

State-Level Accessibility of Head Start Data Across the United States

Jing Tang, Kara Ulmen, Sara Amadon, Katie Richards, Gabriella Guerra, Ja'Chelle Ball, Carlise King, and Dale Richards

*This research was funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The findings and conclusions within are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.





January 2024

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
ntroduction	4
Access to Child-, Program-, Workforce-, and System-Level Data	8
How Head Start Collaboration Offices Use Data	15
Data Infrastructure and Linking	18
Discussion	21
Limitations	23
Future Directions and Conclusions	24
Appendix A: PIR-Related Data Elements Removed from Survey	26
Appendix B: Survey Contacts	27
Appendix C: Accessibility of Child- and Workforce-Level Data by State	28
Appendix D: Accessibility of Disaggregated Data by State	31
Appendix E: Ability to Link Head Start Data with Other Datasets	33

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all the state Head Start administrators who completed the survey for their time and insights. We would like to give special thanks to Vanessa Jones (Head Start State Collaboration Specialist with Maryland State Department of Education) for helping pilot the survey tool and providing valuable feedback.

Suggested Citation

Tang, J., Ulmen, K., Amadon, S., Richards, K., Guerra, G., Ball, J., King, C., Richards, D. (2023). *State-Level Accessibility of Head Start Data Across the United States*. doi: 10.56417/1673d1859j

Executive Summary

The preschool landscape is complex, consisting of several publicly funded programs supported by federal, state, and local funds. Included in this landscape is Head Start, a critical early childhood education (ECE) program that serves—in every state and territory—young children in families with incomes at or below the federal poverty line, families experiencing homelessness, families receiving assistance like Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or Supplemental Security Income (SSI), families of children with disabilities, and children who are in the foster care system. Head Start also provides tailored services for children from Tribal communities and to families of migrant and seasonal farmworkers.¹ Comprehensive data on Head Start programs are available nationally but can be challenging to integrate with other preschool and K-12 data, in part because the data typically flow from local Head Start grantees up to the federal Office of Head Start (OHS), bypassing the state. However, without the inclusion of Head Start data, researchers, policymakers, and preschool administrators are unable to answer key questions about the experiences of those being served or understand which children and families are served in states with Head Start and state pre-kindergarten (pre-K).

To better understand the ways Head Start data are being accessed,^a analyzed, and used with other preschool data at the state level, the Early Childhood Data Collaborative (ECDC) at Child Trends conducted a survey of Head Start State Collaboration Offices (HSCOs). HSCOs play a role coordinating Head Start systems at the state level with other early childhood programs, and they are well positioned to understand the data collection efforts within a state. The primary goal of the survey was to better understand the types of Head Start data that HSCOs can access and how these data are used, disaggregated, and linked with other early childhood and K-12 data; in addition, the survey aimed to understand data-related supports and infrastructure. The survey was administered alongside the nationwide <u>State-funded Pre-K Data Survey</u>, both of which were used to inform the <u>System Transformation for Equitable Preschools (STEP Forward with Data) Framework</u>—a tool designed to help state leaders answer essential questions about their preschool systems, assess data gaps, establish data collection practices that address equity, and identify action steps for using data to create more equitable preschool systems.

^a In the survey, accessible data was defined as data collected by a state agency that is accessible for use within the state agency or by request.

Key Findings

Responses from the 32 HSCOs, representing 32 states, reveal strong data-related capabilities and areas for growth.

HSCOs reported greater access to program- and system-level data than to child- and workforce-level data.

