

Promoting Two-Generation Strategies: A Getting-Started Guide for State and Local Policy Makers

Christopher T. King
Rheagan Coffey
Tara C. Smith



NOVEMBER 2013

FRMC Ray Marshall Center
for the Study of Human Resources

LBJ LYNDON B. JOHNSON
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

FOUNDATIONFORCHILDDEVELOPMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	ii
List of Figures.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	1
Executive Summary.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Local Two-Generation Program Examples.....	4
<i>CareerAdvance</i> [®] , The Community Action Project of Tulsa County, Oklahoma.....	4
Atlanta Civic Site, Atlanta, Georgia.....	5
The Jeremiah Program, Minneapolis, Minnesota.....	6
The Keys to Degrees Program, Endicott College, Beverly, MA.....	6
Facilitating Factors for Successful Two-Generation Programs.....	7
Facilitating Factor 1: Supportive Policy Framework.....	8
Facilitating Factor 2: Leadership.....	9
Facilitating Factor 3: Program Administration.....	10
Sector-Based Workforce Development Programs.....	10
Early Childhood Education Programs.....	12
Facilitating Factor 4: Integrated and Flexible Funding Streams.....	14
Public Funding Opportunities.....	14
Philanthropic and Business Community Funding.....	16
Facilitating Factor 5: Evidence-Oriented Culture.....	17
Common Steps for Getting Started.....	19
Conduct an Environmental Scan.....	20
Link Existing Services.....	21
Identify Program Champions.....	22
Identify Funding Sources and Key Collaborators.....	22
Consider Replicating or Expanding a Successful Two-Generation Program.....	23
Launch a Pilot Program.....	24
Recommendations for Policy Makers.....	24
Endnotes.....	26

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Public Funding Sources for Workforce Development and Early Childhood Care and Education.....	15
Table 2. Checklist of Common Implementation Challenges and Opportunities.....	20
Table 3. Recommendations for State and Local Policy Makers to Start and Support Two-Generation.....	25

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Facilitating Factors of Successful Two-Generation Strategies.....	7
Figure 2. Sectoral Workforce Policies by State.....	11
Figure 3. Pre-Kindergarten Policies by State.....	12
Figure 4. Common Steps for Establishing a Two-Generation Strategy.....	19
Figure 5. Continuum of Two-Generation Strategies.....	21

Acknowledgments

We want to express our gratitude to the Foundation for Child Development (FCD) for supporting our work on this guide. Former president Ruby Takanishi has been a visionary in this policy area, as was her successor Deborah Phillips. Donald J. Hernandez provided guidance at every step in the process, drawing on his own considerable experience and expertise.

The thinking reflected in this guide has its origins in the two-generation strategy we helped design and implement in Tulsa working with the Community Action Project of Tulsa County and partners at Harvard, Northwestern, and Columbia since 2008. Initial funding for Career*Advance*[®] was provided by the George Kaiser Family Foundation, while its expansion is being supported by a Health Professions Opportunity Grant (HPOG) from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families.

The report also benefited from extended discussions with the leadership and staff of the Aspen Institutes' Ascend Program. Ascend director Anne Mosle and deputy director Nisha Patel, as well as Mekaelia Davis and Sarah Haight, have provided helpful insights, particularly in thinking about two-generation strategies and how to scale them. My fellow Ascend Fellows, especially Lindsay Chase-Lansdale, Steven Dow and Gloria Perez, also shaped our thinking about the guide and how it might be used.

Researchers, policymakers and practitioners who participated in a series of meetings jointly convened by the Ray Marshall Center, FCD, and the Ascend Program from the fall of 2011 through the summer of 2012, as well as the Aspen Institute's October 2012 ThinkXChange also were instrumental in our thinking about two-generation strategies and how they might be expanded. Similar meetings sponsored by the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation stimulated our thinking as well.

More recently, we have begun in-depth discussions with Central Texas leaders responsible for early childhood education, postsecondary and adult education and workforce development that raised issues and suggested ideas that are reflected in this guide. We hope we can 'test drive' these ideas as we develop and roll out a two-generation strategy in the greater Austin area.

Finally, many Ray Marshall Center staff supported our work on this guide, including Susie Riley, Karen White, Alanna Burney, Laura Stelling, Greg Cumpton, and especially Bob Glover, who is now basking in a well-deserved retirement. Kori Hattemer, a former student at the LBJ School who now works for Ascend Fellow Andrea Levere at the Corporation for Enterprise Development, contributed to an earlier version of this guide.

Executive Summary

In the current economic environment, state and local governments are being asked to ‘do more with less’, but at the same time, meet the needs of a population that has been particularly hard hit by the Great Recession and the sluggish recovery that has followed it: low-income families. An innovative approach to addressing these challenges is to link quality workforce development services and quality early childhood education for low-income families in an explicit *two-generation strategy*. The goal of a two-generation strategy is to break the inter-generational cycle of poverty, moving the family toward economic security and stability through education, workforce training, and related support services.

This paper is intended to serve as a getting-started guide for state and local policymakers as they begin to develop and implement two-generation strategies in their areas. It begins with an overview of the most recent family of innovative two-generation programs and provides several examples of the model that illustrate different approaches to a two-generation strategy with strong workforce and/or education components. While the programs are by no means identical, each has developed a coordinated array of services to address the needs of low-income families and improve their educational and economic outcomes over time. The guide presents five facilitating factors that appear to be linked to the success of two-generation strategies: supportive policy frameworks; leadership; program administration; integrated and flexible funding streams; and evidence-oriented culture. The guide then details some of the common steps taken in establishing two-generation programs, and identifies recommendations for state and local policymakers interested in implementing a two-generation approach.

Introduction

As the financial resources of states and municipalities become constrained by lower levels of funding, there is increased interest in improving the efficiency and effectiveness of public services. At the same time, poverty rates among families have grown as a result of the Great Recession and sluggish recovery, further straining public resources. An innovative approach to addressing these challenges is to link quality workforce development services and quality early childhood education for low-income families in an explicit two-generation strategy. The best predictor of economic mobility for children is the parents' level of educational attainment.¹ The goal of a two-generation strategy is to break the inter-generational cycle of poverty, moving the family toward economic security and stability through education, workforce training and related support services. Such strategies provide opportunities for both parents and children, economic supports, and social capital in the form of family and peer support services.² These strategies are attractive for state and local implementation because they draw upon existing services, coordinate with the local business community and philanthropic organizations, and can be tailored to regional economic conditions.

This paper is intended to serve as a getting-started guide to state and local policymakers as they begin to develop and implement two-generation strategies in their respective areas. The paper provides several examples of existing programs, along with a discussion of facilitating factors that appear to be linked to the success of two-generation programs.

