

# 2016

## Alameda County Early Care and Education Workforce Study



By Lea J.E. Austin, Laura Sakai, and Devika Dhamija



**Center for the Study of Child Care Employment**

Institute for Research on Labor and Employment

University of California, Berkeley



Center for the Study of Child Care Employment  
Institute for Research on Labor and Employment  
University of California, Berkeley

# 2016 Alameda County Early Care and Education Workforce Study

© 2016 Center for the Study of Child Care Employment. All rights reserved.

Suggested Citation:

Austin, L.J.E., Sakai, L., & Dhamija, D. (2016). *2016 Alameda County Early Care and Education Workforce Study*. Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California, Berkeley.

Center for the Study of Child Care Employment  
Institute for Research on Labor and Employment  
University of California, Berkeley  
2521 Channing Way #5555, Berkeley, CA 94720  
(510) 642-2035  
cscce.berkeley.edu

Established in 1999, the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment (CSCCE) is focused on achieving comprehensive public investments that enable the early childhood workforce to deliver high-quality care and education for all children. To achieve this goal, CSCCE conducts research and policy analysis about the characteristics of those who care for and educate young children and examines policy solutions aimed at improving how our nation prepares, supports, and rewards these early educators to ensure young children's optimal development. CSCCE provides research and expert analysis on topics that include: compensation and economic insecurity among early educators; early childhood teacher preparation; access to educational opportunities and work environments; and early childhood workforce data sources and systems. CSCCE also works directly with policymakers and a range of national, state, and local organizations to assess policy proposals and provide technical assistance on implementing sound early care and education workforce policy.

The 2016 Alameda County Early Care and Education Workforce Study was commissioned by the Alameda County Early Care & Education Planning Council and funded by Alameda County Early Care & Education Planning Council and First 5 Alameda County.

Thank you to 4C's of Alameda County, BANANAS, and Child Care Links for their assistance. Special thanks to the program administrators who gave so generously of their time to take part in this study.

v.2

Design: Felippa Amanta

Editor: Deborah Meacham

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
Purpose of the Study	2
<b>Study Design</b>	<b>6</b>
Survey Population and Study Sample	6
Response Rate	7
Data Collection Procedures	7
Survey Instrument	8
Analyses	8
<b>Findings</b>	<b>9</b>
Characteristics of Center-Based Early Care and Education Teaching Staff	9
Size of the Early Care and Education Teaching Workforce	9
Demographic Characteristics of Early Care and Education Teaching Staff	10
Teaching Staff Experience and Educational Attainment	15
Tenure	15
Educational Attainment	16
Teaching Staff Compensation and Working Conditions	20
Compensation	20
Benefits	23
Working Conditions	25
Stability of the Early Care and Education Teaching Workforce	26
Turnover	26
Characteristics of Children Served in Early Care and Education Sites	27
Number and Ages of Children Served	27
Race and Ethnicity of Children	28
Linguistic Characteristics of Children	30
Children with Special Needs	30
Public Dollars for Early Care and Education Services	31
<b>Discussion</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Appendix</b>	<b>37</b>
Appendix A: Administrators	37
Appendix B: Methodology for Estimating the Number of Children Served and the Size of Center-Based Early Care and Education Workforce in Alameda County	39
Appendix C: Additional Tables	40
<b>Endnotes</b>	<b>45</b>

## List of Tables

- Table 1.1. Minimum Educational Levels for Center-Based Staff, by Auspices
- Table 2.1. Population, Sample Composition, and Response Rate, by Auspices
- Table 3.1. Number and Percentage of Teaching Staff Employed, by Auspices
- Table 3.2. Mean Number of Assistant Teachers, Teachers, and Teacher Directors Employed, by Auspices
- Table 3.3. Race and Ethnicity of Assistant Teachers and Teachers, by Auspices
- Table 3.4. Percentage of Assistant Teachers, Teachers, and Teacher Directors With Different Rates of Tenure, by Auspices
- Table 3.5. Mean (n) Lowest and Highest Hourly Wages for Teachers With No Degree, Associate Degree, or Bachelor's Degree, by Auspices
- Table 3.6. Percentage of Sites Providing a Pay Raise for Full-Time Teaching Staff Who Are Promoted or Complete a Degree, by Job Title
- Table 3.7. Health Benefits Provided to Teaching Staff, by Job Title
- Table 3.8. Percentage of Sites Offering Paid Time Off for Holidays, Vacation, and Sick Leave, by Job Title
- Table 3.9. Working Conditions, by Job Title
- Table 3.10. Number of Children Enrolled, by Age Range
- Table 3.11. Percent of Children Enrolled, by Age Range and by Auspices
- Table 3.12. Percentage of Sites With at Least One Child Enrolled Who Speaks the Following Languages

## List of Figures

- Figure 3.1. Age Distribution of Assistant Teachers, Teachers, and Teacher Directors
- Figure 3.2. Age Distribution of Assistant Teachers, by Auspices
- Figure 3.3. Age Distribution of Teachers, by Auspices
- Figure 3.4. Race and Ethnicity of Teaching Staff Across Job Titles
- Figure 3.5. Tenure of Assistant Teachers, Teachers, and Teacher Directors
- Figure 3.6. Educational Attainment of Teaching Staff, by Job Title
- Figure 3.7. Educational Attainment of Teachers, by Auspices
- Figure 3.8. Educational Attainment of Assistant Teachers, by Auspices
- Figure 3.9. Race and Ethnicity of Assistant Teachers, Teachers, and Teacher Directors Working in ECE Sites Compared to Children Served
- Figure 3.10. Race and Ethnicity of Children Enrolled, by Auspices

# List of Appendix Tables

Appendix Table A1. Demographic and Personal Characteristics of Administrators Participating in Study

Appendix Table A2. Professional Characteristics of Administrators Participating in Study

Appendix Table C1. Percentage of Assistant Teachers and Teachers Working in Center-Based Early Care and Education, by Auspices

Appendix Table C2. Percentage of Sites Providing a Pay Raise to Full-Time Assistant Teachers, Teachers, and Teacher Directors Who Complete a Degree, by Auspices

Appendix Table C3. Percentage of Sites Providing Health Benefits to Assistant Teachers and Teachers, by Auspices

Appendix Table C4. Percentage of Sites Providing Paid Time Off for Holidays to Full-Time Assistant Teachers and Teachers, by Auspices

Appendix Table C5. Percentage of Sites Serving at Least One Child Who Speaks Spanish, by Auspices

Appendix Table C6. Mean Percentage (SE) of Children Speaking English Only, English and Another Language, and Only a Non-English Language, by Auspices

# Introduction

Today in California – and across the country – there is broad recognition among stakeholders in government, businesses, schools, and communities at large that high-quality early care and education experiences are critical to children’s lifelong learning and our nation’s economic well-being. With this understanding come increased expectations for what teachers of young children should know and be able to do,<sup>2</sup> particularly in response to mounting evidence illustrating that early educators’ skills, knowledge, and well-being are inextricably linked to the quality of children’s early learning experiences.<sup>3</sup> Underscoring these expectations, a recent report issued by the Institute of Medicine (IOM) and National Research Council (NRC), *Transforming the Workforce for Children Birth to Age 8: A Unifying Foundation*, calls attention to the important and complex nature of teaching young children, noting that “through the quality work of these adults [...] the nation can make it right from the very beginning for all of its children.”<sup>4</sup> The report further states, based on a review of evidence, that “adults who are under-informed, underprepared, or subject to chronic stress themselves may contribute to children’s experiences of adversity and stress and undermine their development and learning.” Yet our system of preparing, supporting, and compensating early educators in California and throughout the nation does not align with this understanding, but for decades, has hampered educators’ ability to provide the optimal conditions to help children succeed.

State and local initiatives – like Alameda County’s Quality Counts quality rating and improvement system (QRIS) and the AB212 professional development training and stipend program<sup>5</sup> – aim to improve the quality of early care and education (ECE) environments and the qualifications and stability of the ECE workforce. However, these policy efforts in California have set inconsistent standards (including educator qualifications) across settings and program types and for different ages of children. At the same time, insufficient resources continue to lead to low wages that undermines educators’ well-being.

A lack of current, comprehensive data about the ECE workforce poses a further challenge. Basic concerns – about the level of education and training in programs operating under different auspices, for example – make it difficult to guide implementation of quality improvement initiatives and to determine what resources should be directed to which programs and teachers, let alone to assess their impact. Efforts to further document this workforce – their demographic, education, and employment characteristics – have been limited in Alameda County and across the state.<sup>6</sup> The inability to describe and track such basic information prohibits stakeholders from answering questions like “how prepared is the workforce to provide effective education and care for all children?” and “what policies and investments are needed to ensure a skilled and stable early education workforce?”<sup>7</sup>

A decade ago, the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment (CSCCE) issued the *California Early Care and Education Workforce Study*, which included companion studies documenting the characteristics of both the licensed family child care and center-based ECE workforce in Alameda County.<sup>8</sup> In the intervening

## What is QRIS?

A QRIS is a systemic approach to assess, improve, and communicate the level of quality in early and school-age care and education programs. QRIS administrators “award quality ratings to early and school age care and education programs that meet a set of defined program standards.” See the [QRIS Resource Guide](#).<sup>1</sup>

decade, numerous changes to the ECE system have taken place, including the development of the Preschool Learning Foundations and the Early Childhood Educator Competencies and the development and implementation of quality rating and improvement systems. Demographic shifts among the general population in Alameda County and the state have likewise occurred, as have changes in economic and living conditions. We estimate that today, 4,085 teaching staff care for 25,672 children from birth to before kindergarten, part-time or full time in Alameda County center-based programs (See Appendix B for a description of the estimate and methodology). As California, and specifically Alameda County, continues to strive to transform the existing ECE system into one that delivers high-quality early learning opportunities for all children, the ability to understand the current status of the ECE workforce and to answer key questions about the preparation of these workers, their workplace supports, and compensation levels – elements directly linked to quality – is critical for policymakers, funders, advocates, and other stakeholders.

## **Purpose of the Study**

To inform their policy, planning, and advocacy efforts, First 5 Alameda County and the Alameda County Early Care and Education Planning Council sought countywide information about teaching staff employed in center-based ECE programs. The overall goal of this study was to identify the demographic, education, and employment characteristics (including compensation and workplace conditions) of Alameda County's center-based ECE workforce. In addition to informing First 5 Alameda County and the Planning Council, these data are also intended to be a resource for stakeholders that require current information on the state of the early childhood workforce to inform policymaking, planning, and the investment of resources.

The present report contains the study's findings for early care and education centers that serve children prior to kindergarten. Identifying similar data for early educators working in licensed family child care programs remains as important as for those in center-based programs but was not within the scope of this study.



## Licensed Early Care and Education Centers in California

In California, early care and education outside of a home environment is provided in a “center.” A center is usually located in a commercial building, school, or church; it may be independent or part of a larger entity, such as a school district, a community service organization, or a chain. A center may be a for-profit or a non-profit enterprise. In such centers, non-medical care and supervision care can be provided for children from infancy to school age for periods of less than 24 hours.

Almost all centers are required to be licensed by the Community Care Licensing Division (CCLD) of the California Department of Social Services.<sup>9</sup> To receive a license, the center must meet the requirements established in the Code of California Regulations Title 22, related to the facility, the number and ages of children served, and personnel. The total number of children who can be served in a facility is called the “licensed capacity” of the center. The licensed capacity is based on the physical space of a site and the number of staff available to provide care. CCLD issues separate licenses for the different ages of children that can be served, and each age group requires a specific ratio of children to adults: infants, one adult to four children; and preschoolers, one adult to 12 children.

These centers must employ directors and teaching staff who meet the minimum Title 22 personnel requirements, which include 12 college units of early childhood education/child development. Directors must also have an additional three units related to administration, and within their required 12 units, infant teachers (those working with children under 24 months of age) must have completed at least three units related to the care and education of infants.

Employees must have Child Abuse Index Clearance, as well as fingerprint clearance from the California Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. All staff must have tuberculosis clearance and a health report. At least one person on site must have 15 hours of health and safety training approved by the Emergency Medical Services Authority. New regulations under SB792 also require all staff to have received immunization for pertussis and measles.