- Most HSCOs had access to program-level data beyond what is collected in the <u>Program Information Report</u>. The most frequently reported data element that HSCOs had access to was programs' participation in quality initiatives (e.g., accreditation or QRIS, [n = 22]). Program-level data elements that HSCOs were less likely to have access to included professional development provided to staff (n = 14), classroom observations of instructional practice (n = 12), participation in cultural competency or multicultural trainings for staff at that site (n = 10), and provision of services in specific languages or languages other than English (n = 9).
- Over two thirds of respondents could report on system-level data. Among them, most respondents had the ability to report on the number of Head Start slots in each program (n = 22), sources of funding (n = 17), and the demographic characteristics of communities where Head Start programs are located (n = 15). System-level data elements that HSCOs were less likely to have the ability to report on were staff benefits (e.g., staff health care policies, paid vacation policies, and retirement benefit policies, [n = 5]) and funding to support equity-focused activities (n=5).
- Almost one third of HSCOs indicated access to child-level data elements at the state level. Among them, HSCOs' most frequently accessible data elements were children's demographics (i.e., age [n = 10], gender [n = 10], disability status [n = 10], ethnicity and race [n = 9]), and name and address of site where child is enrolled (n = 9). Data elements less likely to be accessible by respondents were attendance of child (n = 6), family migrant status (i.e., whether the family moves to follow seasonal work, [n = 6]), family reason for attending the program (n = 6), and family reason for exiting program (n = 6).
- One half of HSCOs had access to workforce-level data elements. Among them, the most frequently reported data elements they could access included information about workforce members' roles (n = 16), work sites (n = 15), credentials received (n = 15), and the demographic characteristics of workforce members (i.e., ethnicity [n = 15], race [n = 15], language(s) spoken [n = 15], and age [n = 10]). Data elements that were less accessible to HSCOs included presence of a professional development plan for the workforce member (n = 6), whether the workforce member has health insurance (n = 6), and enrollment in financial assistance programs (n = 5).

The capacity to disaggregate data by child, family, and community characteristics varied across respondents.

- Almost half of HSCOs were able to disaggregate data by child and family characteristics. Respondents reported that data could be disaggregated by some child and family characteristics including child race/ethnicity (n = 11), child disability status (n = 9), and family languages spoken (n = 8).
- In addition, almost half of HSCOs were able to disaggregate data by community demographic characteristics. Commonly reported community characteristics included community race/ethnicity (n = 11), community rates of child disability status (n = 11), and median family income in the community (n = 11).

Most states reported using data to inform policymakers, but few could link Head Start data with other preschool and K-12 programs.

- Over half of respondents reported that Head Start data are stored across several databases within the same or multiple agencies at the state level (n = 18). Some respondents also reported that their agency is in the process of creating a centralized database (n = 10) or has data currently stored in a centralized database (n = 6).
- Few respondents were able to link Head Start data with preschool or K-12 data (n = 8 and 3, respectively). Among respondents that could link Head Start with K-12 data, respondents could link, on average, 19 of the 31 data elements asked about in the survey.
- Despite limited capacities to link data, respondents frequently reported using Head Start data to inform policymakers (n = 20), respond to external data requests (n = 18), and conduct needs assessments (n = 17). Users of Head Start data included agency leadership (n = 25), agency program staff (n = 18), and policy and advocacy organizations (n = 16).
- Several states indicated that information or training provided by the OHS (n = 13) and having unique identifiers (n = 11) were supports they have in place that help in accessing, analyzing, or using Head Start data. However, respondents frequently cited barriers to using Head Start data such as challenges with data sharing (n = 18) or limited access to data and lack of data systems or infrastructure (n = 18).
- HSCO respondents reported data quality concerns at the child, program, and workforce levels. Over half of respondents who had access to child- and programlevel data indicated having concerns about the quality of data for at least one element at each level (n = 7 and 12, respectively). Over three quarters of respondents who had access to workforce-level data reported concerns about the quality of data for at least one element one data element (n = 13).

Introduction

Head Start is a comprehensive program in the United States that was launched in 1965 and designed to help young children from low income families prepare to succeed in school by promoting children's development through early learning, health, and family well-being (see Box 1).² Head Start programs^b support children's growth through a range of services, including child care and early education, health and nutrition assistance, and other family supports. As of 2021, Head Start has served more than 38 million children and their families. In this report, we specifically focus on Head Start programs that provide early care and education (ECE) services to 3- and 4-year-olds and their families.

Head Start programs are a critical component of the preschool system that serves children ages 3 to 5 (see Box 2). Evidence has consistently highlighted the positive effects of Head Start services on children's physical health, academic achievement, and emotional development.^{3,4,5} However, as with other preschool programs, there are some aspects of Head Start programs where improvements can be made to promote equity in terms of access, funding, quality, and program components.⁶ For example, while a higher percentage of Black children in poverty enrolled in Head Start compared to children of other races, it has been noted that Black children enrolled in Head Start were more likely to enroll in programs with lower observed quality.⁷ Also, Head Start funding per child tended to be lower in states with higher enrollments of Black children in Head Start, states with a higher percentage of Black

Box 1. Head Start

The Office of Head Start (OHS). within the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), administers federal funds and oversight to the 1,600 agencies that provide Head Start programs in communities across the country and in Tribes and territories. The federal funds are awarded directly to public agencies, private nonprofit and forprofit organizations, Tribal governments, and school systems to operate Head Start programs in local communities. States and communities can also use state- and local-level funding to support Head Start services.

