

In: D. Besharov (Ed.), Enhancing and Expanding Early Childhood Education: A Program Guide, Washington, D.C.: The American Enterprise Institute, 1995.

Head Start and Welfare Reform

Wade F. Horn, Ph.D.

Two of the nation's largest, and most highly touted, programs to move families out of poverty and into self-sufficiency are Head Start and the Jobs Opportunities and Basic Skills Training program (JOBS). Although Head Start is commonly thought of as a comprehensive, preschool child care program for low-income children, a significant amount of its resources are devoted to helping the parents of children enrolled in Head Start achieve the educational and job preparation skills necessary to escape long-term welfare dependency. Conversely, although primarily a welfare-to-work program for AFDC recipients, the JOBS program is also required to address the child care needs of children in participant families. Given this overlap in goals and target population, there is a compelling need to coordinate these two programs. Effective coordination, however, of the JOBS program and Head Start has proven to be more difficult than initially anticipated. This chapter will outline ways in which Head Start and the JOBS program should be coordinating with each other, identify barriers to effective coordination, and suggest solutions to these barriers.

Head Start

Since its inception in 1965 as part of Lyndon Johnson's war on poverty, Head Start has served over 13 million low-income children and their families and has enjoyed the support of every president since Lyndon Johnson. Indeed, it was Republican President George Bush who oversaw

the largest expansion in Head Start's history, increasing funding by 127% in just four years. Continuing this bipartisan commitment to Head Start, President Clinton has pledged to "fully fund" Head Start, setting as his goal a total of \$8 billion in increased funding over the next five years.

Head Start attempts to accomplish its anti-poverty mission in two ways. First, it provides comprehensive and developmentally appropriate preschool services to low-income children designed to enhance the child's cognitive, social and physical development in order to enable them to interact effectively with both their current and their future environments. The theory is that by laying a firm foundation in the preschool years, Head Start alumni will be more successful interacting with future environments, and thereby reduce the likelihood that they will drop out of school or become dependent on welfare.

From its inception, however, Head Start has also recognized that to help a child you must also help his or her family. Thus, the second way that Head Start attempts to deliver on its antipoverty promise is by concurrently supporting efforts by parents of children enrolled in Head Start to improve their educational and economic status as well as their parenting skills.¹ Head Start's two-generation focus has traditionally been accomplished through the parent involvement and social services components of the program.

The parent involvement component of Head Start is concerned with strengthening the role of parents as the most important educators of their children. Part of this process involves providing

opportunities for parents to improve their self-sufficiency, self-image, and self-confidence through a variety of strategies, including parent education, literacy, G.E.D., and college credit programs. The importance of the parents of Head Start children is further reinforced by ensuring that they are also involved in the oversight and administration of local Head Start programs. Each Head Start program is required to establish a Parents Policy Council, which must be consulted on such issues as the hiring and firing of staff, admissions policy, and program direction. Indeed, the annual reapplication grant for continuation funding is not considered valid unless it is endorsed by the local Parents Policy Council.

The social services component of the Head Start program assists families in their attempts to achieve self-sufficiency by first assessing their needs and then helping them to access social services to meet those needs. In some cases, services are provided to the family at the Head Start site. In other cases, Head Start social services staff make referrals to other community agencies and resources. A case management approach is generally utilized by the social services staff; however, high case loads in many local programs often make effective case management difficult to achieve.² Whereas the recommended caseload for social services workers is a 1:35 ratio, according to 1991-1992 program data the actual average ratio is 1:90.

Although research has shown Head Start to have some very clear and immediate positive effects, particularly on children but also on parents and on communities in which Head Start programs are located, less evidence exists to substantiate claims that Head Start significantly improves the long-term outcome of low-income children and their families.³⁻⁴ In an effort to

improve the long-term effectiveness of Head Start, program administrators have been redoubling efforts to secure and provide services that promote parent empowerment and self-sufficiency. Perhaps the most important recent demonstration effort in this regard is the implementation of Head Start Family Service Centers. First funded in 1990, Head Start Family Service Centers provide intensive family support services for Head Start parents designed to help them address the problems of adult illiteracy, unemployment, and substance abuse. In addition, since 1989 the Head Start Bureau has been administering the Comprehensive Child Development Program (CCDP). The CCDP initiative involves providing continuous and comprehensive services to pregnant mothers and infants until the child's fifth birthday. Both of these demonstration efforts have an accompanying national evaluation contract in place to provide detailed process and outcome data on these approaches to enhancing the Head Start model. These two initiatives are described more extensively elsewhere in this volume.

The Family Support Act

In part because of an increasing recognition of the recalcitrant nature of long-term welfare dependency, Congress enacted comprehensive welfare reform legislation in 1988 entitled the Family Support Act. Designed to shift the primary purpose of the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program from providing cash assistance to helping welfare recipients become employed and self-sufficient, the Family Support Act created the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training program (JOBS), an education, training and employment program for AFDC recipients. The program gives federal dollars to states and tribal grantees for various services and activities, including adult literacy services, job readiness activities, job skills training, and job

development and job placement services.

The philosophy of the JOBS program is to help the long-term welfare dependent, or those likely to become long-term welfare dependent, achieve self-sufficiency. As an incentive to do this, higher federal matching rates are provided to States that spend at least 55 percent of their funds on the following three groups of AFDC recipients, the first two of which are also likely to have children who are eligible for Head Start:

- o those who have been on AFDC for 36 of the last 60 months;
- o those under age 24 who have no high school education or the equivalent, or who have little or no work experience in the last year; and
- o those families where the youngest child is within two years of being ineligible for AFDC because of age.