In addition to the Title 22 regulations described above, centers contracted with the California Department of Education (CDE) must meet the regulations set by Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, and federally funded Head Start centers are also required to meet additional regulations established by the federal Head Start Bureau. Both Title 5 and Head Start regulations set minimum personnel requirements above those established by Title 22. Table 1.1 compares the educational levels for center-based staff required by Titles 5, Title 22, and Head Start/Early Head Start.

**Table 1.1. Minimum Educational Levels for Center-Based Staff, by Auspices<sup>10</sup>**

	Title 5	Title 22	Head Start/Early Head Start
<b>Teachers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Associate teacher: 12 ECE units</li> <li>• Teacher: 24 ECE units + 16 GE units</li> <li>• Master teacher: Teacher + 6 ECE units in specialization + 2 adult supervision units</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers must have 12 semester units in Early Childhood Education/Child Development (ECE/CD) and 6 months of experience.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 50% of Head Start teachers nationwide must have a bachelor's degree or higher in Early Childhood Education or a bachelor's degree or higher in any subject and coursework equivalent to a major related to early childhood education with experience teaching preschool-age children.</li> <li>• Early Head Start teachers must have a Child Development Associate® (CDA) credential, with specialized training/coursework in infant and toddler development or the equivalent.</li> </ul>
<b>Assistant teachers*</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher aide: Same as Title 22</li> <li>• Assistant teacher: 6 ECE units</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher aides and assistant teachers must be 18 years or older and work in the presence of a teacher at all times.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must have either a Childhood Development Associate® (CDA<sup>11</sup>) credential or be enrolled in a CDA program and complete the curriculum within two years.</li> </ul>
<b>Teacher directors<sup>+</sup></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site Supervisors: AA or 60 units with 24 ECE units + 5 administration units + 2 adult supervision units</li> <li>• Program director: BA + 24 ECE units + 6 administration units + 2 adult supervision units</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supervisors must have 12 ECE units (core) and 3 administration units</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At minimum, must have a bachelor's degree and experience in supervision of staff, fiscal management, and administration.</li> </ul>

\*Assistant teachers and aides typically work under the supervision of a teacher. The terms assistant teacher and aide used in Table 1.1 reflect the labels used by the auspices.

<sup>+</sup>Note: A teacher director is not a regulatory title. Someone working as a teacher director must meet the qualifications and requirements for a director.

## About Alameda County

The second most populous of the Bay Area counties, Alameda County includes such cities as Berkeley, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Oakland, and San Leandro. The county's economy is focused on information, professional and technical services, health care services, retail trade, and leisure and hospitality services.

In 2015, the most recent year for which data is available, Alameda County's population of 1,584,963<sup>12</sup> represented a 4.9-percent increase over the 2010 Census.<sup>13</sup> The population of the county included 251,560 children between the ages of 0-12; 114,777 of whom were under age six, 64 percent of whom resided in households in which all available parents were in the labor force.<sup>14</sup>

The county reflected a racially and ethnically diverse population. Estimates for 2015 describe the county as 33 percent white, non-Hispanic; 27.5 percent Asian; 22.6 percent Hispanic; 11.3 percent black, African American; 4.2 percent multiethnic; 0.8 percent Pacific Islander; 0.3 percent American Indian.<sup>15</sup> Fifty-seven percent of county households were estimated as speaking only English in their homes, 16.5 percent Spanish, and 18.4 percent an Asian or Pacific Island language.<sup>16</sup>

Although the median family income in Alameda County in 2015 was \$92,328,<sup>17</sup> this figure disguises families' economic stress, which increasingly is driven by high housing costs – the county's 2015 annual fair market rent for a two-bedroom unit was \$19,020<sup>18</sup> – and does not account for low-wage earners who work in the county but may live elsewhere; 53 percent of workers in Alameda county live outside of the county.<sup>19</sup> In an effort to increase the income of the area's lowest-paid workers, three cities – Berkeley, Emeryville, and Oakland – each established a local minimum wage that is higher than the current state minimum wage of \$10 per hour.

# Study Design

## Survey Population and Study Sample

This study examined characteristics of teaching staff employed in center-based early care and education (ECE) programs in Alameda County. The survey population included 293 programs operating 447 ECE sites serving infants and/or preschoolers that were identified by the Alameda County Early Care and Education Planning Council, First 5 Alameda County, and/or listed as of March 2016 with the county's three state-funded child resource and referral agencies: BANANAS, 4C's of Alameda County, and Child Care Links. Centers that serve only school-age children were not included in the survey population. Agencies or programs can operate a single or multiple ECE centers, herein referred to as sites. Data for this study were collected and analyzed at the individual site level. Different sites, sometimes including those operated by the same program, can have different funding and governance and, therefore, may be required to meet different regulations and requirements for personnel. Each site in our sample was classified by its auspices into one of five categories: Title 22 for-profit; Title 22 nonprofit; Title 5 school-district; Title 5 non-school-district; and Head Start/Early Head Start (see Early Care and Education Center Auspices).

### Early Care and Education Center Auspices

Early care and education centers operate under the auspices of a sponsoring agency or governing body (see Licensed Early Care and Education Centers in California, p. 3). Because ECE centers in Alameda County, as across the state, can receive funding or sponsorship from multiple agencies and be subject to more than one governing body, we have assigned each center in our sample to one of five auspices based on funding and governance characteristics that determine ratios, personnel requirements, and other features:

- Title 22 for-profit: For-profit sites that do not receive Title 5 or Head Start funding.
- Title 22 nonprofit: Non-profit sites that do not receive Title 5 or Head Start funding.
- Title 5 school-district: Sites receiving funding from Title 5 funds and which are nested within larger school districts;
- Title 5 non-school-district: Sites receiving funding from Title 5 funds but are not affiliated with a school district; and
- Head Start/Early Head Start: Sites receiving funding from Head Start for at least one child that may or may not receive other types of funding (e.g., Title 5). In addition, this group includes *both* Head Start and Early Head Start sites, which have different educational requirements for teaching staff.

## Response Rate

We attempted to survey administrators at all sites that serve children, birth to before kindergarten, in the county. To this end, 394 administrators responsible for overseeing 447 sites were invited to participate in the survey, including 375 single-site administrators and 19 administrators of multiple sites.<sup>20</sup> Five of 394 administrators declined to participate prior to data collection, four programs were closing (and therefore were excluded from the sample), and administrators for 237 sites did not respond to the survey.<sup>21</sup> The final sample thus included data from 160 administrators overseeing a total of 201 sites, resulting in an overall response rate of 45.0 percent.<sup>22</sup>

The response rate was notably different by site auspices. Head Start and Title 5 school-district and non-school-district sites were more likely to participate in the survey than the Title 22 for-profit and nonprofit sites (see Table 2.1). Title 22 sites had an overall response rate of 33.4 percent compared to the 71.0 percent response rate for Head Start and Title 5 sites. To account for this disparity in response rates, proportion weights<sup>23</sup> were calculated, and all analyses were conducted on these weighted data, unless otherwise stated.

**Table 2.1. Population, Sample Composition, and Response Rate, by Auspices**

	Number of center-based sites in population	Proportion in population	Number of sites in sample	Proportion in sample
Title 22 for-profit	166	37.1%	49	24.4%
Title 22 nonprofit	145	32.4%	55	27.4%
Title 5 school-district	47	10.5%	42	20.9%
Title 5 non-school-district	49	11.0%	30	14.9%
Head Start/Early Head Start	40	9.0%	25	12.4%
Total	447	100.0%	201	100.0%

## Data Collection Procedures

First 5 Alameda County, the Alameda County Early Care and Education Planning Council, and Alameda County's three resource and referral agencies (R&Rs) provided CSCCE with contact information for directors and site administrators working at each of the sites in the sample population. Directors and site administrators (herein referred to as administrators) were identified as the person at the center who could provide detailed information on demographic and employment characteristics of all teaching staff, as well as information on workplace benefits and policies.

Although all administrators were asked to complete the same survey questions about their program and staff, the data collection protocol varied slightly for the programs identified by First 5 Alameda County and those identified by the Planning Council and the three R&Rs. The First 5 Alameda County subsample were participants in a larger study, called SEQUAL,<sup>24</sup> involving teaching staff perceptions of their work environments. In an emailed notification letter co-signed by representatives of First 5 Alameda County and CSCCE, administrators were informed that the purpose of the survey was to gather context information about

program characteristics and staffing that play a role in quality improvement and teaching staff assessments of their work environments. For the subsample obtained from the Planning Council and the R&Rs, a letter co-signed by representatives of the Planning Council, each of the three R&Rs, and CSCCE invited administrators to participate in a survey, the purpose of which was to gather countywide information on wages and benefits.

Approximately one week after sending the letter, CSCCE emailed administrators a link to participate in the survey. Data collection for the First 5 Alameda County subsample took place between March and July 2016. Data collection for the Planning Council/R&R subsample took place between May and August 2016.

## Survey Instrument

The survey used in this study was modeled after the Child Care Center Survey from the California Early Care and Education Workforce Study.<sup>25</sup> Administrators were asked to provide information about the number and ages of children served by their programs, staff wages, benefits, working conditions, and turnover, as well as information about the characteristics of teachers, assistant teachers, and teacher directors they employ, including:

- *Demographic characteristics*: gender, age, and ethnicity; and
- *Levels of education and training*: highest level of education, type of degree (if any), and if a degree was attained, whether it was in early care and education or a related field.

Additionally, administrators completing the survey were asked to provide information about their own demographic characteristics and educational backgrounds (see Appendix A). In contrast to previous studies of the workforce in Alameda County,<sup>26</sup> this study did not collect information on all administrators (e.g., directors, assistant directors, principals, owners, site supervisors, etc.) employed in the sites represented in this sample.

Prior to data collection, the survey instrument and data collection procedures were approved by the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects at the University of California, Berkeley, and pre-tested internally. The survey, which was written in English, was administered online and took approximately 30 to 40 minutes per site to complete.

## Analyses

All analyses were conducted in IBM SPSS Statistics 24.0. Proportion weights were used in the analyses to account for the disparity in response rates of Title 22 programs, except when otherwise noted. These weights were calculated to adjust for the proportion of Title 22 programs in the universe in comparison to the sample. To examine group differences by auspices, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and chi-squared tests were conducted. ANOVAs were conducted to examine group differences by auspices in continuous variables, whereas chi-squared tests were used to determine group differences for categorical variables. Detailed results from these analyses, wherever applicable, are presented in Appendix C.

# Findings

## Characteristics of Center-Based Early Care and Education Teaching Staff

*Administrators in the current sample reported on 1,837 teaching staff, out of an estimated total population of 4085, in the roles of assistant teacher, teacher, and teacher director. Title 22 sites, including private for-profit and private nonprofit, employed a greater percentage of teaching staff than Title 5 or Head Start/Early Head Start sites. The early care and education workforce was racially and ethnically diverse; differences by job title suggest some stratification by race and ethnicity. Assistant teachers were the most ethnically diverse group among teaching staff and most closely reflected the ethnic background of children enrolled in the programs surveyed. Differences in the racial and ethnic composition also varied by auspices, with Head Start/Early Head Start and Title 5 non-school district sites employing the most diverse pool of teaching staff, compared to those working in Title 22 nonprofit sites.*

### Definition of Teachers, Assistant Teachers, and Teacher Directors

**Assistant teachers:** Persons working in a classroom under the supervision of a teacher or master teacher who do not have a supervisory position.

**Teachers:** Persons in charge of a group or classroom of children who often have staff supervisory responsibilities. This includes master teachers, head teachers, and lead teachers, but does not include assistants, aides, or teacher directors.

**Teacher directors:** Persons working both directly with children and as administrators.

### Size of the Early Care and Education Teaching Workforce

Administrators were asked to report the number of assistant teachers, teachers, and teacher directors employed to work in classrooms with infants, toddlers, and preschoolers. The survey did not ask about teaching staff who worked exclusively with school-age children. As shown in Table 3.1, the teacher, assistant teacher and teacher director workforce in our sample comprised 1,837 staff members. Slightly less than three-quarters (74.5 percent) of these staff members were teachers, 19.0 percent were assistant teachers, and the remaining 6.5 percent were teacher directors. Almost three-quarters of all teaching staff (72.9 percent) were employed in Title 22 sites, while 27.1 percent were employed in Title 5 or Head Start/Early Head Start sites. Table 3.1 shows the distribution of assistant teachers, teachers, and teacher directors employed at sites in our sample, by auspices.

