of T.E.A.C.H. has been completed.

Box 2. The T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® Project

The T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® Project addresses the problems of poor education, low compensation, and high turnover in the child care sector by providing early childhood professional development opportunities for teachers, directors, and family child care providers.

The four components of T.E.A.C.H. directly target the problems of the child care industry:
Educational Scholarships—cost-shared funding for tuition, books, and travel and often paid release time.

Formal Education—attainment of an established number of college credits toward a credential or degree in early care and education.

Compensation—a salary raise or bonus upon completion of the education component.

Commitment—commitment of the scholarship recipient to remain in the sponsoring child care organization or child care field for a period of time upon completion of the education component.

The exact configuration of scholarship dollars, college credit, compensation amount, and commitment time is connected to the type of scholarship model developed for use in a given state. Some of the T.E.A.C.H. scholarships currently being offered include:

- State mandated credentials
- Child Development Associate (CDA) credential
- CDA Assessment and CDA Renewal
- Apprenticeship program
- Associate degree
- Baccalaureate degree
- Mentor

Underlying the T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® Project are four principles that direct its administration:
Partnership—scholarships are funded by a partnership between T.E.A.C.H., the scholarship recipient, and the sponsoring child care program. The T.E.A.C.H. portion of the scholarship is often funded by a mix of public and private dollars and pays the largest share of the cost.

Diversity—T.E.A.C.H. seeks to address the diversity of the early childhood workforce by offering equitable access to scholarships across the different types of child care providers (including for- and not-for-profits, pre-K, Head Start, family child care, and religious-sponsored), their geographic locations, educational levels, and age and ethnicities.

Use of Existing Systems—T.E.A.C.H. makes use of existing community college and university early childhood programs for the education of scholarship recipients. Increased enrollment by T.E.A.C.H. scholars often strengthens the early childhood education system in a state.

Collaboration—T.E.A.C.H. seeks to engage the entire early childhood community in a state to improve access to formal education and raise awareness about the connection between education, compensation, and workforce needs. Every state T.E.A.C.H. project has an advisory committee.

Source: CCSA (Child Care Services Association). 2001. *T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® A National Strategy*. Information portfolio published by CCSA.

National Conference of State Legislators, and national state administrators' conferences. Indeed, news of T.E.A.C.H. spread so widely among officials of these professional organizations that, with the exception of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, Sue Russell did not seek out invitations to present—they came to her. Well-known and respected early childhood researchers and advocates also began referring to T.E.A.C.H. in their national presentations. Media stories, including articles in national early childhood publications, appeared about T.E.A.C.H. In short, T.E.A.C.H. was becoming a nationally known education and compensation program for child care workers. This was important not only in informing future players who would bring T.E.A.C.H. to a state but also in facilitating the buy-in of many other state and local players that would make it possible to replicate T.E.A.C.H. once it arrived.

Theories of policy transfer call for both a policy solution and networks to transport the idea. Also in line with the literature, this study found that each of the four states had a primed state environment for child care issues and an organized group of people seeking a policy solution. Awareness about child care issues and problems had already been raised, and groups were ready and willing to address such issues in a concrete way. National- and state-level research on the quality of child care, events with a statewide reach, new statewide programs in the area of early childhood development, and the early childhood community within a state worked to turn attention to broader child care issues. Organized groups seeking solutions sprang from a diverse array of settings, including a national business collaboration, foundation, public/private partnership, and city government officials.

National and state research on the importance of early childhood and the quality of child care raised awareness of the need for change in how child care was delivered in every state in the study. Nationally known research on the development of the brain from birth through age 3 appeared to be most influential, especially among business leaders and elected officials. Indeed, “brain research” was referred to in interviews in each of the study states. The National Governors Association and the Carnegie Corporation through its *Starting Points* report (Carnegie Task Force 1994), among others, were instrumental in disseminating information on brain development research. Also known on a national level were studies conducted in the early 1990s at the Franklin Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and reported in *Cost, Quality and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers* (see, for example, Helburn and Culkin 1995). These studies made the connection between the quality of child care, including training of child care staff, and cognitive and social/emotional outcomes for children.

In addition to these nationally known studies, every state used other research to move forward awareness on early childhood issues. For example, in Florida, the Families and Work Institute conducted research on the quality of child care in the *Florida Child Care Quality Improvement Study* (Howes et al. 1998). It found that improved child-staff ratios and staff training had a positive impact on the quality of child care in the state. In Indiana the most influential studies, funded by state government, were on the quality of child care in the state and an evaluation of a year-long pilot scholarship program supporting attainment of the Child Development Associate (CDA) credential. In Pennsylvania, the Delaware Valley Association for the Education of Young Children conducted a survey on salaries of child care workers and a state-funded study tested children in child care over a period of years. Such studies were key in moving forward

programs to improve the quality of child care in the state. As one child care advocate in Indiana commented about such research, “A red flag went up that said, ‘You need to look at the quality of child care in the state.’”

Awareness-raising events and new early childhood programs in states also drew attention to the need to address quality in child care programs. For example, in Indiana and Florida, the Child Care Action Campaign based in New York City worked with child care advocates to host symposia on child care financing. These symposia targeted private-sector employers to increase their role “as leaders on child care issues and investors in creating high-quality child care for working families” (The Child Care Partnership Project 2003). In Florida, the effort resulted in the Child Care Executive Partnership Program, a dollar-for-dollar match of business and public funds for child care subsidies. In Indiana, the three symposia raised funds for counties to build public/private partnerships for local child care. In Pennsylvania, a Worthy Wage Campaign conducted by the Delaware Valley Association for the Education of Young Children raised awareness of the low compensation of child care workers. The campaign eventually led to the creation of a loan forgiveness program for child care teachers. In Washington, the Washington STARS and Career and Wage Ladder initiatives, implemented two years before T.E.A.C.H., sought to improve the basic training and compensation of child care workers.⁵ At the federal level, welfare reform turned attention to child care issues as welfare mothers entered the workforce and needed access to quality child care programs.

Out of this growing awareness of poor-quality child care and increasing fervor to address it sprang newly organized groups of child care advocates seeking solutions. These groups researched available alternatives, discovered the T.E.A.C.H. project, and came to a consensus about bringing it to a state. Each group was based in or sponsored by a different entity. Indiana’s Child Care Fund (mentioned above) was a public/private partnership that managed the process of starting T.E.A.C.H. in Indiana. In Florida, a national-level business association, the American Business Collaboration (ABC), first brought T.E.A.C.H. to Orlando. In Pennsylvania, a foundation-sponsored early childhood initiative, Child Care Matters, helped to establish T.E.A.C.H. in that state. The city of Seattle was the first to bring T.E.A.C.H. to Washington, though soon thereafter a governor’s task force helped initiate it on the state level.⁶ These groups were instrumental in the initial phases of bringing T.E.A.C.H. to their respective states, including identification of the nonprofit organization that would run the project and initial funding. These T.E.A.C.H. initiators were subsequently involved in the project in varying degrees once it got under way in a state.

In this first stage of diffusion, there were two key roles: the policy originator and the researcher advocate. The policy originator, Sue Russell of CCSA, was an important spokesperson for informing others of her experience with T.E.A.C.H. in North Carolina. Because of her

⁵ The child care community in Washington viewed T.E.A.C.H. as addressing different issues than Washington STARS (Washington State Training and Registry System) and other child care worker initiatives, so these programs were not regarded as competitive programs.

⁶ These four types of T.E.A.C.H. initiators—national-level business association, business-sponsored group, foundation-sponsored initiative, and government-sponsored (city or state) initiative—are common models nationally for starting T.E.A.C.H. Based on her experience in other T.E.A.C.H. states, Sue Russell identified only two additional types of organizations that were initiators of T.E.A.C.H.: grassroots organization (a local-level nonprofit) and a statewide early childhood nonprofit.

connection to the national early childhood community and her willingness to give presentations about T.E.A.C.H. at numerous national and regional conferences of professional organizations, she reached child care advocates looking for solutions to the problem of low-quality child care in their states. Her documentation of the positive outcomes of T.E.A.C.H. in North Carolina gave the model a sense of legitimacy for these audiences.

The role of researcher advocate, on the other hand, was carried out by one or more people in the T.E.A.C.H. initiating organization in each study state. The researcher advocate was charged with researching different program options that the organization could use to address its goal of improving child care. In Indiana, an early childhood educator on the board of the Indiana Child Care Fund played this role. She and her committee researched program solutions used in other states that would meet the board's goal of addressing child care quality at the state level. T.E.A.C.H. was first suggested to her by the Fund's government sector cochair, who had learned of T.E.A.C.H. from a colleague at the Children's Defense Fund. In Pennsylvania, several members of the five-organization partnership, Child Care Matters, held the research advocate role and researched the prospect of T.E.A.C.H. for their state. In Washington, City of Seattle officials heard about T.E.A.C.H. at a conference of the National Association for the Education of Young Children and eventually decided to implement it. Subsequently, a subcommittee of the governor's commission heard about T.E.A.C.H. from the Seattle group and conducted independent research before deciding to take T.E.A.C.H. statewide.

Why did these groups ultimately decide to bring T.E.A.C.H. to their states? The reason most often cited in interviews was that T.E.A.C.H. was viewed as a "good" policy. Interviewees mentioned two principal factors that made T.E.A.C.H. attractive: (1) the main components of T.E.A.C.H. simultaneously addressed long-standing needs in the child care workforce, including the need to increase education and compensation and to reduce turnover among providers; (2) CCSA-reported statistics on the outcomes of T.E.A.C.H. showed it was effective in pursuing these goals. Thus, having a policy that appears to work is an important factor not only in its spread but also in its ultimate selection as a program that is worth transferring to another state.

III. Replicating the Policy Model

This section examines the second stage of policy diffusion, the actual transfer of the policy model from a nonprofit in one state to a nonprofit in another. This stage begins when the originating nonprofit (in this case CCSA) starts to interact with potential project initiators in another state and continues through to the actual transfer of program components. This section also considers how the original T.E.A.C.H. initiating organization often becomes a supportive mediator for the nonprofit in a state implementing T.E.A.C.H. as it faces initial obstacles and challenges. The two key roles in this stage are the policy originator and the operationalizer.

