# 2021–22 Universal PreKindergarten Program Report Data Analysis – County Offices of Education

In May 2022, the California Department of Education (CDE) released the Universal PreKindergarten (UPK) Planning and Implementation Countywide Capacity Building Grant to county offices of education (COEs) for planning and capacity building for UPK. As a requirement for receiving these funds, grantees are required to submit annual reporting to provide information on their progress towards developing a coherent educational system beginning with UPK. The data below is gathered from the 58 COE grantees. The first column “Total Number” indicates the total number of COEs that responded to that question and the “Total Percent Column” indicates the percent of COEs that responded from a total of 58 respondents.

1. **What data sources has the COE used to support local educational agencies (LEAs) in the development of enrollment projections or needs assessments? [select all that apply]**

| **Sources Used to Develop Enrollment Projections** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Transitional Kindergarten (TK) and Kindergarten (K) census day and cumulative enrollment counts from 2013 through 2019 as reported to the CDE (these may be acquired through the CDE TK Data web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filestkdata.asp>) | 49 | 84% |
| CDE TK and K enrollment by school and LEA (these can be found on the CDE TK Data web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filestkdata.asp>) | 48 | 83% |
| Count of births in each zip Code in California as reported by the California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHS); estimated counts of births in each LEA from 2013 through 2019; and estimated count of births in each LEA three, four, five, and six years prior to 2013 through 2026 (these may be found on the CHHS Live Birth Profiles by zip code web page at <https://data.chhs.ca.gov/dataset/cdph_live-birth-by-zip-code>) | 40 | 69% |
| Estimated population of three-, four-, five-, and six-year-old children for each county from 2013 through 2026 produced by the Department of Finance (DOF) (these may be found on the DOF Projections web page at <https://www.dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/projections/>) | 37 | 64% |
| “P-2B County Population by Age” (XLSX), the DOF County Population Projections by Age projection (these can be found on the DOF Projections web page at <https://www.dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/projections/>) | 26 | 45% |
| CHHS Live Birth Profiles by ZIP Code (these can be found at <https://data.chhs.ca.gov/dataset/cdph_live-birth-by-zip-code>) | 25 | 43% |
| California Child Care Resource and Referral (R&R) Network data tools | 25 | 43% |
| California Department of Social Services (CDSS) Licensing data | 22 | 38% |
| Head Start Program Information Report | 21 | 36% |
| Local First 5 needs assessments | 19 | 33% |
| Other | 18 | 31% |
| Quality Counts California (QCC) Common Data File | 14 | 24% |
| Other local birth rate data | 13 | 22% |
| American Institute for Research Early Learning Needs Assessment Tool | 11 | 19% |
| None of the above | 0 | 0% |
| Not applicable | 0 | 0% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

1. **Has the COE partnered with local Head Start providers, California State Preschool Program (CSPP), local childcare and development planning councils (LPCs), Resource and Referral (R&R) agencies, or other early learning and care partners to leverage existing data to inform LEA needs assessments? [Select all the apply]**

| **Agencies Grantees Partnered with to Leverage Data to Inform Needs Assessments** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| CSPP providers | 49 | 84% |
| LPCs | 47 | 81% |
| Head Start providers | 46 | 79% |
| R&R agencies | 41 | 71% |
| Other | 28 | 48% |
| None of the Above | 4 | 7% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

1. **Has the COE provided technical assistance to LEAs in any of the following areas related to projecting enrollment and assessing needs? [select all that apply]**

| **Technical Assistance Provided to LEAs** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Information on available resources and programs to support workforce pipeline development to staff UPK | 49 | 84% |
| Support for parent surveys to gauge interest in service delivery models | 29 | 50% |
| Information on program eligibility requirements to project enrollment across programs | 51 | 88% |
| Projecting staffing needs | 38 | 66% |
| Data analysis capacity building to support staff to refine enrollment projections and project staffing needs based on community context | 33 | 57% |
| Other | 12 | 21% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

