

**Workforce Think Tank  
Meeting NOTES 10.22.08**

OPTION #1 – Maintain Status Quo of Current Workforce Programs with Improved Program Guidelines
--

Strengths/Pros

- It's easy
- Not tied to the same outcome, so there are many opportunities to get stipends
- It's easier to defend the current system than to propose a new one; it's scary out there
- Could start here and refine what we've been doing
- There are a lot of positives about what we are doing. If we change, we may break it
- Mixed approach allow us to reward different paths
- Because we have a few, smaller compensation programs, it is easier to adjust to newly identified needs
- Current recipients are invested and can provide advocacy
- If tweaked, could be complementary and target all of our goals – WAGES Plus (minimum compensation), CARES (educational attainment), and PFA (BA bonus); could be progressive stages

Concerns/Cons

- Given the economic climate, we probably have to make a change anyway
- It's too complicated now
- It could be more strategic
- It's difficult to maneuver through silos
- There is no coordination of the 3 systems
- Current rules create tension b/w staff at the same program
- Doesn't adequately address needed support (e.g. cohorts) to advance professionally
- Not equitable for equal work
- Not fair to penalize people who may make a little more by taking away stipends or bonuses
- Inequity in the workforce creates hostility
- The programs aren't complementary
- Should increase the breadth of stipends

Suggestions

- If there are cuts, cut equitably
- Pro-rate PFA bonuses
- Increase provider input
- Streamline online applications; look into a registry cost
- More outreach for CARES and WAGES Plus
- Reduce paperwork

**Workforce Think Tank  
Meeting NOTES 10.22.08**

- WAGES Plus should bring all floors up to MCO, make it an entry level augmentation; collapse positions
- CARES should get professional development geared towards BA and 24 units (and not beyond that)
- PFA bonus can start where CARES leaves off

OPTION #2 -- Focus on creating a San Francisco ECE compensation system that recognizes the BA teacher\* as the center of every classroom  
(\* NOTE: the option was modified by groups to read "a qualified teacher with a B.A.")

Strengths/Advantages

- Improved program quality
- Establishes a policy justification for increased salaries
- Great role models for children; teachers become greater resource for children
- Teachers learn good pedagogy through their experiences in higher ed.
- Educating women is great for children – theirs and others
- ECE teachers who understand and can access the higher ed system a resource for the families they serve, their co-workers, their neighborhoods
- Increased self esteem
- Essential for parity with K-12 system
- Essential for professionalization
- Start to address the barriers to access
- Field shows readiness to pursue additional education, in spite of barriers
- Need to look at this option in terms of a pipeline – support for workforce to get GE requirements, AA degrees, BA's and MA's.
- To achieve the goal of BA teachers in all classrooms, need to have resources to support education system in addition to a bonus system
- Want to keep BA's in the classroom with adequate compensation
- Look at loan forgiveness
- Field is heading in this direction

Concerns/Disadvantages

- Programs like Teach for America are putting BA's ( mostly recent college graduates) in classrooms with limited or short term child development training
- Need to make sure that BA programs provide quality education.
- Experience and coursework in child development needs to be valued
- Degree attainment can be a difficult – the pathway needs to be created and smoothed for some
- How far will this go toward ensuring quality?
- Need to strategically address bottlenecks in the system
- Need to utilize what is known about adult learners – ESL, math, etc.

**Workforce Think Tank  
Meeting NOTES 10.22.08**

- Programs should be supported, site based, and student success oriented
- Non-academic barriers need to be acknowledged and addressed, e.g. child care, household/family responsibilities, long work hours, etc.
- Structure of financial aid system makes pursuing a higher education difficult for part time students and those who take many semesters to get their degrees
- Essential to have adequate compensation at the end and at increments along the way, e.g. AA completion, etc.
- Are the institutions of higher education ready for these students?
- Be careful of plugging in inexperienced BA teachers and expecting to see program benefits
- Watch how incentives are structured in terms of implications for who is hired at programs
- How much is enough to get to this goal?
- Can create a huge disparity between BA and non BA workforce
- Overall resource concern – not just rewarding BA's but creating BA's;
- Resource concern: Spreading \$\$ across many students
- Need to prioritize within components
- How incentives play out in classrooms with teaching staff with different levels of experience/position/responsibility vs. solely based on degree or permit attainment
- Look to other resources for building/enhancing the higher ed system
- Permit system out of alignment with this goal
- Is adequate funding available now?
- Are BA programs properly/adequately preparing students for the field?