The policy originator role is a prominent factor during the second stage. Sue Russell, the originator of T.E.A.C.H., placed great importance on replicating a framework that had been tried and proven in developing the T.E.A.C.H. project in North Carolina. For her, maintaining the integrity of the program as it was transferred was key to ensuring that the positive outcomes of T.E.A.C.H. in North Carolina would be reproduced in other states. Indeed, the T.E.A.C.H.

Early Childhood[®] Project name is a registered trademark of Russell's organization, CCSA. States must obtain a license from CCSA to operate T.E.A.C.H. and renew it periodically based on program performance.

CCSA's involvement with the actual transfer of T.E.A.C.H. was evident from the earliest phases of its consideration by states in the study. Groups considering T.E.A.C.H. for their state were asked by CCSA to organize a stakeholders meeting, at which Russell presented the basic tenets of the T.E.A.C.H. project. Potential stakeholders were people who would be involved in the start-up and operation of T.E.A.C.H. in the state. These meetings included, for example, representatives from nonprofit child care organizations, state professional associations of child care workers, government agency officials, child care workers, and higher education officials, among others. Meetings created an opportunity for these individuals to buy in at this early phase of bringing T.E.A.C.H. to the state. The final decision to go ahead with T.E.A.C.H. was usually made by the initiating organization after this stakeholders' meeting.

Once a group of stakeholders decided to move forward with the project, they undertook a selection process to identify an organization to administer T.E.A.C.H. They did so according to a specific set of criteria that the policy originator had developed based on her experience in implementing T.E.A.C.H. in North Carolina. In Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Washington, the initiating organization undertook a bidding process to determine the most appropriate organization to implement T.E.A.C.H. Sue Russell was often present at the bidding conferences where criteria were explained and guidelines provided to organizations interested in submitting a proposal. These criteria included, above all, that the organization be a nonprofit with "no conflicts of interest and verifiable experience delivering services to the early childhood community on a statewide basis" (CCSA 2001). Other factors broadly considered included potential for building administrative capacity to implement T.E.A.C.H., potential for political advocacy, and an understanding of the vision of T.E.A.C.H. Sue Russell had the final say on which organization was chosen, though consensus was found among those on the selection committee.

Organizations chosen through the bidding process included the Indiana Association for the Education of Young Children (IAEYC, the Indiana affiliate of the national association), the Pennsylvania Child Care Association (an association for child care professionals), and the Washington State Child Care Resource and Referral Network. In Florida, one of the first states to implement T.E.A.C.H., the Florida Children's Forum (a statewide child care resource and referral organization) won the bid to administer T.E.A.C.H. on a statewide level, although initially it only administered scholarships in Orlando through the initiative of the American Business Collaboration (ABC).

T.E.A.C.H. initiators (or their successors) in the state often continued to play important mediating roles in the development and support of T.E.A.C.H. once the project got under way in the T.E.A.C.H. agency. However, relationships between initiators and the T.E.A.C.H. agency were different in each of the four study states. Relationships ranged from initial short-term funding to longer term support for advocacy, funds management, and the provision of ongoing funding. In Florida, as mentioned, T.E.A.C.H. was first started in Orlando by the ABC with the goal of others eventually taking it statewide. The ABC initially provided funding for T.E.A.C.H.

scholarships in Orlando that were administered through the statewide T.E.A.C.H. agency, but after broad funding of T.E.A.C.H. was secured, ABC was no longer needed for its funding role and moved on to other projects.

In Pennsylvania, the initiating organization, Child Care Matters (CCM), played an important advocacy and funding role for the T.E.A.C.H. agency for the length of its six-year existence. The director and others with CCM were particularly instrumental in advocating with state government officials for public funding of T.E.A.C.H.. CCM, however, was established only as a short-term initiative and concluded its work in June 2003, leaving the T.E.A.C.H. agency without this support. In Indiana, the Indiana Child Care Fund is perhaps the most involved of all the initiating organizations, as it takes a continuing active role in managing the funding for the Indiana T.E.A.C.H. agency. In essence, the Fund has some of the financial management responsibilities for both the state's children and families agency, the Family and Social Services Administration, and the T.E.A.C.H. agency. The Fund provides oversight for the large amount of public money designated for T.E.A.C.H. and manages diverse incoming funds for the project. In Washington, an ongoing relationship is maintained between the successor of the Governor's Task Force, the Foundation for Early Learning, and the T.E.A.C.H. agency. The Foundation is a main source of funds for T.E.A.C.H.—a necessary arrangement owing to the funding environment in Washington (see part IV for discussion of private funding in Washington).

Once a nonprofit organization was chosen in a state, work began on the transfer of the main components and structure of T.E.A.C.H. This transfer occurred largely through training at CCSA, manuals, and technical assistance. Key to understanding the successful transfer of T.E.A.C.H. to new states is that, based on her experience in North Carolina, the policy originator built both flexible and fixed components into the model. The flexibility allowed states to adapt the model to their own environments. The fixed or non-negotiable requirements maintained the integrity of the program (see T.E.A.C.H. principles and components in box 2). This model, with its mix of flexible and fixed standards contributed greatly to the successful⁷ transfer of the T.E.A.C.H. model to different state environments.

Non-negotiable components included those that were explicitly stated in a written agreement between the implementing T.E.A.C.H. agency and CCSA and those that were less formally required. Those in the written agreement included, for example, the requirement of a scholarship model for college credit (as opposed to training hours), compensation to the scholarship recipient of a least \$100 upon completion, and commitment of the scholarship recipient to continued employment in child care for a period of time. Under the written agreement, the T.E.A.C.H. agency also agreed to use the database provided by CCSA for recording and managing scholarship recipient information and processing payments to schools. Other requirements included that the T.E.A.C.H. agency maintain its nonprofit status and that the project serve a diverse array of child care providers. Other, less formal requirements that preceded the written agreement included that only one organization administer T.E.A.C.H. and that the operation of the project be centralized, not decentralized to affiliated local organizations.

⁷ Success is defined here as measurable change in the education, compensation, and retention of child care workers participating in a state T.E.A.C.H. project, according to CCSA assessments.

Areas of flexibility included the design of scholarship models (within certain parameters), sources of funding for the T.E.A.C.H. project in the state, payment arrangements with colleges and universities, and to some extent populations targeted as scholarship recipients. The state environment largely structured the shape of these components. For instance, scholarship models depend on “state policies and licensing regulations regarding education requirements for the early childhood workforce” (CCSA 2001). Also shaping scholarship models is how well the early childhood career path has been established in a state, the availability of formal educational courses in early childhood development, and access to funding for education (CCSA 2001). Technical assistance was provided to guide T.E.A.C.H. agencies not only in developing such scholarship models, but also in securing funding, hiring and training staff, providing outreach to educational institutions, recruiting participants, and maintaining a database.

Each state faced a different mix of obstacles and opportunities in the transfer and start-up of T.E.A.C.H. with some situations more challenging than others. Of the four states, Indiana appeared to have a child care environment and institutional infrastructure that made it easiest to adapt T.E.A.C.H. First, Indiana had a cohesive child care community that was led by a group of individuals from key child care sectors who had worked well together for many years. Second, among this group were personally committed child care advocates who moved easily in and out of state government (i.e., they either worked in government or had access to government officials). Third, this ready access to government enabled advocates to achieve ongoing public funding for T.E.A.C.H. without going through the legislative process. Fourth, Indiana had a statewide community college system that greatly simplified establishing T.E.A.C.H. in higher education on a statewide basis. Fifth, the first T.E.A.C.H. coordinator was highly experienced in the child care field, including the management of child care programs, and had a vision for T.E.A.C.H. in the state. Sixth, because the T.E.A.C.H. initiating organization (the Indiana Child Care Fund) continued to manage the funding, the T.E.A.C.H. agency (IAEYC) was free to focus on the project itself.

Transferring the T.E.A.C.H. model from one state environment to another and adapting it to the new environment did encounter some obstacles and challenges, though none undermined the operation of T.E.A.C.H. in a state. Overcoming these challenges often required a lot of time and energy and the coordination of a number of individuals and entities. Recurring themes expressed in the interviews included problems with funding, staffing, using the database, and providing access to rural communities. Issues with funding arose in Washington, Florida, and Pennsylvania, but for different reasons. In Washington, significant amounts of public funding for T.E.A.C.H. were simply not available, as was the case in other states (see discussion in part IV). This situation resulted in another problem in Washington. The many small private and public funders created a complex mix of funding sources, each supporting different scholarship eligibility rules and reporting requirements that were difficult to track. Florida saw state funding for T.E.A.C.H. cut back when the state hit lean years, which led to a decision to reduce the amount offered to Head Start T.E.A.C.H. recipients.⁸ Staffing was an issue in Washington and Pennsylvania, where T.E.A.C.H. coordinators who initially managed the program did not have the right skills for the job, creating delays and management problems. Getting the database for T.E.A.C.H. up and running in Pennsylvania and Washington was a cumbersome and, for

⁸ Decisionmakers reasoned that Head Start had access to federal training dollars that other child care providers did not have.

Washington, costly undertaking.⁹ States with large rural areas, including Indiana, Washington, and Pennsylvania, initially faced difficulty taking T.E.A.C.H. to these areas, mostly because of the scarcity of community colleges in these settings. Indiana solved this problem by starting online courses through the web site www.childcarelearning.IN.gov for the use of both urban and rural T.E.A.C.H. recipients.

