

**UNIVERSAL PRESCHOOL
FOR
CALIFORNIA**

Gisselle Morales

Public Administration

Independent Study

Professor Paarlberg

December 16, 2004

UNIVERSAL PRESCHOOL FOR CALIFORNIA

Introduction

Few Americans would argue the notion that all children should be ready to succeed in school and that no child should be left behind. Wide agreement on these broad goals reflects public awareness of research showing that learning is truly life long, beginning in the early years and that early experiences build a foundation for learning.

These findings have been brought to public attention by a variety of nonprofit organizations, including the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network. This nonprofit organization provides leadership and vision for the development and enhancement of resource and referral services statewide, helping build, support, and advocate for a quality childcare system that supports the diversity of families and children, in every community in California. Its main activity, advocating for children, parents, and childcare providers is what many Californians know them for. It is the advocating to the public and the government (as it is with many nonprofits) that help them succeed in meeting their vision; for all families in California to have access to information that enables them to make the best child care choices from an array of high quality affordable options. Government generally has been responsive to the requests of nonprofits and have invested large amounts of money into them because of the fact that nonprofits, many times, provide the services that government cannot.

Interestingly enough, in recent years it seems that the role of money has become increasingly important in American politics, which logically, might suggest that nonprofits public interest advocacy may be losing its influence. But according to Jeffery

Berry's (2003) research, nonprofit public interest organizations have gained more influence in recent years and have considerable sway in the policy process. Ironically at a time when money influences politics, nonprofits are still able to succeed in their advocacy campaigns. They are doing so by mimicking the structure of politics and becoming highly professionalized, with complex organizations mobilizing hundreds and thousands of members, conducting expert research and using sophisticated public relations techniques (Boris and Krehely, 2002).

Nonprofit organizations are performing unlimited research, education and dissemination of information about social and economic problems as well as recommending solutions. They are sending their information and analyses to the general public and to public policymakers (Boris and Krehely, 2002). Of course government and nonprofits cannot exist together without tensions. The fact that half of tax-deductible nonprofits are now health or human service providers and that nonprofits are not supposed to represent their clients before legislation, according to regulation placed on them by the federal government, creates a public policy dilemma. Nonprofits exist to serve those in need, therefore strive to provide the best quality services but these services cannot be provided efficiently without the support of government.

The government has placed regulations on nonprofits that are part of Section 501(c)(3) of the IRS code due to the fact that they receive tax-deductible contributions. A 501(c)(3) organization will jeopardize this exemption status if it ceases to be operated exclusively for exempt purposes, which means it engages primarily in activities that accomplish the exempt purposes specified in section 501(c)(3) (Internal Revenue Service, n.d.). An organization will not be regarded as exempt if more than an insubstantial part

of its activities does not further an exempt purpose. To qualify as a 501(c)(3) organization an organization must refrain from participating in the political campaigns of candidates for local, state, or federal office, restrict its lobbying activities to an insubstantial part of its total activities, ensure that its earnings do not benefit any private shareholder or individual, must not operate for the benefit of private interests such as those of its founder, the founder's family, its shareholders or persons controlled by such interests, must not operate for the primary purpose of conducting a trade or business that is not related to its exempt purpose, and may not have purposes or activities that are illegal or violate fundamental public policy (Internal Revenue Service, n.d.).

In this paper the roles and functions and a brief history of nonprofits. This will be followed by a brief description of the legal limitations regarding advocacy, theories on why nonprofits are founded and the major forces shaping nonprofit advocacy. As an example of advocacy within a nonprofit, I will review the case of the Universal Preschool in California. After a history of the issue and its current standings, I will provide an example of how a nonprofit organization, the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network, has advocated for Universal Preschool and why.

Roles and Functions of Nonprofits

The maintenance and renewal of American democracy depend on the roles and functions of nonprofits. Civic participation of individuals in local and national affairs and the active role of the voluntary associations are needed to facilitate the continuously changing American Democracy (Boris and Krehely, 2002).

Nonprofits are service providers, advocates, expressionists, community builders and guardians. As service providers, they deliver much of the hospital care, higher

education, social services, employment and training, low-income housing, community development, and emergency aid, throughout the country (Salamon, 2002). As advocates they identify unaddressed problems and bring them to public attention, such as, protecting basic human rights, and giving voice to many social, political, environmental, ethnic, and community interests and concerns (Salamon 2002). The nonprofit sector also supports and allows for artistic, religious, cultural, ethnic, social and recreational expression (Salamon, 2002). As community builders, they establish connections among individuals and associations, which teach norms of cooperation that carry over into political and economic life (Salamon, 2002). Lastly, as guardians they establish a society where individuals can take the initiative not only to promote their well being, but those of other as well (Salamon, 2002).

History of Nonprofits

The following terms must be clarified before any discussion may take place. Civic participation refers to activities of individuals that relate to community life and public governance (Boris and Krehely, 2002). More specifically, advocacy is the act of pleading for or against a cause, or supporting or recommending a position. For example, nonprofit service providers involve their clients, volunteers, and trustees in advocacy to promote their missions, to secure resources, and to weigh in on issues or policies that are likely to affect their work or constituents (Boris and Krehely, 2002). Lobbying is a particular type of advocacy, which attempts to influence the public policy and issue making functions of a regulatory or legislative body (Boris and Krehely, 2002). There are two types of lobbying, direct lobbying and grassroots lobbying. Direct lobbying is the communication the organization has about legislation with legislators or government

officials who participate in the formulation of legislation and with its own members (Smucker, 1999). Grassroots lobbying refers to any attempt to influence legislation through an attempt to affect the opinion of the general public (Smucker, 1999). Only when an organization is trying to reach beyond its members to get action from the general public does grassroots lobbying occur (Smucker, 1999).

Virtually all nonprofit organizations are permitted to lobby, but for 501(c)(3) public charities lobbying to influence specific legislation cannot be their major activity (Boris and Krehely, 2002). The benefit of having 501(c)(3) status is eligibility to receive tax-deductible charitable contributions. A charitable contribution is a donation or gift to or for the use of an organization whose purpose is religious, charitable, educational, scientific or literary, or who works to prevent cruelty to children or animals (IRS, n.d.).