**Table 3.1. Number and Percentage of Teaching Staff Employed, by Auspices**

	Number of teaching staff	Percent
Title 22 for-profit	613	33.4%
Title 22 nonprofit	725	39.5%
Title 5 school-district	149	8.0%
Title 5 non-school-district	154	8.4%
Head Start/Early Head Start	196	10.7%
Total	1,837	100.0%

As shown in Table 3.2, ECE sites in our sample employed, on average, seven teachers, two assistant teachers, and one teacher director. There were some variations in the average number of teachers and assistant teachers among sites by auspices. Head Start/Early Head Start sites employed greater numbers of assistant teachers, on average, than Title 22 sites. Title 22 private for-profit and nonprofit and Head Start/Early Head Start sites employed, on average, greater numbers of teachers than Title 5 school-district and non-school-district sites. Percentage of total number of teachers and assistant teachers were also computed. See Appendix C for details.

**Table 3.2. Mean Number of Assistant Teachers, Teachers, and Teacher Directors Employed, by Auspices**

	Title 22 for-profit	Title 22 nonprofit	Title 5 school-district	Title 5 non-school-district	Head Start/Early Head Start	Total
Assistant teachers*	1.3	1.4	3.1	3.1	4.5	2.1
Teachers**	8.3	8.8	2.4	4.7	8.3	7.3
Teacher directors***	0.7	0.8	0.1	0.7	0.9	0.7

\* Assistant teachers:  $F(4,177) = 5.01, p < 0.01$ . On average, Head Start/Early Head Start sites employed more assistant teachers than Title 22 for-profit and Title 22 nonprofit sites.

\*\* Teachers:  $F(4,185) = 7.48, p < 0.01$ . Title 5 school-district sites employed fewer teachers than Title 22 for-profit, Title 22 nonprofit, and Head Start/Early Head Start sites.

\*\*\* Teacher directors:  $F(4,179) = 4.75, p < 0.01$ . Title 5 school-district sites, on average, employed significantly fewer teacher directors than did Title 22 for-profit, Title 22 nonprofit, and Head Start/Early Head Start sites.

## Demographic Characteristics of Early Care and Education Teaching Staff

### Gender

Administrators were asked to report the gender of assistant teachers, teachers, and teacher directors employed at their site. The teaching staff workforce is overwhelmingly female: 97 percent of assistant teachers, 96 percent of teachers, and 96 percent of teacher directors were female.



## Age

Administrators were asked to report the age range of their teaching staff (see Figure 3.1). Teachers, assistant teachers, and teacher directors in our sample were typically between 30 and 49 years old. However, assistant teachers were more likely to be younger than 30, compared to teachers and teacher directors, and teacher directors were more likely to be 50 or older, compared to teachers and assistant teachers. The age distribution of assistant teachers and teachers varied by auspices, as shown in Figures 3.2 and 3.3. For teachers, Title 22 for-profit sites reported a smaller proportion of teachers 50 years or older than other sites. For assistant teachers, Title 5 school-district sites reported employing more assistant teachers between the ages of 30 and 50 and fewer assistant teachers younger than 30 than other sites.




Figure 3.2. Age Distribution of Assistant Teachers, by Auspices





Figure 3.3. Age Distribution of Teachers, by Auspices



### Race and Ethnicity

Administrators were asked to report the race and ethnicity of their teaching staff. The teaching staff workforce in our sample was comprised predominantly of women of color (see Figure 3.4). Across job titles, one-quarter (25.6 percent) were Latina, 20.4 percent Asian or Pacific Islander, 13.6 percent African American, and 7.4 percent some other ethnicity.<sup>27</sup> The remaining 33.0 percent of teaching staff were identified as white, non-Hispanic. There were notable differences in the racial/ethnic characteristics of teaching staff by job title and by auspices.


### Job Title

Based on the teaching staff reported on in this survey, there appears to be some evidence of stratification in job title by race and ethnicity. Overall, assistant teachers were notably more likely to be people of color (78.4 percent) than teachers (64.3 percent) or teacher directors (61.3 percent).

Teaching staff who were identified as Latina or Asian/Pacific Islander were more likely to work as assistant teachers than teachers or teacher directors, while those who were identified as white, non-Hispanic, were more likely to work as teachers or teacher directors than as assistant teachers (see Figure 3.4).

- Teaching staff who were identified as Latina represented 25.6 percent of the sample but constituted 32.3 percent of assistant teachers.
- Teaching staff who were identified as Asian/Pacific Islander represented 20.4 percent of the sample but constituted 26.4 percent of assistant teachers.
- Teaching staff who were identified as white, non-Hispanic, represented 33.1 percent of the sample but constituted 21.6 percent of assistant teachers.

Assistant teachers, overall, more closely reflected the ethnic composition of children (see section “Race and Ethnicity of Children,” p. 28).



### Auspices

The ethnic composition of staff differed by site auspices. As shown in Table 3.3, Title 22 nonprofit sites were substantially less diverse than sites under other auspices.

- One-half (51.2 percent) of teachers and 43.3 percent of assistant teachers in Title 22 nonprofit sites were identified as white, non-Hispanic.

- While Title 5 school-district sites employed a high percentage of teachers who were identified as African American (42.4 percent), Title 5 non-school-district and Head Start/Early Head Start sites employed the most diverse pool of teachers.

**Table 3.3. Race and Ethnicity of Assistant Teachers and Teachers, by Auspices**

		Auspices					Total
		Title 22 for-profit	Title 22 nonprofit	Title 5 school-district	Title 5 non-school-district	Head Start/Early Head Start	
<b>Assistant teachers</b>	Black/African American	9.8%	5.0%	19.2%	16.8%	21.6%	14.2%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	29.4%	23.7%	41.6%	18.9%	14.4%	26.4%
	Hispanic	25.4%	19.5%	32.0%	42.1%	47.4%	32.3%
	White, non-Hispanic	29.5%	43.3%	5.6%	16.8%	10.3%	21.6%
	Other	5.9%	8.5%	1.6%	5.3%	6.2%	5.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	<i>Number of assistant teachers</i>	68	79	79	60	61	347
<b>Teachers</b>	Black/African American	11.7%	8.8%	42.4%	19.1%	19.2%	13.1%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	24.4%	14.4%	14.1%	18.3%	26.0%	19.1%
	Hispanic	32.6%	15.3%	16.2%	38.9%	26.6%	23.9%
	White, non-Hispanic	27.3%	51.2%	21.2%	16.8%	12.4%	35.7%
	Other	4.0%	10.3%	6.1%	6.9%	15.8%	8.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	<i>Number of teachers</i>	436	567	62	83	112	1,260

# Teaching Staff Experience and Educational Attainment


Research has indicated that the continuity of the relationship between children and teachers, as well as teachers' knowledge and skill, play a critical role in the development and education of young children.<sup>28</sup> Many early care and education programs across the country, particularly those funded with public dollars like Head Start, have increased the educational requirements and standards for teaching staff. In Alameda County, programs such as Quality Counts and AB212 encourage and support teaching staff to pursue higher education, and the now-defunct CARES program<sup>29</sup>, which operated in the county for more than a decade, rewarded job retention.

Half of all teaching staff had been employed at their sites for five years or longer, and almost all teaching staff have completed some college credit. Teacher directors had longer tenure at their workplace than teachers and assistant teachers. More than one-half of teachers with a bachelor's degree majored in early childhood development or a related field. Similarly, more than one-third of assistant teachers with degrees and most teacher directors with degrees focused on early childhood development or a related field.

## Tenure<sup>30</sup>

We asked administrators to report the number of teachers, assistant teachers, and teacher directors who had been employed at their site for less than a year, from one to five years, or more than five years.

Half (50.1 percent) of the teaching staff, across job titles, had been employed at their sites for five years or longer. Most teacher directors (71.2 percent) had been at their sites for more than five years, compared to one-half of teachers (50.6 percent) and 41.1 percent of assistant teachers. (See Figure 3.5.)



Tenure varied by auspices for teachers and assistant teachers. A higher percentage of teachers and assistant teachers at Title 5 school-district and Head Start/Early Head Start sites were employed for more than five years (see Table 3.4).

**Table 3.4. Percentage of Assistant Teachers, Teachers, and Teacher Directors With Different Rates of Tenure, by Auspices**

		Title 22 for-profit	Title 22 nonprofit	Title 5 school- district	Title 5 non- school- district	Head Start/Early Head Start	Total
<b>Assistant teachers</b>	< 1 year	39.0%	36.4%	20.0%	42.7%	21.8%	31.8%
	1–5 years	37.1%	27.8%	18.3%	34.8%	17.8%	27.1%
	>5 years	24.0%	35.8%	61.7%	22.5%	60.4%	41.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	<i>Number of assistant teachers</i>	75	84	76	56	64	355
<b>Teachers</b>	<1 year	14.2%	18.2%	20.0%	9.6%	7.7%	15.4%
	1–5 years	40.2%	31.4%	11.6%	43.4%	28.2%	34.0%
	>5 years	45.5%	50.5%	68.4%	47.1%	64.1%	50.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	<i>Number of teachers</i>	447	589	60	86	114	1,296
<b>Teacher directors</b>	<1 year	3.3%	12.1%	*	5.6%	5.4%	7.3%
	1–5 years	26.7%	21.7%	*	22.2%	10.8%	21.5%
	>5 years	70.0%	66.1%	*	72.2%	83.8%	71.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	*	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	<i>Number of teacher directors</i>	40	49	*	11	23	126

\*Sample size for Title 5 school-district teacher directors was too small to report.

## Educational Attainment

To document the educational background of teaching staff, we asked administrators to provide information on the numbers of teachers, assistant teachers, and teacher directors with the following highest levels of education:


- Graduate degree;
- Bachelor’s degree;
- Associate degree;
- Some college; and
- High school diploma or less.

In addition, for teaching staff who attained an associate degree or higher, we asked administrators to indicate how many had received their degree in early childhood education, child development, or a related field. The following section first examines the overall educational attainment of teaching staff, then describes educational attainment specifically focused on early care and education.

### Overall Educational Attainment of Teachers, Assistant Teachers, and Teacher Directors

As is true nationally,<sup>31</sup> we found that center-based teachers in our sample typically had completed at least some college credits. The teaching staff in our sample were also more educated than the adult female

population in Alameda County as whole, of which only 50.2 percent had completed some college-level work.<sup>32</sup> As shown in Figure 3.6, all teacher directors (100.0 percent) and virtually all teachers (98.1 percent) had completed some college-level work. The vast majority of assistant teachers (87.4 percent) had also completed some college-level work, although fewer assistant teachers (32.3 percent) had received a college degree than teachers (64.4 percent) or teacher directors (83.8 percent). (See Figure 3.6.)



Most centers (80 percent) employed teachers with a bachelor’s degree or higher. At sites that employed at least one teacher with a bachelor’s degree or higher, half of teachers (53.8 percent), on average, held such degrees.

Not all sites employed assistant teachers with an associate degree or higher. Assistant teachers with an associate degree were concentrated in only 20.6 percent of sites, and those with a bachelor’s degree or higher were concentrated in 26.0 percent of sites. At sites that employed at least one assistant teacher with an associate degree, an average of 27.4 percent of assistant teachers held that degree, and at sites that employed at least one assistant teacher with a bachelor’s degree, 41.9 percent held a bachelor’s degree or higher.

### Education Related to Early Childhood Development

Research indicates that education and training with a specific focus on early care and education leads to more effective care and teaching for children.<sup>33</sup> To get a picture of the extent to which teachers, assistant teachers, and teacher directors have completed their education specifically focused on content related to ECE, we asked administrators to indicate whether any teaching staff who had earned an associate degree or

higher obtained that degree in early childhood education, child development, or a related field (e.g., psychology).

Overall, 41.8 percent of teachers had completed a bachelor's degree or higher, and among these, 59.2 percent obtained their degree in an early childhood-related field. Among the 22.6 percent of teachers who had completed an associate degree, 77.9 percent obtained their degree in an early childhood-related field.

Among the 33.2 percent of assistant teachers with an associate degree or higher, 43 percent earned their degree in an early childhood-related field.

Overall, 67.5 percent of teacher directors had completed a bachelor's degree or higher, and 16.2 percent had completed an associate degree. Nearly 72.7 percent of teacher directors with a bachelor's degree or higher and 74.3 percent of teacher directors with an associate degree had obtained a degree related to early childhood.