To ensure that States aggressively implement the JOBS program, there is a state-wide participation requirement. States must place a percentage of welfare recipients in the program each year. That percentage increases from 7 percent in 1990 and 1991, to 11 percent in 1992 and 1993, to 15 percent in 1994, and to 20 percent thereafter. There are financial disincentives to States who do not meet these participation requirements.

Generally, participation in a JOBS activity for twenty hours per week is required of nonexempt AFDC recipients whose youngest child is at least three years of age (or, at State option, age one). Under the Family Support Act, States must guarantee child care if they determine that child care is necessary for a participant to engage in education, training, job search, or other program activities. A great deal of latitude is granted to States on how they might provide such care; for example, states can contract directly with group child care facilities, provide parents with vouchers, pay individual providers, or use any other mechanism deemed appropriate by the state. Federal reimbursement for child care expenses is open-ended and is not counted as part of the state's basic JOBS allotment. The JOBS program also created a transitional child care program to cover the child care needs of participants for up to 12 months after leaving the welfare rolls.

Slightly less than half (45 percent) of the parents of Head Start children are unemployed and 52 percent are AFDC recipients.⁵ Furthermore, 40 percent of all children on AFDC are under the age of six.⁶ Thus, a significant number of Head Start parents are eligible, and may even be required, to participate in the JOBS program. Assuming the same percentage of Head Start families on AFDC participate in the JOBS program as is required in the AFDC population as a whole, by 1994 a minimum of 132,700 Head Start children should have a parent participating in the JOBS program (see Table 1). This figure could, of course, be even higher if States exceed the minimum participation requirements or if JOBS participants are disproportionately enrolled in Head Start.

Given the overlap between families being served by JOBS and the Head Start program, more

efficient coordination of Head Start with the JOBS program could enhance Head Start's antipoverty mission by strengthening its efforts to help families achieve self-sufficiency. In fact, the Head Start Bureau has been encouraging coordination with the JOBS program for several years. The effort to coordinate these two programs began in earnest in 1990, when a special task force was convened with representatives from the Head Start Bureau and the Family Support Administration, the operating division within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) then responsible for administering the JOBS program. Efforts to coordinate these two programs were further intensified following a reorganization of HHS in the spring of 1991 resulting in the placement of the Head Start Bureau and the JOBS program within the same operating division. As a result of these efforts, on December 31, 1991, the newly formed Administration on Children and Families (ACF) issued an information memorandum outlining ways local Head Start and JOBS programs could coordinate with each other. Model interagency "memorandums of understanding" between Head Start and JOBS programs were also developed and distributed, and guidance on how to allocate costs between these two programs was disseminated to the ACF regional offices.

As outlined in the ACF December 1991 information memorandum, coordination of the two programs should be focused on three areas: developing Head Start as a training and employment site for JOBS participants; facilitating the participation of Head Start parents in the JOBS program; and promoting the creation of "wrap-around" child care arrangements, in which extended-day child care is provided through a combination of the Head Start day and JOBS supported child care. Each of these potential areas of collaboration and coordination are outlined

below.

Developing Head Start as a Training and Employment Site. Historically, Head Start has provided educational and training opportunities to parents of children enrolled in Head Start. As a result, an astonishing 38 percent of all paid Head Start staff nationwide are parents of children either currently or formerly enrolled in Head Start. To enhance Head Start's ability to provide such educational and training opportunities, JOBS education and training funds could be made available to Head Start programs. For example, to increase the ability of Head Start to provide training and credentialing of child care workers, JOBS funds could be used to supplement training monies available under the Child Development Associate (CDA) program. JOBS funds could also be used to enhance the ability of Head Start programs to train nutritionists, receptionists, bus drivers, sanitation staff, secretaries, teacher assistants, and administrative assistants. Once trained, many of these JOBS participants could become employed in the Head Start program. Using JOBS funds to supplement training monies available under the CDA program would have the added benefit of increasing the supply of well-trained child development specialists for employment in the broader child care community.

Co-locating and coordinating Head Start and JOBS education and training services should promote the efficient utilization of often limited resources. For example, Head Start and the JOBS caseworkers could share assessment and case management responsibilities, and JOBS participants could access Head Start services such as family literacy, GED opportunities, substance abuse counseling, and parent training. As an added benefit, JOBS funds can be used to

pay for case management services, offering a way to reduce the high case loads frequently encountered in the social services component of Head Start.

Collaboration between Head Start and the JOBS program would also provide a source of funds to supplement the wages of Head Start employees who are JOBS participants. Through On the Job Training, a component of the JOBS program, an employer who hires a JOBS participant can be reimbursed for up to 50 percent of the wages paid to the JOBS participant during a specified training period. Alternatively, wages could be subsidized by diversion of a portion of the JOBS participant's AFDC grant through the Work Supplementation component of the JOBS program.

Facilitating the Participation of Head Start Parents in the JOBS Program. Given the overlap in populations served by Head Start and the JOBS program, Head Start is in an ideal position to help to recruit AFDC families into the JOBS program. In order to accomplish this most effectively, JOBS agency caseworkers could be housed part-time in the Head Start center to publicize the JOBS program to Head Start families. As an incentive for effective collaboration, Head Start parents could even be given preference for enrollment in the JOBS program.