Nonprofits are almost always founded for other reasons than advocacy in the policy making process (Berry and Arons, 2003). Since the 1960s, demand for nonprofits has soared, and the nonprofit sector has demonstrated little trouble in generating enough 501(c)(3)'s to meet the growing needs of American society (Berry and Arons, 2003).

Clashes between leaders of citizens' groups and the political authorities go back to 17th century America, to the original charters for Harvard College (Clark, 1997). A Harvard leader fought to run the college under the sponsorship of the church rather than consent to political control (Clark, 1997). By the early 18th century, Americans were eager to form organizations. The French writer Alexis de Tocqueville urged the American government to keep its hands off of the formation of associations by the people (Clark, 1997). He claimed that the more the government takes the place of associations,

the more will individuals lose the idea of forming associations and need the government to come to their help (Clark, 1997).

In the late 19th century state governments expanded their support into the health field and the social services in response to urbanization and industrialization (Gronbjerg and Salamon, 2002). Although working together, there were still tensions between nonprofits and government. Nonprofits challenged public neglect of poverty and distress while the government at various times questioned the accumulations of wealth that nonprofit accumulated (Gronbjerg and Salamon, 2002). Nonprofits reacted to this tension by trying to reenergize the government with the intent to mobilize it to finance the initiatives that the nonprofits strived to carry out (Gronbjerg and Salamon, 2002).

By the early 20th century the nonprofit world was well articulated as Congress prepared to enact the first income tax in 1913. The state now, was not responsible for creating any kind of groups, clubs or unions, they all rose from human instinct to form associations, and were expected to be treated by the government as unique, original, and with respect (Clark 1997). Because of this expectation and because there were so many diverse nonprofits already in existence, Congress declined even to debate the rationale behind the tax-exempt status it was creating (Clark, 1997). As the relationship between government and nonprofits would change, in the following decades, to reflect current issues of the time, the tax reform act added new regulations making foundations more open and less political (Clark, 1997).

Finally in the early 1950's, the IRS began formulating precise definitions of the nature, rights, and responsibilities of tax-exempt status. The detail description of the

501(c)(3) category alone is evidence of the breadth and complexity the IRS went into (Clark, 1997).

During the 1960's and 70's as government worked with nonprofits on employment, community development, and social service problems, they stimulated a massive expansion of the nonprofit sector (Gronbjerg and Salamon, 2002). The government support flowed directly into the nonprofits, in the form of contracts and grants, which were highly favorable to the nonprofit organizations. Not only did government funding flourish, but also the government support of nonprofit advocacy and promotion of social and political rights (Gronbjerg and Salamon, 2002).

The 60's explosion of advocacy nonprofits in the area of civil rights, prompted Congress to place some controls on wealthy foundations in the 1969 tax reform law (Clark, 1997). Congress prohibited these foundations from lobbying, called for a minimum payout of 5 percent of the foundations average value of investment assets, and required self-reported financial forms be submitted to the IRS (Clark, 1997).

In 1976 a tax-reform package spelled out the lobbying restrictions and options for nonprofits organized as 501(c)(3), offering them a choice of either insubstantial lobbying, defined as a specific portion of their budgets, or the choice of lobbying more but being governed by detailed IRS expenditure limits (Clark, 2002)

The H election allowed (and still does allow) nonprofits to ignore the substantial limitation on lobbying (Salamon, 2002). For politically active organizations, there is really no reason not to elect the H option (Salamon, 2002). After the H election was implemented, and to this day, most nonprofits remain ignorant of the alternative to the substantial test (Salamon, 2002).

In the late 1970's and early 1980's when President John F. Kennedy, encouraged to move welfare toward a social service approach, nonprofits began to see the need to balance their idealized missions with the need to stay financially solvent (Clark, 1997). The transformation of welfare from a system oriented around income maintenance to a system relying on social services is at the heart of the transformation of the nonprofit sector from being largely a source of private charity to being an arm of the government.

In 1987 Congress passed the tax exempt organizations' Lobbying and Political Activities Accountability Act to sharpen legal distinctions as to what constitutes lobbying and politics, and permitting the IRS to levy fine on violators (Clark, 1997).

Lobbying Regulations

Under IRS regulations, lobbying involves communications to influence specific legislation at any stage of the process, from introduction to repeal of existing legislation (Boris and Krehely, 2002). In the 1976 tax reform law, Congress clarified and greatly expanded the extent to which nonprofits could lobby without jeopardizing their tax-exempt status (Smucker, 1999). That legislation recognized lobbying as an entirely proper function of nonprofits and ended the uncertainty about lobbying by groups that are tax-exempt under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (Smucker, 1999). Lobbying, for a nonprofit electing to come under the law, is only the expenditure of money by the organization for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Fourteen years later on August 31, 1990, the final version of the tax reform law was faithful to the 1976 law (Smucker, 1999). In every critical area, the regulations reflect responsiveness to the criticisms and suggestions offered by nonprofits during the long process that led to the final outcome (Smucker, 1999).

The general rule of Section 501(c)(3), to which all organizations exempt under that provision are subject unless they elect to come under the 1976 lobby law, is that no substantial part of or activities may be of attempting to influence legislation (Smucker, 1999). Unfortunately, the IRS does not define substantial, which causes concern among the charitable community since the penalty for violating the regulation could result in loss of 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status.

Some groups confused, and still do confuse, lobbying with political activity. Lobbying which is influencing the outcome of legislation by a 501(c)(3) is lawful and even encouraged by legislation Congress enacted in 1976. Political activity, which is not permitted, is influencing the outcome of an election by a 501(c)(3) (Clark, 1997). Because all nonprofits need some political power in order to carry out their missions, these basic definitions withstand creative interpretations.

To clarify the rules for lobbying by nonprofits, Section 501(h) was added to the code in 1976, as a result of the enactment of the 1976 lobbying law (Smucker, 1999). Nonprofits must only complete a one page form available from the IRS to make this election which provides a formula they can use to calculate their lobbying expenditure limit (Boris and Krehely, 2002), therefore having their legislative efforts governed by the specific rules of Section 501(h) instead of the vague substantiality standard (Smucker, 1999). The 1976 legislation both sets financial limits for lobbying activities and defines the activities that count against those limits (Smucker, 1999).

The first elements of the 1976 law are the exclusions from lobbying, which are permitted without limit. Nonprofits may contact executive branch employees or legislators in support of or opposition to proposed regulations (Smucker, 1999).