All four state T.E.A.C.H. agencies had concerns, if not serious problems, with adapting certain aspects of the T.E.A.C.H. model to their state environments. In Florida, there was concern initially that the project could not be decentralized to the local community level. In Indiana, there was discussion of the fact that only one organization could hold the license with CCSA. In Pennsylvania, there was a debate with the Department of Public Welfare over the use of public funds toward bonuses for family child care providers. Washington appears to have had the most difficulty adapting the model, with issues related to the database, funding management, and some concerns surrounding work with community colleges. These difficulties were often connected to the context and unique circumstances of T.E.A.C.H. in that state (see the Washington T.E.A.C.H. story in the appendix). At times, interview respondents said that in hindsight they realized CCSA had been right to insist on a particular way of doing things. However, several respondents in two of the states also said they had seriously considered dropping the T.E.A.C.H. license and going with a scholarship program of their own.

Other, less prominent, problems included challenges with community colleges, directors of child care agencies, and unionized child care workers. Pennsylvania had a more difficult time than others in working with the community college system to establish payment systems, though this was largely because community colleges were not well integrated with each other in the state. Also, some T.E.A.C.H. agencies ran into difficulties with child care directors reluctant to give T.E.A.C.H. recipients release time from the job or compensation. Florida and Pennsylvania had isolated cases in which unionized child care workers could have been excluded from T.E.A.C.H. because of pre-established scales for salary increases. However, payment agreements were worked out in each of the cases.

The T.E.A.C.H. coordinator in the T.E.A.C.H. agency served as the program “operationalizer” and played a key role along with the policy originator at this stage of the model’s transfer. The operationalizer was the day-to-day manager of T.E.A.C.H. and was responsible for setting up the T.E.A.C.H. project according to the agreement with CCSA and under its guidance. This role required a host of management skills and experience in accessing and working with systems including the early childhood, higher education, public finance, and private funding systems in a state. (The public finance and private funding systems were not a concern of the T.E.A.C.H. coordinator in Indiana because the Indiana Child Care Fund managed finances for the project.)

⁹ CCSA provides the database, training, and technical support as a part of the license; however, organizations have different needs in terms of infrastructure to support the database and reporting requirements for funders. As a result, data collection and tracking costs vary from organization to organization.

IV. Achieving Broad Funding

Establishing a broad funding base was crucial for implementing T.E.A.C.H. on a statewide basis. Initial funds for T.E.A.C.H. came from business, foundations, or city government and were generally limited to support of the project in one or several cities. A much more substantial amount of funding was needed to take the program statewide. In three of the states, this broad funding came from public funds that a state set aside from the federal government's Child Care Development Fund (CCDF).¹⁰ Typically, states authorized \$1 million or more per year for T.E.A.C.H. In Washington, advocates were unable to access this level of public funding, and mostly private funds support T.E.A.C.H. This section considers the factors leading to public as well as private funding for T.E.A.C.H., including how T.E.A.C.H. was framed by advocates to appeal to funders, other policies that supported or detracted from public funding of T.E.A.C.H., and the different political routes that shaped advocacy for state funding. The key roles highlighted in this stage are the state agency insider and lobbyist advocate.

As part of their advocacy strategy to obtain initial funding for T.E.A.C.H., program advocates approached different groups and framed T.E.A.C.H. according to the audience being addressed. Thus, advocates sold business leaders and conservative politicians on the benefit T.E.A.C.H. would bring to the workforce, both current and future. They also emphasized that T.E.A.C.H. is based on a funding partnership among T.E.A.C.H., the child care center, and the scholarship recipient. CCSA's research on T.E.A.C.H. outcomes in education, compensation, and retention appealed to businesses because there would be concrete outcomes as a return on their investment. Support from the business community was a key factor in getting initial funding in Florida, Indiana, and Washington.

For public officials and policymakers, T.E.A.C.H. was often framed as a win-win situation in terms of public dollars. Public funds invested in T.E.A.C.H. would benefit not only the T.E.A.C.H. recipient but also the public community and technical colleges they attended. A portion of the money invested in T.E.A.C.H. would remain in the public sphere. Public officials were also drawn to the cost-sharing aspect of the program that created a public-private partnership and ensured that public monies alone were not bearing the cost of the program. Some public leaders liked the small infrastructure required to run T.E.A.C.H. as compared with some government programs. An additional argument in some states was the "pay now or pay later" idea that a little investment in providing quality child care for children now would save a lot in social service costs down the road.

To get other child care advocates on board, T.E.A.C.H. was framed as a program that addressed the underlying problems of poor quality in child care, including child care worker education, compensation, and retention, as well as an avenue for enhancing school readiness. For employers, it provided a better working environment for employees, who could be confident their children were being well cared for. For child care providers themselves, it was a rare opportunity to increase their education. In Florida, it was additionally framed as an equal opportunity initiative for all the different types of providers in the child care sector. Interestingly, in Florida, organized networks of faith-based providers and for-profit providers were actively included from the outset of state funding as part of a broader effort of state child

¹⁰ Also sometimes referred to as the Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG).

care administrators to include all stakeholders in child care policy decisionmaking. Addressing some of the faith-based providers' concerns regarding scholarship models later resulted in support for T.E.A.C.H. from this sector of the child care community.

Interview respondents commented repeatedly on how CCSA statistics documenting the outcomes of T.E.A.C.H. helped sell the program, regardless of the audience. As a child care advocate in Indiana stated, "Whenever we would do any marketing of T.E.A.C.H., we would always go back to the history of T.E.A.C.H. in North Carolina and bring that with us because...the association with a model like that was superb." This information was especially influential with private funders such as foundations. Also cited by all respondents was the minimal cost of the program to achieve desired outcomes.

Existing policy and programs played a large role in shaping the environment in which advocates sought public funding for T.E.A.C.H. From the mid-1990s onward, national and state policies often supported programs that addressed child care quality issues. Most important was the federal set-aside for quality improvement in child care that states received as a part of the CCDF. This ongoing federal source of funding was key to the stability of T.E.A.C.H. funding in three of the four study states. As an earmarked, federal set-aside for quality, these dollars were protected from other uses the state might deem more urgent, such as subsidizing child care slots. It also provided ongoing funding for T.E.A.C.H. in times of state budget decline.

Welfare reform also influenced funding possibilities for T.E.A.C.H. Legislation for welfare reform allowed Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) dollars to be spent outright on child care as well as be transferred to CCDF. T.E.A.C.H. was, therefore, often financed from a mix of CCDF and TANF funds. In one case, a surplus of TANF dollars caused by a fall in welfare caseloads provided extra funds for T.E.A.C.H. In 2000, Florida had a surplus of almost \$400 million in TANF dollars and authorized that \$1.3 million be spent on T.E.A.C.H. in addition to T.E.A.C.H.'s regular allocation. Aside from funding, child care advocates in some states used welfare reform as leverage for supporting T.E.A.C.H. because T.E.A.C.H. provided training for low-skilled, low-income women. This argument was not successful in Pennsylvania, however. Until the late 1990s, welfare reform in Pennsylvania focused almost solely on child care as a support to women leaving welfare, with emphasis on increasing the number of child care slots rather than improving quality. Thus, Pennsylvania child care advocates felt welfare reform detracted from their efforts to get T.E.A.C.H. funded.

Another federal policy that affected T.E.A.C.H. was the 1998 Head Start reauthorization that raised minimum education requirements for Head Start teachers. The Head Start mandate required that 50 percent of providers in every state have a minimum of an associate's degree by September 30, 2003. While Head Start had access to some federal dollars for this training, Head Start centers in Florida and Indiana used T.E.A.C.H. to supplement this funding, especially for assistant teachers not covered by federal training dollars. Head Start centers also liked the extra support T.E.A.C.H. provided in the way of counselors, travel stipends, and release time. Thus, changes in Head Start education requirements increased demand and support for T.E.A.C.H. in these states.

On the state level, state requirements that teachers in child care centers have the CDA credential gave T.E.A.C.H. advocates another argument for state-allocated funding. In Florida and Pennsylvania, where a CDA requirement was in place before T.E.A.C.H. was introduced, advocates told policymakers that without financial support, child care providers would find it difficult to comply with the mandate. Child care workers simply did not earn enough to pay for the education themselves.¹¹

An important factor shaping advocacy for public funding of T.E.A.C.H. was the state government system and where *accessible* authority over child care funds was located. This was different in each of the four study states. It reflected how the state system structured authority over CCDF and TANF dollars, where child care advocates had access historically, and where policymakers sympathetic to child care issues were located. Interestingly, it made no difference whether the political environment was largely Republican or Democratic. In most of the study states, initial public funding for T.E.A.C.H. came under a Republican legislature.

In Florida, a team of two child care advocates regularly lobbied the legislature on child care matters. One was the director of a statewide nonprofit child care agency and a registered lobbyist, and the other was the director of child care programs in the Florida Department of Children and Families. These advocates had the support of an influential female senate president as well as the governor, both of whom were solidly behind improving child care in the state. Their efforts resulted in the legislature passing funding earmarked specifically for T.E.A.C.H. in the state budget.

In Pennsylvania, child care advocates had learned from experience that the best route to funds for child care was through top state administrative officials. As a child care advocate from Pennsylvania explained, “We did it administratively because legislatively it wouldn’t have passed.” In Pennsylvania, child care advocates used a process in state government called the program revision request (PRR), also used for new programs. Lobbyists from both Child Care Matters (the T.E.A.C.H. initiating organization) and Pennsylvania Partnerships for Children (a nonprofit children’s advocacy organization) delivered requests to senior administration officials, including the deputy director of the governor’s budget and the deputy director and secretary of Department of Public Welfare. In addition, a professional lobbyist hired by Child Care Matters opened doors for meetings with legislators, getting T.E.A.C.H. on the agenda in briefing breakfasts at the state capitol. As a result of these efforts, the Department of Public Welfare put funding for T.E.A.C.H. as a line item in its budget, which was subsequently approved in the state legislature.

In Indiana, funding for T.E.A.C.H. resulted from a decision within the state Family and Social Services Administration. At the time, the deputy director of the Bureau of Child Development within this agency (and program manager for child care quality) was also the founder and cochair of the Indiana Child Care Fund, the T.E.A.C.H. initiating organization. Working from her position within the state agency, she was able to educate state officials on the value of increased investment in early childhood professionals. Soon after T.E.A.C.H. was initiated with

¹¹ Indiana reversed this argument. T.E.A.C.H. was in place before the state established its CDA requirement; thus the availability of scholarship money to help providers meet a CDA mandate was used to support passage of the CDA requirement.

private funds, it received a sizable amount of funding from CCDF. The fact that the Indiana Child Care Fund was launched by an executive order of the governor also lent legitimacy to the request for designated CCDF funds.