OPTION #3 – Focus on improving wages with goal of all early childhood professional earning at the level of S.F.'s Minimum Compensation Ordinance
--

Strengths/Pros

- Helps low paid workers on an education track
- Helps family child care assistants who go to school
- More centers would be eligible for program if wage floors were increased
- Needs to be attached to professional development
- Number of workers who could be reached
- Stipends to family child care increase income
- Addresses the reality of the economics of the field – allows centers to be able to afford higher wages for educational attainment
- Have to start somewhere moving salaries up
- Fundamental right per qualifications, but has to be partnered with professional development
- Safety net for workforce in these times
- Easy to communicate; Mayor and Board of Supervisors know the issue of increasing wages for lowest paid workers
- Might increase wages for everyone

**Workforce Think Tank  
Meeting NOTES 10.22.08**

- Clear program goal – not mixing professional development and compensation
- Could help with quality depending on how it is designed

Concerns/Cons

- Could result in wage compression
- New resources (\$\$) difficult to get now
- Leaves out centers paying above the floor; those that pay well are penalized
- Leaves out BA attainment
- Difficult to administer
- Doesn't get us closer to quality or educational attainment
- Does not address benefits
- Does not address pathways to education
- No reward for employees of centers paying above the MCO now
- Doesn't address family income- how does it relate to self sufficiency
- Increasing wages increases other costs (?)
- When raising wages may make some no longer eligible for subsidies but still not enough to be self sufficient
- Budget tight – difficult to get an additional \$2million
- Don't address compensation without looking at degree and professional recognition
- Don't address professional recognition without looking at compensation for lowest paid workers
- Weakest of options – needs to be a center threshold(?)
- Most difficult to apply to family child care homes
- All focus on compensation
- Center based, not individual based
- How would funding sources keep up?
- How use PFA bonus \$\$\$?
- Doesn't lead to bigger system changes on early childhood education workforce issues

OPTION #4 – Focus all resources on workforce working in programs serving low income children
--

Strengths/Pros

- Could really target making an impact on the quality of centers in high need neighborhoods
- Differential for this group might make a difference because they haven't felt supported in the past
- The City's diminishing child population is increasingly from low income families, so it might be easier to get public money
- Research shows that high quality care disproportionately benefits low income children

## **Workforce Think Tank Meeting NOTES 10.22.08**

- We are already doing this to some extent
- Justification of public sector investment in this private good in this way would make sense

### Concerns/Cons

- For FCC's in particular, it divides the field
- Might limit public support if just focused on low income kids
- Would exclude a lot of children, and we already prioritize low income children
- SF has such a high cost of living, almost anyone serving children can benefit
- Sites fluctuate as to how many low income children they serve; would be difficult to measure, especially for family child care
- Given PFA's universality, this may lead to different eligibility standards; we wanted to move away from that
- A recent stud showed that it is middle income children that receive the lowest quality care
- We may be heaping support on children that are leaving the City (population declining – clarification needed, are low income children disproportionately leaving or remaining in the City?)
- Costly to administer; how would this affect undocumented workers; would add a layer of administration to PFA and CARES
- May shift who is in your program for the wrong reasons
- Excluding moderate income families reduces support for these programs
- An unintended consequence – staff might stay at their programs for the wrong reasons
- May not really have an impact

### Suggestions

- If it were an option, could give a higher differential for teachers in programs serving low income children
- Need to measure low income children with a snapshot, once or twice a year at the most to minimize administrative burden
- Would have to be administered site-based
- Outreach key
- Could be done in a time-limited way
- If we had to define low income, make sure that it is high enough to benefit San Francisco's working families
- Could be a high need neighborhood focus, or neighborhoods with the least prepared children
- If defining low income, don't just define by families receiving a subsidy slot, and subsidies fall short of meeting family needs
- Since we are basically doing this, we might just need to look at workforce education through a different lens
- If we did this, would need one form for all programs to verify family income

**Workforce Think Tank  
Meeting NOTES 10.22.08**

- If we did this, should adopt programmatic standards for higher quality

ADDITIONAL OPTIONS/IDEAS
--------------------------

- PFA is for four year olds, thus there may be legal issues involved in serving other ages.  
( Note from Carol – the actual language of the proposition should be checked, the requirement to serve 4 year olds only was created by the implementers of the proposition, not the language of the law itself.)
- Reorient CARES to prioritize BA + 24 units; invest in infrastructure to reduce barriers to general education requirements. Create two tracks for BA 's -- track 1 master teacher; track 2 site supervisor & management  
Goal: Reward good teachers and keep them in the classroom
- Realign funding to lift Standard Reimbursement Rate for contracted programs to the Regional Market Rate and hold employers accountable for wages and quality.  
Concerns: - Think about for profit and private non-profit programs  
- Think about benefit costs which may eat up the gap  
- Are there supplantation issues/considerations; maintenance of effort requirements?  
- Think about FCC  
- Think about accountability – programs don't always prioritize wages, just because they have resources
- Implement Quality Rating System to provide income incentives for quality  
Quality differential can't just be tied to scores
- Market the profession – focus on college programs to build the field