Lobbying by a volunteer for a nonprofit is not counted as a lobbying expenditure to the organization and is not lobbying. If the volunteer is reimbursed by the nonprofit organization for out-of-pocket expenditures, then the reimbursed funds do count as a lobbying expenditure (Smucker, 1999). A nonprofits communications to its members on legislation, even if it takes a position on the legislation, is not lobbying as long as the nonprofit does not directly encourage its members or others to lobby (Smucker, 1999). A response to written requests from a legislative body or technical advises on pending legislation by a nonprofit is also not considered lobbying. Self-defense activity, that is lobbying legislators, not members, on matters that may affect the organizations own existence, powers, tax-exempt status, and similar matters are not be lobbying (Smucker, 1999). The most common approach to advocacy that nonprofits take, that is not considered lobbying, is making available the results of nonpartisan analysis, study, or research on a legislative issue that presents the pertinent facts, to enable the audience to form an independent opinion. Finally, a nonprofits discussion of broad social, economic, and similar policy issues whose resolution would require legislation, even if specific legislation on the matter is pending, is not considered lobbying as long as the discussion does not address the qualities of specific legislation (Smucker, 1999).

The second key element of the 1976 law is that it declares that activities that do not constitute active lobbying are permitted, provided only that they fall within the spending limits established by the law (Smucker, 1999). The spending ceilings are based on percentages of the nonprofit's budget for the year, beginning at twenty percent of the first \$500,000 and ending at five percent of expenditures over \$1.5 million (Smucker, 1999).

The third important element of the 1976 legislation was the establishment of a new and more flexible system of sanctions to replace the loss of exemption as the principal action for violation of the substantiality standard (Smucker, 1999). The initial sanctions for nonprofits under the 1976 law that spend more than the limit is a twenty five percent excise tax on the lobbying spending in any year in excess of the ceiling (Smucker, 1999). Loss of exemption is possible only if spending normally exceeds one hundred fifty percent of the limit (Smucker, 1999).

Nonprofits and Advocacy

The number of nonprofits in the country is increasing every year. Economists claim that the sharp rise in the number of nonprofits over the years seems to be a classic case of supply and demand. They theorize that nonprofits are a response to market failure where neither government nor business steps in to provide necessary services (Berry and Arons, 2003).

Berry (2003) defines three theories to why new nonprofits are being founded everyday. The first theory states that nonprofits operate in a regulated market. To operate in a regulated market means to understand that government sets rules making it easier or more difficult for private or nonprofit organizations to participate in public policy making (Berry and Arons, 2003). The second theory, similar to the economist's theory, states that interest groups operate in an open market. Therefore groups arise, as they are needed, as citizens come to understand that their interests are at stake in some emerging policy debate (Berry and Arons, 2003). The final theory Berry (2003) cites is the Political Process Theory or the Political Opportunity Theory. This theory states that new groups periodically challenge the status quo, but their success depends on the

current governmental structure and process, for example, whether that government is a democracy or not (Berry and Arons, 2003).

The most adequate explanation for the participation of nonprofits in public policy making is to think of the interest group as a regulated market (Berry and Arons, 2003). This framework emphasizes the ongoing bargaining and negotiation between government and the groups that are governed by the regulations. Regulation is an active process, and adjustments in the rules are made frequently as government responds to requests from groups for easier access or from opponents of particular groups wanting to inhibit those lobbies' access (Berry and Arons, 2003).

According to Berry (2003), there are four rationales for government regulation of interest groups. The first is integrity and accountability. If government did not regulate the participation of interest groups, the wealthiest organizations would have such great influence that democracy would be threatened if not extinguished (Berry and Arons, 2003). The second rationale is to preserve order. Government is sometimes called on to referee participation when it is impractical to let interest groups participate in any way they want. For example, the Wagner Act was enacted to eliminate employers' interference with the autonomous organization of workers into unions. The third rationale is incorporation. Government often finds that it is in its interest to draw interest groups more formally into the policy making process since they have the first hand experience with the people of the community. The final rationale for government involvement in regulating interest groups is subsidy and promotion. Government sometimes goes a step forward and helps to create interest groups where it sees necessary or where it senses that there has been a market failure (Berry and Arons, 2003).

Significantly, if there were no subsidy for charitable donations, our marginal tax rate, the amount of tax paid on an additional dollar of income, could be a bit lower. (In other words, as income rises, so does the tax rate.) Alternatively, if there were no subsidy for nonprofits, government could spend more on various programs or create other subsidies. But, one of the strongest arguments in defense of the subsidy is that nonprofits perform services that government would like to see offered. Government may even pay the nonprofit directly to perform that service, but it gets the added bonus of nonprofits attracting private money to support these activities too (Berry and Arons, 2003).

It is safe to assume that nonprofits that administer government programs are likely to have a significant stake in public policy (Berry and Arons, 2003). In any community in the United States there are nonprofits trying to push local government to do more, there are nonprofits criticizing government, and there are nonprofits trying to stop the best-laid plans of administrators and block the pet projects of legislatures (Berry and Arons, 2003).

Although it would seem that in official policy and actual practice, the federal government discourages nonprofits from interacting with the legislators that represent their nonprofit clients (Berry and Arons, 2003). But many of these nonprofits rarely encounter organized opposition. The services they provide to the poor, disabled, unemployed, and homeless are universally embraced (Berry and Arons, 2003). Americans see nonprofits as compassionate and generous because nonprofits facilitate voluntarism, they tackle the problems that government cannot solve and business cannot make a profit from. Nonprofits enrich our lives in every possible way. Relationships and partnerships are two main factors that have an influence on the success of a nonprofits

impression on government. The California Childcare Resource and Referral Network has significant relationships with various government officials at the local, state and even at the federal level and has created partnerships with many public and private organizations in order to provide more quality services to community members.

On the state and local level, research shows that personal relationships still seem to count a great deal (Berry and Arons, 2003). Individuals who get to know one another as their organizations interact on a repeated basis are going to develop more trust and understanding of each other, therefore facilitating bigger projects and bigger deals (Berry and Arons, 2003). The goal of most nonprofit leaders who work with government is to create a set of relationships that enhances the place of their organization within the governmental process. The keys are to understand what governmental bureaucracies want from nonprofits, build those capacities into one's own organization, and develop personal relationships with the policymakers who make the decisions affecting the nonprofit (Berry and Arons, 2003).