Components of a Two-Generation Strategy

- **Quality early childhood education**
- **Sectoral job training**
 - Postsecondary education
 - Workforce intermediaries
- **Wrap-around family support services**
 - Adult education and ESL
 - Career coaching
 - Peer community-building
 - Financial education
 - Transportation assistance

Local Two-Generation Program Examples

A number of local areas around the country are implementing explicit two-generation models, which are customized to meet local workforce needs and service availability within their unique institutional and programmatic contexts. Two-generation examples include, among others: Tulsa, Oklahoma's Career*Advance*[®] program; the Atlanta Civic Site in Georgia; the Jeremiah Program in Minneapolis, Minnesota; and Endicott College's Keys to Degrees Program in Beverly, Massachusetts. Each of these programs is profiled below to illustrate different approaches to a two-generation strategy with strong workforce and/or education components. Each has developed a coordinated array of services to address the needs of low-income families and improve their educational and economic outcomes over time.

Career*Advance*[®], The Community Action Project of Tulsa County, Oklahoma

Career*Advance*[®] is a sectoral workforce development program targeting jobs in the healthcare industry with a ladder of education, training, and certifications in selected occupations offering opportunities for advancement and family-supporting earnings with fringe benefits. Training is structured through a career pathways approach and provided at Tulsa Community College and the Tulsa Technology Center. The program began in mid-2009 as a pilot for the parents of children in Head Start/Early Head Start programs operated by the Community Action Project of Tulsa County (CAP). The program design initially featured a stackable series of training courses in nursing from Certified Nurse Aide (CNA) through Registered Nurse (RN). In 2011, a career path in health information technology (HIT) was added, and later stand-alone programs for Medical Assistant (MA) and Pharmacy Technician. Participants may “stop-out” (either temporarily or permanently) at each level with an industry-recognized credential that provides participants with opportunities for higher wages and advancement opportunities.

Career*Advance*[®] is designed to support and motivate participation through several key elements: a cohort training model; peer mentoring and support through facilitated weekly meetings of participants; tuition payments and other education/training expenses; incentive bonuses for good performance; adult basic education and tutoring services; and wrap-around services such as before and aftercare for children, and transportation assistance. Tulsa's George Kaiser Family Foundation funded the initial development and operations of the program from 2008-2010; since September 2011, it has been supported by the Health Professionals Opportunities Grant (HPOG) program at the U.S. Department of Health and

Human Services. The program relies on a number of community partners, including Tulsa Community College, Tulsa Technology Center, Child and Family Services, and Union Public Schools. *CareerAdvance*[®] is the subject of a comprehensive multi-methods evaluation led by the Institute for Policy Research at Northwestern University and the Ray Marshall Center at the University of Texas at Austin's Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs examining implementation and longitudinal parent/child outcomes and impacts.³

Atlanta Civic Site, Atlanta, Georgia

The Atlanta Civic Site in Georgia is coordinated and funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation through its *Making Connections* program, a long-term initiative to improve the futures of at-risk children. The program incorporates education achievement, family economic success, and neighborhood transformation elements. The Atlanta Civic Site employs a strategy that bundles workforce development, work supports, and asset-building programs for low-income families.⁴ The program's expectation is that parents will be employed on a pathway to a family-supporting career, accessing work supports, and building assets and wealth while their children are on a pathway to student success. The Center for Working Families, Inc. (TCWFI) is implementing this strategy in conjunction with Sheltering Arms Early Education & Family Centers, which operates a high-quality early childcare center at the Atlantic Civic Center site.

The partnership between TCWFI and Sheltering Arms Center represents a two-generation strategy that ensures children's health and school readiness as well as parents' achievement of economic success. Children aged 0-10 years of age receive high-quality care at the Sheltering Arms Center while their parents engage in development activities at TCWFI. Key advantages of the Atlantic Civic Site include the fact that children can matriculate from Sheltering Arms to the elementary school adjoining the Center (following a continuous Pre-K through Grade 3 curriculum), while their parents receive workforce services from TCWFI located directly across the parking lot. Sheltering Arms further supports parents by offering caregiving resources, parent engagement, and education programming.⁵ At TCWFI, each family works with a Family Coach to identify the family's strengths and determine the services and interventions that are needed to help the family thrive. TCWFI functions as a hub linking participants to a wide array of partner organizations. The Family Coach remains engaged to ensure that the supports are high quality and well aligned with participant needs.⁶ Drawing on support from the United Way of Metropolitan Atlanta and other funders, TCWFI is able to leverage and bundle the services of other United Way-funded organizations. The Family Coach continues to interact with participants as they transition into work, maintain their job, and take steps to advance in their career.

It is important to note that the Casey Foundation is in the process of launching a multi-site two-generation strategy in Fall 2013 and will be engaging an evaluator to examine the implementation and measure its outcomes and impacts over time.

The Jeremiah Program, Minneapolis, Minnesota

The Jeremiah Program defines itself as “a proven, holistic approach to transform families from poverty to prosperity two generations at a time.”⁷ The place-based program began in Minneapolis, Minnesota and is currently expanding to sites in North Dakota and Austin, Texas.

Rather than a cohort-oriented program, individual participant goals are pursued through a coordination of postsecondary education support and employment services, early childhood programs, affordable housing, and parenting and life skills development.

The Jeremiah Program provides single-parent families with stable housing and other on-site services, including: a high-quality child development center; access to a library, computer labs, classrooms, and life coaches; and job placement assistance. Participants attend Personal Empowerment Training to develop important personal characteristics that contribute to their success in workplace settings as well as participating in life skills education classes during their time as residents. Although rigorous evaluations have not been conducted on the effects of participation in the Jeremiah Program, the program reports strong outcomes for mothers and children: “40% of graduates obtain a four-year degree, and 60% obtain an Associate’s degree.... 90% report their children are performing at or above grade level.”⁸ Recently the program has developed a new focus on broadening connections with major corporate funders to enhance employment pathways for participants and alumnae.


The Keys to Degrees Program, Endicott College, Beverly, MA

The Keys to Degrees Program, another place-based postsecondary initiative, began at Endicott College just north of Boston in 1993. This program provides the opportunity for academically qualified, single parents to complete their undergraduate degrees at Endicott College while living on campus. In addition to academic support services, the program combines on-campus housing, access to childcare in the community, and parenting support services. The goals of the program are for students to earn a baccalaureate degree from Endicott College; balance academic, work, and family obligations; become economically self-sufficient in their chosen field; be responsible and contributing members of the community; and live and learn on campus with their children.⁹ The program has since been replicated at Eastern Michigan University with a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.¹⁰

Facilitating Factors for Successful Two-Generation Programs

Although two-generation programs are as diverse as the communities they serve, several features emerge as consistent factors in the success of the programs. These factors include: supportive policy frameworks; leadership; program administration; integrated and flexible funding streams; and evidence-oriented culture.