Box 2. Preschool definition

The preschool landscape is inclusive of locally, state-, and federally funded preschool programs for 3- and 4-year-olds including Head Start. The term "pre-K" in this report is used to specifically refers to state-funded pre-kindergarten.

children in the overall population, and states with a higher percentage of Black teachers.⁸ A comprehensive understanding—via high quality data—of Head Start students, educators, and programs can help identify and remedy disparities in access or quality, among other factors.

^b Head Start consists of multiple components: Head Start, Early Head Start, Migrant and Seasonal Head Start, and American Indian and Alaska Native (AIAN) Head Start programs. Head Start primarily serves children ages 3 to 5 in families with low incomes while Early Head Start, established in 1994, primarily serves children from birth to age 3 in families with low incomes, as well as pregnant people. Migrant and Seasonal Head Start programs serve children ages birth to 5 from families engaged in agricultural work, either seasonally or across geographic regions. AIAN Head Start programs serve children from federally recognized Tribes and others in their communities.

Building a more equitable preschool system requires a strong data infrastructure.

Establishing robust data collection and analysis systems can support data-informed decision making and evidence-based improvement strategies. These strategies can be used to identify areas where disparities remain and make equitable improvements in access, quality, and outcomes for children and families by focusing on the populations of greatest need.⁹ For example, individual-level child and family data could help identify and understand the needs of children and families who may be underrepresented in Head Start programs despite their eligibility. As another example, while nationally 13 percent of children in Head Start had an Individualized Education Plan or Individualized Family Service Plan, this percentage varied greatly across the states; Wyoming had the highest at 31 percent, while nine states and three territories had less than 10 percent.¹⁰

Head Start is a core component of every state preschool landscape, especially in states that do not offer enough (or any) state-funded pre-K services. As early childhood investments have expanded, obtaining a full understanding of states' access to preschool data from Head Start, state pre-K, and other state-funded programs is imperative. States' ability to access and analyze Head Start data is a part of developing a comprehensive and robust data infrastructure that facilitates data linkages across various preschool programs. Through these efforts, states can foster a more equitable preschool landscape that can enhance access to high-quality programs, improve program quality, and build a more effective ECE workforce.

Required data collection and reporting for Head Start.

The federal Office of Head Start (OHS) Program Information Report (PIR) provides comprehensive data on the services, staff, children, and families served by Head Start programs nationwide every year, collected from Head Start grant recipients and delegates that offer Head Start services^{c,11} Although states have access to the PIR, ^d PIR data are not sufficient for states to understand the full picture of Head Start. Head Start programs report aggregated program data at the grantee-level directly to OHS in the PIR (e.g., total number of enrolled children with disabilities); yet states can benefit from access to non-aggregate data at the child-, program-, and workforce- level to answer key questions about these groups. Furthermore, while the Head Start Program Performance Standards (HSPPS) encourage data sharing, there is no requirement for local Head Start programs to link or share their data with other state data systems. Without linking or sharing data across systems, states lack a comprehensive understanding of their preschool systems.^e The

^c Head Start programs also would have knowledge of how accessible Head Start data is at the state level. Head Start grantees are required to collect specific data and report it via the PIR to the federal OHS; individual programs also may collect more information.

^d Head Start Program Information Report data are available to the public on request.

^e Previous research has revealed that a handful of states, such as Pennsylvania and Georgia, have taken steps to link Head Start child-level data with state-level data systems. <u>https://cms.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/ecdc-head-start-brief.pdf</u>

accessibility of Head Start data across state systems remains unclear, as does the potential for linking Head Start data with other preschool-related data sources.

To better understand the ways that states are accessing, analyzing, and using Head Start data, the Early Childhood Data Collaborative at Child Trends fielded the Head Start Data Survey in 2023 to survey Head Start State Collaboration Offices (HSCOs, see Box 3)^f.