Partnerships (which goes hand in hand with relationship building) between government and social service providers influence the ability of nonprofits to carry out their advocacy role. Researchers focus on partnerships because of the increasing dependence of governments on nonprofits has made nonprofits increasingly dependent on government. The concern is that dependence on government for a sizable part of their budget forces nonprofits to be too compliant, and too ready to do what funding agencies want (Berry and Arons, 2003). In reality due to their extensive knowledge on community issues, nonprofit social service providers are commonly involved with agency

administrators, if not at the beginning of new or newly revised programs, long before the request for proposals is published (Berry and Arons, 2003).

Major Forces Facing Nonprofit Advocacy

Public interest advocacy is pervasive and powerful. It has shaped public consciousness about many issues including, nuclear weapons, tobacco use, civil and human rights, and the environment. As we have established so far, advocates are part of the give and take of the policy process and although nonprofit organizations have grown in size and influence in recent decades, they will still confront a number of challenges in the years ahead (Boris and Krehely, 2002).

A number of possible social and demographic trends may be posing new problems for nonprofit advocacy. Regardless of the growing number and the variety of organizations, the high levels of giving and volunteering, and the fact that many people belong to multiple organizations, indicators of civic health such as voting levels, citizen involvement in politics, and trust in public institutions have declined in the U.S. (Boris and Krehely, 2002). One possible cause of the apparent decline in civic participation is the growing diversity of the American population. Greater diversity increases the need for nonprofit civil rights groups to protect and politically engage broader and diverse communities (Boris and Krehely, 2002). Another important development is the growing income disparity in the country, which affects the capacity of disadvantage groups to have their voices heard in an increasingly resource-intensive advocacy process. Research shows that the poor and underserved are less likely to be heard than other groups (Boris and Krehely, 2002). They may have strong civic networks, but many organizations lack sufficient resources and access to the press, which are needed for political participation

and success (Boris and Krehely, 2002). On the other hand, recent social and demographic shifts have created new demand for nonprofit services and new prospects for attracting the personnel these organizations will need (Salamon, 2002).

A second challenge to nonprofit advocacy arises in the realm of management and operations. Professionalism can lead to efficiency gains but may have a negative impact on membership involvement and therefore on the legitimacy of the organization. Building organizational capacity, mastering new technologies, learning how to make use of coalitions, and finding suitable organizational structures are all manifestations of this challenge. (Boris and Krehely, 2003)

Another set of changes shaping nonprofit advocacy is regulatory in character. Over the past few years, several attempts have been made to tighten the regulatory environment that shapes nonprofit advocacy. Concerns about whose interests are represented by nonprofits have led recently to efforts to limit their legislative lobbying. Government regulations determine the types of organizations eligible for tax-exempt status, the procedures to secure this status, the type of activities they can undertake and the kinds of public disclosures they must make (Gronbjerg and Salamon, 2002).

The growing strengths and sophistication of business advocacy are also affecting nonprofit advocacy (Boris and Krehely, 2002). Nonprofits and businesses are creating coalitions to advocate for particular causes or policies. Both side have something to gain from the collaboration. Businesses often have superior financial resources and public relation skills, while nonprofits have social capital, visibility, public legitimacy, networks and relationships (Boris and Krehely, 2002). Major legislation is enacted most often through the combined efforts of a number of groups working in a coalition (Smucker,

"Child care costs more than public college tuition in most states," **Helen Blank** of the Children's Defense Fund

1999). Coalitions coordinate and focus the resources on many groups that have a common interest in a legislative issue (Smucker, 1999).

In the recent years nonprofits have had the opportunity and have gained greater visibility and policy salience. For example, the events of September 11 have increased the public's recognition of the nonprofit sector. Nonprofit organizations were visible participants in the response to this tragedy (Salamon, 2002). These kinds of events reawaken Americans to the importance of the function that nonprofit institutions perform.

Universal Preschool

In California, there is one licensed childcare slot for every five children estimated to need care (California Child Care Resource and Referral Network [CCRRN], 1999). Low-and moderate-income families have additional difficulties finding quality care due to the high cost of care, the lack of available subsidy assistance, transportation issues, and non-traditional work hours.

For a family in California earning minimum wage (approximately \$14,040/year), the combined costs of housing and child care add up to more than 100% of that family's annual income (CCRRN, 2003). Even if parents can afford childcare there may not be any availability. Only 4% of care in childcare centers offer care available during non-traditional hours, and yet 20% of Californians work non-traditional hours (CCRRN, 2003).

Children are ready to learn and develop the skills they will need throughout their lives well before kindergarten. Yet, many children start school without ever having been to preschool. These children face challenges in kindergarten that are difficult to

overcome. Solid scientific research shows that ninety percent of brain growth occurs before the age of five and proves the wisdom of investing in quality preschool education to ensure that children begin learning early, during this critical period, in order to prepare children for elementary school and to succeed in life (First 5 San Francisco, 2004).

Participants in a longitudinal study of quality care had significantly higher high school grades, scored higher on literacy tests at age 19, and were more likely to earn a high school diploma (California's Childcare Crisis, 2001). Early care and nurture have a decisive, long-lasting impact on how people develop, their ability to learn, and their capacity to regulate their own emotions (Shore, 1997). Every dollar invested in high quality childcare can yield up to \$7.16 in savings to the public in crime costs, welfare dependency, and other savings (Schweinhart, Barnes, and Weinkart, 1993).

Although the evidence shows positive results of early education programs for all children, there is a current debate that pits the notion of voluntary early learning programs, available to all preschoolers, against targeted services, reserved for those at greatest risk of poor achievement, based on economic disadvantages, disabilities or other special needs (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004). Proponents for targeted programs cite three key advantages. Compared to universal preschool programs proponents for targeted programs say they are more efficient and cost the public less, they are higher in quality because they serve a relatively small number of children with the greatest needs, therefore have the resources to focus on quality, and they receive greater public support because there is a smaller total budget required by a targeted program, making it more affordable, and more likely to be fully funded by the public (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004).

Historically, policymakers across the nation have supported targeted programs based on the above three advantages (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004). The largest of these existing targeted programs are Head Start, preschool special education, and means-tested child care subsidies (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004). The federal Head Start program dates back to 1964. It was developed based on the idea that poverty severely restricted the capacity of many families and communities to adequately support the development of young children, which is why eligibility for Head Start is limited to young children in families with incomes below the federal poverty line or who potentially qualify for public assistance (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004).