Figure 1. Facilitating Factors of Successful Two-Generation Strategies



In the following sections, the five factors illustrated in Figure 1 are described in detail. These factors will also provide a framework for identifying challenges, opportunities, and next steps later in the guide.

Facilitating Factor 1: Supportive Policy Framework

Two-generation programs are most successful when state- and local-level policies include systemic approaches that simultaneously address the needs of parents and their children. Currently, most systems serving adults and children lack the necessary policy coordination for successful, effective two-generation programs.

Postsecondary education and workforce programs focus on serving adults, while early childhood education programs concentrate on developmental outcomes for children. These silos exist primarily due to the separate federal funding streams and Congressional authorizing committees for these different initiatives, and continue to the state and local level because state policy structures typically mirror the federal format.¹¹ Addressing the lack of coordination between workforce development and early education programs will likely require examining the available budgets and incentive mechanisms for each type of program, and overcoming institutional inertia to encourage coordination among existing programs.

Over the past few decades, some states have moved towards more comprehensive policy frameworks that incorporate workforce development and childcare programs, creating an opportunity for the establishment of two-generation programs. For example, Utah has a history of comprehensive policymaking in workforce and family policies. Their One-Stop Career Centers are organized according to function instead of funding stream and help participants with a full range of services that span educational aid, workforce development, childcare, and social supports. Additionally, Utah rotates staff through different functions, which can encourage program coordination and break down organizational silos.¹²

Texas also has a supportive policy framework that offers a relatively integrated system under the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC). TWC, in conjunction with regional workforce boards, controls the major workforce development funding including: Workforce Investment Act (WIA) training programs, Employment Services, Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) work programs, as well as childcare funding through the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) block grant. Although Texas does not have as integrated a system as Utah, they have laid the groundwork for future coordination of service delivery. Other states with comprehensive policy frameworks that could readily support two-generation strategies include Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin.¹³ It should be acknowledged that the existence of supportive policy frameworks does not necessarily mean that the states that have them are taking full advantage; rather there is the potential for coordinated service delivery.

Supportive policy frameworks:
Allow two-generation investments to focus on families rather than just adults or just children.

Facilitating Factor 2: Leadership

Strong leadership, political and otherwise, can greatly increase the likelihood of implementation of innovative programs. Challenging the status quo to reorganize large programs, such as workforce development and early childhood education, into a structure that provides coordinated services requires substantial political will. In a study by the National Governors Association (NGA), state partners implementing sector-based strategies identified gubernatorial and legislative leadership as a success factor for these initiatives. The NGA report found that legislative support beyond the tenure of the originating Governor often made the difference between a short-term initiative, and long-term success.¹⁴ Research suggests that public policy changes will be necessary to support broader-scale implementation of two-generation initiatives. Examples of such changes could include lengthening Head Start to a full-time, year round program to accommodate working parents, or establishing workforce system performance metrics better suited for longer-term sectoral training programs, rather than short-term “Work First” programs.¹⁵ State and local policymakers will need to build a broad coalition of elected and appointed officials to ensure long-term sustainability for two-generation programs.

**Leadership:
Every two-generation
strategy project needs
a champion, a trail
blazer, or a lead
organization.**

State and local elected officials need to be informed not only on how two-generation strategies can be implemented, but also the potential short- and long-term effects on children and their parents, taxpayers, and society as a whole. Provisions for two-generation strategies should attract bipartisan support if evidence suggests they have the potential to produce long-term positive results for families. In an effort to build the case for two-generation programs, The Aspen Institute has founded Ascend—a hub for two-generation strategy, policy research, and program design. The program is developing the methodology of successful programs, and building a network of leaders for two-generation strategies.¹⁶

Another example of outreach and education for local political leaders is The Sector Skills Academy. The Sector Skills Academy was launched in 2005 as a collaboration of The Aspen Institute, National Network of Sector Partners, and Public/Private Ventures¹⁷ that seeks to encourage and support rising leaders in the sectoral workforce development field. Through three workshops over a 12-month period, participants learn new skills in sectoral workforce development, network with other individuals in the field, and establish mentor relationships. One of the goals of the academy is to expand the depth and breadth of leaders in sectoral programs, which can be a key component to two-generation programs.¹⁸

Facilitating Factor 3: Program Administration

Successful two-generation strategies rely on program partners to provide some of the services to participants, ranging from adult education to social support. However, program inertia in the respective partners can hinder the level of coordination between agencies, and lead to infighting and inaction. Having multiple agencies, funding streams, and partners involved requires strong program administration and coordination. One way to encourage strong coordination is to create and support a workforce intermediary to administer and guide the two-generation strategy and build connections between partner programs and employers who are essential to its success.¹⁹ A workforce intermediary would have contacts between the various workforce development programs and early childhood initiatives and would also seek input from the local business community to ensure that the program is meeting the economic needs of the community. Although two-generation strategies can draw upon many different programs, the two most common partners are sector-based workforce development, typically provided via well-structured career pathways, and early childhood education programs. Below is a description of these partners.

Sector-Based Workforce Development Programs

An increasing number of local regions and states are adopting sector approaches to workforce development as a response to their workforce challenges. Sector-based workforce initiatives target specific industries, or *sectors*, and are designed to meet regional workforce needs.²⁰ Multiple national-level organizations have been working with states to advance their sector strategies. The map below illustrates the growing interest in sector-based workforce initiatives. States that have participated in the *State Sector Strategies*²¹ initiative promoted by the National Governors' Association, the National Network of Sector Partners, and the Corporation for a Skilled Workforce are noted by a dot. The number of programs from each state that have participated in the Aspen Institute's Sector Skills Academy²² are highlighted by shading.


Workforce Intermediary:

An approach to program administration that brings together employers, workers, and training partners to create pathways to family-supporting careers for low-skilled workers.

Sector-Based Programs often focus on jobs in:

- Healthcare
- Energy
- Utilities
- Information Technology
- Transportation Logistics
- Advanced Manufacturing

Figure 2. Sectoral Workforce Policies by State



Sources: Sector Skills Academy Fellows <http://www.sectorskillsacademy.org/FellowsNEW.html>; Insight Center for Community Economic Development: <http://www.insightccd.org/programs/workforce/accelerating-state-adoption-of-sector-strategies.html>

Note: Some of the states shown as not supporting sector strategies (e.g., Texas) have had their own version of sector or cluster strategies supported at the state level.

The *State Sector Strategies* initiative identified a set of characteristics for successful sector strategies, including:²³


- Collaboration with agencies
- Alignment with other strategies such as career pathways
- Work credentialing
- Leveraging other funding
- Providing incentive and planning funds
- Strong industry and employer involvement
- Operating within an “economic competitiveness” framework
- Providing technical assistance to local areas
- Gubernatorial and legislative leadership

Policymakers should look for the above characteristics when searching for workforce partners to serve adults as part of their two-generation strategy.