About the Head Start Data Survey

Box 3. Head Start Collaboration Offices

Head Start Collaboration Offices facilitate partnerships between Head Start agencies and other state, territorial, or Tribal entities that provide services to benefit children and families with low incomes. These offices contribute to state systems for early care and education, which coordinate and regulate various services for children from birth to age 5 and their families. Local HSCOs collaborate with agencies across the 50 states, DC, Puerto Rico, American Indian Alaska Native (AIAN) Head Start, and Migrant and Seasonal Head Start.

The goal of the Head Start Data Survey was to comprehend HSCOs' understanding of the state-level access to Head Start data and understand the quality, consistency, and availability of data as well as the ability to link Head Start data with other data. We focus on HSCOs because, as the state agency responsible for coordinating across Head Start programs and other state entities, they would have knowledge of how accessible Head Start data is at the state level. HSCOs themselves do not store or access data. However, their role in coordinating Head Start services within the state preschool system positions them to understand what data may be accessible at the state level.

Head Start programs are required to report program-level data, aggregated data about children, families, and the workforce in the publicly available PIR and state agencies can access these data.¹² Therefore, the survey asked about program-level data elements that are not reported in the PIR. There are instances when the survey asked about similar data elements that are in the PIR, but the survey asked about HSCOs' access to *non-aggregated* data, such as data at the child or educator level rather than at the program level. (To view a list of data elements that were not asked in the survey because they are in the PIR, please see <u>Appendix A.</u>)

The survey was sent to HSCO administrators in 50 states and the District of Columbia and fielded from January to March 2023.⁹ Survey links were sent via email, and contacts were encouraged to collaborate with their colleagues to adequately answer questions. The survey also suggested that other staff may be more appropriate to complete or assist with the survey and that the survey recipient could forward the survey to others as needed. A few state HSCO administrators forwarded to staff members to assist in completing the survey. Therefore, in some instances, the respondent may have been someone other than the HSCO director. Even so, we presume that the HSCO was involved in survey completion in some capacity because they all received the original survey link. Thirty-two HSCOs responded,

^f Child Trends also fielded a nationwide State-funded Pre-K Data Survey to learn more about states' pre-K data capacity to inform these efforts. For more detailed findings of the State-funded Pre-K Data Survey, please refer to <u>The Data Capacity of State-Funded Pre-K Programs Across the United States</u> report.

⁹ A Tribal Head Start survey was sent out to 22 administrators and 3 partially or fully completed the survey, which are not included in this analysis. To gain further insights into Tribal Head Start data infrastructures, the research team intended on interviewing Tribal Head Start representatives; however, the team was unable to make further contact beyond the National Indian Head Start Directors Association (NIHSDA). In general, Tribal Head Start data infrastructures vary in their capacities and some Tribes may opt to connect Tribal Head Start data with state pre-K data, while others may not.

representing 32 different states (see <u>Appendix B</u> for a full list of contacts). Because not all respondents completed the survey, survey results do not reflect the experience of all HSCOs nationally. Respondents also had an opportunity to review responses and provide clarity or corrections on answers.

We conducted descriptive analyses, primarily generating frequencies, and described findings from survey respondents. State-by-state data are provided in <u>Appendices C-E</u>. Survey findings are organized by the following categories addressed within the survey:

Access to data at the child, program, workforce, and system levels. HSCOs were asked whether they have access to data elements for analysis and use at the child level (e.g., gender, race, or date of birth), program level (e.g., participation in quality initiatives, professional development provided to staff, or

Box 4. Access to data definition

Accessible data was defined as data collected by Head Start grantees which are accessible for use within the HSCO or by request.

classroom observations of instructional practice), and the workforce level (e.g., gender, race, languages spoken of workforce member). See Box 4 for a definition of access.^h It is possible that certain data elements might have been collected by states but not accessible to the HSCO. HSCOs were also asked about data elements they were able to report on at the Head Start system level. System-level data were referred to as items related to the administration, funding, and management of the Head Start program. See <u>Appendix C</u> for additional details about states' access to data on children and the workforce.

- How states use data. HSCOs were asked about the various ways they use data collected to inform decision making, such as administrative and programmatic practice and policy. They were also asked about their ability to disaggregate data to understand subgroup differences in outcomes and experiences.
- Data infrastructure, linkages, and supports. HSCOs were asked about the management and coordination of Head Start data, including where data are housed; ability to share data and link data with other preschool and K-12 databases; and supports and barriers to access, analyze, use, and link data.