Under the Federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act all states provide preschool special education to children with one of 13 disabilities or who meet state criteria for developmental delay (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004). Most of these costs are borne by state and local school districts. State funded preschool programs have expanded significantly over the past ten years but mostly only serve 4 year old children and have limited slots available (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004). And finally, the last area of growth is public funding for childcare services. State subsidized childcare programs target children whose parents work or attend school and who meet a means-test, meaning the family income must be below a state established cutoff (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004).

At the same time that targeted programs are growing, the case for universal preschool has gained momentum, winning the support of educational leaders most responsible for the achievement levels of American students, as well as business leaders, who have much to gain from raising those achievement levels (Barnett, Brown & Shore,

2004). The rationale often has been based on the concern that across the nation underachievement is a widespread problem, not limited to populations labeled at-risk (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004).

Proponents of universal preschool challenge all three presumed advantages of targeted programs. They argue that targeted programs are less efficient and cost the public more in the long run because problems are not limited to the poor and many children who are not in targeted groups can benefit from a high quality preschool education. Also they claim that targeted programs are lower in quality because programs for the poor tend to be poor programs. And lastly proponents for Universal preschool say that targeted programs receive less public support (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004). Although preschool for all requires a larger budget than targeted programs, it will nevertheless receive greater public support because of the larger more influential population benefiting from the program (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004).

Over the next twenty years the population of the young people in the U.S. will grow from almost 9 million to more than 79 million (David and Lucile Packard Foundation, 2004). Nearly half of that population growth will occur in California. Yet today, less than 46 percent of California's three and four year olds are enrolled in preschool (David and Lucile Packard Foundation, 2004).

The vision of Universal Preschool encompasses programs that meet school readiness standards and are available to all three and four year olds whose parents choose to enroll them. Universal Preschool could be full time or part time and full year or part year. The program would operate in a wide variety of settings and be free for all children for at least a half day (David and Lucile Packard Foundation, 2004).

History of Universal Preschool

Georgia was the first state to offer preschool to all 4-year-old children, opening its program for unrestricted enrollment in 1995. The initiative is supported by lottery funds, and half of the state's 4-year-olds enrolled during 2002-2003 (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004). In 1998, Oklahoma became the second state to open its preschool program to all 4-year-olds, but districts are not required to participate, so the program is not yet available everywhere in the state. Their funding flows through the public schools, which receive a per child allotment based on the K-12 funding formula (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004). During the 2002-2003 school year, Oklahoma maintained relatively high-quality standards, while serving 60 percent of its 4-year-olds in the state Pre-K program (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004).

New York established a pre-kindergarten program in 1997 with the intention of achieving universal availability after five years, but the program has not been adequately funded to do so, and access remains targeted primarily to children from low-income families (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004).

New Jersey and Kentucky offer targeted preschool programs. New Jersey law mandates free, high-quality preschool for 3- and 4-year-olds living in the state's highest-poverty districts, while Kentucky provides free preschool to 4-year-olds from the state's lowest-income families, and to 3- and 4-year-olds with disabilities (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004).

Florida voters amended the state constitution through a ballot initiative to require that all 4-year-olds be provided with a high-quality preschool education beginning in 2005 (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004).

West Virginia passed legislation to make pre-kindergarten available to all 4-year-olds by 2012. Teachers in this program must attain state certification in early childhood education within five years of employment (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004).

At the moment, universal preschool is available on a first-come, first-served basis to 4-year-olds in Washington D.C. and Los Angeles County is currently using tobacco taxes to develop a program for the city's 3- and 4-year-olds (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004).

With currently 40 states providing state funded pre-kindergarten, obviously many states have recognized the importance of quality early childhood education. The growth in the pre-kindergarten movement is directly attributed to the recognition that supporting young children and their families meet their essential needs yields children starting school ready to learn (Barnett, Brown & Shore, 2004).

California's education system, and in the long run, economy will suffer if it does not act on the issue, which is why efforts to establish a system of voluntary, high quality preschool that can serve all of our young children and families at no cost are well underway (First 5 California). State and local partners including First 5 California, County First 5 Commissions, and the Packard Foundation have committed major funding for a range of Universal Preschool demonstration projects and countywide plans (First 5 California). The three and four year olds that will be served by Universal Preschool are part of a 0 to 5 state population that is the largest and most ethnically diverse in the nation (First 5 California). Nearly half of these children are Latino and less than one third are white (First 5 California). Over one third of the parents of the children in California are foreign born, and almost forty percent of these parents have not completed high school

(First 5 California). Reflecting this fact, many of the prospective preschoolers speak another language other than English at home.

Fewer than half of California's three to five year olds are in preschool (First 5 California). These low levels of preschool enrollment among California families, we now know, reflect a lack of access (First 5 California). Most Californians rate school readiness as a higher priority than tax reduction, and 60 percent of all respondents went so far as to say that the state should offer organized education to all, starting at age four or younger (First 5 California) according to First 5 California's most recent public opinion study conducted by Hart research Associates in December 2003.

The challenge which the California Childcare Resource and Referral Network is facing of Universal Preschool is designing programs that meet the needs of all the children and families being served. Especially since, many children now do not speak English as their primary language and come from a variety cultural backgrounds.

Proposition 10, the California Children and Families First Act of 1998 increased the tax on cigarettes and tobacco products directing the tax moneys into the new California Children and Families First Trust Fund to improve early childhood development from the prenatal stage to age five (California Budget Project, 1999). It created a new state commission and individual county commissions to oversee the expenditure of these moneys, specifying that the state commission is responsible for spending 20 percent of the moneys and the county commissions are responsible for the remaining 80 percent (California Budget Project, 1999).

Proposition 10 allows funds to be spent on a broad range of programs to improve the early development of children from the prenatal stage to age five. Specifically, the

initiative emphasizes community awareness, education, nurturing, childcare, social services, health care, and research. Proposition 10 also specifies the moneys can only be spent to supplement existing levels of service and prohibits any of its moneys from being used to fund existing levels of service (California Budget Project, 1999).