Early Childhood Education Programs

High-quality early childhood education, from pre-kindergarten (Pre-K) through third grade, has proven to be a good investment that prepares children to succeed educationally, which can lead to future success in the workforce. As of 2011, forty states use public funds to support Pre-K programs in public schools, and 34 of them meet more than five of the ten quality standards outlined by The National Institute for Early Education Research.²⁴ The map below identifies those states offering state-funded Pre-K and the number of quality standards each state meets.

Figure 3. Pre-Kindergarten Policies by State



Source: Barnett et al., (2012). The State of Preschool 2012.

Note: For states with multiple state-funded Pre-K programs, only the program meeting the highest number of quality standards is shown.

States that are providing high-quality Pre-K could incorporate these programs as part of a two-generation strategy if other mechanisms are also in place. Successful program administration could bring together existing early childhood education and incorporate two-generation elements such as coordinated schedules (i.e. full-day program), parent support groups, and social supports.

Head Start and Early Head Start programs can provide high quality early education and comprehensive support services to infants through four-year-olds in low-income families.^{25,26} Head Start traditionally seeks to engage children’s parents, a strategy that could be expanded to include parental training programs as part of a two-generation strategy. Educare is an early education program that offers full day, full year, and high-quality education to at-risk children from birth to age five. The program provides early childhood education programming and support for parent-child relationships that “create the foundation for successful learning.”²⁷ The program has demonstrated promising results and is currently being implemented in 14 states and the District of Columbia.²⁸ Educare and Head Start are partner agencies with CareerAdvance® in Tulsa, OK, providing early childhood education for program participants.

Unfortunately, without follow-up, the gains from participation in Pre-K programs can fade by the third grade. A more comprehensive approach to early childhood education that encompasses Pre-K *through* third grade is needed to ensure that students achieve academic success into elementary school and beyond. High quality Pre-K alone, “cannot inoculate children against academic failure”.²⁹

A solid Pre-K through the third grade education is the foundation upon which academic and personal achievement is based. The Foundation for Child Development has identified several school districts as case studies for how to approach quality early childhood education, including:³⁰

- Union City Public Schools, New Jersey
- Seattle Public Schools, Washington
- Montgomery County Public Schools, Maryland

Each of these school districts have implemented coordinated curriculum for Pre-K through third grade, and have made promoting a two-generation strategy a priority within the schools.

Early Childhood Education: Extends from Pre-K through third grade education to provide a solid foundation for future academic and economic success.

Facilitating Factor 4: Integrated and Flexible Funding Streams

Early childhood education and workforce development are currently funded from different sources, each with a unique set of requirements. Since two-generation strategies span across multiple agencies, and perform multiple functions, integrated sources of funding are preferred. This funding could come from a variety of entities, including traditional funding sources—workforce development funding, early childhood education subsidies – but also funding from the business community and philanthropic resources. Given the current funding crisis at the federal and state levels, policymakers should be prepared to “think outside the box” for funding sources.

Two-generation strategies should consider any and all funding sources available. One way to secure funding is to take a “braided” approach. Rather than attempting to fund a program from a singular source, funding is secured from multiple sources to create a package based upon the needs of the families participating. This approach has been used successfully with workforce intermediaries and could be extended to two-generation programs.

Public Funding Opportunities

Table 1 below provides a brief description of potential workforce³¹ and early childhood care and education funding through various public sources. Federal funding for workforce programs, such as WIA, is likely to be limited for the foreseeable future, due to budget constraints. However, other, more flexible funding streams can be used to incorporate two-generation strategies into state plans. These include Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and Workforce Innovation funds, along with state-specific funds to promote local education and workforce development.

Public funding streams for early childhood care and education include the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) and other childcare subsidies, Head Start, and publicly funded Pre-K. Costs for two-generation strategies could be lower if Pre-K and kindergarten are already in place, or states could prioritize CCDF block grant funding for parents in sector-based training programs.³² A distinction should be made between *childcare* and early childhood *education* as most funding sources provide for childcare and not necessarily high-quality early childhood education.

Integrated and Flexible Funding Streams: Think beyond traditional investments to identify opportunities to link, leverage, or otherwise capitalize on existing workforce and education funding.

Braided Funding: Pulls together resources across a number of public, private, or non-profit funding streams to meet the needs of participating families.

Table 1.

Public Funding Sources for Workforce Development and Early Childhood Care and Education

	Federal	State	Local
Workforce Development/Job Training Funding	<p>Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF): States can deploy the TANF block grants in ways that are much more flexible than the traditional, formulaic funding, which can lead to some flexibility for two-generation programs</p> <p>SNAP Education & Training: Under SNAP E&T funds, there is an underused option that allows states to receive additional Federal funding on a cost-reimbursement basis for providing allowable services to SNAP recipients.³³</p> <p>Workforce Innovation Fund—Congress established the Workforce Innovation Fund in 2011 to “generate long-term improvements in the performance of the public workforce system, both in terms of cost-effectiveness and outcomes for job seeker and employer customers.”³⁴ This Fund may allow states to pursue innovative programs, such as two-generation strategies, and has a grant specifically for New and Untested Ideas. Last year, the Department of Labor awarded nearly \$150M in grants, several of which were for sectoral programs.³⁵ That said, it is worth noting that the WIF was created by reducing the amount of discretionary funding available to governors. Many innovative states have complained that they have had to compete for “venture capital” that they once received by formula.</p>	<p>State-Funded Workforce Development: Many states have developed their own funds for workforce development. Most of these funds are supported by Unemployment Insurance taxes or general revenues. Examples of these funds include California’s Employment and Training Panel, or Texas’ Skills Development Fund. Rules for these funds vary widely, but since they operate outside of Federal programs, they are not subject to Federal operating rules and reporting structures.</p>	<p>Locally-Funded Workforce Development: Several cities have created their own workforce funding systems with more flexibility than Federal funds. Some of these funds have specific purposes, such as the Utility Pre-Craft Trainee (UPCT) Program in Los Angeles, CA. In the UPCT program, the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power funds job training for ‘green jobs’ for individuals interested in long-term careers with the utility. Although the program was initially funded out of a Federal weatherization grant, the utility now funds it out of its own energy efficiency and general training budgets.³⁶ Another way that local governments support workforce development is by directly funding local workforce agencies, intermediaries, and training programs. Travis County and the City of Austin, Texas, take this approach to provide supplementary funding to several area workforce development agencies.</p>
Early Childhood Care and Education Funding	<p>Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF): This funding comes to the states as a block grant, and the states then determine the standards for who receives funding. Not surprisingly, the quality of childcare options varies widely, and the emphasis is much more on childcare, rather than early childhood education. However, the block-grant nature of the funding could allow states to prioritize participants of two-generation programs and set quality standards.</p> <p>Head Start/Early Head Start: Unlike other childcare funding, Head Start and Early Head Start funds flow directly from the Federal government to the providers. Although the emphasis is on early childhood education, the programs are traditionally part-time, academic year programs. Additional funding would need to be secured to extend Head Start/Early Head Start into a full-day program that operates year-round.</p> <p>Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF): TANF funds can be spent directly on childcare, or via CCDF. The investment emphasis is typically on childcare, not early childhood education.</p>	<p>State-Sponsored Pre-Kindergarten: 39 states provide some form of state-funded Pre-K. Some states have funded both Pre-K programs and expanded Head Start with state supplemental funding.³⁷ As a starting point, policymakers could pair children’s participation in state-funded Pre-K with parents’ participation in workforce development programs.</p>	<p>Local governments are also beginning to explore and in some cases actually provide Pre-K as an investment in their community’s future. For example, San Antonio recently approved a 1/8-cent sales tax to support universal pre-kindergarten for four-year-olds.³⁸ Other communities may also have similar programs.</p>