Collaboration with the JOBS program could spur Head Start sites to become single points of contacts (SPOCs) for many different welfare services and benefits. For example, Head Start could help welfare recipients apply for Medicaid, access health care providers, and obtain information, referrals and follow-up for a broad range of support services. Such case-

management services have been found to be especially important in remote, rural locations, and can be effective in helping multi-problem families negotiate what is often a complex and confusing maze of bureaucratic requirements for accessing different social services.

Promotion of Head Start Wrap-Around Arrangements to Provide Child Care Services to JOBS Participants. Under the Family Support Act, States must guarantee child care for AFDC parents who are required to participate in a JOBS activity or who are employed through the JOBS program. Because most Head Start programs provide only part-day services totaling twenty hours or less per week, it is likely that the education, training, or work schedules of many JOBS participants will not correspond with that of the Head Start program. In addition, some JOBS participants will obtain employment or enroll in training or education programs that exceed twenty hours per week, making access to a part-day child care arrangement less relevant. To make matters worse, Head Start is most typically a nine-month program, leaving the need for child care unanswered for those who work year round.

There are two possible solutions to this problem. First, Head Start funds could be used to expand Head Start from a part-day, part-year program, to a full-day, full-year program. This solution has the advantage of ease of administration. For example, if Head Start funds are used to expand the hours of the program to full-day, full-year, program administrators could be certain as to space requirements and staffing needs. Not all children, however, enrolled in Head Start require full-day child care. In fact, fewer than half of all children currently enrolled in Head Start live in homes where the parents are employed full-time. Should Head Start expand into a full-day,

full-year program, it would be tempting for program administrators to enroll all children in the full-day, full-year program whether or not there was a compelling need for full-day child care. Using Head Start funds to implement full-day, full-year programs, therefore, runs the risk of service inefficiency: large numbers of full-day child care slots may not actually be used to serve children with full-day child care needs.

A second possible solution is to require Head Start programs to provide extended day services through wrap-around child care arrangements. Wrap-around child care entails using other funding sources to keep the Head Start center open for those children for whom full-day child care is a necessity. Thus, Head Start would be able to provide child care for families where parents or, in the case of single-parent households, the sole parent are employed full-time outside the home, without having to transport the child across town to another child care setting. Those children who do not require full-time child care would be sent home after the delivery of the three-to-four hour core Head Start services.

The primary disadvantage to wrap-around child care arrangements is the burden it places on program administrators to seek out, procure, and coordinate different funding streams. Coordinating funding streams is never an easy task, but coordinating child care funding streams has proven particularly difficult because of idiosyncratic and sometimes contradictory programmatic requirements. If Head Start programs are expected to accomplish this difficult task, adequate training and encouragement will be necessary from both federal and state governments.

The most obvious source of funds for wrap-around child care arrangements is the JOBS program itself. Although maintenance of effort provisions in the law prohibit the use of JOBS child care and transitional child care funds to pay for child care that coincides with the regular Head Start program, funds can be used to pay for child care that extends the core Head Start day. The Head Start grantee and the State IV-A agency administering the JOBS program can make various arrangements for paying for wrap-around child care, but the best arrangement would be "purchase of service" contracts between the IV-A agency and the Head Start grantee. Such an arrangement would allow Head Start administrators to know in advance the amount of space and the number of child care providers necessary to fulfill the contract. Furthermore, whereas after-the-fact reimbursement arrangements could place financial burdens on the Head Start program because of unexpected absences, purchase of service contracts under the JOBS regulations do allow for reasonable absences as determined by the State.

The JOBS program is by no means the only source of funds for wrap-around child care arrangements. Other sources of funding for wrap-around child care arrangements include the Chapter One program within the Department of Education, the Dependent Care Planning and Development Program, the Child Care Development Block Grant, the At-Risk Child Care Program, the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), the Community Development Block Grant, and the Social Services Block Grant (Title XX). As described elsewhere in this volume, these various sources of child care funds add up to a substantial amount of money (see chapter by Besharov & Fowler in this volume).

Barriers to Effective Coordination

Unfortunately, early efforts to coordinate Head Start and the JOBS program have proven to be less successful than anticipated. Despite three years of urging by both the Head Start Bureau and the federal administrators of the JOBS program, effective coordination has been difficult to achieve. Instead, a number of unanticipated barriers to effective coordination of these two anti-poverty programs have been encountered. In this section a number of these barriers will be identified and discussed.

Perhaps the most difficult barrier to effective coordination is the difference in culture and mission between Head Start and the JOBS program. Although local program administrators reportedly found the initial ACF information memorandum helpful in setting a tone for collaboration, both programs continue to see their mission and standards for accountability as different from each other. Most notably, despite the explicit focus in the JOBS program on the chronically unemployed, many local JOBS programs continue to be held accountable for expeditiously moving JOBS participants through the JOBS program. This has led at least some observers to feel the JOBS program, like the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) before it, focuses on the recently, rather than the chronically, unemployed. In contrast, Head Start's mission has always been to focus on the "poorest of the poor." There are few, if any, expectations for Head Start programs to move families expeditiously off welfare and into self-sufficiency. Indeed, it is not uncommon to hear Head Start staff talk of using a full year of Head Start simply to get the parents comfortable with the idea of accepting help through the Head Start program.