In order to allocate the funds designated for local programs, Proposition 10 created county commissions, which must be composed of five to nine members appointed by the counties' boards of supervisors (California Budget Project, 1999). Before each county could receive funds from the new tax, county boards of supervisors had to adopt an ordinance creating a county Children and Families First Commission, appoint a majority of the commission's members, and establish a local Children and Families First Trust Fund and complete a strategic plan (California Budget Project, 1999). The amount allocated to the individual counties is based on the number of births in the county as a percentage of the statewide total. If one or more counties choose not to participate, the funds that would have gone to those counties would be divided proportionately among participating counties (California Budget Project, 1999).

Proposition 10 was a first step into allocating money for early childhood education programs. Although not allocated for Universal Preschool specifically, some of the moneys were used for the purpose within the county level only. For example, Los Angeles is providing early education programs for their 3 and 4 year old through the funds they receive from Proposition 10.

San Francisco is in the planning phase and is using Proposition 10 funds to carry out their mission of providing preschool for all three and four year olds. First 5 San Francisco convenes monthly meetings with 25 stakeholders to design Preschool for All in

San Francisco. This group is currently preparing a plan for the first year of Universal Preschool, which will be presented to the First 5 San Francisco Commissioners at a public meeting in January 2005 (Sutherland, personal communication, 2004). Once the Commissioners have approved the plan, it will be presented to the Board of Supervisors at which time they will either approve the plan or send it back to the Commission for amendments (Sutherland, personal communication, 2004). Once the Board of Supervisors has approved the final plan for the first year of Universal Preschool, public meeting in each of the neighborhoods in San Francisco will be held and childcare providers will have an opportunity to apply for Universal Preschool participation (Sutherland, personal communication, 2004).

In March 2003, the California Board of trustees approved a five-year strategic plan to achieve Universal Preschool in California by 2013. The central focus is to achieve access to voluntary preschool for all three and four year olds by funding research, analysis, leadership, and constituency building which promote this goal. Adopted by the Children, Families, and Communities program of the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, in 2003 as an integral part of this strategy, Universal Preschool flagship demonstration programs were launched (David and Lucile Packard Foundation, 2004).

On September 29, 2004 Governor Schwarzenegger vetoed the Universal Preschool bill, Assembly Bill 712 (previously known as AB 56), after advocates and legislators spent months providing input and building consensus around the bill's measures. AB 712 would have required completion by late 2005 of a cost study of a voluntary statewide preschool for all program, and would have convened a committee of stakeholders to address workforce issues related to early care and education programs,

Universal Preschool, and kindergarten through grade 3 (California State Legislature, 2003). These issues include educating, preparing and supporting a well trained, culturally and linguistically diverse teaching and administrative staff (California State Legislature, 2003).

During the past 9 months, AB 712 underwent many changes prior to submission to the governor for approval. After it came out of conference committee, AB 712 no longer included many of the comprehensive provisions to establish a framework for a universal, statewide preschool program that stakeholders had negotiated over the past eight months. Advocates reported that sponsors of the bill altered its contents after learning that the governor was not ready to support its comprehensive approach (Mercer, personal communication, 2004).

California ChildCare Resource and Referral Network

The California Child Care Resource and Referral Network (Network) is the oldest, most well established system of childcare resource and referral (R&R) agencies in the United States (CCRRN, n.d.). The Network combines practical knowledge at the local level with extensive experience in working on state and national childcare policy. The public and private support for childcare R&R services in California is acclaimed throughout the country (CCRRN, n.d.).

Over the past twenty-eight years, California's R&R services have evolved from a grassroots effort helping parents find child care, to a well-developed system that supports parents, providers, and local communities, in every county in California, in finding, planning for, and providing affordable, quality child care. California has allocated state funds, administered by the Child Development Division of the California Department of

Education, for the local R&R's to provide services since 1976, and its commitment to R&R is evidenced by the growth in funding from \$900,000 in 1976 to a budget in FY 2003 of \$16,000,000 in state funds and \$4 million federal funding (CCRRN, n.d.).

The state's proud history of public support for R&R services stems in large part from the Network's effective voice and role. After operating for four years as an informal, mutual support organization, the Network incorporated as a private, nonprofit, public benefit corporation in 1980 (CCRRN, n.d.). To accomplish its mission during the past twenty-four years, the Network has raised millions of dollars from foundations, corporations, and periodic public contracts to increase the effectiveness of local R&R services, and to document and articulate childcare and family needs to widespread audiences (Mercer, personal communication, 2004). It has actively participated in the public debate, which shapes policies and programs central to the lives of California's children and families, and has consistently sought creative solutions to their childcare needs.

As a private, nonprofit organization, which exists outside the public sector, but maintains a unique connection to the state through its member agencies, the Network has enjoyed the freedom and challenge of developing creative solutions, which stimulate new approaches to the existing service delivery system. Their position, independent of state funding streams, has facilitated effective links and partnerships with the private sector.

The Network's creative solutions also build on its unique perspectives on childcare needs and issues. These perspectives come directly from the hundreds of thousands of parents and providers served annually by the 61 local R&R agencies in every county in the state (CCRRN, n.d.). Through the Data Standardization Project and the resulting

California Child Care Portfolio, the Network is able to capture these diverse perspectives and needs in a standard, systematic way, providing locally and statewide, an invaluable planning tool for addressing childcare issues (CCRRN, n.d.).

The California Child Care Portfolio has, for years, revealed critical gaps in the supply of quality, affordable childcare, which the Network has addressed since 1985 through its Child Care Initiative Project (CCIP) (CCRRN, n.d.). Developed by BankAmerica Foundation, the initiative is the largest public-private partnership working to increase the supply of quality childcare in the country. It has incorporated over 300 funders, and has provided support to 61 R&Rs over the past 19 years to recruit, train, and retain family childcare providers (CCRRN, n.d.). Since 1992 the core training model and curriculum has been successfully adapted to meet the needs of Spanish-speaking providers and families. Additionally, in response to the needs of parents, a new funding source for CCIP projects was implemented in 1997. Using federal dollars from the Child Care Developmental Block Grant, the California Department of Education, Child Development Division provides grants to counties to develop family childcare homes to care for infants and toddlers and to train family childcare providers to care for infants and toddlers (CCRRN, n.d.).