While no states appear to have integrated both their workforce development and early childhood education funding, some states have taken steps to integrate their workforce and childcare funding streams. For example, Utah features an innovative approach to workforce development services that balances elements of work-first and human capital development, though not ECE. Utah has a highly integrated One-Stop delivery system in which Employment Centers provide a range of services, including support for childcare, to their participants, but it does not offer Pre-K statewide.³⁹ Texas also has laid the groundwork for integrated workforce and childcare funding by giving local workforce boards oversight for multiple programs, including WIA, TANF and SNAP Employment & Training, and CCDF block grants. While Texas has a performance rating system for preschool programs, CCDF funds are not restricted to center-based care. Quality standards are difficult to monitor and enforce for home- and family-based childcare arrangements. States could use the integration of workforce and childcare funding as an intermediate step towards coordinated funding of early childhood *education* and workforce development.

Philanthropic and Business Community Funding

Despite the numerous and varied funding streams, the restrictions on taxpayer sourced funding make it an awkward fit for innovative programs such as two-generation strategies. Funding from the local business community and philanthropic sources can ensure that the two-generation strategy has the flexibility to meet the needs of the participants, while demonstrating meaningful results within the local area. Outside financing from philanthropic donors has provided the funding—especially the “venture social capital”—necessary for developing and initially launching most of the current two-generation initiatives. Numerous national and local foundations have shown an interest in funding two-generation strategies. These organizations can provide the resources needed to supplement federal and state funding streams to establish a two-generation initiative in a state or locality. Given the difficult budget climate at the federal and state level in which many legislatures are cutting funding for education and workforce programs, decision makers wishing to adopt two-generation strategies need to explore innovative approaches to funding strategies.⁴⁰

Philanthropic organizations that have demonstrated interest in or commitment to funding two-generation strategy implementation include, but are not limited to, the George Kaiser Family Foundation, Annie E. Casey Foundation, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The local business community can be a natural fit for funding workforce development programs, particularly sectoral programs. If there is a demonstrated need for skilled workers in the community, (healthcare workers, for example), state and local leaders can develop public-private partnerships with the business community to develop and fund training programs to meet the economic needs. Developing public-private partnerships can also be a key factor in securing other types of funding, such as the Federal Workforce Innovation Fund.

Facilitating Factor 5: Evidence-Oriented Culture

As new programs are implemented, robust data collection and reporting systems are needed to evaluate the effectiveness of two-generation strategies to support evidence-based policymaking. Many states have developed data collection and reporting systems that could be used to evaluate the effectiveness of two-generation strategies from both the workforce development and early childhood education viewpoints. The goal of collecting data on the programs is to test the viability of two-generation strategies, as compared with more traditional programs, to ensure that policymakers support programs with the strongest outcomes. Potential research elements include identifying challenges and necessary conditions for successful programs and documenting outcomes. The development of performance measures (indicators) can assist policymakers in the long-term benefit-cost analysis.⁴¹

An Evidence-Oriented Culture: Exists when policy makers collect and use data to understand the impacts of investments. Successful two-generation strategies require careful analyses of current conditions and family (parent + child) outcomes.

Washington State leads a project to design an innovative performance management system across workforce development programs using state core measures they have developed, including:⁴²

- Short-term employment rate
- Long-term employment rate
- Earnings level
- Credential completion rate
- Repeat employer customers
- Employer market penetration
- Taxpayer return on investment
- Participant return on investment

Another initiative that seeks to enhance data collection and measurement across silos is the U.S. Department of Education’s Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Grant Program. This program is intended to “enhance the ability of States to efficiently and accurately manage, analyze, and use education data, including individual student records”.⁴³ These data systems are encouraged to include linked preschool through higher education and workforce training records as well as employment outcomes obtained through the state unemployment insurance program. On the early childhood education side, the National Institute for Early Education Research has established quality standards checklist for early childhood education (as shown earlier in Figure 3). These standards fall into ten critical areas, which encompass the comprehensive services preschool or early childhood education provides and could be used as a basis for performance metrics:⁴⁴

1. Early learning standards based upon National Education Goals Panel content areas
2. Lead teachers with a minimum of a bachelor’s degree
3. Lead teachers must have specialized training in Pre-K area
4. Assistant teacher must have a Child Development Associate (CDA) credential or equivalent
5. 15 hours/year of professional development and training for staff
6. Maximum class size of 20 or fewer students
7. Staff-child ratio of 1:10 or better
8. Screenings and referrals for vision, hearing and health, and one additional support service
9. At least one meal served daily
10. Routine site visits to ensure adherence to state requirements


Evaluation is a critical tool that can be used to assess the effectiveness of two-generation strategies and build support for promising programs and policies. The Ascend program at The Aspen Institute is also seeking to identify effective performance measures and is working with researchers to develop a methodology for evaluating two-generation programs. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has begun evaluating Health Profession Opportunity Grants (HPOG), including an evaluation of the Tulsa CAP’s *CareerAdvance*[®] program, through the University Partnership Research Grants. That evaluation—the CAP Family Life Study—includes a mixed-method, quasi-experimental evaluation of implementation, outcome, impact, and continuous improvement dimensions. Parent, child, and family measures will provide critical evidence for two-generation strategies.⁴⁵

Common Steps for Getting Started

The goal of two-generation strategies is to move the *entire* family forward out of poverty and into economic stability. States and local policy makers interested in pursuing two-generation strategies have a wide range of options open to them; the scope and breadth of their strategies can vary considerably. Because local and regional labor markets differ widely, as do postsecondary education and workforce development systems, each two-generation program must be tailored to state/local policies, program environments, and regional conditions. There is no one “right way” to approach a two-generation program. There are, however common steps that successful programs have undertaken in their development. These are illustrated in Figure 4.

There is no one “right way” for two-generation programs to move families forward out of poverty and into economic stability.