In Washington, some public funds (\$250,000) for T.E.A.C.H. came from TANF through the governor's office. Washington has allocated limited public funds for T.E.A.C.H. for three reasons. First, the governor's commission that took T.E.A.C.H. statewide was committed to promoting a bipartisan atmosphere and determined that none of the initiatives that resulted from the commission's work would seek public funding. Second, CCDF dollars were already tied up in the support of STARS, a training, scholarship, and tracking program for child care providers. Third, by the time T.E.A.C.H. was under way and public funding was considered, the state was in a budget crunch and cutting other quality programming for child care. The small sum of public dollars that was allocated to T.E.A.C.H. was from the governor's office, not the legislature. In Washington, the governor has exclusive control over TANF funds. During recent budget cuts, TANF funding for T.E.A.C.H. saw only minor reductions, apparently because of its early influential connections stemming from the governor's commission.

Indeed, T.E.A.C.H. in Washington stood out from the other states in the study because it followed a private rather than a public funding model. T.E.A.C.H. in Washington originated from a governor's commission cochaired by First Lady Mona Locke and Melinda Gates. From the beginning, business dollars were counted on to support any initiatives that resulted. Indeed, the commission established the Foundation for Early Learning for longer term support of its initiatives. This Foundation was the source of initial funding for T.E.A.C.H. on a statewide level and continues to be its main supporter. Fundraising efforts by the T.E.A.C.H. agency have garnered other foundation money and private support, but the combined total still remains far less than the millions of dollars in public funds received in other study states. Lack of funding has limited the reach of T.E.A.C.H. in Washington. While geographically it has spread to most counties in the state, often there are only a few T.E.A.C.H. recipients in a given region.

The state agency insider and the lobbyist advocate had recurring key roles in those states in which significant public funding was obtained for T.E.A.C.H.. The lobbying team that helped obtain T.E.A.C.H. funding in the Florida legislature consisted of a welfare agency director and a child care lobbyist. Their success was due in part to the fact that strong advocates from both inside and outside state government were seeking the same thing. In Indiana, one person appeared to fulfill both these roles. As a state agency insider, she was deputy director in the Bureau of Child Development, and as an advocate she was founder and cochair of the Indiana Child Care Fund and had strong working relationships with the two governors and first ladies who held office during the development of T.E.A.C.H. In Pennsylvania, the roles were spread among several individuals. Key players were advocates from CCM and Pennsylvania Partnerships for Children who had contacts and established legitimacy with a number of players within state government.

Once public funds began to support T.E.A.C.H. scholarships, T.E.A.C.H. agencies were able to draw on the experiences of scholarship recipients to advocate for continuing public funding. Such advocacy strategies included personal stories sent to legislators from recipients, directors, and parents about the effect of T.E.A.C.H. on their lives and the lives of children. Advocates

from community colleges showed how enrollment had increased because of T.E.A.C.H. scholarships. Parents and directors sent cards to their legislators when a teacher left a child care center to highlight the problem of turnover. A particularly effective advocacy strategy in Pennsylvania was holding an awards ceremony for T.E.A.C.H. graduates at the state capitol. Legislators were invited to present T.E.A.C.H. scholars from their districts with awards. Local news media covered the event.

There were several overall themes that child care advocates shared across the study states. Most often mentioned was the importance of bringing people together, that is, getting the buy-in of different groups in the child care community so that everyone spoke with one voice on child care issues. Another was knowing the political context and developing relationships with key political contacts. Also important was advocating on more than one level in state government, targeting both elected officials and state administrators. In terms of the advocacy message, child care advocates stressed again and again how the combination of statistics on T.E.A.C.H. outcomes in the state, collected by the T.E.A.C.H. agency, and personal stories of T.E.A.C.H. recipients were highly effective in getting the attention of policymakers and funders.

V. Taking the Project Statewide

Once the T.E.A.C.H. agency had achieved broad funding, the next task was to move T.E.A.C.H. out to child care providers across the state. Often the first large sum of money left T.E.A.C.H. agencies overwhelmed with the need to learn the intricacies of administering the program and, at the same time, to quickly fill hundreds of scholarship slots across the state. This section examines how states decided where to take the program first, collaboration with providers of higher education, the marketing of T.E.A.C.H., and organizational change in the T.E.A.C.H. agencies and community colleges. The key role at this stage is again the operationalizer of the project, the T.E.A.C.H. coordinator.

With funding in place, states faced the question of where to take T.E.A.C.H. first. Most often, initial targets were counties that had higher education institutions with early childhood education programs and a high number of child care providers. Of the four states studied, the T.E.A.C.H. agency in Washington had the most systematic approach. With the help of the advisory committee, it conducted surveys of communities and child care providers throughout the state to determine readiness for T.E.A.C.H. Based on survey results, communities were grouped by community college service delivery area rather than county, and college areas were slated for start-up according to readiness and availability of funding. Politics did intervene in the selection of one county that pressured the Foundation for Early Learning (a main funder of T.E.A.C.H.) to move T.E.A.C.H. into that region ahead of its scheduled time. In every state, a critical challenge was to be sure that community colleges had appropriate curriculum in early childhood education to meet the needs of child care providers.

Although some universities were involved, community colleges were usually the main providers of early childhood education for T.E.A.C.H. recipients. To establish a scholarship program with a community college, the T.E.A.C.H. agency had to contact administrators and negotiate payment levels and scholarship arrangement. Collaborating with institutions of higher education was easier in some study states than others. In Indiana, the process was greatly simplified

because there are only two two-year, state-run community colleges, which are now combined as community college partners and reach most areas of the state. Here the T.E.A.C.H. coordinator was able to negotiate the same price for T.E.A.C.H. scholars at all schools, including the several four-year universities. By contrast, in Pennsylvania, community colleges are mostly county- or school district-based. After drawn-out negotiations with community college presidents, the T.E.A.C.H. agency was able to pull together one rate for all the community colleges, although four-year schools have separate rates.

Sometimes T.E.A.C.H. agencies had to make the case for expanding or even maintaining existing early childhood education programs in community colleges. In 1999, Indiana had only five community college campuses offering child development courses, but by 2003 all campuses had classes. In Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Florida, the arrival of T.E.A.C.H. scholarship recipients actually prevented the closing of early childhood programs.¹² Community colleges willingly accommodated T.E.A.C.H. scholarship recipients, as it was a sure way to increase enrollment. Indeed, once scholarships were under way, community colleges often became advocates for state funding of T.E.A.C.H..

Another major ongoing task of the T.E.A.C.H. agency was getting the word out to potential T.E.A.C.H. recipients about the availability of scholarships. CCSA provided initial training on recruiting participants for T.E.A.C.H. and training manuals on conducting recruitment campaigns based on North Carolina's experience. Following CCSA guidelines, study states used both direct and indirect contacts for recruitment purposes and often used existing child care networks in the state. Direct contacts took various forms. For example, in every state, letters and packets were mailed to both center and home child care providers. Direct contact was also made through the state child care licensing office, usually found in the state welfare agency. State child care licensing staff provided new centers and those undergoing relicensing with information and applications for T.E.A.C.H. scholarships.

Another direct contact activity used by all states in the study was outreach presentations. They were often given by the T.E.A.C.H. coordinator or counselor to a variety of groups, including early childhood education classes at institutions of higher education; child care providers; Head Start; and most prominently, at local, regional, and state professional child care association meetings and conferences. Personal contact with a T.E.A.C.H. counselor was another form of direct contact that came as a result of referrals from community college instructors, resource and referral agencies, and past and present T.E.A.C.H. recipients.

Indirect contact activities provided information to individuals and groups that were in a position to recruit child care providers to T.E.A.C.H. These contacts were helpful in generating referrals directly to T.E.A.C.H. counselors. These activities included information letters to early childhood education coordinators at higher education institutions requesting their help in recruiting child care providers who were attending classes. Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies were provided with information brochures and packets to aid in recruiting T.E.A.C.H. participants. Announcements about T.E.A.C.H. were also printed in newsletters of Resource and

¹² The 2003 Head Start mandate to improve teacher training also increased enrollment in many states during this time.

Referral Agencies, the state affiliate of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, and other professional child care organizations.

The growth of T.E.A.C.H. to a statewide program led to both expected and unexpected changes in the organizations most closely involved: the T.E.A.C.H. agency and community colleges. Every T.E.A.C.H. agency in the study had to expand to meet the new challenge of providing scholarships on a statewide basis, in addition to maintaining the organization's original programming. Prior to the introduction of T.E.A.C.H., the organizations were usually staffed with only one or two paid employees, some of whom worked part time. At a minimum, T.E.A.C.H. agencies had to add counselors to their staff. CCSA guidelines recommend one counselor for every 250 to 300 associate in applied science (AAS) or bachelor of arts (BA) recipients to guide scholarship holders through the process (when the counselor is primarily working with recipients and their sponsoring programs and not undertaking other tasks).¹³ In Pennsylvania for example, staff grew from one and a half to nine and a half, including three counselors, a bookkeeper, a communications director, and a finance director in addition to the agency director, T.E.A.C.H. coordinator, and secretary.

Managing the large amount of information on scholarship recipients and flow of money in and out of the organization was another area in which T.E.A.C.H. agencies had to quickly expand and organize themselves. CCSA provided a database system to help in organizing, processing, and recording information on each scholarship recipient including, their connection to colleges and sponsoring agencies. The database also pays bills, tracks contacts, and enables the agencies to generate statistics on the results of T.E.A.C.H. in the state in terms of education, compensation, and retention. Providing sponsors with information on T.E.A.C.H. outcomes was key in showing accountability for dollars spent and in generating the support of other funders. Although CCSA trained staff to operate the database, two states found the database cumbersome and difficult to use and had to simultaneously maintain an additional database to generate other information funders needed.