The Initiative works through existing nonprofit community-based childcare resource and referral agencies (R&Rs). To date, the project has raised over 10 million dollars from public and private sector funders, including an annual commitment of up to \$250,000 in matching funds from the State of California (CCRRN, n.d.). During fiscal year 2003-2004, the Network funded 14 projects and raised over 1.3 million dollars in matching fund. In the 2002-2003 fiscal year, the project was expanded to serve every

county in California, representing significant growth from 28 projects in 2001 to 71 projects in 2003 (CCRRN, n.d.).

The state, through the California Department of Education, Child Development Division, has supported the efforts of the Child Care Resource and Referral (R&R) agencies and since 1976, which are located in every county in California (CCRRN, n.d.). Over the last two decades, R&R services have evolved from a grassroots effort to help parents find child care, to a well-developed system that supports parents, providers, and local communities in finding, planning for, and providing affordable, quality child care.

Local resource and referral agencies help parents find child care that best meets their family needs, and document parents' requests for child care services. They maintain comprehensive databases of childcare providers in their communities, including licensed family childcare homes and childcare centers, track providers' licensing status, the languages they speak, the age groups they serve, the schedules they offer, and the number of spaces available in centers or family child care homes (CCRRN, n.d.). They also work with providers to improve the quality of childcare and to maintain and expand the supply of childcare in each county, provide training and other services that help providers stay in business. Finally they compile and disseminate information on the statewide supply and demand for childcare, and educate local communities and leaders to understand childcare issues and to plan effectively to address child care needs (CCRRN, n.d.). These services are free and available to all parents and child care providers.

In response to parents' complex childcare needs, the Network also delivers core parent services in conjunction with its member agencies. These include maintenance of the TrustLine Registry, a background check available to parents choosing license-exempt

childcare providers and most recently, and Parent Voices, a grass-roots parent leadership development effort.

Endorsed by the California Academy of Pediatrics and Administered by the California Department of Social Services and the California Child Care Resource & Referral Network TrustLine is a database of licensed and licensed-exempt nannies and baby-sitters that have cleared criminal background checks in California (CCRRN, n.d.). It's the only authorized screening program of in-home caregivers in the state with access to fingerprint records at the California Department of Justice and the FBI.

Parent Voices is a parent-run, parent-led grassroots organization committed to strengthening the capacity of parents to effectively advocate for their childcare concerns (CCRRN, n.d.). It combines leadership development, advocacy and community organizing in its efforts to increase funding, improve quality, and provide better access to childcare.

A project of the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network, Parent Voices is hosted by Child Care Resource and Referral agencies. Currently there are 11 chapters in different counties in California. They accomplish their goals through trainings, regular meetings, special events, media, and participation in the political process. Parents testify before legislative committees, help draft legislation, organize candidate forums, register voters, and encourage other parents to become active in Parent Voices.

Despite over twenty years of solid advocacy work and many major victories for childcare, the Network realizes that expanded parent leadership and an amplified parent

voice is essential to elevate the crisis in unmet childcare needs to a new level of public engagement.

The Network is the only statewide childcare organization which has well-developed representation and communication with every county in the state (CCRRN, n.d.). This long history of collaboration, trust, and action has allowed the Network to amplify the statewide and national impact of local R&Rs by supporting their individual strengths and by helping them build independent accomplishments.

Advocacy

The Networks interest in Universal Preschool existed before the huge outbreak of interest by many of the existing organizations that are involved in the development of Universal Preschool in California, except they were taking another approach. The Network was providing information about the importance of early childhood education. They were assisting families in finding affordable and accessible programs to meet the needs of individual families. Through its extensive research and the development of the California Childcare Portfolio, which is published every other year, they were and still are able to recognize the needs, and requests of families regarding early childhood programs.

Also because the Network cannot control the development of the Universal Preschool Plan for California, they want to put as much weight on the issue as they can. Unfortunately, the Packard Foundation opened the doors for Universal Preschool in California. Other organizations were interested but nothing was really initiated to make Universal Preschool a reality until the David and Lucile Packard Foundation. Therefore, because of the open window, many organizations want to make sure that they have a part

in the process to Universal Preschool, including the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network.

In order for the Network to achieve a quality childcare system and Universal Preschool system, which meets the needs of all children and families, they must work persistently at the local, state, and national level. The core methods the Network accomplishes this work are through staff monitoring of state and federal policy issues, dissemination of the information and policy alerts to the local R&Rs, discussions of the major policy issues at monthly regional and annual R&R meetings, and representation of the Network's positions and agenda at appropriate state and national hearings, forums and conferences (Mercer, personal communication, 2004).

The most significant feature of the Network's policy work is its ability to hear, document, and communicate the impact of national and state policies on childcare within local communities throughout the state, through the local resource and referral agencies. This collaboration allows the Network to bring a comprehensive, reality-based position to policy makers, representing all geographical areas of the state.

Because of the reality that Universal Preschool is not far away for California, the Network wants to make sure that the needs of children, parents and home child care providers are met. The last thing they want is for the state to offer Universal Preschool that is not Universal. There are specific principles that the Network is advocating for. These principles come in response to the concerns of parents and in home childcare providers. First of all, they are advocating that preschool be free for all families, in order for the preschool system to be accessible to all families (Mercer, personal communication, 2004). Second, they are advocating that the law include a provision that

protects funds for existing programs and designates new funds for universal preschool, because each three and four year old was once an infant and toddler and will be school-aged one day, the creation of preschool for all three and four year olds must build on and not take away from existing programs for children of other ages (Mercer, personal communication, 2004). Third, the network is also advocating for families to have choices as to where their children attend preschool including school, centers and family child care homes, and to have choices that include programs that respond to children's special needs and their cultural and linguistic needs (Mercer, personal communication, 2004). Most importantly, the network is advocating that teachers be trained in special needs detection and bilingual education. With this preschool system serving all Californians, which includes great diversity in geography, culture, language, and needs, the preschool system should offer choices that are diverse as the population (Mercer, personal communication, 2004).

The Network is advocating that preschool programs are offered in a full day context, recognizing the need for flexibility due to different working parents' schedules, and that the Department of Education contract with existing child care centers and homes to provide preschool so that children do not have to move from location to location throughout the day. The preschool system must offer flexibility and choice in the programs and acknowledge the real needs of full time working parents, because parents work different schedules to meet their family's economic needs.