Figure 4. Common Steps for Establishing a Two-Generation Strategy



Conduct an Environmental Scan

Policy makers interested in two-generation solutions should begin by conducting an environmental scan of policies, programs, and resources in the region. The challenges to developing and implementing two-generation strategies are not negligible, but there are opportunities to leverage existing resources and policy frameworks in every community. Table 2 provides a checklist of common challenges and opportunities associated with each of the facilitating factors for two-generation strategies discussed in previous sections. State and local policymakers considering establishing two-generation programs can start by using this list to identify which elements are present in their regions.

Table 2. Checklist of Common Implementation Challenges and Opportunities

Check each of the challenges and opportunities present in your region:

Facilitating Factor	Challenges	Opportunities
Supportive Policy Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Policy and program inertia <input type="checkbox"/> Policy development and planning in isolation from other systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Commitment to evidence-based policy development <input type="checkbox"/> Support for integrated planning and policy development at state and local level with comprehensive policy structures
Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of strong political and/or program leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Absence of support for high-level policies to enable coordination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Active recruitment and training for state and local policymakers <input type="checkbox"/> Prior collaborative projects and community-driven efforts
Program Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Rigid or resistant organizational culture <input type="checkbox"/> Conflicting goals, performance expectations, and services <input type="checkbox"/> Program silos—services planned, delivered, and evaluated in isolation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Organizational interest in efficiency and effectiveness of services <input type="checkbox"/> Experience with integrated family policy structures and programming <input type="checkbox"/> Active intergovernmental workgroups in social, educational, or economic development <input type="checkbox"/> Well-developed sector-based workforce development program <input type="checkbox"/> Active workforce intermediary activity in the region <input type="checkbox"/> Community & tech colleges with strong workforce/career pathways orientation and flexible scheduling
Integrated & Flexible Funding Streams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Structural separation of funding and service delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple, restrictive funding mechanisms <input type="checkbox"/> Resource limitations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Flexible funding sources such as TANF and SNAP Employment & Training programs <input type="checkbox"/> Local and state government resources including general revenues and unemployment insurance taxes <input type="checkbox"/> Existing philanthropic and business community resources
Evidence-oriented Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Ineffective approaches to adult basic and developmental education <input type="checkbox"/> Different schedules for parent and child programming <input type="checkbox"/> Communication within and across programs and systems <input type="checkbox"/> Performance measures that favor short-term (temporary) results over long-term gains 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Existing investments in high-quality education programs demonstrating strong outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Robust data collection and reporting systems to support program improvement and decision-making

Link Existing Services

Another common step in establishing two-generation programs can be to more directly link existing services and funding for parents and children. Local policy makers can take an incremental approach, where individual at-risk families are paired with the workforce development services they need, and quality childcare for their children. If there is a strong early childhood education program already providing some support services and outreach in the area, policymakers can partner with that program to see what type of workforce development training the parents need. From the workforce development side, policymakers can investigate strong adult education and training programs (‘bridge programs’) to identify the childcare needs of the students’ families. The two-generation strategies that result might be thought of as positioned along a continuum (Figure 5) ranging from coordinated services within existing policies and programs on one end to more fully integrated strategies that require extensive policy and systems changes on the other.

Figure 5. Continuum of Two-Generation Strategies



Identify Program Champions

A vitally important step is to identify a person or persons who will serve as the “champion” for the program. The role of champion is easy to overlook; however, this is the person who will be persistent, bring partners to the table, press for support, and generally drive to get the strategy implemented. In the language of the emerging literature on collective impact initiatives, the champion may also be an organization that serves as the “backbone” for the two-generation initiative in a state or local area.⁴⁶ Potential champions include an existing workforce intermediary or a leader of a local community organization. An existing workforce intermediary has connections within the local business community and with workforce development programs, while the leaders of existing community development programs have extensive “on the ground” knowledge of the targeted populations. The champion might also be a political figure with a strong interest in and record of supporting family-oriented services.

It’s hard to understate the importance of the initial *environmental scan*.

It will lay the groundwork for other common steps including identifying:

- **Program champions**
- **Potential funding sources**
- **Key collaborators**

Identify Funding Sources and Key Collaborators

While states and local communities need to be creative in seeking support for two-generation strategies in today’s constrained fiscal environment, there are likely to be multiple and varying sources available. Policy makers should reach out to potential sources of funding at the regional and state levels to explore public-private partnerships to support two-generation strategies. One step is to meet with potential funders to examine their existing portfolios in early childhood, workforce development, and education to identify opportunities for more systematic funding of two-generation strategies. Interested parties should consider whether future funding priorities are in the areas of policies and programs or research and evaluation.

Finally, all partners should explore joining resources, including foundations, states, cities, and possibly private sector groups, to support two-generation strategies. A least-cost option for these key collaborators is to align the populations already being served—parents enrolled in postsecondary education and training and their children participating in quality early childhood education—so that the investments can be linked with only modest increases in overall cost. New funding can be sought from either public or philanthropic partners at the national, state, or local level. Other options may involve mixed or “braided” funding strategies. What is feasible in one state or community may not be feasible in another.

Consider Replicating or Expanding a Successful Two-Generation Program

Although it is possible for each state or local community to build their own two-generation program, there are benefits to joining with an existing program through an expansion or replication that should be considered. “Leveraging the knowledge developed by someone else can enable a new site to increase the speed of implementation and the odds of obtaining the desired outcomes.”⁴⁷ There are a variety of ways to replicate successful programs, from individual site expansions, to nationwide rollouts of specific initiatives. Below is a list of approaches to replication:⁴⁸

Build from Other Successful Programs: There are a number of ways to apply the lessons learned from other two-generation programs. Policy makers should consider which replication/expansion approach best fits the resources, public policies, and other factors present in the region.

- **Franchise Approach**—The product is the program itself, and the components are standardized. There is a central or national office that coordinates administration of the programs.
- **Mandated Replication**—This approach is typically sponsored by the government, and occurs when the parent body wants to replicate a program throughout its organization.
- **Staged Replication**—A three-stage approach beginning with a pilot to test the viability of the concept, then a demonstration stage where the program is implemented at a variety of sites, and then full replication.
- **Concept Replication**—This approach focuses on the general components and principals of a program that can be utilized at other sites, instead of the specific program elements. Success in this model is measured by the adaptation to local context.
- **Spontaneous Replication**—Occurs when there is a demand for information “from below”, (i.e. from a potential partner or recipient). This type of replication is usually spontaneous, and is a collaborative process for both parties involved.

The Concept and Spontaneous Replication approaches are useful for state and local leaders to consider. In general, the more elements of a program that are standardized, the more likely the replication will succeed.⁴⁹ However, this needs to be balanced with the needs of the community in which the program will be established, and the importance of culture within the program.