## Focus Area A: Vision and Coherence

1. **How many districts is the COE offering or planning to offer support to?**

| **Districts the COE Offers Support To** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| All districts in the county | 30 | 52% |
| More than 10 | 10 | 17% |
| 9-10 | 6 | 10% |
| 1-2 | 5 | 9% |
| 3-4 | 3 | 5% |
| 5-6 | 2 | 3% |
| 7-8 | 2 | 3% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

1. **How many districts have accepted or participated in COE-administered Universal PreKindergarten (UPK) planning supports within the county to date?**

| **Number of Districts That Have Accepted or Participated in Planning Supports** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| All districts in the county | 21 | 36% |
| More than 10 | 19 | 33% |
| 9-10 | 6 | 10% |
| 1-2 | 5 | 9% |
| 5-6 | 3 | 5% |
| 3-4 | 2 | 3% |
| 7-8 | 2 | 3% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

1. **How many charters is the COE supporting or planning to support within the county?**

| **Number of Charters the COE Will Support** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1-2 | 18 | 31% |
| All charters in the county | 15 | 26% |
| 3-4 | 10 | 17% |
| More than 10 | 6 | 10% |
| 5-6 | 4 | 7% |
| 7-8 | 3 | 5% |
| 9-10 | 2 | 3% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

1. **What proportion of districts and charters is the COE supporting or planning to support within the county?**

| **Proportion of Districts and Charters the COE Will Support** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 100% | 37 | 64% |
| 76-99% | 18 | 31% |
| 10-25% | 1 | 2% |
| 26-50% | 1 | 2% |
| 51-75% | 1 | 2% |
| Less than 10% | 0 | 0% |

1. **How did the COE support LEAs to develop a local vision for UPK?**

\*Open response only

1. **Has the COE supported or does the COE plan to support districts to incorporate UPK into their Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs)?**

| **Will the COE Support Districts to Incorporate UPK into Their LCAPs?** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | 54 | 93% |
| Unsure | 3 | 5% |
| No | 1 | 2% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

1. **Did the COE implement or is the COE planning to implement internal organizational structures or modifications to ensure that COE child development and early education staff collaborate and coordinate effectively with staff in other departments within the COE (for example, Special Education, Curriculum and Instruction)?**

| **Will the COE Ensure Child Development and Early Education Staff Collaborate with Other Departments?** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | 49 | 84% |
| Not Applicable | 5 | 9% |
| No | 4 | 7% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

1. **Does the COE plan to support LEAs in the county to either apply to operate a CSPP contract or apply to expand existing CSPP contracts? (Select One)**

| **Will the COE Support LEAs to Expand CSPP?** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes - the COE will support LEAs that plan to apply to administer a new CSPP contract in future years (if funding is appropriated by the legislature) | 15 | 26% |
| Yes - the COE supported LEAs in applying to expand existing CSPP contract(s) in 2022–23 | 13 | 22% |
| No - The LEAs in the county do not hold a CSPP contract nor plan to apply for a CSPP contract in the future | 11 | 19% |
| Yes - the COE will support LEAs in applying to expand existing CSPP contracts in future years (if funding is appropriated by the legislature) | 9 | 16% |
| No - The COE has no plans to support LEAs in beginning or expanding a CSPP contract in future years | 6 | 10% |
| Yes - the COE supported LEAs in applying for new CSPP contract(s) in 2022–23 | 4 | 7% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

1. **In which of the following Focus Area A: Vision and Coherence areas has the COE provided technical assistance to LEAs? (Select all that apply)**

| **Technical Assistance Provided to LEAs in Focus Area A** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Adjusting classroom practices to support the district’s UPK model (for example, mixed-age classrooms) | 45 | 78% |
| Creating inclusive classrooms, including implementing Universal Design for Learning | 45 | 78% |
| Considerations for TK early admittance | 39 | 67% |
| Implementing internal organization changes to ensure LEA child development and early education staff collaborate and coordinate effectively with staff in other departments within the LEA (for example, Special Education, Curriculum and Instruction) | 37 | 64% |
| Technical assistance on how to integrate UPK and Preschool through Third Grade alignment (P-3) in the district LCAP | 36 | 62% |
| Models for administrative structures that support effective UPK programs and facilitate connections with the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELO-P) and non-LEA-administered early learning and care programs | 35 | 60% |
| Guidance on best practices for smooth transitions through the P-3 continuum | 33 | 57% |
| Support for developing and applying to administer a CSPP contract | 23 | 40% |
| Developing templates or frameworks for drafting a P-3 vision that incorporates partners’ and parents’ voices | 16 | 28% |
| Other | 6 | 10% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