The fifth principle for which the Network is advocating for is to see preschool programs also serve as resources for parenting, nutrition and healthcare for children, similar to Head Start, and for parents to play a respected role in the planning,

implementation and evaluation process of Universal Preschool. A wide range of factors influences how a preschooler develops, therefore the preschool system should be developed within a comprehensive framework. And because parents best know and represent the diverse needs of California's children, preschool success is dependent on parent involvement (Mercer, personal communication, 2004)

Advocacy efforts for children, parents and providers by the Network have been effective. The major challenge they face is how to make sure that all the programs meet the needs of all children. Along with this issue another challenge is who is going to lead the changes around preschool and make sure that all providers are trained in the same way.

Discussion

Many people say that universal preschool is a bad idea no matter how qualified the teachers are. No study has ever shown that it's better for kids to be away from their parents than with their parents. On top of that, some may feel that the government cannot even provide public education correctly in California, therefore they rationalize why one would want to hand over their 0-to 5-year-olds to a system that can't do what it's supposed to be doing now. Although all these concerns and arguments are valid, there is also significant research that early childhood education is beneficial for brain development and future success in life.

Advocates, educators and parents, even stay at home parents, feel the benefits of preschool are tremendous. Just a few hours a day will help a child grow intelligently, emotionally and socially.

The California Child Care Resource and Referral Network has always existed to provide parents with the resources needed to make a decision on childcare and have worked with childcare providers to make certain that parents and children have the options of multiple high quality child care services

According to a statewide survey conducted by First 5 California, 83 percent of parents of young children in California say they would enroll their child if free, voluntary preschool for four-year-olds were available through their local public schools. Almost two thirds of adults believe that California should be doing more to provide opportunities for children to attend quality preschool programs before kindergarten. When asked to identify the biggest obstacles parents face in finding quality preschool programs, the number one reason cited was that programs are too expensive. The second reason was lack of availability (Peter D. Hart Associates Inc., 2004).

There are many organizations involved in the development of Universal Preschool for California, proving that many feel early childhood education programs are extremely important for young children. But for the California Childcare Resource and Referral Network it is important that parents are involved in the planning process and that their voice is heard, since it is their children that will be benefiting for the programs. They want to be sure that all families, from all different ethnicities and geographical locations have access to early childhood education programs for their children.

The Network has developed partnerships with other organizations and have developed relationships with key individual in the policy making process. Patty Siegal, the Executive Director of the Network, is well known in the policy arena. She has made it a point to include herself in many discussions, forums and committees that benefit the

options of parents and childcare providers. Her leadership and dedication to the Network and their mission has been acclaimed by many organization leaders.

References

- Barnett, W.S., Brown, K., & Shore, R. (2004, April). *Preschool Policy Matters: The Universal vs. Targeted Debate: Should the United States Have Preschool For All?* The State University of New Jersey Rutgers: National Institute For Early Education Research.
- Berry, J.M., & Arons, D.F. (2003). *A Voice For Nonprofits*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute.
- Boris, E.T. & Krehely, J. (2002). Civic Participation and Advocacy. In L. Salamon (Ed.), *The State of Nonprofit America* (pp. 229-330). Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institute.
- California Budget Project. (2001, March 21). *How Many Children Need Subsidized Child Care in California?* Retrieved October 20, 2004, from <http://www.cbp.org/2001/qh010328.pdf>
- California Budget Project: Budget Brief. (1999, March). *The Implementation of Proposition 10: The California Children and Families First Act of 1998*. Retrieved December 1, 2004, from <http://www.cbp.org/1999/bb990301.htm>
- California Child Care Resource and Referral Network (CCR RN). (2001). *California Child Care Portfolio*. Retrieved October 7, 2004, from http://www.rrnetwork.org/rrnet/resources_and_links/1046998625.php
- California Child Care Resource and Referral Network (CCR RN). (n.d.). *California Child Care Resource and Referral Network Online web page*, Retrieved October 22, 2004, from <http://www.rrnetwork.org/rrnet/index.htm>

California Defense Fund (CDF) report (1998, May) California: Child Care Challenges. California State Legislature. (2003). Assembly Bill No. 712.

Clark, C.S. (1997, December 26). Are Tax-Exempt Groups Too Political? [Electronic Version]. *CQ Researcher* 7(48).

David and Lucile Packard Foundation. (2004, March 18). Preschool And Early Education. Retrieved October 20, 2004, from <http://www.packard.org/index.cgi?page=cfc-upe&id>

First 5 California. (n.d.). Preschool For All: Meeting the Educational Needs of an Increasingly Diverse California. San Francisco: Author.

First 5 San Francisco. (2004, November). Children Need Quality Child Care. San Francisco: Author.

Giannarelli, L., Barsimantov, J. (2000). Child Care Expenses of America's Families. Urban Institute. Retrieved October 21, 2004, from <http://www.urban.org/Template.cfm?Section=ByTopic&NavMenuID=62&template=/TaggedContent/ByTopic.cfm&TopicID=9&TopicName=Child%20Care%20and%20Development&StartRow=147&PreviousStartRow=128>

Gronbjerg K. A. & Salamon, L. M. (2002). Devolution, Marketization, and the Changing Shape of Government –Nonprofit Relations. In L. Salamon (Ed.), *The State of Nonprofit America* (pp. 447-470). Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institute.

Peter D. Hart Research Associates. (2004). What Californians Think About Preschool: A Statewide Survey of Attitudes.

Internal Revenue Service. (n.d.). *Life Cycle of a Public Charity-Ongoing Compliance*. Department of the Treasury. Retrieved November 20, 2004, from

- <http://www.irs.gov/charities/charitable/article/0,,id=123304,00.html>
- Mercer, S. (2004). Personal Communication, Statewide Lead Parent Voices Organizer, housed at the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network. San Francisco, CA.
- Salamon, L. M. (2002). The Resilient Sector: The State of Nonprofit America. In L. Salamon (Ed.), *The State of Nonprofit America* (pp. 3-61). Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute.
- Schweinhart, L.J., Barnes, H.V., & Weinkart, D.P. (1993). *Significant Benefits: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 27*. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press.
- Shore, R. (1997). *Rethinking the Brain: New Insights into Early Development Families and Work Institute*.
- Smucker, B. (1999) *The Nonprofit Lobbying Guide* (2nd ed.). Independent Sector.
- Sutherland, S. (2004, November 9 & 11). Personal Communication, San Francisco Preschool for All committee member representing the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network. San Francisco, CA.