Launch a Pilot Program

Policymakers can also “start small” by establishing a pilot program, perhaps within a larger workforce development or community development organization that can leverage the resources of a large organization, but be small enough to adjust to changing conditions. A pilot also allows for programs to make changes before implementing on a larger scale. An example of this approach is the *CareerAdvance*[®] program, which began as a pilot program within the Community Action Project of Tulsa County (CAP). Efforts should be made to identify performance measures that reflect the long-term desired outcomes of the program. Putting some effort up-front to establish good measures can pay dividends in the future by avoiding unintended outcomes.

Recommendations For Policy Makers

The recommendations presented in Table 3 are specific actions state and local policymakers can take to start and better support two-generation strategies. These recommendations, combined with the Common Steps outlined above, should provide the necessary foundation to implement two-generation strategies across the country. Policy makers are also encouraged to seek-out the end notes listed at the back of this guide to further build their knowledge base and connect with others around the country interested in moving two-generation approaches forward.

Table 3. Recommendations for State and Local Policy Makers to Start and Support Two-Generation Strategies⁵⁰

Facilitating Factor	State	Local
Supportive Policy Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue policy guidance and directives from state agencies to promote two-generation efforts • Integrate program funding, planning, and service delivery within and across workforce, education, and human services systems • Coordinate across agencies responsible for workforce development, education, and human services to remove barriers to collaboration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify low-income families as a target population for service by local governments, community-based organizations, and others • Bridge the multiple systems involved and ensure that efforts target local economic opportunities using workforce intermediary organizations • Build onto existing collaborations by layering two-generation components that address identified gaps
Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate agencies to shift the operating environment away from siloed approaches towards more flexible and innovative systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify potential partners across workforce, education, and human service organizations • Identify program champions in the community to spearhead change
Program Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide technical assistance and training to support local implementation of two-generation strategies • Convene partner agencies to educate them on steps and supports needed for two-generation approaches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop frequent communication between organizations and among staff at various levels • Offer programming for children and parents on the same schedule to facilitate full-time/full-year engagement • Offer individualized case management, career/life coaching, and family support services
Integrated & Flexible Funding Streams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow existing funding streams to be targeted for two-generation approaches • Develop grant programs to pilot test programs and encourage adoption of two-generation strategies • Create funds to incentivize implementation of two-generation approaches locally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach local government, philanthropic organizations, and business community groups to raise awareness and identify potential sources of funding—particularly to support the coordination tasks required for implementation • Connect existing economic support services in the community around a common mission to improve outcomes for low-income families
Evidence-Oriented Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect data or establish performance measures related to family services rather than just child or adult services • Allow time for programs to work through issues and stabilize before assessing the full impact of the approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect and use data to improve programs • Schedule time for feedback and planning sessions among partner programs to identify issues and develop new solutions • Require significant engagement in skill development each week for participants with poor basic skills, focusing on college readiness rather than GED standards • Use peer cohorts and other communities of support to help participants manage multiple responsibilities and build the social capital needed for success

Endnotes

- 1 Aspen Institute. (2012). *Two Generations, One Future: Moving Parents and Children Beyond Poverty Together*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.
- 2 Aspen Institute. (2012). *Two Generations, One Future: Moving Parents and Children Beyond Poverty Together*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.
- 3 Glover, R.W., Smith, T.C., King, C.T., and Coffey, R.D. (2010). *CareerAdvance®: A Dual-Generation Antipoverty Strategy*. Austin, TX: Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas. August.
Glover, R.W., King, C.T., and Smith, T.C. (2012). *Expanding the CareerAdvance® Program in Tulsa, Oklahoma*. Austin, TX: Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas. January.
King, C.T., Glover, R.W., Smith, T.C., Coffey, R.D., and Levy, B. (2009). *The CareerAdvance® Pilot Project: Recommended Jobs Strategy for Families Served by the Community Action Project of Tulsa County*. Austin, TX: Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas. August.
- 4 Sommer, T.E., Chase-Lansdale, P.L., and Brooks-Gunn, J. (2011). *Promoting Dual-Generation Anti-Poverty Programs for Low-income Families: Three Approaches and Their Implications for Practitioners*.
- 4 “Casey Foundation Civic Site: Atlanta.” (2013). Atlanta Civic Site webpage: <http://www.aecf.org/MajorInitiatives/CivicSites/Atlanta.aspx>. Last accessed: 05.12.13.
- 5 “Atlanta Civic Site: Education Achievement.” (2013). Atlanta Civic Site webpage: <http://www.aecf.org/MajorInitiatives/CivicSites/Atlanta/ThreeResultAreas/EducationAchievement.aspx>. Last accessed: 05.12.13.
- 6 “Atlanta Civic Site: Family Economic Success.” (2013). Atlanta Civic Site webpage: <http://www.aecf.org/MajorInitiatives/CivicSites/Atlanta/ThreeResultAreas/FamilyEconomicSuccess2.aspx>. Last accessed: 05.12.13.
- 7 “About us: Jeremiah Program.” (2011). Jeremiah Program webpage: <http://www.jeremiahprogram.org/about-us/>. Last accessed: 07.15.12.
- 8 “About us: Jeremiah Program.” (2011). Jeremiah Program webpage: <http://www.jeremiahprogram.org/about-us/>. Last accessed: 07.15.12.
- 9 “Endicott College: The Keys to Degrees Program.” (2013). Endicott College webpage: <http://www.endicott.edu/Student/SingleParProg-Student.aspx>. Last accessed: 05.12.13.
- 10 “Eastern Michigan University: Keys to Degrees Single Parent Program.” (2013). Eastern Michigan University webpage: <http://www.emich.edu/keystodegrees/index.php>. Last accessed: 05.12.13.
- 11 King, C.T., Smith, T.C., and Glover, R.W. (2011). *Investing in Children and Parents: Fostering Dual-Generation Strategies in the United States*. Austin, TX: Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas. November.
- 12 King, C.T., Smith, T.C., and Glover, R.W. (2011). *Investing in Children and Parents: Fostering Dual-Generation Strategies in the United States*. Austin, TX: Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas. November.
- 13 King, C.T., Smith, T.C., and Glover, R.W. (2011). *Investing in Children and Parents: Fostering Dual-Generation Strategies in the United States*. Austin, TX: Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas. November.
- 14 National Governors Association. (2008). *Accelerating State Adoption of Sector Strategies: An Eleven-State Project to Promote Regional Solutions to Worker and Employer Needs*, Washington, D.C.: National Governors Association. May.
- 15 King, C.T., Smith, T.C., and Glover, R.W. (2011). *Investing in Children and Parents: Fostering Dual-Generation Strategies in the United States*. Austin, TX: Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas. November.
- 16 Aspen Institute. (2012). *Two Generations, One Future: Moving Parents and Children Beyond Poverty Together*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.
- 17 Public/Private Ventures closed its doors in 2012 but the Sector Skills Academy continues.
- 18 “Sector Skills Academy.” (2013). Sector Skills Academy webpage: <http://sectorskillsacademy.org/About.html>. Last accessed: 01.21.13
- 19 Coffey, R.D. (2011). *Challenges to Implementing Sectoral Workforce Programs and Proposed Changes for This Model*. Austin, TX: The University of Texas.
- 20 King, C.T., Smith, T.C., and Glover, R.W. (2011). *Investing in Children and Parents: Fostering Dual-Generation Strategies in the United States*. Austin, TX: Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas. November.
- 21 More information on State Sector Strategies available at: <http://www.sectorstrategies.org/>
- 22 More information on the Sector Skills Academy available at: <http://www.sectorskillsacademy.org/>
- 23 National Governors Association. (2008). *Accelerating State Adoption of Sector Strategies: An Eleven-State Project to Promote Regional Solutions to Worker and Employer Needs*. Washington, DC: National Governors Association. May. p. 3.
- 24 Barnett, W.S., Carolan, M.E., Fitzgerald, J., & Squires, J.H. (2012). *The State of Preschool 2012: State Preschool Yearbook*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.
- 25 Schmit, S., and Ewen, D. (2012). *Putting Children and Families First: Head Start Programs in 2010*. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.
- 26 Early Childhood Learning and Knowledge Center. “Head Start Program Fact Sheet Fiscal Year 2010.” Head Start. Last modified February 2010. Available online at: <http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/mr/factsheets/fHeadStartProgr.htm>.
- 27 “What is Educare – Educare Schools.” (2013). Educare webpage: <http://www.educareschools.org/about/what-is-educare.php>. Last accessed 02.09.2013.
- 28 Yazejian, N., and Bryant, D.M. (2010). *Promising Early Returns: Educare Implementation Study Data*. Chapel Hill, NC: FPG Child Development Institute, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- 29 Shore, R. (2009). *The Case for Investing in PreK-3rd Education: Challenging Myths about School Reform*. Policy to Action Brief No. 1. New York, NY: Foundation for Child Development. January.