A second difference in mission between these two programs is that JOBS sees the parent(s) as its primary client, whereas Head Start sees the child as its primary client. Given this difference in perspective, JOBS program administrators and frontline staff often lack the background and expertise to know how to meet the needs of the children in participant AFDC households. In addition, the adult focus of the program frequently leads JOBS workers to view child care arrangements as acceptable so long as that child care setting provides a safe, healthy and sanitary environment for the child while the child's parent(s) is in an education or training program, or at work. Little emphasis in the JOBS program is given to the developmental appropriateness of the child care setting or to addressing the individual needs of a particular child while in that child care setting. Head Start, in contrast, sees as its primary mission the enhancement of the child's developmental status. To Head Start administrators and frontline staff, a safe environment is not nearly adequate enough; the setting must also be developmentally appropriate and designed to meet each child's individual needs. Although the perspective of the JOBS administrator may not be entirely inappropriate for many participant families, it does conflict with that of the Head Start program.

Similarly, state welfare agencies often have little history in, and consequently little appreciation for, performing such tasks as conducting family needs assessments, networking with other social service agencies, and administering child developmental screenings; all hallmarks of a successful Head Start program. Rather, heretofore state welfare agencies were primarily charged with determining eligibility for welfare benefits. Providing for the non-cash assistance needs of families on AFDC was seen as the purview of other social service agencies. Effective coordination is

largely dependent on the sharing of a common sense of purpose, and these conflicting perspectives, sense of mission, and standards for accountability make coordination between the two programs difficult to achieve.

In addition to differences in culture and mission, there are a number of procedural differences which have also proven to be barriers to effective coordination. One such procedural barrier has already been discussed: differences in hours of operation. Relatedly, many half-day Head Start programs employ double shifts in which separate morning and afternoon classes are conducted utilizing the same classroom space. The use of double shifts most commonly occurs in communities lacking adequate space for Head Start classrooms. Thus, in many communities it may be impossible to extend the day for children of parents enrolled in the JOBS program because the available classroom space is already being fully utilized. Although in the long-run this barrier may be at least partially addressed by recently passed legislation allowing Head Start appropriations to be used under certain conditions for facility construction, in the shorter term double shifts will continue to present a barrier to effective JOBS-Head Start collaboration.

Another procedural barrier is the fact that the JOBS program enrolls participants throughout the year, whereas Head Start primarily enrolls children during the spring and summer preceding the Head Start school year. This means that families enrolled in the JOBS program after the beginning of the Head Start school year, will most likely be unable to enroll their child in Head Start; all the available slots will have been filled. The fact that Head Start enrolls children only part of the year and the JOBS program enrolls families continuously throughout the year, can

result in JOBS administrators becoming frustrated with the inability of Head Start to satisfy the child care needs of their clients. Such frustration naturally leads to a reluctance to continue to refer JOBS participants to the Head Start program.

The need for child care by JOBS participants may also change over time. During an education and training period there may be less of a need for full-time child care because of the flexibility and limited hours of many education and training programs. Once employed, however, JOBS participants may have a greater need for full-time child care. Unfortunately, part-day Head Start programs may not be able to accommodate to changing child care needs over time. Nor is the funding of child care by the JOBS program flexible enough to assure Head Start program administrators that funds will continue to be available to them despite changing client needs. As a result, children of parents enrolled in the JOBS program may experience multiple disruptions in their child care arrangements as they are transferred back and forth from Head Start to other child care arrangements. Even more concerning is the possibility that some parents may actually turn down bona fide, and otherwise attractive, employment opportunities in order to keep their child enrolled in Head Start. Conversely, some children may be denied the Head Start experience altogether because the program can not accommodate to the child care needs of the parent.

Some barriers to effective coordination also arise because of Head Start staff attitudes and preconceived notions about welfare agencies. Given the historical emphasis of state welfare departments on the eligibility determination process, it should not be surprising that many Head Start staff, as well as low-income families, view public welfare agencies with a certain amount of

suspicion and mistrust. Such attitudes are antithetical to effective coordination which requires a measure of mutual respect and trust.

Some within the Head Start community have also been slow to reach out to the JOBS program because of a reluctance to embrace what they perceive to be an unwarranted broadening of the Head Start mission. For example, Avern Moore, the immediate past-President of the National Head Start Association and executive director of the Institute of Community Services which runs the Head Start program in Holly Springs, Mississippi, stated in relation to the Family Service Center initiative, "The policy makers are putting too much on us. Head Start is successful now. What they want to do is layer a lot of other kinds of issues on Head Start."⁷ The fear is that the broadening of Head Start's mission to include moving families out of poverty will dilute the program's overall effectiveness; any one program can only do so much. As Cecile Dickey of Concerned Parents of Head Start in Patterson, New Jersey, stated, "They are giving you so much to do, you can't really concentrate on doing anything well."⁸

In addition, Head Start staff themselves may be reluctant to shift from part-day to full-day employment. Research suggests that one reason individuals are attracted to employment in day care settings is that such employment may not be full-time, allowing time to be with their own children or the freedom to pursue other education or career goals.⁹ In fact, when in 1993 a summer Head Start program was contemplated, there were reports of Head Start staff raising objections to having to work during the summer and disrupt family vacation plans.¹⁰

Turf battles among different constituent groups have also hampered collaboration efforts. Most notably, Head Start programs have frequently encountered disinterest, and at times even active discouragement, when seeking to access child care funding streams for wraparound child care arrangements. Rather than using the different categories of federal funding of child care to develop a seamless system of child care services, each child care grant program has developed its own constituents who have a rather proprietary view of the monies made available through "their" particular grant program. Indeed, when the Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG) was implemented in 1989, representatives from the Head Start community were often specifically not invited to attend state-wide planning meetings because of the feeling that Head Start has its own source of funds, and the CCDBG monies were for the non-Head Start child care community. There are even reports that in some states the broader child care community is actively lobbying against the use of JOBS funds to pay for child care slots in Head Start programs.