### **Education by Auspices**

Research suggests that programs rated higher in quality are staffed by teachers and assistant teachers with higher levels of education and training specifically focused on early childhood education.<sup>34</sup> In California, teaching staff and administrators working in programs regulated by Title 5 of the California Code of Regulation or in Head Start/Early Head Start are required to meet higher educational standards than staff working in programs regulated only by Title 22 (see Licensed Early Care and Education Centers in California, p. 3). In the previous sections, we described the educational attainment of teaching staff employed in ECE sites. Here, we explore differences in educational attainment by site auspices.

We found that teachers' educational attainment varied by auspices. As shown in Figure 3.7, Title 5 school-district sites in our sample reported a higher percentage of teachers who had attained a bachelor's degree or higher than teachers employed at other sites. In addition, one-quarter of teachers at Title 5 school-district sites had attained a graduate degree or higher, which was two to four times more than teachers at other sites. With respect to assistant teachers, those employed at Title 22 sites reported higher levels of education than their counterparts at other types of sites, as shown in Figure 3.8.

Head Start regulations require that 50 percent of teachers in center-based programs have a bachelor's or advanced degree in early childhood education or a bachelor's or advanced degree and coursework equivalent to a major related to early childhood education, with experience teaching preschool-age children.<sup>35</sup> Only one-quarter of teachers (25.6 percent) at Head Start/Early Head Start sites in the current sample held a bachelor's degree or higher. This percentage might appear lower than expected, however, this sample includes *both* Head Start and Early Head Start sites, and Early Head Start sites have lower educational requirements for teachers working at their centers. In addition, Head Start/Early Head Start sites in this sample were defined as sites that served at least one child receiving Head Start or Early Head Start funding. It is possible that one or more classrooms at the same site did not serve *any* children receiving Head Start/Early Head Start funding, and therefore, teachers in those classrooms did not need to meet the Head Start educational requirement for teaching staff.



Figure 3.7. Educational Attainment of Teachers, by Auspices





Figure 3.8. Educational Attainment of Assistant Teachers, by Auspices



# Teaching Staff Compensation and Working Conditions<sup>36</sup>

*The CSCCE report, Worthy Work, STILL Unlivable Wages,<sup>37</sup> documented the nation's longstanding failure to provide adequate support and compensation for the early care and education workforce. The Early Childhood Workforce Index<sup>38</sup> likewise revealed that in California, those identified as "child care workers" earn a median hourly wage of \$11.61, and 47 percent of these workers' families utilize one or more public income support programs; those identified as "preschool teachers" fare somewhat better, with a median hourly wage of \$15.25. Low wages and economic insecurity plague the field of early care and education, and an absence of a rational wage structure and the low value accorded to educational attainment undermine efforts to attract and retain skilled teaching staff key to high-quality care and education of our youngest children.<sup>39</sup> Furthermore, low compensation is often accompanied by few benefits and professional supports.<sup>40</sup>*

*The wages paid to those identified as teachers ranged from a little more than \$12.00 to \$23.23 per hour. The level of wages rose with increased levels of education but varied by auspices; the highest-paid teachers with bachelor's degrees can expect to earn \$22.23 an hour, on average, if they work in a Title 22 nonprofit site and \$18.29 an hour in a Title 5 non-school-district site. Most teaching staff could not depend on receiving a pay raise if they completed a college degree during the course of their employment. Only two out of five administrators indicated that teachers or assistant teachers receive a pay raise if they complete a degree. More than 70 percent of administrators reported that teaching staff, across roles, received paid health benefits. However, assistant teachers were less likely (74 percent) than teachers (87.8 percent) and teacher directors (86.7 percent) to receive paid health benefits. Teaching staff, across job titles, were not able to reliably depend on being paid for a range of professional responsibilities that include required professional development training, completing work outside of regular work hours, and planning time during work hours while they were not also responsible for children.*

## Compensation

### Wages

We sought to document the current wages of teachers, assistant teachers, and teacher directors working in our sample of ECE sites. We were particularly interested in wage ranges among staff with similar positions but varying levels of education. We asked administrators to report hourly wages for their highest- and lowest-paid teachers, assistant teachers, and teacher directors with no degree, an associate degree, and a bachelor's degree. By asking for the lowest rate of pay, we were able to capture what is likely to be paid at a center to a new teacher. By asking for the highest rate of pay, we were able to gain a sense of the pay ladder available to more tenured teachers with and without degrees.

Although our intent was to document compensation for teaching staff by job title, a large proportion of administrators did not provide wage data for assistant teachers and teacher directors. Due to the high level of missing data, we are unable to report wages for these staff positions; as many as 40.9 percent of administrators did not provide wage data for assistant teachers by level of education; and as many as 38.5 percent of administrators did not provide wage data for teacher directors by education level. In Table 3.5, we report average lowest and highest hourly wage for *teachers only*, by educational level.

Table 3.5 provides the average lowest and highest hourly wages paid to teachers with no degree, an associate degree, and a bachelor's degree, by auspices.<sup>41</sup> For both lowest- and highest-paid teachers, wages varied by education level. The lowest average wage for teachers with no college degree was \$13.59 per hour, compared to \$16.61 for teachers with an associate degree and \$17.91 for teachers with a bachelor's degree. The highest average wage for teachers with no degree was \$16.97 per hour, \$3.00 more than the lowest-paid teachers with the same level of education, but \$5.00 less than the highest-paid teachers with a bachelor's degree.

**Table 3.5. Mean (n) Lowest and Highest Hourly Wages for Teachers With No Degree, Associate Degree, or Bachelor's Degree, by Auspices\***

		Mean (n) lowest hourly wage	Mean (n) highest hourly wage
<b>No degree</b>	Title 22 for-profit	\$13.92 (22)	\$17.13 (23)
	Title 22 nonprofit	\$14.27 (30)	\$18.53 (30)
	Title 5 non-school-district	\$12.91 (19)	\$15.12 (17)
	Head Start/Early Head Start	\$12.15 (10)	\$15.03 (10)
	Total	\$13.59 (81)	\$16.97 (80)
<b>Associate degree</b>	Title 22 for-profit	\$16.48 (19)	\$19.65 (20)
	Title 22 nonprofit	\$16.46 (29)	\$19.53 (28)
	Title 5 non-school-district	\$16.08 (9)	\$17.31 (9)
	Head Start/Early Head Start	\$17.37 (15)	\$21.00 (16)
	Total	\$16.61 (72)	\$19.61 (73)
<b>Bachelor's degree</b>	Title 22 for-profit	\$18.05 (29)	\$21.39 (30)
	Title 22 nonprofit	\$17.89 (34)	\$23.23 (35)
	Title 5 non-school-district	\$16.83 (13)	\$18.29 (13)
	Head Start/Early Head Start	\$18.80 (12)	\$22.93 (13)
	Total	\$17.91 (88)	\$21.87 (91)

\* Based on unweighted data.

The overall ANOVA was significant for highest wages earned by teachers who do not have a college degree [ $F(3,76)=3.73, p<0.01$ ] and those who have earned a bachelor's degree. [ $F(3,90)=3.56, p<0.05$ ]. Post-hoc tests reveal that the mean highest hourly wage for teachers with no degree and teachers with bachelor's degree working in Title 22 nonprofit sites is significantly higher than their counterparts working in Title 5 non-school-district sites.

Note: Due to insufficient data, average lowest and highest salaries are not presented for teachers employed in Title 5 school-district programs. Anecdotal evidence indicate teaching staff working at such sites earn higher wages, on average, than teaching staff working at other types of sites.

In addition to average wages, we examined the distribution of wages among highest- and lowest-paid teachers with varying levels of education. Two-thirds (66.7 percent) of sites in our sample paid their lowest-paid teachers with no degree \$14.75 per hour or less (about \$30,680 per year) and about one-quarter (24.6 percent) paid their lowest-paid teachers with an associate degree \$14.68 per hour or less (or \$30,534 per year). Only 12.9 percent of sites paid their highest-paid teachers with an associate degree \$25.00 per hour or more (or \$52,000 per year), and only 19.3 percent of sites paid their highest-paid teachers with a bachelor's degree \$25.00 or more. Consequently, most teaching staff (including those with college degrees) earned less than the median annual earnings of \$53,425 for female workers in Alameda County, across education levels.<sup>42</sup>

We also examined whether wages of teachers varied by auspices. There were no statistically significant differences among sites by auspices for *lowest* hourly wages. However, Title 22 nonprofit sites paid their highest-paid teachers with no degree (Mean=\$18.53) and highest-paid teachers with a bachelor's degree (Mean=\$23.23) significantly more on average, than Title 5 non-school-district sites (no degree: mean=\$15.12); bachelor's degree: mean=\$18.29).

### Pay Raise for Promotion and Degree Completion

We asked administrators whether full-time teaching staff received a pay raise if they were promoted to a position with more responsibility or if they completed a degree (see Table 3.6). Most administrators in our sample reported that across job titles, teaching staff would receive a raise if they were promoted to a position with more responsibility, although approximately one-quarter of sites reported that a raise would depend on the specific circumstances. Teaching staff were less likely to receive a pay raise for completing a degree (see Table 3.6) than for a promotion. Less than one-half of administrators reported that teaching staff would receive a pay raise for completing a degree. Administrators of Title 22 for-profit sites were more likely to report providing a pay raise for degree completion compared with administrators of Title 5 non-school-district sites (see Appendix C).

**Table 3.6. Percentage of Sites Providing a Pay Raise for Full-Time Teaching Staff Who Are Promoted or Complete a Degree, by Job Title\***

	Assistant teachers	Teachers	Teacher directors
<b>Pay raise for a promotion</b>			
No	15.1%	5.8%	11.5%
Yes	59.1%	68.6%	59.4%
Depends on specific case	25.8%	25.6%	29.2%
<i>Number of sites</i>	93	121	96
<b>Pay raise for completing a degree</b>			
No	23.7%	21.4%	23.8%
Yes	41.2%	46.0%	35.6%
Depends on specific case	35.1%	32.5%	40.6%
<i>Number of sites</i>	97	126	101

\* Based on unweighted data.

## Benefits

Employer contributions to health plans and the provision of paid leave are an important part of employee compensation and can contribute to attracting and retaining staff. In this next section, we document benefits provided to teachers, assistant teachers, and teacher directors and whether they vary by site auspices.

### Health Benefits

We asked administrators to report whether teachers, assistant teachers, and teacher directors received employer-paid health benefits and, if so, whether health premiums were fully paid for the employee and dependents, fully paid for the employee only, partially paid for employee and dependents, or partially paid for the employee only. The majority of administrators reported that teaching staff, across roles, received some paid health benefits, though assistant teachers were less likely than teachers and teacher directors to receive paid health benefits (see Table 3.7).

- Three-quarters of administrators in our sample reported that their site provided paid health benefits to assistant teachers. Assistant teachers employed at Title 5 non-school-district sites (100.0 percent) were more likely to receive paid health benefits than assistant teachers at Title 22 for-profit sites (50.0 percent).
- Teachers employed at 87.8 percent of sites in our sample received employer-paid benefits (see Table 3.7). Teachers employed at Title 5 non-school-district sites were more likely to receive employer-paid health benefits; all Title 5 non-school-district sites reported partial or full payment of health care premiums (see Appendix C).
- Eighty-seven percent of ECE sites in our sample provided teacher directors with paid health benefits (see Table 3.7).

Across job titles, the level of benefits provided by sites varied. One-half of sites provided fully paid health benefits to either the employee only or the employee and dependents for teachers and teacher directors, compared to only 39.6 percent of sites that provided this benefit to assistant teachers. Among these sites, approximately one-quarter provided fully paid health benefits for the employee only to teachers (28.2 percent) and teacher directors (28.6 percent); fewer sites (21.9 percent) provided this coverage to assistant teachers.