^h The options included "Yes", "No", "Not yet, in the planning process", "I don't know", or "Other". Respondents who reported having access to data were then asked to indicate the levels of accessibility for specific data elements, categorized as follows: (1) accessible, (2) collected but not accessible, (3) data are not collected, (4) in the planning process to collect, (5) unknown.

Access to Child-, Program-, Workforce-, and System-Level Data

Key findings

- HSCO respondents reported having access to more program-level and system-level data, compared to individual child- or workforce-level data.
- HSCO respondents were more likely to have access to data about lead teachers and assistants compared to directors and family child care providers.
- Concerns around the quality of data were persistent across all types of data collected, with workforce data being the most frequently reported issue.

Child-level

Child-level data refer to any information specific to individual children enrolled in Head Start programs, like age or gender. Analyzing child-level data helps states understand who their programs are serving and what their needs may be. While aggregated child-level information is provided in the PIR, having access to individual child-level data can allow states to answer more questions, such as what the most prominent races/ethnicities of dual-language learners are.

Among the 32 respondents, less than half could access child-level data (n = 13). Respondents were asked to specify which of 31 data elements they could access. On average and among respondents who could access child-level data, respondents indicated they could access 18 of the 31 data elements asked about in the survey.

Among the 13 respondents who could access child-level data, the child-level data elements most likely to be accessible were age (n = 10), disability status (n = 10), gender (n = 10), ethnicity and race (both n = 9), and name and address of site where child is enrolled (n = 9). Most data elements asked about were accessible to over half of the 13 survey respondents. Table 1 has a full list of child-level data elements accessible to over half of the respondents.

Among the 13 respondents with child-level data access, the data elements least likely to be accessible by respondents were attendance of child (n = 6), family migrant status (i.e., whether the family moves to follow seasonal work) (n = 6), family reason for attending the program (n = 6), and family reason for exiting program (n = 6).

Table 1. Child-level data elements reported to be accessible by 50% or more of respondents (n = 13)

Data Element	Number of Respondents
Gender of child	10
Age or date of birth of child	10
Disability status of child	10
Name and address of site where child is enrolled	9
Race of child	9
Ethnicity of child	9
Full or part time status of child	8

Data Element	Number of Respondents
Child assessment scores/results for child (formative and summative)	8
Child's teacher	8
Child's class	8
Multilanguage learner status of the child	8
Foster care status of the child	8
Family active military status	8
Family housing status	8
Family eligibility for state assistance programs, e.g., TANF or SNAP eligibility	8
Country of birth	7
Family address	7
Whether child is meeting developmental milestones	7
Disciplinary actions (such as expulsions or suspensions)	7
Child's assistant teacher	7
School child attends in kindergarten	7
Home language(s) of child	7
Parent education level	7
Family income	7
Referrals to other services (e.g., health or mental health services, food support)	7
Child eligibility status for Head Start enrollment	7
Child assessments conducted with child (formative and summative)	7

Source: Child Trends' Head Start Data Survey

Program-level

As discussed, Head Start programs report program-level data via the <u>PIR</u>. We asked about five additional program-level data elements that HSCOs may have access to within the state. Program-level data asked about include program quality, professional development of staff in the program, and the language of services offered within the program.

Among the 32 respondents, three quarters (n = 24) could access at least one of the five program-level data elements asked about in this survey. The average number of data elements accessible was two. Importantly, these two program-level elements are above and beyond the dozens of PIR data elements. The only data element accessible to more than half of respondents was a program's participation in quality initiatives (n = 22). A full list of program-level data elements can be found in Table 2.

Data Element	Number of Respondents
Participation in quality initiatives	22
Professional development provided to staff	14
Classroom observations of instructional practice	12
Participation in cultural competency or multicultural trainings for staff at that site	10
Provision of services in specific languages or languages other than English	9

Table 2. Program-level data elements accessible by respondents (n = 32)

Source: Child Trends' Head Start Data Survey

Workforce-level

Workforce-level data refer to information on members of the workforce, like educators' level of education, credentials, and languages spoken. Workforce-level data can include information about staff members who work directly with children in Head Start, like teachers, aides, directors, and family child care providers. Workers bring unique characteristics to the classroom through their lived and professional experiences that enable them to better support children and families. Having a detailed description of early childhood educators can help states better support their workforce.