At the same time, some Head Start programs are declining to seek out funds for wraparound child care. In part this reluctance is due to their feeling genuinely overloaded by the unprecedented expansions of the last several years. But there are others in the Head Start community who have decided for strategic reasons not to apply for other sources of child care funds because of a desire to have the federal government pay for full-day services directly through Head Start appropriations.

It is also important to recognize that while Head Start is a locally controlled and administered program, JOBS is directed and administered at the state level. Effective communication between

different levels of government is always difficult to achieve. The fact that Head Start has historically lacked a forceful and effective voice at the state level, exacerbates this difficulty. This situation may be improving in that since 1990, the Head Start Bureau has been funding state level collaboration projects. Currently, twenty-two states are receiving funds from the federal government to place a Head Start representative within the state level governing structure. Although the results of these grants have been variable, in some states Head Start has achieved real influence through this mechanism. One particularly noteworthy effort is the state of Minnesota which has chosen to place its Head Start representative within the Department of Labor specifically to enhance the collaboration of Head Start with welfare-to-work programs.

A final barrier to effective coordination between Head Start and the JOBS is that these two programs have entirely different funding mechanisms. From its inception, Head Start has been a direct grants program. Funding levels for specific Head Start programs are based upon a determination as to what it will cost to operate an effective early childhood intervention program. Although it is possible to calculate a per child cost in Head Start, funds are not generally awarded based upon such a calculation. The JOBS program, on the other hand, awards funds through contracts and vouchers based upon a unit cost per child calculation. Head Start program operators are not accustomed to administering programs in which funding is tied so explicitly to an individual child. Conversely, JOBS administrators seldom have the luxury of thinking programmatically when it comes to child care arrangements because funds are tied so explicitly to individual children. This difference in funding mechanisms can make it difficult for these two programs to coordinate with each other.

Models of Effective Coordination

Despite these barriers, effective coordination has been achieved by a number of local Head Start and JOBS programs. According to data collected by the Head Start Bureau on the 1991-1992 school year, 216 Head Start programs have thus far made some arrangement to coordinate with the JOBS program. Of these, over half (119) received funds through the JOBS program for these services.

One example of a model Head Start-JOBS collaboration agreement is an initiative begun in 1990 in Philadelphia involving the coordination of Philadelphia's JOBS program, called New Directions, with local Head Start programs. Recognizing that many of the nearly 4,000 children and families served by the local Head Start programs were eligible for AFDC, representatives of the Philadelphia Head Start agency and the state JOBS program decided to coordinate their efforts to prepare these families for employment. A series of meetings were then conducted at which representatives learned about each other's programs. Attending these meetings were national, regional and local administrators and managers of both Head Start and JOBS, all sharing the common vision of creating a system of comprehensive supports for families that would provide parents with opportunities to improve both their life circumstances and the future prospects of their children.

After an extensive two-year planning period, the directors of two local Head Start agencies signed an agreement of cooperation with the administrators of the New Directions program.

Among other things, Head Start agreed to:

- o inform parents during their orientation about the education and training opportunities available through the JOBS program;
- o identify parents who demonstrated an interest in the JOBS program, and help them obtain eligibility clearances;
- o complete a family needs assessment to determine employment needs;
- o make referrals to outside agencies as needed;
- o provide on-going counseling and monitor progress;
- o extend the hours of Head Start to meet the child care needs of parents enrolled in the JOBS program; and
- o develop new reporting forms with which to track and communicate services rendered and client progress.

In exchange, the JOBS program agreed to:

- o schedule special JOBS orientations for Head Start parents whenever Head Start staff indicated they had enough interested parents to hold one;
- o train Head Start staff about employment regulations, procedures, and services in the JOBS program;
- o coordinate case management activities for each family jointly enrolled in JOBS and Head Start; and
- o share the results of assessment testing with Head Start staff.

In addition, both Head Start and JOBS agreed to create activities to encourage participation in the collaborative effort. These activities, which are in various stages of implementation, include:

- o creating special on-site classes for JOBS participants;
- o offering extended day care services paid for with JOBS child care funds;
- o continuing cross-training of Head Start and JOBS staff; and
- o identification of an Education Coordinator to act as the point-of-contact for the program.

Although the implementation of this particular collaboration agreement has not been without difficulties, the clarity and specificity of this agreement does serve as a model for similar efforts. The reader is referred to the excellent book entitled, Pathways to Self-Sufficiency for Two Generations by Smith, Blank and Collins (1992) for additional details of this collaboration effort.¹¹

A notable example of effective Head Start-JOBS collaboration beyond the negotiation of a collaboration agreement is found in Erie County, New York. In 1991, the Community Action Organization of Erie County, which administers twenty-eight Head Start centers serving over 1,700 low-income children and their families, began working with the Erie County Department of Social Services (DSS) to link Head Start with JOBS. The first activity was to conduct a study to identify the possible benefits and disadvantages to collaboration. Among other things, this study found that 75 percent of Head Start families listed AFDC as their major source of income and thus were eligible to enroll in the JOBS program

Once both the need for and the potential barriers to effective collaboration were identified, a JOBS/Volunteer Coordinator, paid for with funds from a discretionary grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), was hired to serve as the link between the Head Start program and DSS. The JOBS/Volunteer Coordinator received extensive preservice training by DSS to ensure knowledge of the overall collaboration initiative. Subsequently, monthly meetings were held with both a DSS contact person and a member of the Head Start social services staff to ensure ongoing and effective communication between the two agencies.