Community colleges also experienced change as a result of T.E.A.C.H. The increase in enrollment generated by T.E.A.C.H. often resulted in more courses offered and thus more faculty. Perhaps the most unexpected consequence of T.E.A.C.H. was the effort to improve articulation¹⁴ among different community colleges and between two-year colleges and four-year institutions. Articulation allowed early childhood education students, including T.E.A.C.H. recipients, to transfer credit from one school to another without having to start over, which could be a great deterrent to some students. For example, the state community college system in Indiana now has six articulation agreements with four-year universities; in 1997, it had none. In Washington, the newest of the study states to take T.E.A.C.H. statewide, none of the community colleges had good articulation agreements with technical schools or four-year institutions. In commenting on articulation, one child care advocate in Washington said there was "no incentive before T.E.A.C.H. to figure this out." Moreover, this respondent regarded T.E.A.C.H. as a

¹³ The number of scholarship recipients per counselor can vary greatly depending on whether it is a new T.E.A.C.H. state, whether the counselor has outreach as well as counseling responsibilities, and the number of students in a caseload seeking a credential rather than a degree.

¹⁴ Articulation is an agreement between two schools that certain courses or degrees can be transferred from one school to the other.

catalyst for broader change in the community college system. He stated, “So while just a small piece, in the future we might be able to leverage or tie things to T.E.A.C.H. that will make the whole system work better...it will change and improve the community college system.”

The program operationalizer role played by the T.E.A.C.H. coordinator was again key in this stage. In every state, the operationalizer actively took T.E.A.C.H. to community colleges and universities, went on the road to personally present the program at conferences and to child care groups, and was the first to navigate the database and essentially manage the entire project. Indeed, success of the project at this stage hinged on the management and recruitment skills of the T.E.A.C.H. coordinator. When these skills were in place, the project steadily gained momentum and grew, and when they were not, it was hampered by the problems that arose. Initial poor management of T.E.A.C.H. in two of the states was corrected by hiring a new T.E.A.C.H. coordinator with the appropriate skills.

VI. Continuing the Project Long-Term

Although T.E.A.C.H. has had a solid start in each of the four study states, key factors may affect its future. State T.E.A.C.H. projects are vulnerable over time to internal and external changes that may affect the integrity of the program and its outcomes. Declining state budgets and the uncertainty of continuing public and private funding raise questions regarding the future of T.E.A.C.H. funding and the need for different fundraising strategies by T.E.A.C.H. agencies. Also, new federal policies being considered could either increase demand for T.E.A.C.H. or provide opportunities for it to supplement other programs. This section considers these factors.

A particularly difficult aspect of policy diffusion is maintaining, over time, the character of a program in a new environment. Shifts in the political and child care environments within a state, staff turnover, and other changes within the T.E.A.C.H. agency can result in alterations to the project that hinder its ability to achieve expected goals. While some changes are beyond the control of program administrators, others can be identified and corrected with appropriate monitoring. The T.E.A.C.H. Technical Assistance Center along with the T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood National Advisory Committee has taken on the task of maintaining the integrity of the T.E.A.C.H. projects now operating in many of the states. The purpose is to ensure that T.E.A.C.H. will continue to bring about positive results in the education, compensation, and retention of child care workers to improve the lives of those associated with the project.

Quality assurance is achieved by requiring, in the written agreement between the T.E.A.C.H. agency and CCSA, that the agency follow a certain protocol. Included in this agreement is the requirement that the T.E.A.C.H. agency provide CCSA with quarterly and annual reports, act on all reasonable recommendations from CCSA, conduct a yearly evaluation on the effectiveness of the T.E.A.C.H. scholarship programs offered in the state, and make any needed programmatic changes. CCSA has developed the *T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood[®] Self-Study Tool*, a monitoring instrument that state T.E.A.C.H. projects use to evaluate themselves in 15 competency areas. A team of three validators, including two peers, reviews the portfolio that state projects put together as a result of this assessment. If state T.E.A.C.H. projects are unable to maintain an acceptable level of program performance, CCSA may require a performance

improvement plan and reserves the right to revoke their T.E.A.C.H. license. This ongoing oversight by CCSA provides a level of assurance that program integrity will be maintained.

Another consideration for the future of T.E.A.C.H. is whether public funding can be maintained, or in the case of Washington, expanded. Both the federal and state economic environments are important factors, as funding for the study states has come mainly from federal, state, business, and private funds. Almost all child care advocates in the study identified the 4 percent quality set-aside from the federal CCDF as the most stable and reliable source of money states could earmark for T.E.A.C.H. Advocates in Indiana and Pennsylvania were most confident of continued funding of T.E.A.C.H. because support for the program came mostly from CCDF. Funds directly from TANF were a little less certain because of increasing welfare rolls in some states. Use of state funds for T.E.A.C.H. only occurred in Florida for a portion of T.E.A.C.H. funding. However, the fact that state dollars were used for T.E.A.C.H. in Florida made it vulnerable in a recent economic downturn there.¹⁵ Both business and foundation support can be uncertain in poor economic times. However, in Washington, where CCDF quality dollars were already earmarked for other programs, TANF dollars were dwindling, and state funding was nonexistent, child care advocates felt fortunate that T.E.A.C.H. has used mostly private rather than public funding.

Florida is the only study state where T.E.A.C.H. funding was reduced from one year to the next, and as a consequence, it developed strategies to compensate. For example, the T.E.A.C.H. agency turned to local communities interested in funding T.E.A.C.H. recipients from their areas. Already several local governments in Florida have supported a number of T.E.A.C.H. scholars. Another strategy was to reduce the percentage of T.E.A.C.H. funding per Head Start T.E.A.C.H. recipient, given that Head Start already had access to federal training dollars for its teachers. This helped fund more T.E.A.C.H. scholarships for child care providers who had no other source of educational support.

Although federal CCDF quality dollars were identified as the most stable of all the funding sources for T.E.A.C.H., child care advocates are aware that these dollars can be affected by changes in federal policy. In Washington, child care advocates involved with T.E.A.C.H. have advocated at the national level through Voices for America's Children (formerly the National Association of Child Advocates) for stable and even increased funding of CCDF quality dollars so that states have this money available for T.E.A.C.H. and other quality improvement programs.

Federal policies in the area of education may also affect T.E.A.C.H. in specific ways. A growing emphasis on school readiness for children entering elementary school includes President George W. Bush's directive to establish common standards in early childhood programs, particularly in literacy. Child care advocates in the study often indicated that any school readiness initiative would require better-skilled early childhood teachers and therefore would increase demand for T.E.A.C.H. scholarships. Some advocates noted that T.E.A.C.H. scholarship models may have to be more flexible to accommodate increased course and practicum hours to meet teacher certification requirements. Some states are considering the

¹⁵ Funding for T.E.A.C.H. in Florida was reduced and for a short time, cut altogether, although it was restored later through other funding channels.

possibility of linking early education and pre-K with the public school system. This concept fits with the school readiness discussion on the federal level. According to some respondents, if this linkage occurs, it will also stimulate greater demand for T.E.A.C.H. and similar programs.

Another federal policy change under consideration, the 2003 Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, may include pre-K teachers in its K–12 provisions for federal education scholarships and loans. Increased funding for the education of pre-K teachers was viewed positively, as it would turn attention to the need to support the education of child care providers. Moreover, rather than compete with or replace T.E.A.C.H., many respondents saw these new opportunities for educational funding as complementary. T.E.A.C.H. could “wrap around” other scholarship opportunities and fill in essential pieces such as release time, travel stipends, compensation, and staff commitment to remain with child care for a period of time.

Although difficult to forecast, the potential exists for competing visions of early care and education to create competition for federal dollars among child care, pre-K, and Head Start programs. Limited funds and a concerted effort to move early care in the direction of school readiness might result in a shift of CCDF funds away from child care quality programs to staff training and education for pre-K and Head Start. Under such a scenario, T.E.A.C.H. is likely to lose CCDF dollars, a major source of funding in many of the states where it is operating, and it might see many of its programs reduced. While Florida is an example of where this almost happened because of state legislative decisions, Washington provides an example in which private and local government dollars can, to a limited degree, keep quality child care programs afloat in the absence of federal funding.

VII. Conclusion

Child care advocates seeking to replicate nonprofit child care programs across states can learn a number of lessons from the experience of the transfer of the T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood[®] Project to Florida, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Washington. The research suggests that the transfer of a policy innovation from a nonprofit in one state to a nonprofit in another state differs from the diffusion of government policy in that it consists of multiple stages and a number of “policy entrepreneur” roles. Because of this complexity, the study found a variety of lessons for child advocates at each stage of the policy diffusion process:

I. Diffusing the policy idea to a state:

- 1) A policy idea must be perceived as “good” (i.e., evidence provided must foster the view that the idea is effective) for the idea to travel and be accepted in other states.
- 2) Networks of national professional organizations help facilitate the broad diffusion of an idea.
- 3) Groups seeking and initiating new policy arise out of state environments that are primed for a particular child care issue.
- 4) Public-private partnerships are helpful in initiating a new policy idea in a state.

II. Replicating the policy model:

- 5) Training and technical assistance provided by the originating nonprofit facilitate effective replication of the policy model in another state.

- 6) Groups initiating policy transfer within a state can subsequently act as supportive mediators for the implementing nonprofit.
- 7) Positive outcomes of the originating nonprofit are more likely to be replicated if the model that is transferred is flexible enough to be adapted to a new environment yet fixed enough in key areas to maintain program integrity.

III. Achieving broad funding:

- 8) Appropriate framing of a new initiative is important to gaining the support of different groups (including potential funders).
- 9) Existing state and federal policy may provide reasons for why a new initiative should be supported (i.e., T.E.A.C.H. scholarships help child care providers meet state-mandated CDA credential requirements) and may be an important source of public funding.
- 10) The structure of the state government system influences ways of targeting advocacy efforts in a given state.
- 11) After the program has been initiated, participants in the new program are valuable advocates for generating support for additional public or private funding.