Among the 32 respondents, just over half reported having access to workforce-level data (n = 17). On average, these respondents can access 10 out of 17 workforce-level data elements. See Table 3. Data elements most commonly accessible by respondents included staff position or role (n = 16), ethnicity (n = 15), highest level of education (n = 15), languages spoken (n = 15), and race (n = 15). Data elements least likely to be accessible by HSCOs include country of origin (n = 7), salary (n = 7), presence of a professional development plan (n = 6), if the workforce member has health insurance (n = 6), and enrollment in financial assistance programs (n = 5).

Table 3. Workforce-level data elements reported to be accessible by 50% or more of respondents (n = 17)

Data Element	Number of Respondents
Workforce member position or role (for example, assistant or lead teacher)	16
Ethnicity of workforce members	15
Highest level of education of workforce member	15
Language(s) spoken by workforce members	15
Race of workforce members	15
Credentials and/or certifications received by the workforce member	12
Site where workforce member is a staff member	12
Gender of workforce members	11
Age of workforce members	10
Years of experience working with young children	9

Source: Child Trends' Head Start Data Survey

Among the 17 respondents who had access to workforce-level data, almost all respondents had data on teachers/lead teachers (n = 16) and aides/assistant teachers (n = 15). Fewer collected data on directors (n = 11) and family child care providers (FCCs; n = 8). Table 4 depicts the availability of workforce-level data by role.

 Table 4. Workforce-member roles data are collected on by respondents (n = 17)

Workforce Role	Number of Respondents
Teachers/lead teachers	16
Aides and assistants	15
Directors*	11
Family child care providers**	8
Another position***	7

Source: Child Trends' Head Start Data Survey

* The survey did not distinguish director as Program Director or Site Leader.

** All respondents with access to workforce-level data were asked if they collect data on FCCs, even though not all Head Start programs have FCCs.

*** Additional roles included positions such as cooks, home visitors, and family service workers.

System-level

Respondents were asked about their ability to report on 13 system-level data elements.ⁱ These data elements included items related to the administration funding and management of the Head Start programs as well as states' ability to report on demographic characteristics of families and communities involved in Head Start program engagement activities.

Among the 32 respondents, the majority (n = 22) could report on at least one system-level data element. On average, respondents could access 5 out of 13 system-level data elements. The most common data elements that can be reported on by states were the number of Head

¹ Response options included "Yes, my agency can report on this," "No, we cannot report on these, but these data are collected," "No, data are not collected," "In the planning process," or "I don't know."

Start slots in each programⁱ (n = 22) and the source of funding (n = 17). Table 5 displays the 13 data elements reported by states.

Data Element	Number of Respondents
Number of Head Start slots in each program	22
Source(s) of funding	17
Demographic characteristics of communities where Head Start programs are located (racial/ethnic composition, income, etc.)	15
Waitlists for Head Start in each community	8
Head Start enrollment procedures	8
Methods of communicating program health and safety information with families	8
Family involvement in program leadership and administrative decision making (e.g., family satisfaction surveys, Parent Policy Councils)	6
Feedback from families on how this Head Start program can best meet their needs	6
Funding to support equity-focused activities (e.g., cultural sensitivity trainings, increasing the diversity of the workforce, etc.)	5
Staff health care policies	5
Staff paid vacation policies	5
Staff sick leave policies	5
Staff retirement benefits policies	5

 Table 5. System-level data elements reportable by states (n = 32)

Source: Child Trends' Head Start Data Survey

Among the 32 survey respondents:

- Almost half the respondents could report on community demographic characteristics (n = 15). Of the 15 respondents who reported the capacity to report on demographic characteristics of communities where Head Start programs are located, most monitored community race or ethnicity (n = 11), community rates of child disability status (n = 11), and median family income in the community (n = 11). Over half reported the capacity to report on languages spoken by members of the community (n = 9) and community rates of migrant status (n = 7). Fewer had the capacity to report on Tribal affiliation within the community (n = 6). See Figure 1.
- Less than one quarter of respondents were able to report on family engagement activities and feedback about families' needs (n = 6). Among the six respondents who were able to report on family involvement in program leadership and administrative decision making, all six reported collecting characteristics on families engaged in program leadership and administrative decision making, including child disability status, child race and ethnicity, family income, and family languages spoken. No respondents reported collecting information on child's birth country or family Tribal affiliation of families engaged in program leadership. The six respondents who were able to report on feedback from families were further asked what approach their state agency uses to collect family feedback; frequently reported methods included

^j This data element is available in the PIR.

through surveys with parents and families (n = 4), needs assessments (n = 3), and families participating in program decision making bodies (n = 3).