**Table 3.7. Health Benefits Provided to Teaching Staff, by Job Title\***

	Percent of sites
<b>Assistant teachers</b> (number of sites=96 sites)	
No employer-paid benefits	26.0%
Employer-paid benefits	74.0%
Fully paid for employee and dependents	17.7%
Fully paid for employee only	21.9%
Partially paid for employee and dependents	13.5%
Partially paid for employee only	20.8%
<b>Teachers</b> (number of sites=131 sites)	
No employer-paid benefits	12.2%
Employer-paid benefits	87.8%
Fully paid for employee and dependents	21.4%
Fully paid for employee only	28.2%
Partially paid for employee and dependents	16.0%
Partially paid for employee only	22.1%
<b>Teacher directors</b> (number of sites=105 sites)	
No employer-paid benefits	13.3%
Employer-paid benefits	86.7%
Fully paid for employee and dependents	21.0%
Fully paid for employee only	28.6%
Partially paid for employee and dependents	15.2%
Partially paid for employee only	21.9%

\* Based on unweighted data.

### **Paid Holidays, Vacation, and Sick Leave**

We asked administrators whether teaching staff received paid time off for holidays, paid vacation (sometimes referred to as paid annual leave), and paid sick leave (see Table 3.8). Almost all administrators reported that teaching staff, across job titles, receive paid vacation and sick leave, although assistant teachers were somewhat less likely to receive these benefits than teachers and teacher directors (see Table 3.8).

Almost all administrators in our sample reported that teaching staff receive paid time off for holidays. Most reported that staff receive paid holidays as a benefit, while slightly less than one-fifth of administrators reported that teaching staff receive paid time off for holidays as part of their annual paid-time-off benefit, rather than as separate from vacation leave. Paid holidays for assistant teachers varied by auspices: 96.1 percent of Title 5 non-school-district administrators reported paid time off for holidays, compared with only 65.2 percent of administrators at Title 22 for-profit sites. (See Appendix C.)

**Table 3.8. Percentage of Sites Offering Paid Time Off for Holidays, Vacation, and Sick Leave, by Job Title\***

	Assistant teachers	Teachers	Teacher directors
Paid time off for holidays**	85.3%	94.0%	96.1%
<i>Number of sites</i>	95	134	103
Paid vacation	83.3%	93.3%	95.2%
<i>Number of sites</i>	96	134	105
Paid sick leave	93.0%	98.5%	96.3%
<i>Number of sites</i>	100	136	108

\* Based on unweighted data.

\*\* Assistant teachers:  $\chi^2(6) = 14.94, p = .021$ . Title 5 non-school-district (96.1%) were most likely to provide paid time off for holidays. Title 22 for-profit (65.2%) were less likely to provide paid time off for holidays.

## Working Conditions

Working conditions – including paid planning time, paid breaks, and payment for attending staff meetings – support staff’s ability to do their job well. In this next section, we describe working conditions provided to teachers, assistant teachers, and teacher directors and whether they vary by site auspices.

We asked administrators whether full-time teaching staff received the following: (1) paid breaks during the work day; (2) payment for attending center meetings; (3) payment for required professional development and training; (4) payment for work outside of regular work hours (e.g., home visits, parent conferences, evening or weekend events); and (5) planning time during their paid work week (see Table 3.9). Almost all administrators – though notably not all – reported providing teaching staff with paid breaks, which are required by law, and most administrators reported payment to teaching staff for attending staff meetings.

Across job titles, teaching staff were not able to reliably depend on being paid for a range of professional responsibilities that include required professional development training, completing work outside of regular work hours, and planning time during work hours while they were not also responsible for children.

- Across job titles, about one-half of administrators reported that staff are paid to participate in required professional development and training; about one-quarter reported that staff are only sometimes paid for this required activity.
- Across job titles, many staff members cannot rely on being paid for work that occurs outside of regular work hours. About one-half of site administrators reported that teachers (51.3 percent) and assistant teachers (46.8 percent) can expect to be paid for work outside of regular work hours, and 37.6 percent of site directors reported that teacher directors can expect to be paid for work outside of regular work hours. Less than one-quarter reported that teaching staff sometimes get paid for this work.
- We asked administrators whether teaching staff received paid planning time and, if so, whether planning time occurred while teaching staff were also responsible for children. Sixty-seven percent of administrators reported paid planning time for teachers when they were not also responsible for caring for children, while one-fifth (19.5 percent) provided teachers and 15.8 percent provided teacher directors paid planning time only when they were also caring for children.

**Table 3.9. Working Conditions, by Job Title\***

	Assistant teachers	Teachers	Teacher directors
<b>Payment for attending staff meetings</b>			
Yes	69.1%	71.8%	67.6%
Sometimes	9.6%	8.4%	10.8%
<i>Number of sites</i>	94	131	102
<b>Payment for required professional development and training**</b>			
Yes	51.0%	57.1%	59.0%
Sometimes	28.6%	27.8%	21.0%
<i>Number of sites</i>	98	133	105
<b>Payment for work outside of regular work hours</b>			
Yes	46.8%	51.3%	37.6%
Sometimes	17.7%	23.0%	19.4%
<i>Number of sites</i>	79	113	93
<b>Planning time during paid work week</b>			
Yes, without child responsibilities	42.9%	66.9%	60.0%
Yes, during time with children	21.4%	19.5%	15.8%
<i>Number of sites</i>	84	133	95
<b>Paid breaks</b>			
Yes	90.9%	90.4%	86.5%
Sometimes	1.0%	1.5%	1.0%
<i>Number of sites</i>	99	136	104

\* Based on unweighted data.

\*\* Teachers:  $X^2(6) = 17.04, p = .009$ . Title 22 for-profit (78.1% yes; 18.8% sometimes) > all other site types. Head Start/Early Head Start (44.0% yes; 28% sometimes) < all other site types.

## Stability of the Early Care and Education Teaching Workforce

*For center-based early care and education programs, staff stability has been linked to overall quality, the ability to improve quality, and children’s social and verbal development.<sup>43</sup> Turnover rates provide one important index of workforce stability, namely, marking how much change in staffing has occurred over a given period, typically within the previous year.*

*On average, nearly one in five teachers and one in four assistant teachers left their job in the last year. Turnover rates varied considerably among participating sites. Although many centers reported no turnover among teaching staff, 19 percent reported that one-quarter or more of their teachers left in the last year, and 21 percent of centers reported that one-half or more of their assistant teachers left in the last year. Average teacher director turnover was lower than turnover among other teaching staff, with few administrators reporting turnover for this group.*



## Turnover

To determine rates of turnover, we asked administrators to report the number of teachers, assistant teachers, and teacher directors who had left or stopped working at their site for any reason, including leaves of absence, over the last 12 months.<sup>44</sup> On average, 16.9 percent of teachers and 23.9 percent of assistant teachers were reported to have done so. However, turnover rates varied considerably among sites participating in the study. Whereas one-half of sites (49.6 percent) reported no turnover in the previous 12 months among teachers, and 63.8 percent reported no turnover among assistant teachers, 19.0 percent of sites reported turnover rates of 25 percent or more among teachers and 21.0 percent of sites reported 50 percent or more turnover among assistant teachers. Only 4.4 percent of sites reported that one-half or more of teachers and 13.0 percent of sites reported that 80.0 percent or more of assistant teachers had left or stopped working at their site during the previous 12 months. Turnover rates did not vary by auspices.

Average teacher director turnover (11.7 percent) was lower than turnover among teaching staff. The majority of sites (89.3 percent) reported no teacher director turnover in the previous 12 months.

## Characteristics of Children Served in Early Care and Education Sites

*The sites participating in this study reported serving a total of 11,544 children who were 0–5 years old and 1,526 children who were five years or older. Seventy percent of the children, birth to before kindergarten, were children of color, and only 30 percent were white, non-Hispanic. Children at Title 5 and Head Start/Early Head Start sites were more ethnically diverse than children at Title 22 sites. These children were also linguistically diverse, with more than 81 percent of sites serving at least one child who spoke Spanish and more than 56 percent serving at least one child who spoke Mandarin and/or Cantonese. Only three-quarters of administrators responded to questions about children with special needs. Of these, 66 percent reported serving at least one child with special needs at their site.*

### Number and Ages of Children Served

We asked administrators to report the number of children enrolled (part-time and full time) at their site by age range. As shown in Table 3.10, ECE programs in our sample provided services in 2016 to 11,544 infants, toddlers, and preschoolers not yet in kindergarten. Table 3.10 presents a distribution by age group of the numbers of children enrolled.<sup>45</sup> Approximately 79.8 percent of children were preschoolers age three to five, 15.4 percent were two years old, and 4.8 percent were under two years old. The total number of children enrolled is based on our sample. See About Alameda County, p. 5, for an estimate of the *actual* number of children enrolled in Alameda County.

**Table 3.10. Number of Children Enrolled, by Age Range**

	Number enrolled
Under age 2	558
Age 2 to 2 years, 11 months	1,778
Ages 3 to 5, not yet in kindergarten	9,208
<i>All ages</i>	<i>11,544</i>

Sites varied considerably in terms of the overall number of children enrolled. One-quarter of sites (26 percent) enrolled fewer than 25 children, and one-quarter (24.7 percent) enrolled 75 children or more. Sites on average enrolled 59 infants and/or preschoolers.

Less than 20 percent (17.7 percent) of sites in our samples reported caring for children across the age span from infancy through age five, not yet in kindergarten. Children under age three were more likely to be enrolled in Title 22 for-profit and nonprofit sites. Almost all children enrolled in Title 5 school-district sites were ages three to five, not yet in kindergarten. See Table 3.11.


**Table 3.11. Percent of Children Enrolled, by Age Range and by Auspices**

	Title 22 for-profit	Title 22 nonprofit	Title 5 school-district	Title 5 non-school-district	Head Start/Early Head Start	Total
Under age 2	2.8%	8.2%	0.0%	5.0%	4.8%	4.8%
Age 2 to 2 years, 11 months	22.8%	18.7%	0.3%	8.9%	11.2%	15.4%
Age 3 to 5, not yet in kindergarten	74.4%	73.1%	99.7%	86.2%	84.0%	79.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Number of children</i>	<i>3,170</i>	<i>4,103</i>	<i>1,530</i>	<i>955</i>	<i>1,786</i>	<i>11,544</i>

## Race and Ethnicity of Children

Administrators reported the racial and ethnic background of children age birth to before kindergarten enrolled at their site, see Figure 3.9.


The ethnic composition of children enrolled in ECE sites in our sample was diverse and differed by auspices. Almost three-quarters of children, birth to before kindergarten, were children of color. Assistant teachers more closely reflected the ethnic composition of the children under their instruction and care.



\* Includes all children enrolled, full and part-time, age birth to before kindergarten.

Less than 10 percent of children in Title 5 or Head Start were white, non-Hispanic, compared to 32.3 percent and 45.6 percent of children served in Title 22 for-profit and Title 22 nonprofit sites, respectively. Title 22 for-profit sites reported serving the highest percentage of Asian children. See Table 3.10.

Figure 3.10. Ethnic Composition of Children Enrolled, By Auspices



\* Includes all children enrolled, full and part-time, age birth to before kindergarten.

### Linguistic Characteristics of Children

To assess the linguistic diversity of children in ECE sites, we asked administrators to report on the languages spoken by children at their centers. As shown in Table 3.12, the children were linguistically diverse. Almost all sites served at least one child who speaks English and at least one child who speaks a non-English language. Most administrators (81.7 percent) reported that at least one child enrolled spoke Spanish; more than one-half (56.7 percent) reported that at least one child at the site spoke Mandarin and/or Cantonese, almost one-quarter (23.3 percent) reported that at least one child at the site spoke Tagalog; and of note, one-half (51.5 percent) reported that at least one child at the site spoke some other language. According to the California Department of Education, nearly 40 percent of the current kindergarten students are English Language Learners, speaking more than 50 languages.<sup>46</sup>

The languages spoken by children varied significantly by auspices. Whereas Title 5 school-district and non-school-district sites were more likely to serve children who spoke Spanish, Title 22 for-profit sites were less likely to serve children who spoke Spanish. For details, see Appendix C.

**Table 3.12. Percentage of Sites With at Least One Child Enrolled Who Speaks the Following Languages**

	Percentage of sites
Spanish	81.7%
Mandarin and/or Cantonese	56.7%
Tagalog	23.3%
Other	51.5%
<i>Number of sites*</i>	168

\*Weighted number of sites that provided information on languages spoken by children.