IV. Taking the program statewide:

- 12) Ease of statewide implementation depends on existing service provider systems (such as community colleges in the case of T.E.A.C.H.).
- 13) In-state professional and other networks are important vehicles for marketing the program within the state.
- 14) Lead staff with appropriate management skills and the expansion of the implementing nonprofit are important factors in expanding administrative capacity to take the program statewide.
- 15) Ongoing training, technical assistance, and monitoring by the originating nonprofit can provide a level of assurance that the transferred program maintains its integrity over time.

These lessons are based on the diffusion experience of Child Care Services Association in the transfer of T.E.A.C.H. to other states. When contrasted with other policy diffusion across state boundaries, the extended role of CCSA in the diffusion process is unusual. With most diffusion, policy ideas are picked up and implemented without the need for consent of the originating body. CCSA requires anyone wanting to replicate the program to obtain a license from CCSA. Likewise, ongoing technical assistance and monitoring during implementation is uncommon. The policy originator's concern for quality assurance motivated the close oversight of the replication of T.E.A.C.H. in new states.

Child care advocates attempting the transfer of child care policy across states should understand the importance of concurring events in the successful diffusion of policy. In the case of T.E.A.C.H., a policy solution developed in North Carolina came together with a growing national awareness of the problem of poor quality in child care and federal funding opportunities. Child care advocates seeking solutions to the problem of low-quality child care often had limited time and few technical and financial resources. The availability of what appeared to be a proven "off-the-shelf" model and funds (particularly from federal sources such

as CCDF and TANF) were basic to the successful diffusion of this nonprofit child care program.¹⁶ The convergence of a problem, a solution, and a favorable policy environment for funding created a “policy window” of the type discussed in Kingdon’s (1995) work on policy agenda setting.

An underlying current in the discussion of T.E.A.C.H. and its transfer are its implications for system change in child care on state and national levels. According to CCSA statistics, T.E.A.C.H. is already having a modest impact on child care provider systems in states where it is operating in terms of the education, compensation, and turnover of workers who participate in the program (CCSA 2002). In the states in this study, it was also found to be influencing the community college system in the area of early childhood education through increased enrollment, expanded courses, and improved articulation between schools. T.E.A.C.H. was also beginning to influence the creation of new public policy or was being integrated with it.

From a national perspective, change is less apparent. Early childhood advocates understand that T.E.A.C.H. can only partially address the problems of quality in the child care system. T.E.A.C.H. fills a void by organizing and using the opportunities available when working outside of government. In the absence of sweeping public policy that could expand improvements, T.E.A.C.H. and similar nonprofit initiatives are addressing the problem in an incremental fashion (DeVita and Montilla 2003). The originators of T.E.A.C.H. view this incremental progress as a potential catalyst for the development of broad public policies at the national and state levels to strengthen the professional development of child care providers through education and better compensation.

¹⁶ Implicit in this discussion is that there was a policy void on this issue. That is, either no policy/program addressed the problem of low-quality child care, or existing policy was not adequate to the task. If adequate policy had been in place, the problem would have been addressed and would not have elicited such attention.

Appendix A: The Stories of T.E.A.C.H. in the Study States

T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® FLORIDA

Begun in 1995, the T.E.A.C.H. project in Florida is the oldest of the four projects in the study. Florida also is the only state in the study where a national organization initiated the project. The T.E.A.C.H. project in Florida experienced cuts in its extensive public funding in 2001, but advocates found strategies to adjust in the new funding environment. The program has now almost returned to previous funding levels and is regarded as a program that attempts to unify a diverse yet collaborative early care and education provider network.

The story of T.E.A.C.H. in Florida begins in Massachusetts with the American Business Collaboration (ABC) and the organization contracted to manage it, WFD Consulting. ABC is a national group of U.S. companies working together to improve access to quality dependent care programs and services for their employees. Several staff members at WFD Consulting were well integrated into the child care field nationally and heard about T.E.A.C.H. through a long-time colleague. They chose T.E.A.C.H. on behalf of ABC because it addressed the issue of quality in child care, a concern of employees of ABC companies across the nation.

ABC's collaboration with Sue Russell of CCSA began when WFD staff arranged a meeting with her at an annual conference of the National Association for the Education of Young Children. Plans for ABC to use T.E.A.C.H. as one of its initiatives progressed from there. The vision for the project was to bring T.E.A.C.H. to a state through interested local ABC initiatives and then expand it statewide with other funding. In Florida, ABC dollars were used initially to fund T.E.A.C.H. scholarships in centers used by AT&T employees in Orlando beginning in 1995. Business dollars were therefore used to start T.E.A.C.H. as a pilot project with the intention of generating interest and eventually leveraging other support, including public dollars, to expand the program.

National networking opportunities also played a part in identifying a statewide T.E.A.C.H. agency in Florida. Around the time WFD staff began collaborating with Sue Russell, the director of the Florida Children's Forum (a statewide nonprofit children's advocacy organization) met her at a Children's Defense Fund meeting. They discussed T.E.A.C.H., and the director expressed interest in bringing it to Florida. When WFD and CCSA solicited bids for the project, the Florida Children's Forum won and became the administrative home for T.E.A.C.H. Initially, the Forum administered the T.E.A.C.H. scholarships in Orlando using only ABC funds, but other scholarships soon followed in Tampa with funding by a local foundation.

Meanwhile, increasing discussion and advocacy for taking T.E.A.C.H. statewide eventually resulted in public funding for the program. The director and T.E.A.C.H. coordinator at the Florida Children's Forum spread the word about the project's statewide potential through their contacts and channels in the state. Most important was the advocacy partnership already established between the director of the Florida Children's Forum (a registered lobbyist) and a state child care administrator. With strong advocates from both inside and outside state government and a supportive senate president, this advocacy team was able to get funding for

T.E.A.C.H. passed in the legislature as an earmarked item in the state budget. Thus, in spring 1998 the Florida Children's Forum received \$2 million from state-allocated CCDF and TANF funds to take T.E.A.C.H. statewide.

During the next three years, T.E.A.C.H. experienced funding increases and the turnover of several key people who had helped launch the project. Each year from 1999 to 2001, the state allocated \$3 million in funding for T.E.A.C.H., leaving the source of money (TANF, CCDF, or state funds) at the discretion of the state's Department of Children and Families. In 2000, a surplus in TANF dollars created by a drop in the welfare caseload resulted in an extra \$1.3 million being added to the T.E.A.C.H. budget for the year. In spring 1999, the individuals in the advocacy partnership who brought in public funding moved to different positions. This meant that the well-known advocates from the state's child care office and the T.E.A.C.H. agency no longer had a strong presence for T.E.A.C.H. in the state legislature. However, by then, scholarship recipients, sponsors, and other early childhood organizations had begun to play a role.

Although 2001 began with the allocation of \$3 million in public funds for T.E.A.C.H., budget cuts in the fall threatened its existence. Florida was particularly vulnerable to the drop in tourism following the September 11 terrorist attacks because so much of its tax base stems from tourist activities (Florida has no state income tax). Thus, in fall 2001, the state, facing an increasing budget deficit, required state agencies to reduce costs. The Florida Department of Children and Families' formula for cost reduction was to cut back on programs that did not serve children directly, making T.E.A.C.H. a target. By this time, funding for T.E.A.C.H. was coming from a mix of CCDF, TANF, and state funds, making it additionally vulnerable to cost-cutting measures. Thus, in fall 2001, in special legislative session B, \$1.2 million was cut from T.E.A.C.H. However, the worst was yet to come. In what was a complete surprise for T.E.A.C.H. advocates despite their best efforts to preserve T.E.A.C.H. funding, all future funding for T.E.A.C.H. was cut a month or so later in special legislative session C.

At about this same time, ongoing reorganization of the state administration resulted in responsibility for T.E.A.C.H. funding being transferred from the Department of Children and Families to the Partnership for School Readiness within the Agency for Workforce Innovation. The transfer of the program, although written "in proviso" as an amendment to the budget, was effective at the beginning of 2002 and brought alternate funding of T.E.A.C.H. Strong supporters of T.E.A.C.H. within the Partnership for School Readiness, including its director, used discretionary dollars (CCDF funds) from the Partnership to support T.E.A.C.H. Partnership funding of T.E.A.C.H. reached \$2.9 million for the 2002–03 fiscal year, almost restoring it to its previous funding level.

Funding cuts brought several changes to the administration and financing of T.E.A.C.H. scholarships. For several months, the T.E.A.C.H. agency did not fund any new scholarship recipients, although it continued to sponsor existing scholarships. Also, funding for Head Start T.E.A.C.H. recipients was reduced because Head Start teachers had access to federal training dollars. This adjustment made more funds available to child care providers who did not have access to other educational support. Several local communities also helped fill in the gap by funding T.E.A.C.H. scholarships in their regions. Once funding was restored to near previous

levels, a new recruitment effort was undertaken to inform providers that T.E.A.C.H. scholarships were available again on a wider basis.

T.E.A.C.H. in Florida is an integral part of the child care community. As of 2002, more than 6,400 scholarships have been awarded since statewide funding began in 1998. T.E.A.C.H. has gone to every county in the state and has strong ties with the community college system. It is currently working with 48 colleges, universities, and vocational-technical schools and 25 community-based training institutions. T.E.A.C.H. is also beginning to influence state policy for quality child care. The availability of T.E.A.C.H. scholarships helped support legislation for a child care director's credential that was passed in 1999.

T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® INDIANA

The transfer and implementation of T.E.A.C.H. in Indiana was the most straightforward of all the study states. The environment, funding, and immediate programmatic factors all came together to facilitate the transfer of T.E.A.C.H. to the state in 1999. The diffusion of the project is distinctive in that it was brought in by a public/private partnership. Leaders of the child care community, both inside and outside state government, had a long history of working well together and were instrumental during each phase of bringing T.E.A.C.H. to Indiana.