To recruit families into the JOBS program, the JOBS/Volunteer Coordinator provided both center-based and individual presentations. With the aid of workshops, flyers and pamphlets, many supplied by the JOBS program, parents learned about the options available through JOBS, general information about the JOBS program, and their rights and responsibilities as JOBS participants. Following these presentations, the JOBS/Volunteer Coordinator provided other written materials, and made herself available to parents to answer their questions and alleviate their fears, without pressuring them to become involved in JOBS. For those parents who chose to enroll in the JOBS program, the JOBS/Volunteer Coordinator also helped prepare them for their JOBS interviews and acted as their advocate when problems arose. The Head Start social service staff continued to provide referrals and counseling services to Head Start parents in need of other social services.

Prior to the HS-JOBS collaboration in Erie County, only 3 percent of the Head Start parents eligible for JOBS participated in the JOBS program. At the end of the 1992-1993 school year, the JOBS participation rate of Head Start parents had risen to 14 percent. In addition, the number of full day Head Start classrooms, paid for with a combination of Head Start, JOBS, and HHS discretionary grant funds, rose from one in 1990-1991 to fifteen in 1993-1994. The one negative finding was a decrease in the number of volunteer hours contributed by parents of enrolled children. This decline was attributed to the fact that as more parents became employed or pursued education and training opportunities, there was a decrease in the pool of parents available to participate as volunteers in the Head Start classroom.

A second notable example of effective Head Start-JOBS coordination is the Head Start

MassJOBS Collaboration effort. Begun in 1991, the Massachusetts JOBS program agreed to set aside \$1 million in child care vouchers for Head Start agencies willing to provide child care services before and after Head Start hours to AFDC recipients engaged in MassJOBS employment or training activities. Eleven Head Start agencies originally expressed an interest in participating in this program. Three Head Start agencies subsequently withdrew from the project due primarily to lack of parent interest and late recruitment efforts.

As of the fall of 1992, there were 139 Head Start children enrolled in the Head Start MassJOBS collaboration effort. The majority of the MassJOBS participants were enrolled in an education component consisting of either a GED program or attendance at a local community college with their children enrolled in wraparound Head Start child care arrangements. The success of this collaboration effort has been attributed by program administrators to an assurance from the MassJOBS program that they would reimburse Head Start collaborative programs to the maximum extent allowable, and a focus on Head Start programs in communities where referrals to alternative child care arrangements were possible should parents end their participation in the MassJOBS program.

An alternative model for collaboration is to have a third agency act as a "go between" for JOBS and Head Start. One example of a community action agency coordinating Head Start and jobs training is the Drop-out Prevention Program in Detroit Michigan. Located in four middle schools in Wayne County, Michigan, Department of Social Service (DSS) workers are assigned to work with children on AFDC identified by the schools as at-risk for educational failure. The DSS

workers engage the children in activities, make home visits to work with the children's parents, refer both the children and their parents to other social service agencies, and provide consultation to the children's teachers and school counselors.

One aspect of the Drop-Out Prevention program is to case manage the needs of the entire family. Thus, case managers variously refer parents to education and job training programs, as well as younger siblings to the local Head Start program. This "third party" case management approach has the advantage of avoiding turf issues that may arise between the Head Start program and JOBS.

Making Coordination Work

Through an examination of the fits and starts of Head Start-JOBS collaboration efforts over the past several years, one can deduce a number of factors which seem to be predictive of successful coordination efforts. First, it appears critically important that adequate time be given to planning the collaboration effort. Although it may be tempting to move quickly to coordinate the two programs, such efforts seem destined to fail if not enough time is taken to identify the risks as well as benefits of collaboration. Time too must be afforded the staff of both programs to learn of the culture, mission, and standards for accountability of the other. This involves more than simply exchanging literature. At a minimum, joint meetings over a number of months appear necessary to ensure that each gains an appreciation of the other. Staff exchange programs may also be worthwhile.

Time too must be spent generating a shared vision of what effective collaboration can produce -- a vision which is shared not only by the upper levels of management, but by the frontline staff who, ultimately, will determine whether coordination occurs or does not occur. Time spent with each other can also overcome any preconceived notions or mistrust that the staffs may have for the other. Until such a shared sense of purpose, mutual respect, and trust is achieved, little effective collaboration will occur at the "street level."

Effective coordination also requires on-going and open communication between Head Start and JOBS staff even after the decision to collaborate is made. Joint monthly meetings appear to be a particularly successful way to achieve this goal. Such meetings can also serve as a feedback mechanism for airing complaints and troubleshoot solutions.

Whereas it seems to be a relatively simply matter to convince JOBS participants to enroll their children in Head Start, convincing Head Start parents to participate in JOBS is a much more difficult undertaking. Simply handing out fliers or one-shot presentations do not appear to be adequate to entice Head Start families into the JOBS program. Again, patience and time must be invested in a longer term strategy, with a plan for multiple presentations and discussions of the benefits of enrolling in the JOBS program by both Head Start and JOBS staff. Even after Head Start families indicate a desire to participate in the JOBS program, there is often a need for followup support and encouragement. For example, many parents may need help in negotiating the eligibility determination process, coaching in how to approach the interview process, or an advocate to broker solutions should a problem arise.