We also asked administrators to report on how many children at their sites spoke English only, English and another language, and only a language other than English. On average, 57.9 percent of children spoke English only, 34.6 percent spoke English and another language, and 7.4 percent spoke only a language other than English. The mean percentage of children speaking English only, English and another language, and another language only all varied significantly by auspices. Whereas Title 22 for-profit sites had a significantly higher mean percentage of children who spoke English only, in comparison to Title 5 sites, Title 22 nonprofit sites had a significantly higher mean percentage of children who spoke English only, in comparison to Title 5 as well as Head Start/Early Head Start sites. Title 5 school-district sites had a significantly higher mean percentage of children who only spoke a language other than English than all other auspices. For details, see Appendix C.

### Children With Special Needs

Administrators were asked how many children, if any, currently enrolled at their site had an identified special need (e.g., children with social, emotional, physical and/or cognitive difficulties) that affected their learning and development. Slightly less than one-quarter of administrators (23.5 percent) either did not know how many children at their site had identified special needs or declined to provide us with this information. Of those who responded, 65.3 percent indicated their site served at least one child with special needs. The likelihood of serving at least one child with special needs did not differ by auspices. On average, children with special needs constituted 9.1 percent of the child population at sites that enrolled at least one such child. Slightly more than one-quarter of sites in our sample (27.8 percent) reported that 10 percent or more of their children had special needs, and only 2.7 percent of sites reported that children with special needs constituted 50 percent or more of all children enrolled.

### Public Dollars for Early Care and Education Services

Public subsidies to assist families with the costs of ECE services may be provided for enrolled children as a condition of a contract held with Head Start/Early Head Start or the California Department of Education for Title 5 programs or by accepting vouchers available to families. To determine whether Title 22 sites in our sample enrolled any children who received a publicly funded voucher, we asked administrators how many children, birth to before kindergarten, at their site had tuition paid fully or in part by government subsidies. Forty-three percent of Title 22 for-profit and 33.3 percent of Title 22 nonprofit sites reported enrolling at least one child who received a government subsidy.

# Discussion

Ten years ago, CSCCE released a comprehensive study of the early care and education workforce in Alameda County.<sup>47</sup> In the intervening decade, numerous efforts to improve ECE services have been implemented in the county, including a quality rating and improvement system (QRIS) and multiple workforce initiatives, such as supports for college attainment, job-embedded coaching models, and a series of professional development trainings. In addition, evidence about the central role of a skilled and stable early education workforce to children’s well-being and development has continued to mount across the nation.<sup>48</sup> Amid ongoing efforts to improve the quality of ECE services, the current report offers an updated portrait of teaching staff who work in center-based programs in Alameda County and is intended to help to inform policy, planning, and the investment of resources.

## Demographic Characteristics

As was true in 2006, the racial and ethnic characteristics of ECE teaching staff in the current sample closely mirrored those of both the population of the county as whole and the population of children in the programs surveyed. With two-thirds people of color (mostly women), the ECE workforce is substantially more diverse than the K-12 teaching workforce in the county, in which only one-third are people of color.<sup>49</sup> This diversity among the ECE workforce should be considered a strength.

However, limiting our examination to only the overall characteristics of teaching staff in the sample obfuscates notable differences by job title and auspices. For example, staff who were identified as people of color were overrepresented in assistant teacher roles, accounting for more than 75 percent of assistant teachers, even though they were 67 percent of all teaching staff in the sample. In particular, those identified as Latina or Asian/Pacific Islander were more likely to work as assistant teachers than as teachers or teacher directors.

In this study, we were unable to link individual race and ethnicity to educational attainment or compensation. However, extant data reveals that ECE teaching staff from historical minority groups in California and across the country have faced multiple barriers to accessing education and have been concentrated in lower-status, lower-paying jobs in the field. Critical examination of these differences among teaching staff in Alameda County programs is required to better understand what may be driving differences in job title and to develop strategies for change.

## Educational Attainment

Early care and education teaching staff in the current sample had attained relatively high levels of education, as was the case in 2006, and a substantial portion exceeded minimal regulatory requirements. Furthermore, assistant teachers and teachers in the current sample had completed college degrees at a higher rate than were documented a decade ago. Fewer teaching staff in the current sample had completed *only* some college, and substantially more had completed a bachelor’s degree or higher: in 2006, 14.8 percent of assistant teachers and 33.1 percent of teachers had completed a bachelor’s degree or higher, whereas in the current study, 21.4 percent of assistant teachers and 41.2 percent of teachers had completed a bachelor’s degree or higher.

These increases in educational attainment may be a reflection of local and state investments designed to support or reward participation in education, like AB212 and the former CARES program, as well as increased educational requirements for Head Start teaching staff. Nonetheless, in the absence of consistent qualifications for early educators, across settings and age groups of children, fully one-third of teachers in the sample had no college degree. As in 2006, educational attainment continued to vary by auspices. Access to teachers who are equally well qualified is critical for all children in the county, regardless of the auspices of the center they attend. Stakeholders in Alameda County can look to these findings and other research, including the Institute of Medicine and National Research Council report, *Transforming the Workforce for Children Birth Through Age 8: A Unifying Foundation*,<sup>50</sup> for documentation regarding the importance of advocating for changes that increase consistency and reduce fragmentation in qualifications of the workforce.

## Compensation<sup>51</sup>

Low wages among the ECE workforce persist, despite increased expectations for teachers and greater rates of educational attainment. The wages of ECE teachers in this sample reveal that wages have remained stagnant over the last decade. Teachers in the current sample earn a mean hourly wage between \$16.61 and \$19.61, and those with no college degree earn a mean hourly wage between \$13.59 and \$16.97 per hour. Most of the teaching staff in this sample, including those with a college degree, earned less than the median annual earnings of \$53,296 for all female workers in the county, across degree levels. When compared to 2006 wages, the mean hourly wage – at both lowest and highest ends reported – for those identified as teachers with a bachelor’s degree in our sample experienced less than 1 percent growth in real wages.<sup>52</sup> The lowest mean hourly wage of teachers with a bachelor’s degree in 2006 in 2016 dollars was \$17.73; in the current sample, it was \$17.91. The highest mean hourly wage of teachers with a bachelor’s degree in 2006 in 2016 dollars was \$21.61; and in the current sample, the highest mean wage paid to teachers with a bachelor’s degree was \$21.87 per hour.

Low wages are also often linked to economic insecurity, and a companion report to this study, *Teachers’ Voices: Work Environment Conditions that Impact Teacher Practice and Program Quality*,<sup>53</sup> provides a more in-depth examination of levels of economic worry among ECE teaching staff in a sample of programs in Alameda County.

In addition to wages, the current study examined whether ECE programs provided health and paid-leave benefits to teaching staff, a critical component of employee compensation. While the majority of programs reported that teaching staff were provided some level of these benefits, one-quarter of assistant teachers were not provided employer-paid health benefits.

The compensation of ECE teaching staff should be further considered in the context of Alameda County being a high-cost county in which the median family income of \$75,619 is well above the state median income of \$61,489.<sup>54</sup> Stakeholders in Alameda County, along with their counterparts across the state, can seek to identify a rational and equitable set of guidelines for determining regionally-based compensation levels, including benefits, from entry-level to director positions in line with education, training, and experience.

## Minimum Wage Increases and Its Impact on ECE Centers in Alameda County

California currently has a minimum wage of \$10 per hour, nearly \$3 more than the current federal minimum wage set at \$7.25. In 2017, the California minimum wage will rise to \$10.50 per hour and continue to increase until it reaches \$15 per hour in 2022. Reflecting the high cost of living in Alameda County, three cities have enacted local minimum wage ordinances: Berkeley at \$12.53 per hour, Emeryville at \$14.44 per hour, and Oakland at \$12.25 per hour (Emeryville and Oakland minimum wages increase annually based on the Consumer Price Index). We asked administrators a series of questions to understand if and how ECE programs in Alameda County have been impacted by increases in the minimum wage. Administrators in the sample reported that most of their staff working as teachers in the centers they oversee were already paid more than the applicable minimum wage, though most administrators reported that teachers still received an increase in wages (Title 5 school-district sites were mostly not impacted, as their teaching staff are typically paid according to a scale set by the district). The experience for assistant teachers was somewhat different. Some assistant teachers *were* making less than minimum wage, and they received an increase accordingly. For assistant teachers who were already earning a wage at or above the minimum wage, many administrators, especially those in Title 22 for-profit and Title 5 non-school-district sites, reported providing a wage increase. Administrators recognized the importance of providing these increases and adjustments both for teacher well-being and to aid in staff retention, but they expressed concern about losing children due to families' inability to pay. This worry was especially marked for Title 22 program administrators, as nearly one-third reported that the cost of increased wage was partially or fully passed on to families.

## Working Conditions

The current report includes a new area of examination not addressed in previous workforce studies (or the 2006 study<sup>55</sup>) related to the working conditions and professional activities of teaching staff. Regardless of the age of children under their care and instruction, teaching staff require professional supports to help them plan their work with children and to continue to develop their knowledge and skills on the job. Whereas working conditions for K-12 teachers regularly include paid time for planning, professional development, and participation in required staff meetings and activities, these conditions are not routinely available to ECE teachers.<sup>56</sup> In the current sample, teaching staff, across job titles, were not able to reliably depend on being paid for a range of professional responsibilities, including required professional development training, completing work outside of regular work hours, and planning time during work hours while they were not also responsible for children.

Notably, in light of the low wages of many ECE teachers, nearly one-half of administrators reported that assistant teachers were only sometimes or not at all paid to participate in required professional development activities; about 40 percent of administrators reported that this was also the circumstance for teachers and teacher directors. Also of note, less than two-thirds of administrators reported that teachers and teacher directors were provided with paid planning time during work hours while they were not also responsible for children. While some paid professional activities for teaching staff can be addressed at the individual



program and/or site level – through reorganizing staffing schedules or planning in advance for closures to allow for staff development – establishing these arrangements may require additional program resources. A companion report to this study, *Teachers' Voices: Work Environment Conditions that Impact Teacher Practice and Program Quality*,<sup>57</sup> provides a more in-depth examination of ECE workplace supports for a sample of programs in Alameda County and offers strategies to address identified challenges.

## Turnover

Despite ongoing calls to stabilize the ECE teaching workforce as a condition critical for improving and sustaining quality services, turnover levels continue to be of concern. While the average rates of turnover among the current sample of assistant teachers and teachers has decreased from the 2006 study, rates remained relatively high among those sites that experienced some turnover, particularly among assistant teachers.

Although many sites in this sample reported no turnover among teaching staff, approximately one in five sites reported turnover rates of 25 percent or more among teachers and 50 percent or more among assistant teachers; more than 10 percent of sites reported 100 percent or more turnover of assistant teachers during the previous year. These data represent point-in-time turnover, but more nuanced and ongoing data about turnover of ECE teaching staff – such as that regularly collected about the K-12 teaching staff through the Schools and Staffing Survey<sup>58</sup> – would allow for better understanding of whether teaching staff are leaving the occupation entirely or leaving for another (presumably better-paying) job within the ECE field. In the latter case, changes should be tracked by auspices and ages of children served. One strategy to help capture this information would be for Alameda County to invest in the California Early Care and Education Workforce Registry and require participation among staff employed in programs supported by public county funds as well as individuals who participate in any similarly funded programs (e.g., Quality Counts, AB212, other professional development/training).

## Concluding Thoughts

Alameda County relies on the members of the ECE teaching workforce to facilitate the well-being, development, and learning of its youngest children. The teaching staff in the current sample, based on 45 percent of centers in Alameda County, are entrusted with providing high-quality early care and education environments to more than 11,000 children, birth to age five.

The complex work of teaching young children in a diverse community like Alameda County is intensified because teachers must be skilled and well prepared for responsibilities that include supporting emergent language and literacy skills for children representing multiple home languages. Over the last decade, Alameda County has made notable, albeit uneven, progress as it relates to improving the education levels of the workforce. Yet this progress – and the investment it represents – has not targeted the entrenched poor compensation and working conditions of teachers or intentionally focused on disrupting stratification by race and ethnicity across job titles.