The story of T.E.A.C.H. in Indiana begins in 1995 with the first Indiana Symposium on Child Care Financing. The symposium brought together leaders in the private and public sectors to address the poor quality of child care in the state through funding county initiatives to build local public/private partnerships. A deputy director in Indiana's Bureau of Child Development (in the Family and Social Services Administration), who managed child care quality access and partnerships, worked with the Child Care Action Campaign of New York City to organize the symposium in Indiana. The symposium was repeated for three consecutive years, and in the third year the Indiana Child Care Fund was established by executive order of Governor Frank O'Bannon as an outcome of the symposium.

One of the Fund's objectives was to initiate statewide programs that would address the quality of child care in the state. The Fund's board, which consisted of state agency officials appointed by the governor, corporate sponsors, and higher education and early childhood professionals, formed a program search committee that was headed by a leading professor of early education from the state's community college system. The committee researched programs addressing the quality of child care in other states and learned about T.E.A.C.H. from the Fund's government sector cochair, who had heard about it from contacts at the Children's Defense Fund. In 1998, Sue Russell was invited to meet with the program committee to discuss the feasibility of bringing T.E.A.C.H. to Indiana and then again with the board before the board voted to implement it. The board's main concerns were whether the T.E.A.C.H. model was flexible enough to meet Indiana's needs, whether ongoing funding for the project was available, and the requirement that only one organization could be the T.E.A.C.H. licensee. However, board members were enthusiastic about T.E.A.C.H. because it addressed the underlying problems of poor quality in child care, it had measurable outcomes, and adopting it meant they did not have to "reinvent the wheel."

Once the board decided to go forward, a T.E.A.C.H. agency was selected and implementation got under way. A bidders' conference was held for prospective T.E.A.C.H. agencies and at the beginning of 1999, the Indiana Association for the Education of Young Children was selected to implement T.E.A.C.H. Initial funding for the project (\$150,000) came from corporate sponsors of the Indiana Child Care Fund. Indeed, the Fund supported T.E.A.C.H. not only by providing start-up funds but also by managing the funding of the project. An experienced manager of public and nonprofit child care programs was hired to be the T.E.A.C.H. coordinator, and the first T.E.A.C.H. scholarships were awarded a few months later. In fall 1999, the same deputy director in the Bureau of Child Development who initiated the symposia and the Fund secured \$1.5 million in CCDF funds for T.E.A.C.H.

With the windfall in funding, the T.E.A.C.H. agency was pressed to take T.E.A.C.H. out to the state as quickly as possible. Working through the state community college system (where doors were opened by the professor on the Fund board), the T.E.A.C.H. coordinator was able to quickly conduct an assessment of community college campuses statewide. Several four-year universities were also brought on board, and one pay rate was negotiated for all 33 participating institutions of higher education. The T.E.A.C.H. coordinator approached these institutions in partnership with the Indiana Head Start professional development specialist¹⁷ to show that between T.E.A.C.H. and Head Start funding, there would be significant *funded* demand for early childhood education courses.

The other significant task in taking T.E.A.C.H. statewide was the recruitment of scholarship recipients. The first T.E.A.C.H. scholarships were given in areas of the state where corporations connected to the Fund were investing in the program. In addition to the usual presentations and mailings targeted at a diverse array of providers to obtain broader funding, the coordinator took T.E.A.C.H. on the road to make personal contact with potential recipients and sponsors in local communities. She identified and approached critical local players who could serve as sponsors, including licensed child care providers, United Way agencies that supported child care, the local Early Childhood Alliance, local foundations, and county child care resource and referral agencies.

To meet the needs of the child care community in Indiana, the T.E.A.C.H. agency participated in the development of two new initiatives: (1) the development of online instruction for the Child Development Associate (CDA) certificate, and (2) educational courses for school-age child care providers. Growing concerns that child care providers in rural areas of Indiana had limited or no access to higher education institutions led to the development of online instruction for the CDA credential. The Family and Social Services Administration, together with higher education specialists and other partners, developed the web-based model www.childcarelearning.IN.gov offered through the state community college and a private university. T.E.A.C.H. plays an important role by funding scholarships for students taking the online courses. T.E.A.C.H. in Indiana also has sought to meet the needs of school-age child care providers by working with universities, sponsoring agencies, and a school-age child care

¹⁷ The Head Start professional development specialist worked with colleges and universities to set up degree programs for Head Start staff who needed to be in compliance by 2003 with the Head Start associate degree mandate.

consortium to help these providers meet T.E.A.C.H. eligibility requirements and take courses applicable to caring for school-age children.

By all indicators, T.E.A.C.H. in Indiana is a well-established and -integrated part of the early care and education system. Despite a recent economic downturn in the state and large state budget deficits, funding for T.E.A.C.H. over the long-term appears to be stable, given its average core support of \$1.5 million yearly in CCDF quality dollars. As of February 2003, T.E.A.C.H. was in 89 of 92 counties, had awarded 3,139 scholarships, and still had money available for new scholarships. In addition, higher education institutions are increasingly invested in T.E.A.C.H.-sponsored enrollments. T.E.A.C.H. is now beginning to influence the creation of other state policy supporting quality in child care. In 2001, Indiana passed a CDA requirement that was promoted, in part, by the availability of T.E.A.C.H. scholarships to help child care providers meet the new standard. A new School Age Credential will also be supported by T.E.A.C.H. scholarships.

T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® PENNSYLVANIA

The story of T.E.A.C.H. in Pennsylvania is characterized by a small but strong group of advocates who worked to bring T.E.A.C.H. into a state environment that was less prepared overall than others in the study. In Pennsylvania, considerable effort was made to overcome different philosophical and programmatic approaches between state child care administrators and child care advocates promoting T.E.A.C.H. The structure of the community college system also necessitated a great deal of work initially to streamline payments for T.E.A.C.H. scholarships. In the context of a fragmented child care environment, T.E.A.C.H. in Pennsylvania was implemented in 1998 and subsequently expanded through the concerted efforts of a devoted group of child care advocates.

In 1997, the Philadelphia-based William Penn Foundation began an initiative aimed at improving the quality of child care in the state. The Foundation had funded child care initiatives for a long time, but with the start of welfare reform and local reports on the dismal quality of care, staff saw the need for an integrated initiative on a larger scale. The Foundation's program officer called a meeting of Philadelphia child care agencies with the intention of creating a unified body for collaborative child care and early education work in southeastern Pennsylvania and the state. The result was Child Care Matters (CCM), a temporary initiative of five partner agencies with a focus on child care in three main areas: public policy, quality initiatives, and public education.

Like other initiating organizations in the study, CCM conducted a national search to identify programs to improve the quality of child care. Their criteria were threefold: (1) a research-based program that was replicable and aimed at improving quality; (2) a program that did not require new infrastructure; (3) a program that had potential for support from public resources. The group was familiar with T.E.A.C.H. because of their previous work in the child care field, including attending national child care meetings where Sue Russell presented on T.E.A.C.H. Eventually, a group went to North Carolina to speak with Sue Russell at CCSA. A short discussion of creating a T.E.A.C.H.-like program ensued, but North Carolina advocates pointed

out the benefits of the T.E.A.C.H. license; that is, it prevented legislators and department administrators from diluting the program by accepting only certain components. In the end, T.E.A.C.H. received enthusiastic support, and bringing it to Pennsylvania became the first priority of CCM.

Child care advocates in CCM knew that any attempt at improving the quality of child care in the state would come head to head with the existing approach in the state's Department of Public Welfare. Pressures to increase the number of child care slots had eclipsed the need to improve quality as the main focus for state child care administrators. Advocates noted that the Department's vision of quality improvement was limited to workshop training hours to meet a requirement for clock hours. Additionally, disagreement on new regulations for child care subsidies for the poor had created an almost adversarial relationship between child care advocates and the Department. Even before CCM was formally organized, child care advocates in the group worked to change the focus of the Department by organizing a seminar retreat for state officials (including the welfare secretary) on alternative approaches in child care. Over time, through subsequent seminars, meetings, and one-page briefs, these "soft" advocacy approaches smoothed the way for an improved relationship with state officials, although difficulties still surfaced.

Tension between state child care administrators and CCM child care advocates arose during selection of the T.E.A.C.H. agency. CCM brought together a selection committee that included stakeholders from across the state. Although CCM would be funding T.E.A.C.H. only in the southeastern part of the state, the intention was for the program to eventually spread with public funding to every county. The selection committee put together a list of 16 agencies as possible candidates for T.E.A.C.H. administration. However, few organizations met CCSA's eligibility requirements, and the list quickly dwindled to three: an organization that had been administering the state's child care worker training program, a child care resource and referral agency whose primary home was in Delaware, and the Pennsylvania Child Care Association (PACCA). State child care administrators preferred that T.E.A.C.H. go to their contracting organization because they felt PACCA lacked sufficient capacity and they were uncomfortable with its role as an advocacy organization. The state's contracting organization, however, submitted a poor application, and the resource and referral agency was deemed ineligible because it was out of state. In the end, PACCA was the only organization CCSA would consider as a licensee. In late 1997, PACCA was awarded the T.E.A.C.H. contract and quickly got up to speed by changing its status from a trade association to a 501(c)(3) organization. Initial funding for T.E.A.C.H. scholarships came from CCM and the American Business Collaboration (the same organization that brought T.E.A.C.H. to Florida).

CCM advocates hired a professional lobbyist and continued their soft advocacy efforts. CCM and Pennsylvania's Partnership for Children (a respected children's advocacy organization) sent program revision requests to top-ranking officials, including the deputy director of the governor's budget and the deputy director and secretary of the Department of Public Welfare. CCM's professional lobbyist also helped open doors to key legislators and administrators. Briefing breakfasts were held for legislators, and other meetings were organized to raise awareness about child care quality and specifically about T.E.A.C.H. These efforts paid off when the Department included T.E.A.C.H. as a line item in its budget—a budget that was

subsequently approved in the state legislature. Thus, in winter 1998, news came that T.E.A.C.H. would receive \$500,000 in CCDF dollars.