- 30 “FCD Case Studies.” (2013). Foundation for Child Development webpage: <http://fcd-us.org/resources/fcd-case-studies>. Last accessed 05.27.2013.
- 31 King, C.T., Smith, T.C., and Glover, R.W. (2011). *Investing in Children and Parents: Fostering Dual- Generation Strategies in the United States*. Austin, TX: Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas. November.
- 32 King, C.T., Smith, T.C. and Glover, R.W. (2011). *Investing in Children and Parents: Fostering Dual- Generation Strategies in the United States*. Austin, TX: Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas. November.
- 33 This option is described further in: Jablow, J. (2007). “Food Stamp Employment and Training” in *Strategies for Financing Workforce Intermediaries: Working Papers*. Boston, MA: National Fund for Workforce Solutions, Jobs for the Future.
- 34 “Workforce Innovation Fund Grant Awards.” (2012). U.S. Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration webpage: http://www.doleta.gov/workforce_innovation/grant_awards.cfm. Last accessed 01.21.13.
- 35 As of the date of this writing, the U.S. Congress has not yet reauthorized this funding.
- 36 Avis, E., and Zabin, C. (2013). *Training for the Future: Workforce Development for a 21st Century Utility*. Berkeley, CA: Center for Labor Research and Education, University of California-Berkeley.
- 37 Barnett, W.S., Carolan, M.E., Fitzgerald, J., and Squires, J.H. (2011). *The State of Preschool 2011: State Preschool Yearbook*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.
- 38 “Pre-K 4 San Antonio.” (2013). City of San Antonio, Office of the City Manager webpage: <http://www.sanantonio.gov/Pre-K4SanAntonio.aspx>. Last accessed 02.09.2013.
- 39 Barnow, B.S., and King, C.T. (2005). *The Workforce Investment Act in Eight States*. Albany, NY: The Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government.
- 40 National Governors Association. (2008). *Accelerating State Adoption of Sector Strategies: An Eleven-State Project to Promote Regional Solutions to Worker and Employer Needs*. May.
- 41 King, C.T., Smith, T.C., and Glover, R.W. (2011). *Investing in Children and Parents: Fostering Dual- Generation Strategies in the United States*. Austin, TX: Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas. November.
- 42 Washington Training and Education Coordinating Board. (2005). “Executive Report.” In *Integrated Performance Information for Workforce Development: A Blueprint for States*. Olympia, WA: Washington Training and Education Coordinating Board. February. p. i-v.
- 43 “Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems Grant Program.” National Center for Education Statistics Institute of Education Sciences webpage: http://nces.ed.gov/programs/slds/about_SLDS.asp. Last accessed 10.30.2013.
- 44 Barnett, W.S., Carolan, M.E., Fitzgerald, J., and Squires, J.H. (2011). *The State of Preschool 2011: State Preschool Yearbook*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.
- 45 “University Partnership Research Grants for the Health Profession Opportunity Grants (HPOG) Program.” U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families webpage: <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/university-partnership-research-grants-for-the-health-profession>.
- 46 For example, see: Hanleybrown, F., Kania, J., and Kramer, M. (2012). “Channeling Change: Making Collective Impact Work.” *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. January 26, 2012.
- 47 Bradach, J. (2003). “Going to Scale, The Challenge of Replicating Social Programs.” *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Spring 2003.
- 48 Adapted from: van Oudenhoven, N., and Wazir, R. (1998). *Replicating Social Programmes: Approaches, Strategies, and Conceptual Issues*. Management of Social Transformations Discussion Paper Series No. 18. Paris, France: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.
- 49 Bradach, J. (2003). “Going to Scale, The Challenge of Replicating Social Programs.” *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Spring 2003.
- 50 Adapted from: King, C.T., Smith, T.C. and Glover, R.W. (2011). *Investing in Children and Parents: Fostering Dual-Generation Strategies in the United States*. Austin, TX: Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas. November.
- Aspen Institute. (2012). *Two Generations, One Future: Moving Parents and Children Beyond Poverty Together*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.
- Sommer, T.E., Chase-Lansdale, P.L., and Brooks-Gunn, J. (2011). *Promoting Dual-Generation Anti-Poverty Programs for Low-income Families: Three Approaches and Their Implications for Practitioners*.



Ray Marshall Center

3001 Lake Austin Blvd., Suite 3.200

Austin, Texas 78703

Phone: (512) 471-7891

Fax: (512) 471-0585

Email: rmcinfo@raymarshallcenter.org

FOUNDATION FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Foundation for Child Development

295 Madison Avenue, 40th Floor

New York, NY 10017

Phone: 212-867-5777

Fax: 212-867-5844

Email: info@fcd-us.org

For more information please visit www.raymarshallcenter.org and www.fcd-us.org