Although, like politics, all effective coordination is local, there are things the federal government can do to support these efforts. First, it is extremely difficult to get coordination going without additional funds. In reality, neither Head Start nor the JOBS program has adequate funds to serve all the families in need of their services. Thus, any funds diverted toward collaboration efforts will be seen by frontline staff to come at the expense of existing services. The federal government can help by supplying seed money for collaboration efforts.

One example of how seed money can be successful in encouraging collaboration efforts is the Head Start-Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) collaboration of the early 1990's. After deciding to encourage the development of Head Start classroom sites in federal housing projects, HUD transferred \$4.8 million in 1991 to the Head Start Bureau for initial renovation and development costs of turning HUD space into Head Start classrooms. The Head Start Bureau then held a national competition for these funds. Successful applicants were those who could demonstrate that there was a commitment by both the local housing authority and Head Start to work cooperatively. Twenty-two grants were eventually awarded ranging from \$67,000 to \$300,000 per grantee. This program was so successful, that an additional \$9.9 million was made available in 1992, resulting in forty-eight additional grants to Head Start programs and local housing authorities.

The federal government can also be helpful by ensuring that the requirements of these different funding streams are better synchronized. As indicated earlier, child care funding streams often have idiosyncratic rules and eligibility requirements. If the federal government wants Head Start

to access these funds for wraparound child care, it must demonstrate the leadership necessary to help overcome turf issues and make the funds easier to co-mingle.

State governments can also be helpful in this regard. For example, the state of North Carolina has allocated \$4.5 million of their CCDBG funds to Head Start grantees to provide wraparound child care services. These funds will allow Head Start programs to provide full year, full day Head Start and child care to approximately one-third of the Head Start families in North Carolina, and afford over 2,000 Head Start families in North Carolina increased access to employment, training and education opportunities. Similarly, the state of Virginia has set aside \$2.7 million of CCDBG funds for Head Start programs to be used for wraparound child care services and program enhancements. For other examples of effective state leadership the reader is referred to the chapters in this volume by Blum, Koser and Meservey, and Frawley and Stoney.

In addition to the provision of financial incentives and better synchronization of federal child care funding streams, there are bolder steps which the federal government can take to ensure effective collaboration of these two programs. First, the federal government could mandate, either through legislation or executive decree, that local Head Start programs must give preference to JOBS participants for enrollment in Head Start. Currently, enrollment decisions are left entirely to the discretion of the governing bodies of the local Head Start programs. Although such discretion is largely desirable, local priorities may conflict with the desire to have Head Start serve JOBS participants. In addition, local enrollment priorities can shift from year to year resulting in uncertainty as to whether or not JOBS administrators and participants can count on

Head Start services. A federal mandate to give preference to JOBS participants for enrollment in Head Start would provide greater stability and certainty in Head Start-JOBS coordination efforts.

Similarly, the federal government could require that local Head Start programs reserve a certain number slots throughout the school year for enrolling JOBS participants. As discussed earlier, coordination of these two programs is hampered by the fact that Head Start recruits perspective enrollers only in the spring and summer preceding the school year, whereas the JOBS program recruits participants continuously throughout the calendar year. By setting aside a certain number of Head Start slots for recruitment of JOBS participants throughout the year, more effective and continuous coordination could be achieved. If such a strategy were pursued, it would be important to exempt JOBS participant slots which remain unfilled from average daily attendance calculations to ensure that pressures for full attendance do not conflict with the flexibility required to ensure that slots remain available for year-long recruitment of JOBS participants.

Finally, the JOBS legislation could be changed to allow JOBS funds to be used to pay for Head Start slots and not just wraparound child care. Currently, maintenance of effort and nonsupplantation provisions prohibit the use of JOBS child care monies to pay for Head Start slots. This results in burdensome and often confusing financial accounting and cost allocation requirements that obstruct the ability of these two programs to serve the same child in a coordinated way. A change in legislation allowing JOBS monies to be used to pay for Head Start slots would afford program administrators greater flexibility in creating a truly seamless system of

child care and early childhood education for low-income children whose parents are participating in the JOBS program.

Remaining Questions

Over the past decade there has been a growing interest in providing services simultaneously to children and their parents in order to enhance social competency in children, promote family self-sufficiency, and reduce the incidence of intergenerational poverty.¹² A number of factors have provided the impetus for developing such two-generation integrated service delivery systems, including an increasing recognition of the intergenerational nature of poverty,¹³⁻¹⁴ an emerging consensus on the importance of the family as a mediator of a child's school and later life success, somewhat disappointing findings on the long term effects of Head Start and other early intervention programs,¹⁵⁻¹⁶ and an increasing number of multiproblem families.

Effective coordination between Head Start and JOBS ultimately means transforming both into true two-generation programs. As this transformation occurs, there will need to be a concurrent effort to redesign and implement adequately funded evaluation efforts. For example, most past studies of the effectiveness of Head Start have emphasized the assessment of the child's future school achievement. Within the context of two-generation programs, the assessment of gains in the parents' educational and vocational status becomes important as well. In addition, there is a critical need for information as to whether and how working with children and their parents together can help Head Start children maintain gains they made while in Head Start.

Research and evaluation studies are also direly needed to resolve a fundamental, but still unanswered, question: What is the effect on children when low-income parents, and especially single mothers, of three- and four-year-olds are required to work full-time outside the home? The research on this question is sketchy at best, and scholars, politicians, and public policy experts are divided on this issue. It is simply unknown what the effects will be of mandating training or work outside the home for mothers of young children.¹⁷ Coordination of Head Start and JOBS would provide an excellent opportunity to investigate this important issue.