However, tensions between the T.E.A.C.H. agency and the Department of Public Welfare surfaced again. The Department announced it would not be able to fund the scholarship model proposed by PACCA and approved by CCSA. Because of past experiences, the state would not provide funding that directly compensated scholarship recipients. While center scholarship models were revised so that the state did not have to pay for the compensation component, family child care providers with no sponsoring organization to assume the bonus or salary piece could not access T.E.A.C.H. Recently, private funds have been allowed to pay for bonuses to family child care providers; however, these funds remain limited.

The process of taking T.E.A.C.H. statewide was encumbered by several factors: (1) Pennsylvania has no state community college system, (2) certain types of public child care providers were absent or excluded, and (3) staff difficulties emerged. Community colleges in Pennsylvania are either county- or school district-based, each with their own payment schedules. Complicating the situation further was the fact that community colleges often had a different pay rate for students from outside the colleges' county or school district. After much negotiation, PACCA negotiated one payment rate for T.E.A.C.H. scholarships with the presidents of the community colleges, which greatly simplified administration. Recruitment of T.E.A.C.H. recipients was also hampered by the lack of a statewide child care resource and referral agency and the fact that most Head Start programs could not access scholarships because of a CCM requirement limiting T.E.A.C.H. to state-licensed child care providers (most Head Starts are not licensed in Pennsylvania because they are federally monitored). In addition, start-up problems within the T.E.A.C.H. agency slowed the development of the project and again created tension with the Department of Public Welfare.

T.E.A.C.H. in Pennsylvania has taken root and spread despite an environment initially requiring considerable adaptation. In fiscal year 2002–2003, state funding of T.E.A.C.H. reached nearly \$2 million, making up for a drop in funds after the CCM initiative ended in June 2003. In terms of policy integration, T.E.A.C.H. is increasingly being used as a resource for other state child care quality initiatives. Such policy integration ensures a degree of stability for T.E.A.C.H. funding as other programs become reliant on its scholarships to fulfill their initiatives. As of August 2003, T.E.A.C.H. in Pennsylvania had provided almost 2,000 scholarships and was in 62 of 67 counties. The T.E.A.C.H. agency continues to move forward as it expands its funding base to include more private dollars and involves T.E.A.C.H. graduates in advocacy for continued public support of the program.

T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® WASHINGTON

Started in 2000, the T.E.A.C.H. project in Washington is the newest of the four in this study. It is also perhaps the most unusual in terms of program origination and funding. While Washington followed a slightly different path than the other states, its experience highlights cooperation by key players in the policy community to address obstacles to policy diffusion.

The idea to bring T.E.A.C.H. to Washington was first introduced in 1998 when the City of Seattle organized a team of city planners to research and evaluate programs around the nation aimed at increasing the quality of child care. While some administrators knew of T.E.A.C.H. through national conferences, such as the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) conference, it was this search process that officially introduced the project to the city and led them to invite Sue Russell to present the T.E.A.C.H. model to Human Service agency staff and others. T.E.A.C.H. had never been introduced in a state by way of a local government, and doing so required some negotiation between the city and Sue Russell. They reached a compromise in early 1999: a slightly altered program name and the understanding that when the state adopted T.E.A.C.H., the administration of the program would change hands and implementation at the state level would follow the established protocol outlined by CCSA. For the next year, Sue Russell worked with the city to approve it as the licensee, as well as to hire and train new and current staff for what was officially the T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood[®] Seattle Pilot.

At the same time, the state was turning its attention to the broad issue of learning, birth through 5, and the governor established a Commission on Early Learning in summer 1998. The commission was cochaired by the governor's wife, Mona Locke, and her personal friend Melinda Gates, wife of Microsoft founder Bill Gates. Among the committee members were business leaders, child development specialists, and the governor's early learning policy advisor. The commission's child care subcommittee conducted a search, similar to the one conducted by the City of Seattle, for quality initiatives undertaken by other states and invited Sue Russell to present in late 1999. T.E.A.C.H. was quickly endorsed, and the commission released a CCSA-generated request for proposals to find a statewide administering organization.

T.E.A.C.H.'s unusual introduction into Washington was followed by an equally unusual funding situation. The Seattle pilot was fully funded with city dollars earmarked for quality initiatives through a campaign called Project Lift-Off. However, the governor made it clear that no government money was available for any action that resulted from the Commission on Early Learning. To overcome this funding problem, the commission decided to raise money for a foundation that would carry out its recommendations. Melinda and Bill Gates donated the original endowment for the Foundation for Early Learning, which then became the funding source for the first T.E.A.C.H. scholarships awarded at the state level.

In summer 2000, the pieces of T.E.A.C.H. in Washington seemed to come together. The Foundation for Early Learning officially became a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization (although a director was not hired until November). The Seattle pilot was under way and had successfully awarded the first T.E.A.C.H. scholarships in the Seattle area. Indecision over which of two child care organizations would be better suited to implement T.E.A.C.H. led to a joint meeting and decision by members of the child care community that, of the two, the Washington Child Care Resource and Referral Network (R&R Network) was in a better position to apply for the project. The R&R Network was granted the license after an arduous process of proving its qualifications as a viable state presence and a successful advocate and service delivery organization. Among the most difficult challenges initially for the R&R Network was integrating T.E.A.C.H. into the state's community college system—a system that prides itself on

the autonomy of each college's curriculum. This situation complicated articulation among individual community colleges.

With the statewide T.E.A.C.H. agency selected, the City of Seattle passed the program to the state in January 2001. Statewide implementation, however, proved difficult. The initial grant from the Foundation for Early Learning for \$647,000, plus the City of Seattle's grant for \$100,000, added significantly to the R&R Network's budget, yet no capacity building, such as fund development, business development, and staff training, accompanied it, making it difficult to manage the lump-sum grant. Early hires for T.E.A.C.H. staff positions turned out to have different skill sets than were needed for starting up a program of this magnitude. In addition, the CCSA requirement that licensees spend a year tracking scholarships, the classes taken, and more without the aid of the database (a learning-by-doing strategy) overwhelmed the nonprofit with administrative tasks at a time it was implementing \$1.3 million in new statewide program grants unrelated to T.E.A.C.H. At the same time, the organization was struggling with how to meet the needs of the child care community in the state and also adhere to the T.E.A.C.H. model as a trademarked program. For instance, many child care advocates felt a specific model had to be developed for family providers because they make up a large proportion of the child care providers in Washington. Also, with many providers in rural areas, some as far as three hours from the nearest community college, advocates were looking for a T.E.A.C.H. model that did not require physically attending college.

Support came to the R&R Network when Foundation staff intervened. First, the grant was extended over a longer period, from the original one-year grant to three and then four years. Also, part of that money was set aside for the R&R Network to hire a development coordinator to work out some of the program details, such as how to budget scholarship money disbursements on a semester basis and how to raise additional funding. By March 2001, the R&R Network was ready to take over the Seattle files and expand the program to King County. In June 2001, the program was extended to two additional community colleges serving nine new counties.

The next obstacle came after the one-year probationary period of learning the tracking and records system ended. The R&R Network shifted to the required T.E.A.C.H. database, but the system was not designed to track Washington's unusual funding and disbursement patterns. By this time, the program funding came from three sources—the City of Seattle, King County, and the Foundation—each with different reporting requirements, student eligibility requirements, and restrictions on when the money could be spent. After watching the R&R Network struggle with this system for a year and a half, the Foundation was close to rescinding its grant. By now, two more funders were on board (the state and the Paul G. Allen Charitable Foundation) and the reporting requirements of the five funders and CCSA were too cumbersome to meet efficiently with the database CCSA required. Fortunately, the Foundation's position as part of the philanthropic community enabled it to call all the funders together and reach an agreement to standardize many of the individual reporting requirements. At the same meeting, funders agreed to allow the R&R Network to use a portion of each grant to add features to the CCSA database to better handle the unique situation of multiple reporting requirements.

Adapting T.E.A.C.H. to an environment with a multitude of funding sources, a nascent community college system, and a geographically and ethnically diverse population continues to be a challenge. Still, interviewees expressed wide admiration for the crucial elements of T.E.A.C.H., often calling the decision to adopt the program a “no-brainer.” As of June 2003, T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood[®] Washington had awarded 318 scholarships, and, if funding materializes as anticipated, the program is expected to be in every county in the state by spring 2004.

References

Balla, Steven J. 2001. “Interstate Professional Associations and the Diffusion of Policy Innovations.” *American Politics Research* 29(3): 221–245.

Carnegie Task Force on Meeting the Needs of Young Children. 1994. *Starting Points: Meeting the Needs of our Youngest Children*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

CCSA (Child Care Services Association). 2000. *T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood[®] Celebrating Ten Years July 1, 1990–June 30, 2000*. Brochure.

_____. 2001. *T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood[®] A National Strategy*. Information portfolio.

_____. 2002. *T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood[®] Project 2001–2002 Annual Report*.

De Vita, Carol J., and Maria Montilla. 2003. *Improving Child Care Quality: A Comparison of Military and Civilian Approaches*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Howes, Carollee, Ellen Galinsky, Marybeth Shinn, Annette Sibley, Martha Abbott-Shim, and Jan McCarthy. 1998. *Florida Child Care Quality Improvement Study: 1996 Report*. New York: Families and Work Institute.

Helburn, Suzanne W., and Mary Culkin, eds. 1995. *Cost, Quality and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers: Public Report*. Denver: Economics Department, University of Colorado at Denver.

Kingdon, John. 1995. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, 2nd ed. New York: HarperCollins.

Mintrom, Michael. 1997. “Policy Entrepreneurs and the Diffusion of Innovation.” *American Journal of Political Science* 41(3): 738–770.

Mintrom, M., and Vergari, S. 1998. “Policy Networks and Innovation Diffusion: the Case of State Education Reforms.” *Journal of Politics* 59(1): 126–148.

The Child Care Partnership Project: Financing Quality Child Care in Indiana.
<http://ericps.ed.uiuc.edu/nccic/ccpartnerships/cases/indiana.htm> (accessed June 2003).