## Focus Area B: Community Engagement and Partnerships

1. **Is the COE collaborating with other COEs (for example, sharing resources, developing joint plans, administering joint technical assistance sessions) to provide UPK planning and implementation support to LEAs?**

| **Partnering with Other COEs to Provide Joint Technical Assistance** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | 38 | 66% |
| No | 20 | 34% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

1. **Which partners has the COE worked with or convened to support UPK implementation in their county?**

| **Partners Supporting UPK Implementation** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| First 5 County Commission | 52 | 90% |
| CSPP Providers | 52 | 90% |
| LPCs | 51 | 88% |
| R&R Agencies | 49 | 84% |
| Head Start Providers | 49 | 84% |
| Special Education Local Plan Areas | 44 | 76% |
| Community-based organizations (CBOs) providing early learning and care | 41 | 71% |
| District curriculum groups | 31 | 53% |
| District early learning groups | 30 | 52% |
| Parent engagement centers (for example, Parent Training and Information Center [PTIC], Community Parent Resource Center [CPRC], Family Empowerment Centers [FEC]) | 23 | 40% |
| District business officials’ groups | 21 | 36% |
| Other | 12 | 21% |
| None of the above | 0 | 0% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

1. **What forums has the COE joined, administered, or convened to elevate and support UPK implementation within the county?**

| **Forums Joined to Elevate UPK Implement** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| LPCs | 50 | 86% |
| Local QCC meetings | 44 | 76% |
| First 5 County Commission meetings | 40 | 69% |
| R&R Agency meetings or forums | 34 | 59% |
| Other | 28 | 48% |
| County Child Welfare Agency meetings or forums | 14 | 24% |
| County Board of Supervisors meetings | 12 | 21% |
| Local Parent Teacher Association forums | 5 | 9% |
| None of the above | 4 | 7% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

1. **How has the COE worked with community-based extended learning and care providers to share information about UPK planning and implementation?**

| **Information Sharing with Community-based Extended Learning and Care Providers** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Provided information to the R&Rs and LPCs to share with providers | 47 | 81% |
| Joined or convened meetings with community-based providers | 43 | 74% |
| Provided information about TK expansion directly to providers | 43 | 74% |
| Provided information about changes in law and eligibility for early learning and care programs | 41 | 71% |
| Provided information on how community-based providers could alter their service models to provide early learning and care opportunities for younger children or to provide extended learning and care after school | 35 | 60% |
| Helped community-based providers identify which district they are located in | 26 | 45% |
| Helped connect community providers to staff at their local school or district | 25 | 43% |
| Other | 6 | 10% |
| None of the above | 5 | 9% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

1. **In which of the following Focus Area B: Community Engagement and Partnerships areas has the COE provided technical assistance to LEAs? [select all that apply]**

| **Technical Assistance Provided for Focus Area B** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Provided information and technical assistance on the intersection of TK and ELO-P | 49 | 84% |
| Strategies for meeting the ELO-P requirements through different models of extended learning and care, including models of blending and layering funding to support the nine-hour day and ensuring developmentally-informed environments for young children | 48 | 83% |
| Support for community engagement activities including best practices for coordination with LPCs, Local QCC Consortia, First 5 county commissions, Head Start Policy Councils, and other early learning and care leadership tables | 47 | 81% |
| Provided information and technical assistance on the intersection of TK and other early learning and childcare care programs (both Title 5 and Title 22\*) | 40 | 69% |
| Shared information about allowable blending, braiding and layering of programs, including examples | 38 | 66% |
| Guidance on best practices for enrolling more children with disabilities in UPK classrooms and providing services in inclusive settings | 34 | 59% |
| Strategies for Increasing UPK enrollment and parent awareness of programs | 33 | 57% |
| Support for parent surveys and engagement activities to understand parent needs and support authentic choice | 32 | 55% |
| Provided information about various funding streams that are available to districts to support inclusion programs (for example, early intervention special education dollars) | 32 | 55% |
| Other | 4 | 7% |