Alameda County does not operate in a vacuum, of course, but is largely reliant on the early care and education policies and resources established at the state and federal level. In California, policies and resources related to the ECE system as whole,<sup>59</sup> and the workforce specifically, generally do not yet align with the growing body of evidence stressing the importance of quality early care and education experiences

in shaping children’s lifelong development and the increasing understanding of the varied knowledge and complicated skills involved in effectively teaching young children and nurturing their development. This challenging reality notwithstanding, leaders and stakeholders can take several steps toward the goal of transforming ECE jobs:

- Ensure that the local definition of quality, as codified in the QRIS, includes compensation and paid professional supports;
- Invest in and enroll members of the Alameda County ECE workforce in the California ECE Workforce Registry;
- Join in or initiate efforts to establish a local wage initiative to improve compensation of the ECE workforce;
- Continue and expand efforts that provide financial and other supports for a diverse cadre of the current teaching workforce to attain college degrees; and
- Utilize the present report, in coordination with other resources, such as the [\*Early Childhood Workforce Index\*](#)<sup>60</sup>, [\*Worthy Work, STILL Unlivable Wages\*](#)<sup>61</sup>, [\*State\(s\) of Head Start\*](#),<sup>62</sup> and other reports, to draw attention to the need to transform ECE policies, increase investments, and improve infrastructure.

Long a beacon of progress on ECE issues, Alameda County is well positioned with robust data about the workforce to serve as a catalyst for change, locally and beyond. Delivering on the promise of high-quality early learning experiences for all children in the country requires transforming early childhood jobs to ensure that all early educators – regardless of job title or program auspices – are well prepared, compensated fairly, and work in environments that support effective practice and ongoing learning.

# Appendix

## Appendix A: Administrators

Appendix Table A1. Demographic and Personal Characteristics of Administrators Participating in Study

		Percent
<b>Gender</b> (n=140)	Male	5.0%
	Female	95.0%
<b>Age</b> (n=132)	Under 30–49	49.2%
	50 and over	50.8%
<b>Ethnic distribution</b> (n=137)	White, non-Hispanic	39.4%
	Hispanic/Latino	16.1%
	African American	17.5%
	Asian	16.1%
	Other	10.9%
<b>Country of birth</b> (n=138)	United States	71.7%
	Other	28.3%
<b>Highest level of education</b> (n=138)	Associate degree or less	23.6%
	Bachelor's degree	37.8%
	Graduate or professional degree	38.5%
<b>Marital status</b> (n=138)	Single, not living with a partner	31.2%
	Married or living with a partner	68.8%
<b>Household income</b> (n=93)	Less than \$50,000	22.6%
	\$50,000–99,999	38.7%
	\$100,000–150,000	22.6%
	More than \$150,000	6.5%
<b>Children</b>	Have at least one child age 5 or younger living in their household (n=134)	17.9%
	Have at least one child age 6–18 years old living in their household (n=135)	39.3%
<b>Languages spoken</b> (n=139)	Speaks only English	56.1%
	Speaks English and another language	43.9%

Appendix Table A2. Professional Characteristics of Administrators Participating in Study

		Percent
<b>Job title (n=137)</b>	Teacher director (works both as a teacher and a director)	40.9%
	Director, assistant director, or site supervisor	49.6%
	Other*	9.5%
<b>Membership in professional association (n=134)</b>	Administrators who are members of a professional association	54.5%
<b>Professional development (n=140)</b>	Administrators who received professional development or training on working with young children in the last 12 months	87.9%
		Mean years
<b>Tenure</b>	In early care and education (n=138)	21.3
	At their current place of employment (n=140)	12.7
	In their current position at their current place of employment (n=140)	9.2

\* Includes principal, clinical director and therapist, administrator, office administrator, office manager and enrollment coordinator, admissions director, paraprofessional, and accountant.

## Appendix B: Methodology for Estimating the Number of Children Served and the Size of Center-Based Early Care and Education Workforce in Alameda County

We attempted to interview administrators from all centers serving infants and/or preschoolers in the population (see Study Design, p. 6, for more details). As anticipated, only a subset of this population responded to our request for the survey or actually completed the survey. Our final sample gave us sound information about the percentages of the center population with specific characteristics as presented in the Findings (p. 9) section of this report. However, to obtain an estimate of the total number of teaching staff and children served in Alameda County, extrapolation of total numbers obtained from the sample was required.

First 5 Alameda County, the Alameda County Early Care and Education Planning Council, and the three Alameda County R&Rs provided information on all center-based programs in Alameda County. At the time of data collection, the total universe of centers serving infants and/or preschoolers was 447. Surveys were completed by administrators of 201 of these centers. To calculate an estimate of the number of children served and the size of the workforce in Alameda County, we used the following methodology:

- Calculate a ratio to create a multiplier for the sample to the universe:  $447/201=2.22$ .
- Multiply the sum total number of full-time and part-time children reported in our sample by the multiplier (2.22) to calculate the estimated total number of children served.
- Multiply the sum total of teaching staff reported in our sample by the multiplier (2.22) to calculate the estimated size of the workforce.

This method was used to calculate an estimate of the total number of children enrolled and the number of teaching staff employed only (see Introduction, p. 1). All other data presented in this report is a reflection of the sample, rather than an estimation of Alameda County as a whole.

## Appendix C: Additional Tables

Appendix Table C1. Percentage of Assistant Teachers and Teachers Working in Center-Based Early Care and Education, by Auspices

	Assistant teachers	Teachers
Title 22 for-profit	20.3%	36.8%
Title 22 nonprofit	23.0%	43.8%
Title 5 school-district	22.8%	4.6%
Title 5 non-school-district	15.4%	6.3%
Head Start/Early Head Start	18.5%	8.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Number of teaching staff</i>	365	1,352

Note: The 365 assistant teachers were employed at 178 sites, and the 1,352 teachers were employed at 186 sites.

Appendix Table C2. Percentage of Sites Providing a Pay Raise to Full-Time Assistant Teachers, Teachers, and Teacher Directors Who Complete a Degree, by Auspices

	Title 22 for-profit	Title 22 nonprofit	Title 5 non-school-district	Head Start/ Early Head Start	Total
<b>Assistant teachers*</b>					
No	8.0%	15.4%	52.0%	19.0%	23.7%
Yes	48.0%	42.3%	24.0%	52.4%	41.2%
Depends on specific case	44.0%	42.3%	24.0%	28.6%	35.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Number of sites</i>	25	26	25	21	97
<b>Teachers**</b>					
No	6.1%	17.4%	52.0%	18.2%	21.4%
Yes	60.6%	45.7%	24.0%	50.0%	46.0%
Depends on specific case	33.3%	37.0%	24.0%	31.8%	32.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Number of sites</i>	33	46	25	22	126
<b>Teacher directors***</b>					
No	7.7%	16.7%	50.0%	26.7%	23.8%
Yes	57.7%	38.9%	16.7%	20.0%	35.6%
Depends on specific case	34.6%	44.4%	33.3%	53.3%	40.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Number of sites</i>	26	36	24	15	101

Note: Sample size for Title 5 school-district sites was too small to report.

\* Assistant teachers:  $\chi^2(6) = 16.79, p = .01$ . Title 5 non-school-district (24.0%) < Title 22 for-profit (48.0%).

\*\* Teachers:  $\chi^2(6) = 20.08, p = .003$ . Title 5 non-school-district (24.0%) < Title 22 for-profit (60.6%).

\*\*\* Teacher directors:  $\chi^2(6) = 18.97, p = .004$ . Title 5 non-school-district (16.7%) < Title 22 for-profit (57.7%).

Appendix Table C3. Percentage of Sites Providing Health Benefits to Assistant Teachers and Teachers, by Auspices

	Title 22 for-profit	Title 22 nonprofit	Title 5 non-school-district	Head Start/ Early Head Start	Total
<b>Assistant teachers*</b>					
No employer-paid benefits	50.0%	31.0%	0.0%	21.1%	26.0%
Partially or fully paid benefits	50.0%	69.0%	100.0%	78.9%	74.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Number of sites</i>	24	29	24	19	96
<b>Teachers**</b>					
No employer-paid benefits	20.6%	16.7%	0.0%	4.3%	12.2%
Partially or fully paid benefits	79.4%	83.3%	100.0%	95.7%	87.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Number of sites</i>	34	48	26	23	131

Note: Sample size for Title 5 school-district sites was too small to report.

\* Assistant teachers:  $X^2(3) = 16.22, p = .001$ . Assistant teachers at Title 5 non-school-district sites (100.0%) were more likely to receive paid health benefits than assistant teachers at Title 22 for-profit sites (50.0%).

\*\* Teachers:  $X^2(3) = 8.06, p = .045$ . Title 5 non-school-district sites (100.0%) were more likely to provide health benefits to teachers.



Appendix Table C4. Percentage of Sites Providing Paid Time Off for Holidays to Full-Time Assistant Teachers and Teachers, by Auspices

	Title 22 for-profit	Title 22 nonprofit	Title 5 non-school-district	Head Start/ Early Head Start	Total
<b>Assistant teachers*</b>					
No	34.8%	7.4%	3.8%	15.8%	14.7%
Yes	39.1%	70.4%	84.6%	68.4%	66.3%
Yes, included in annual leave	26.1%	22.2%	11.5%	15.8%	18.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Number of sites</i>	23	27	26	19	95
<b>Teachers**</b>					
No	11.4%	4.1%	3.8%	4.2%	6.0%
Yes	65.7%	77.6%	84.6%	75.0%	75.4%
Yes, included in annual leave	22.9%	18.4%	11.5%	20.8%	18.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Number of sites</i>	35	49	26	24	134

Note: Sample size for Title 5 school-district sites was too small to report.

\* Assistant teachers:  $X^2(6) = 14.94, p = .021$ . Title 5 non-school-district sites (92.6%) were more likely to provide paid time off for holidays. Title 22 for-profit (65.2%) were less likely to provide paid time off.

\*\* Teachers:  $X^2(6) = 4.23, p = .65$ . Paid time off for holidays to full time teachers did not differ by auspices.

Appendix Table C5. Percentage of Sites Serving at Least One Child Who Speaks Spanish, by Auspices

	Title 22 for-profit	Title 22 nonprofit	Title 5 school-district	Title 5 non-school-district	Head Start/Early Head Start	Total
No	30.2%	25.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.5%
Yes	69.8%	74.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	81.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Number of sites</i>	53	58	26	17	14	168

$\chi^2(4)=19.87, p = .001$ . Title 5 school-district and non-school-district (100.0%) were significantly more likely to serve children who speak Spanish. Title 22 for-profit sites (69.8%) were less likely to serve children who speak Spanish.

Appendix Table C6. Mean Percentage (SE) of Children Speaking English Only, English and Another Language, and Only a Non-English Language, by Auspices

	Title 22 for-profit	Title 22 nonprofit	Title 5 school-district	Title 5 non-school-district	Head Start/Early Head Start	Total
English only*	63.9% (4.6)	73.5% (3.0)	33.4% (4.6)	37.6% (6.4)	46.6% (8.2)	57.9% (2.5)
English and another language**	35.3% (4.7)	25.1% (2.8)	34.0% (6.9)	57.4% (6.4)	48.9% (8.0)	34.6% (2.4)
Only a non-English language***	0.8% (0.3)	1.4% (0.6)	32.6% (6.9)	5.0% (1.9)	4.4% (2.6)	7.4% (1.6)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Number of Sites</i>	39	53	26	14	11	145

\*Percentage of children speaking English only:  $F(4,143) = 14.8, p < 0.01$ . Title 22 nonprofit sites served, on average, a greater number of children who spoke English only, in comparison to Title 5, and Head Start/Early Head Start sites.

\*\*Percentage of children speaking English and another language:  $F(4,143) = 5.04, p < 0.05$ . Title 5 non-school-district sites served, on average, a greater number of children who spoke English and another language than Title 22 nonprofit sites.

\*\*\*Percentage of children only speaking another language:  $F(4,143) = 21.1, p < 0.05$ . Title 5 school district sites served, on average, a greater number of children who only spoke a language other than English than Title 22, Title 5 non-school-district and Head Start/Early Head Start sites.

# Endnotes

---

## Introduction

<sup>1</sup> National Center on Early Childhood Quality Assurance (n.d.) *About QRIS*. Retrieved from

<https://grisguide.acf.hhs.gov/index.cfm?do=grisabout>

<sup>2</sup> Whitebook, M., Phillips, D., and Howes, C. (2014). *Worthy Work, STILL Unlivable Wages: The Early Childhood Workforce 25 Years after the National Child Care Staffing Study*. Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California, Berkeley.

<sup>3</sup> Whitebook et al. (2014); Institute of Medicine (IOM) and National Research Council (NRC) (2015). *Transforming the Workforce for Children Birth Through Age 8: A Unifying Foundation*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Retrieved from <http://www.nationalacademies.org/hmd/Reports/2015/Birth-To-Eight.aspx>.