• Few respondents were able to report on staff benefit policies and equity-focused activities. Only five respondents were able to report on staff health care policies, staff paid vacation policies, staff sick leave policies, or staff retirement benefits policies. Similarly, only 5 respondents reported the capacity to report on funding to support equity-focused activities (e.g., cultural sensitivity trainings, increasing the diversity of the workforce, etc.).

states Community race/ethnicity Community rates of child disability status Median family income in the community Languages spoken by members of the community Community rates of migrant 7 status Tribal affiliation within the 6 community Δ I don't know Other 2 None of the above 0

Figure 1. Community demographic information collected by survey respondents (n =15)

Source: Child Trends' Head Start Data Survey

Data quality concerns

Examples of data quality issues include data entry errors, missing data, and data integration issues, which can all be significant barriers to using data in a meaningful way. To identify the extent of data elements with data quality concerns, survey respondents were asked to indicate if there were any data accuracy or quality limitations for the data elements they had access to by using response options "Yes", "No", or "I don't know."^k While survey respondents reported having access to various types of data elements, most reported some data quality concerns about one or more data elements.¹

Among the 13 survey respondents who had access to child-level data, over half (n = 7) reported having concerns about the quality of data for at least one data element. On average, respondents reported quality concerns for 11 out of 31 child-level data elements. The five child-level data elements that were reported for data quality concerns by most respondents included assessment scores/results for child (formative and summative [n = 6]), referrals to other services (e.g., health or mental health services, food support [n = 5]), who was child's assistant teacher (n = 5), and school child attends in kindergarten (n = 5).

^k Survey respondents were not given additional guidance on what could be considered data accuracy or quality caveats.

¹ Survey respondents were asked about data quality concerns for each element they had access to; therefore, the denominator changes at each data level and for each data element.

Half of the 24 survey respondents who had access to program-level data reported concerns about the quality of some program-level data (n = 12). On average, respondents reported quality concerns for 1 out of 5 program-level data elements: participation in quality initiatives (e.g., accreditation status or QRIS [n = 8]), professional development provided to staff (n = 8), participation in cultural competency or multicultural trainings for staff at that site (n = 4), provision of services in specific languages or languages other than English (n = 4), and classroom observations of instructional practice (n = 3).

Of the 17 respondents who had access to workforce-level data, over three quarters (n = 13) reported concerns about the quality of some workforce-level data. On average, respondents reported quality concerns for 7 out of 17 workforce-level data elements. Most respondents reported these five workforce-level data elements for data quality concerns: ethnicity of workforce members (n = 11), language(s) spoken by workforce members (n = 11), race of workforce members (n = 11), workforce member position or role (e.g., assistant or lead teacher [n = 10]), and credentials and/or certifications (n = 10).

How Head Start Collaboration Offices Use Data

Key findings

- State HSCOs most frequently cited using data to inform policymakers, respond to external data requests, and conduct needs assessments.
- The most common data users were from state agencies that house HSCOs.
- Most HSCOs reported having the ability to disaggregate data by child race, child disability status, and languages spoken.

HSCOs work to facilitate partnerships between Head Start agencies and other entities that provide services for children and families.¹³ Among their priorities is to work with other state entities to collect data on early childhood programs and outcomes.¹⁴ HSCOs and affiliated state agencies or offices use data to understand Head Start in their states, among other priorities, and to situate Head Start with other state ECE and pre-K programming. Data also can be used to ensure that all groups of children have equitable access and experiences in Head Start. Respondents were asked about the uses of data within their agency or office.

Among the 32 respondents, most of them indicated that they used data to inform policymakers^m (n = 20), respond to external data requests (n = 18), and conduct needs assessments (n = 17; see Figure 2 for additional details). Fewer states reported using data to conduct research studies (n = 6), answer key policy questions to inform Head Start policy about supply needs (n = 8), or understand similarities and differences in how different groups of children and families experience Head Start (n = 8).