## \*Title 5 refers to requirements for all state-funded early learning programs. Title 22 refers to licensing requirements for all programs, including licensed child care centers providing non-medical care and supervision to children or infants in a group setting, licensed family child care homes, and CSPP.

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

## Focus Area C: Workforce Recruitment and Professional Learning

1. **How is the COE supporting districts in creating a pipeline of ethnically, culturally, and racially diverse, multilingual TK and early education teachers?**

| **Support for a Teacher Pipeline of Ethnically, Culturally, and Racially Diverse, Multilingual TK and Early Education Teachers** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Encouraging preparation programs to offer coursework during non-traditional hours, for example, after 6 p.m. | 45 | 78% |
| Offering coursework online or coursework that can be completed on candidates’ own time | 40 | 69% |
| Encouraging workforce programs to offer culturally competent mentoring and coaching | 37 | 64% |
| Creating pipeline programs to elevate the qualifications of existing early education staff, including targeted recruitment of racially and culturally diverse individuals | 33 | 57% |
| Working with local public institutions of higher education (IHEs) to establish or implement culturally and linguistically responsive preparation programs | 29 | 50% |
| Offering or collaborating to offer paid internship and apprenticeship programs | 24 | 41% |
| Working with private IHEs to establish or implement culturally and linguistically responsive preparation programs | 19 | 33% |
| Providing learning cohorts organized by primary language | 17 | 29% |
| Creating a plan to ensure wages increase as qualifications increase | 10 | 17% |
| Working with schools to set targets for hiring a diverse workforce | 10 | 17% |
| Other | 9 | 16% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

1. **Which of the following strategies does the COE intend to use to support a pipeline of diverse and effective prospective TK teachers to earn a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential? [select all that apply]**

| **Supports for Prospective TK Teachers to Earn a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Partner with one or more local accredited IHEs or other COEs to help support teachers holding less than a full credential to complete requirements to earn a Preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential | 50 | 86% |
| Establish a relationship with other LEAs to establish pathways for high school students interested in a career in CSPP or in P-3 teaching through Career Technical Education programs, dual enrollment programs, clubs, registered apprenticeships, or other such early recruitment opportunities | 44 | 76% |
| Apply for workforce development funding and competitive grant opportunities from the CDE | 43 | 74% |
| Provide a stipend for tuition and fees for coursework leading to a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential | 41 | 71% |
| Collaborate with IHEs to offer unit-bearing coursework at a local LEA site during times that work for teachers and other interested staff members | 25 | 43% |
| Apply for a California Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program grant (<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/grant-funded-programs/Classified-Sch-Empl-Teacher-Cred-Prog>) | 24 | 41% |
| Partner with an IHE to provide other services to candidates seeking to earn a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential | 24 | 41% |
| Create a countywide matrix of workforce programs to share with LEAs and prospective educators | 24 | 41% |
| Request to join an existing intern preparation program to recruit and prepare teachers | 16 | 28% |
| Partner with another COE to provide other services to candidates seeking to earn a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential | 16 | 28% |
| Lead a coalition application for statewide grants (for example, partner with districts to apply for statewide grants) | 15 | 26% |
| Apply for a California Teacher Residency Grant Program (<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/grant-funded-programs/teacher-residency-grant-program>) | 13 | 22% |
| Other | 12 | 21% |
| Request to join an existing apprenticeship cohort program to recruit and prepare teachers | 10 | 17% |
| Partner with the California Center on Careers to contact registrants who might be interested in becoming teachers in the county | 10 | 17% |
| None of the above | 1 | 2% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