As efforts to coordinate Head Start and JOBS proceed, it will also be important to find ways to continue to focus much effort on parenting education. Indeed, one of the implications of higher JOBS participation rates by Head Start families is that fewer parents will be available for traditional Head Start parent involvement activities, such as volunteering in the classroom or attending parenting skills classes. It would be tragic if in an effort to enroll more AFDC parents in education, training and job opportunities, one loses the chance also to enhance their childrearing skills. This issue is especially critical if the Clinton Administration is successful in its stated intention to require all welfare recipients to work after a specified period of time on welfare.

It is unclear to what extent the Clinton Administration will continue to emphasize efforts to coordinate Head Start with the JOBS program. For example, it is not yet known whether the Clinton Administration will emphasize enrolling more three- and four-year-olds, or whether they will choose to expand downward and serve a greater percentage of the zero to three-year-old

population. Thus far, the Clinton Administration has stated that they intend to do both; enroll all three- and four-year-olds **and** expand downward into the 0-3 population. The truth is that even assuming the Clinton Administration can get Congress to appropriate the full \$8 billion it is seeking over the next five years in increased funding for Head Start, there will not be enough money to serve all eligible three- and four-year-olds and expand downward into the 0-3 population. This is especially so if the Clinton administration also intends, as spokespersons for the administration have stated, to increase staff salaries, build new facilities, and implement full-day, full-year services. Choices will have to be made, and at this time it is unclear what those choices will ultimately be. If the choice is to encourage the enrollment of younger children at the expense of three- and four-year-olds, fewer Head Start parents would be likely to be enrolled concurrently in the JOBS program than would be the case if priority is given to first enrolling all three- and four-year-olds. The smaller the percentage of families simultaneously enrolled in both programs, the less pressure may exist to coordinate the two.

Regardless of the outcome of these important debates and policy decisions, one thing is clear: given the overlap in mission and target population of Head Start and JOBS, efficient management of scarce resources demands that these two programs be better coordinated. Effective coordination of these two programs may have the added benefit of enhancing Head Start's anti-poverty mission as well.

Table One
 Number of AFDC Children Potentially in Head Start
 if States Meet JOBS Participation Requirements

-- Year	Partic. Standard	As % of AFDC Caseload	Projected # of Kids on AFDC	# of Kids Ages 3 & 4	Number in Head Start
1992	11%	5.5	8,694,000	1,304,000	71,720
1993	11%	5.5	8,782,000	1,317,000	72,435
1994	15%	7.5	8,815,000	1,322,000	99,150
1995	20%	10.0	8,844,000	1,327,000	132,700

--
 Source: House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means. 1991 Green Book. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991, p. 620.

Notes: Estimate of number of children aged 3 or 4 on AFDC is based on the assumption that the percentage remains at the 1992 level of 15%.¹⁸

1. Edward Zigler, "Project Head Start: Success or Failure?" in Edward Zigler and Jeanette Valentine, eds., Project Head Start: A Legacy of the War on Poverty (New York: Free Press, 1979), pp. 495-507.
2. National Head Start Association, Head Start: The Nation's Pride, A Nation's Challenge (Alexandria, VA: National Head Start Association, 1990).
3. Ruth Hubbel McKey, Larry Condelli, Harriet Gasmon, Barbara J. Barrett, Catherine McConkey, and Margaret C. Plantz. The Impact of Head Start on Children, Families and Communities: Final Report of the Head Start Evaluation, Synthesis and Utilization Project (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1985).
4. Ron Haskins, "Beyond Metaphor: The Efficacy of Early Childhood Education," American Psychologist, vol. 44, no. 2 (February, 1989), pp. 274-282.
5. Head Start Bureau, 1991-92 Program Information Report. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1993).
6. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means. 1991 Green Book. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991), p. 620.
7. Tamara Henry, "Head Start Officials Skeptical of Expanded Role," St. Louis Post-Dispatch (June 28, 1992).

8. Ibid.
9. Victor R. Fuchs, and Mary Coleman, "Small Children, Small Pay: Why Child Care Pays so Little," The American Prospect (Winter, 1991), pp. 74-80.
10. Douglas Besharov, "Fresh Start: What Works in Head Start?" The New Republic (June 14, 1993), pp. 14-16.
11. Sheila Smith, Susan Blank, and Ray Collins, Pathways to Self-Sufficiency for Two Generations: Designing Welfare-to-Work Programs that Strengthen Families and Benefit Children (New York: Foundation for Child Development, 1992).
12. Ibid.
13. Nicholas Zill, Kristin A. Moore, Ellen Wolpow-Smith, Thomas M. Stief, and Mary Jo Coiro, The Life Circumstances and Development of Children in Welfare Families: A Profile Based on National Survey Data (Washington, D.C.: Child Trends, 1991).
14. Children's Defense Fund, "Child Poverty Worsens in 1990," CDF Reports, vol. 13, no. 2 (1991).
15. Karl R. White, "Efficacy of Early Intervention," Journal of Special Education, vol. 41 (1985-1986), pp. 401-416.

16. Lois Datta, "Another Spring and Other Hopes: Some Findings from National Evaluations of Project Head Start," in Edward Zigler and Jeanette Valentine, eds., Project Head Start: A Legacy of the War on Poverty (New York: Free Press, 1979), pp. 405-432.

17. Olivia Golden, Poor Children and Welfare Reform (New York: Foundation for Child Development, 1991).

18. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, 1991 Green Book. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991), p. 620.