<sup>4</sup> IOM and NRC (2015).

<sup>5</sup> In Alameda County, AB212 is integrated in Quality Counts for Title 5 centers. The Alameda County Early Care and Education Planning Council coordinates the AB212 program and funds.

<sup>6</sup> Only the counties of Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Santa Clara have invested in and added large proportions of their early education workforce to the California Early Care and Education Workforce Registry. Other initiatives, like the Resource and Referral Network quality improvement training, may require participants to join this registry, which only represents a small swath of the workforce.

<sup>7</sup> Whitebook, M., McLean, C., and Austin, L.J.E. (2016). *Early Childhood Workforce Index - 2016*. Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California, Berkeley.

<sup>8</sup> Whitebook, M., Sakai, L., Kipnis, F., Lee, Y., Bellm, D., Almaraz, M., and Tran, P. (2006). *California Early Care and Education Workforce Study: Licensed child care centers. Alameda County 2006*. Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, and San Francisco, CA: California Child Care Resource and Referral Network.

<sup>9</sup> Centers that are exempt from licensing include certain school-age and preschool programs run by Park and Recreation Departments and school districts; informal arrangements in which no money changes hands for care, such as co-ops and playgroups; on-site military child care programs; and programs administered by the Department of Corrections.

<sup>10</sup> Community Child Care Council of Santa Clara County, Inc. (n.d.) *Regulation and Licensing of Child Care Programs in California*. San Jose, CA: Community Child Care Council of Santa Clara County, Inc. Retrieved from

[https://d3n8a8pro7vymx.cloudfront.net/rnetwork/pages/78/attachments/original/1451607399/CA\\_Licensing\\_Regulation\\_Compare.pdf?1451607399](https://d3n8a8pro7vymx.cloudfront.net/rnetwork/pages/78/attachments/original/1451607399/CA_Licensing_Regulation_Compare.pdf?1451607399); Administration for Children and Families (2016). *Head Start Performance Standards*. Federal Register 81(172) RIN 0970-AC63. Retrieved from <https://www.federalregister.gov/d/2016-19748/p-2114>.

<sup>11</sup> Washington, V. & Roberson Jackson, B. (2016). *Routes to Competency: The Child Development Associate® Credential and State-Based Professional Development*. Washington, DC: Council for Professional Recognition. Retrieved from

[http://www.cdacouncil.org/storage/Routes\\_to\\_Competency\\_final\\_041816-rev.pdf](http://www.cdacouncil.org/storage/Routes_to_Competency_final_041816-rev.pdf).

<sup>12</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder (2015). *Table DP05 ACS Demographic and Housing Estimates*. Retrieved from <http://factfinder.census.gov>.

<sup>13</sup> U.S. Census Bureau (2010). *Table DP-1 Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010*. Retrieved from <http://factfinder.census.gov>.

<sup>14</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder (2015). *Table B23008 Age of Own Children Under 18 Years in Families and Subfamilies by Living Arrangements by Employment Status of Parents*. Retrieved from <http://factfinder.census.gov>;

California Department of Finance (2014). Report P-3 State and County Total Population Projections by Race/Ethnicity and Detailed Age. Retrieved from <http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Projections/>.

<sup>15</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder (2015). *Table DP05 ACS Demographic and Housing Estimates*. Retrieved from <http://factfinder.census.gov>.

<sup>16</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder (2015). *Table S1601 Language Spoken at Home, 2015 ACS 5-year estimates*. Retrieved from <http://factfinder.census.gov>.

<sup>17</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder (2015). *Table DP03 Selected Economic Characteristics*. Retrieved from <http://factfinders.census.gov>.

---

<sup>18</sup> U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2015). *The Final FY 2015 Alameda County FMRs for All Bedroom Sizes*. Retrieved from <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/fmr.html>.

<sup>19</sup> Randolph, S., Grose, T., Chwierut, M., and Bellisario, J. (2014). *In the Fast Lane: Improving Reliability, Stabilizing Local Funding, and Enabling the Transportation Systems of the Future in Alameda County*. Bay Area Council Economic Institute. Retrieved from [http://www.bayareaeconomy.org/files/pdf/BACEI\\_InTheFastLane\\_Report\\_20140627.pdf](http://www.bayareaeconomy.org/files/pdf/BACEI_InTheFastLane_Report_20140627.pdf).

## Study Design

<sup>20</sup> Of the 19 multi-site administrators, 14 were contacted to provide information for two sites, two administrators were contacted to provide information for five sites, and one administrator each was contacted to provide information for six, nine and 19 sites respectively.

<sup>21</sup> It was not feasible to separate those who may not have received the email with the survey link due to an outdated email or filtered by spam from those who chose not to respond. These incidences are all collectively grouped as nonrespondents.

<sup>22</sup> Of the 160 administrators participating in the survey, 153 completed the survey for one site each, and seven administrators completed the survey for multiple sites: one administrator completed the survey for two sites; two administrators completed the survey for three sites; and one administrator completed the survey each for five, seven, nine and 19 sites.

<sup>23</sup> The proportion of Title 22 sites in the population was 69.6 percent but only 51.7 percent in the sample, and the proportion of publicly funded programs was 30.4 and 48.3 percent in the population and sample, respectively.

<sup>24</sup> Supportive Environmental Quality Underlying Adult Learning (SEQUAL) is a multi-purpose tool for examining and improving environments in which early childhood teaching staff work and learn. For more information, see Whitebook, M., King, E., Philipp, G., and Sakai, L. (2016). *Teachers' Voices: Work Environment Conditions That Impact Teacher Practice and Program Quality*. Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California, Berkeley.

<sup>25</sup> Whitebook et al. (2006).

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

## Findings

<sup>27</sup> Across all job titles, those identified as "Other" ethnicity (including multiethnic or American Indian/Alaskan Native) were the smallest ethnic group.

<sup>28</sup> IOM and NRC, 2015; Phillips, D., Mekos, M., Scarr, S., McCartney, K., and Abbott-Shim, M. (2001). Within and beyond the classroom door: Assessing quality in child care centers. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 15, 475–496; Phillipsen, L. C., Burchinal, M. R., Howes, C., and Cryer, D. (1997). The prediction of process quality from structural features of child care. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 12, 281–303; Scarr, R., Eisenberg, M., and Seater-Deckard, K. (1994). Measurement of quality in child care centers. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 9, 131–151; and The Cost-Quality and Outcome Team. (1995). *Cost, quality, and child outcomes in child care centers: Final report of the Cost, Quality and Outcome Study*. Denver, CO: University of Colorado.

<sup>29</sup> Alice, B., Mihaly, J., Kagiwada, J., and Whitebook, M. (2000). *The CARES Initiative in California: Pursuing Public Policy To Build a Skilled and Stable Child Care Workforce, 1997-2000*. Washington, DC: Center for the Child Care Workforce.

<sup>30</sup> While tenure measured length of time with current employer, we are unable to determine whether teaching staff were regularly working in the same classroom, with the same group of children.

<sup>31</sup> National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2013). *Number and Characteristics of Early Care and Education (ECE) Teachers and Caregivers: Initial Findings, National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)*. OPRE Report #2013-38. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved from <http://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/26496/pdf>.

<sup>32</sup> These data represent the female population in Alameda County age 25 and older. 2015 American Community Survey (2015). *Table B15002 – Sex by Educational Attainment for the Population 25 Years and Over*. Retrieved from <http://factfinder.census.gov>.

<sup>33</sup> IOM and NRC (2015); Whitebook, M., Austin, L. J. E., Ryan, S., Kipnis, F., Almaraz, M., & Sakai, L. (2012). *By default or by design? Variations in higher education programs for early care and teachers and their implications for research*

---

*methodology, policy, and practice*. Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California, Berkeley.

<sup>34</sup> IOM and NRC (2015).

<sup>35</sup> Head Start Policy and Regulations. (n.d.). *Staff Qualifications and Regulations*. Retrieved from <http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/policy/head-start-act/sec-648a-staff-qualifications-and-development>.

<sup>36</sup> Administrators filling out the survey for more than one site were asked to provide information on compensation and benefits survey only once, under the assumptions that such programs follow the same pay structure across different sites. For this reason, the analyses were conducted at the administrator level and on unweighted data.

<sup>37</sup> Whitebook et al. (2014).

<sup>38</sup> Whitebook et al. (2016).

<sup>39</sup> IOM and NRC (2015); Whitebook et al. (2014).

<sup>40</sup> Whitebook, M. (2014). *Building a Skilled Teacher Workforce: Shared and Divergent Challenges in Early Care and Education and in Grades K-12*. Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment.

<sup>41</sup> These analyses do not include data from Title 5 school-district sites due to low sample sizes.

<sup>42</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder (2015). *Table S2001. Earnings in the Past 12 Months (in 2015 Inflation-Adjusted Dollars)*. Retrieved from <http://factfinder.census.gov>.

<sup>43</sup> Cassidy, D.J., Lower, J.K., Kintner-Duffy, V.L., Hegde, A.V., and Shim, J. (2011). The day-to-day reality of teacher turnover in preschool classrooms: An analysis of classroom context and teacher, director, and parent perspectives. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 25(1), 1–23; Mims, S.U., Scott-Little, C., Lower, J.K., Cassidy, D.J., and Hestenes, L.L. (2008). Education level and stability as it relates to early childhood classroom quality: A survey of early childhood program directors and teachers. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 23(2), 227–237; Whitebook, M., Phillips, D., and Howes, C. (1998). *Worthy Work, Unlivable Wages: The National Child Care Staffing Study, 1988–1997*. The Center for the Child Care Workforce; Whitebook, M., and Sakai, L. (2004). *By a thread: How centers hold on to teachers, how teachers build lasting careers*. Kalamazoo, MI: Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

<sup>44</sup> Turnover discussed in this report refers to job turnover, the number of staff who leave employment at their centers over a given period of time. This study did not collect information about position turnover (changes of role while maintaining employment at the same center) or occupational turnover (departure from the early care and education field).

<sup>45</sup> The licensed capacity of an early care and education program (the number of children it is approved to serve) may be less than or greater than the actual number of children enrolled. Some programs, for example, may choose to enroll fewer children than permitted in their space or may not be able to find enough children to reach their full capacity. Alternately, some programs may enroll children in part-day sessions and thus serve a higher overall number of children but never exceed their licensed capacity at any given time.

<sup>46</sup> California Department of Education (2016). *2015-16 Enrollment by English Language Acquisition Status (ELAS) and Grade, Alameda County Report*. Retrieved from <http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>; California Department of Education (2016). *English Learner Students by Language by Grade, Alameda County 2015-16*. Retrieved from <http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>.

## Discussion

<sup>47</sup> Whitebook et al. (2006).

<sup>48</sup> IOM and NRC (2015).

<sup>49</sup> California Department of Education (2014). *Staff Counts by County by Ethnicity*. Retrieved from <http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>.

<sup>50</sup> IOM and NRC (2015).

<sup>51</sup> Due to high non-response on questions related to wages, statistics for assistant teachers and teacher directors could not be obtained. Sufficient data were available to compute mean wages for teachers only, except for those working in Title 5 school-district sites.

<sup>52</sup> Figures for 2006 were adjusted for inflation using the Bureau of Labor Statistics CPI Inflation Calculator. Retrieved from <https://data.bls.gov/cgi-bin/cpicalc.pl>.

<sup>53</sup> Whitebook, M., King, E., Phillip, G., and Sakai, L. (2016).

<sup>54</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder (2015). *Table DP03 Selected Economic Characteristics – Alameda County*. Retrieved from <http://factfinder.census.gov>; U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder (2015). *Table DP03 Selected Economic Characteristics – California*. Retrieved from <http://factfinder.census.gov>.

<sup>55</sup> Whitebook et al. (2006).

---

<sup>56</sup> Whitebook, M. (2014).

<sup>57</sup> Whitebook, M., King, E., Philipp, G., and Sakai, L. (2016).

<sup>58</sup> National Center for Education Statistics (2015). *Schools and Staffing Survey*. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/>.

<sup>59</sup> Whitebook et al. (2016).

<sup>60</sup> Whitebook et al. (2016).

<sup>61</sup> Whitebook et al. (2014).

<sup>62</sup> Barnett, W. S., & Friedman-Krauss, A. H., (2016). *State(s) of Head Start*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.