1. **Which of the following strategies does the LEA intend to employ to support diverse and effective prospective TK teachers, including multilingual educators, to meet the requirements under California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 48000(g)(4)? [select all that apply]**

| **Supports for Prospective TK Teachers to Meet Requirements Under *EC*** Section **48000(g)(4)** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Partner with a local IHE offering eligible early childhood education (ECE) or childhood development coursework | 53 | 91% |
| Provide information on scholarship and grant opportunities | 51 | 88% |
| Offer advice to existing teachers on ECE requirements and how to meet the requirements | 49 | 84% |
| Apply for workforce development funding and grant opportunities | 47 | 81% |
| Provide a stipend for tuition, fees, and other programmatic costs associated with obtaining credit-based coursework or a degree | 44 | 76% |
| Provide a stipend for tuition, fees, and other programmatic costs associated with obtaining a Child Development Teacher Permit | 43 | 74% |
| Partner with an IHE or COE to operate cohort models for LEA teachers earning 24 units | 39 | 67% |
| Develop or work with an established mentorship program to support new TK teachers | 32 | 55% |
| Create a countywide matrix of workforce programs to share with LEAs and prospective educators | 24 | 41% |
| Offer IHE coursework at a local LEA site during times that work for teachers | 22 | 38% |
| Lead a coalition application for statewide grants (for example, partner with districts to apply for statewide grants) | 20 | 34% |
| Other | 8 | 14% |
| None of the above; the LEA currently has enough Multiple Subject Teaching Credential holders who have at least 24 units in early childhood education, or childhood development, or both; professional experience in a classroom setting with preschool-age children that is comparable to the 24 units of education described in subparagraph (a); or a Child Development Teacher Permit issued by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing | 0 | 0% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

1. **Which of the following strategies does the LEA intend to employ to support diverse and effective prospective CSPP or LEA-operated preschool teachers, including multilingual educators, to obtain a Child Development Teacher Permit? [select all that apply]**

| **Supports for Prospective CSPP or LEA-operated Preschool Teachers to Obtain a Child Development Teacher Permit** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Provide information on scholarship and grant opportunities | 51 | 88% |
| Partner with an IHE (including both community colleges and four-year IHEs) offering eligible early childhood education or childhood development coursework | 50 | 86% |
| Apply for workforce development funding and grant opportunities | 46 | 79% |
| Offer advising and transcript analysis to prospective CSPP teachers on requirements and support individual planning for how to meet the Child Development Teacher Permit requirements | 46 | 79% |
| Provide a stipend for tuition, fees, and other programmatic costs associated with obtaining credit-based coursework or an associate or baccalaureate degree | 44 | 76% |
| Partner with an IHE or COE to operate cohort models for educators working towards a Child Development Teacher Permit | 36 | 62% |
| Offer unit-bearing coursework at a local district site during times that work for teachers | 15 | 26% |
| Other | 8 | 14% |
| None of the above | 0 | 0% |

1. **In which of the following Focus Area C: Workforce Recruitment and Professional Learning areas has the COE provided technical assistance to LEAs? [select all that apply]**

| **Technical Assistance for Focus Area C** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Additional guidance on UPK workforce requirements (TK, CSPP, and other early learning and care providers) | 53 | 91% |
| Creating joint professional learning opportunities for preschool and elementary school teachers within LEAs or across LEA- and CBO-administered programs in the county | 48 | 83% |
| Building partnerships with IHEs or COEs to support professional learning opportunities and degree attainment | 46 | 79% |
| Creating professional learning opportunities to provide school site leaders with more early childhood knowledge | 42 | 72% |
| Sharing strategies to support the teacher pipeline (for example, strategies for recruiting multilingual educators, the impact of cohort models, ways to implement apprenticeships or residency programs, and so forth) | 31 | 53% |
| Support for communications to recruit prospective educators and share grant and scholarship opportunities to support degree attainment | 31 | 53% |
| Other | 3 | 5% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

## Focus Area D: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

1. **If any LEAs in the county administer CSPP, does the COE plan to support them with providing any of the following language model(s) for CSPP students? [select all that apply]**

| **Supports for CSPP Language Models** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| English-only instruction with home-language support | 36 | 62% |
| None | 14 | 24% |
| Dual language program with a language allotment of 50/50 | 13 | 22% |
| Dual language program with a language allotment of 90/10 | 9 | 16% |
| Dual language program with a language allotment of 80/20 | 6 | 10% |
| Dual language program with a language allotment of 70/30 | 5 | 9% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

1. **In which of the following Focus Area D: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment areas has the COE provided technical assistance to LEAs? [select all that apply]**

| **Technical Assistance for Focus Area D** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Guidance on how to support effective classroom organization practices and behavior management strategies to ensure a positive learning environment for a diverse population of UPK students | 47 | 81% |
| Specific instructional strategies to support specific skills including, but not limited to, children’s social-emotional development and home language development | 45 | 78% |
| Guidance on how to adopt the California Preschool Learning Foundations and the California Preschool Curriculum Frameworks into a specific UPK setting (for example, mixed-age classrooms) | 44 | 76% |
| Guidance on instructional practices to support children with disabilities in UPK (for example, implementing Universal Design for Learning, providing specialized job embedded services in the classroom with peer models, and implementing social-emotional strategies such as the Pyramid Model) and partnerships with early learning and care providers to support services for children with disabilities | 43 | 74% |
| Guidance on appropriate assessment selection and utilization | 43 | 74% |
| Guidance on the selection, development, or integration of developmentally-informed curricula and aligning curricula across the early grades | 42 | 72% |
| Guidance and best practices on how to monitor and support curriculum fidelity in UPK settings | 39 | 67% |
| Guidance on creating dual language immersion or bilingual programs | 15 | 26% |
| Other | 7 | 12% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

## Focus Area E: LEA Facilities, Services, and Operations

1. **In which of the following Focus Area E: LEA Facilities, Services, and Operations areas has the COE provided or plans to provide technical assistance to LEAs? [select all that apply]**

| **Technical Assistance Provided for Focus Area E** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Guidance on how to modify an elementary school classroom to serve young children, including but not limited to proximity of bathrooms within or near classrooms and location of parking near drop-off locations | 45 | 78% |
| Guidance to support strategies that ensure TK students have access to meals and LEAs implement age-appropriate meal time practices, including adequate time to eat | 39 | 67% |
| Utilizing outdoor learning environments | 35 | 60% |
| Best practices for preventing displacement of early learning education programs operated by non-LEA administrators on LEA campuses and transitioning programs to serve younger children (or to offer extended learning opportunities, including in intersession and summer) | 28 | 48% |
| Making modifications to district data systems to support access to UPK assessment data and other relevant information across community and elementary school settings | 23 | 40% |
| Strategies to address transportation issues related to UPK access and enrollment | 20 | 34% |
| Other | 8 | 14% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

## Technical Assistance and Capacity Building Questions (optional)

The CDE is collecting information on the type(s) and topics of technical assistance that COEs may need to support LEAs to implement effective UPK programming.

1. **How is the COE developing capacity to support UPK? [select all that apply]**

| **Supports for UPK Capacity Building** | **Total Number** | **Total Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Joining UPK or P-3 webinars offered by the CDE | 46 | 79% |
| Providing technical assistance or coaching on key issues such as braided and blended funding models, curriculum and instruction best practices | 44 | 76% |
| Serving as a liaison between LEAs and early education community partners | 44 | 76% |
| Integrating the LPC with UPK planning and implementation efforts | 41 | 71% |
| Facilitating standing capacity building, peer learning, or collaboration meetings | 40 | 69% |
| Joining trainings or webinars offered by other organizations | 39 | 67% |
| Hiring a dedicated staff person to focus on UPK or P-3 | 36 | 62% |
| Partnering with other COEs to increase or share expertise | 36 | 62% |
| Partnering with the local First 5 county commission | 34 | 59% |
| Holding forums for parents | 17 | 29% |
| Other | 4 | 7% |

\*Responses ordered from greatest to least

*California Department of Education, Early Education Division, April 2023*