Figure 2. Most frequently reported ways respondents' agencies use Head Start data (n = 32)



^m The survey did not define "policymaker", so it was up to the discretion of the respondent to define. Policymaker could be inclusive of those at the state or federal levels. Respondents indicated that data users were concentrated in the state agencies affiliated with HSCOs when asked about who uses Head Start data. Respondents indicated that agency leadership (n = 25), agency program staff (n = 18), and policy and advocacy organizations (n = 16) were the most common data users (see Figure 3). External researchers (n = 12) and the state legislature (n = 10) were less apt to use Head Start data.ⁿ



Figure 3. Who uses Head Start data (n = 27)

Source: Child Trends' Head Start Data Survey

Respondents were also asked about their ability to disaggregate data by child and family characteristics. Disaggregating child-level data can aid HSCOs and affiliate state agencies in identifying where disparities or inequities in Head Start may exist to target key populations of need.

Among the 32 respondents, almost half of them (n = 15)° indicated that data could be disaggregated by child or family characteristics (see Figure 4). Commonly reported child or family characteristics that data could be disaggregated by included child race/ethnicity (n = 11), child disability status (n = 9), and child languages spoken (n = 8). Notably, about one third of respondents (n = 10) indicated that data could not be disaggregated by child or family characteristics. For a full list of accessibility of disaggregate data by state, see <u>Appendix D</u>.

 ⁿ Importantly, because the PIR is available upon request, other data users can access and use program-level data. Thus, unlike state pre-K data, aggregate level Head Start data can be accessed via a public and centralized data source. HSCOs may have access to other data elements, in addition to the PIR, as discussed.
 ^o Four respondents who did not indicate if they could disaggregate their data were excluded from this denominator.



Figure 4. How Head Start data can be disaggregated (n = 32)

Source: Child Trends' Head Start Data Survey

Data Infrastructure and Linking

Key findings

- State HSCOs most frequently reported storing data across several databases or systems.
- Few respondents have the capacity to link Head Start data with K-12 data or with other preschool programs.
- Over two thirds of HSCOs reported having at least one support in place to facilitate accessing, analyzing, or using Head Start data. Most identified data sharing agreements.
- Over half of HSCOs reported barriers to accessing, analyzing, or using Head Start data due to challenges with data sharing or limited access to data and a lack of data systems or infrastructure.

Data infrastructure refers to the components necessary to access, collect, store, and link data in an efficient manner. Components include structures such as data storage and management software, unique identifiers, data linkages and coordination policies, and staff expertise and capacity. While questions about a single program, such as the number of Head Start teachers, could be answered through a single data source, answering questions about all preschool teachers (inclusive of pre-K and Head Start, for example) would require the capacity to access and link multiple sources of data. Due to the fragmented nature of preschool data,^{15,16} specific data infrastructure supports are often needed to facilitate accessing and linking Head Start data with other data sources. Without a strong infrastructure in place, an organization's ability to analyze and use data in meaningful ways is limited.

Data storage

Head Start grantees are responsible for collecting and reporting data to OHS. For this reason, Head Start data are typically stored at the grantee level.^p However, survey respondents were asked to identify the ways in which Head Start data are housed at the state level, if at all. Respondents were allowed to select all applicable options and provide further detail as needed.

The most frequently reported method of storing data was across several databases or systems (n = 18, see Table 6).^a Ten respondents reported that they are in the process of establishing a single central database. The least reported method of storing data was in a paper system/format (n = 4). Those who responded that data are typically housed within the same or multiple agencies were further asked if there is a process in place to share data between databases or agencies; 2 survey respondents said this can be done, either easily (n = 1) or with some difficulty (n = 1).

P A Head Start grantee is the designated agency (public or private non-profit or for-profit) which has been granted financial assistance to operate a Head Start program. A grantee may operate more than one Head Start grant.

^q Survey respondents could select all response options that applied.

 Table 6. How data from Head Start programs are stored (n = 32)

Data Element	Number of Respondents
Across several databases within the same or multiple agencies	18
In process of creating a centralized database	10
In a centralized database	6
Paper system/format	4
l don't know	4

Source: Child Trends' Head Start Data Survey

Data linkages

The capacity to link Head Start data with other preschool data is important as it can give administrators and policymakers a complete picture of their preschool system. In addition, having the capacity to link Head Start data with K-12 education data is also key as it allows administrators to understand the impacts of early childhood experiences on longer-term outcomes, such as test scores and graduation rates. See <u>Appendix E</u> for state-specific types of data linkages with other data.

Eight out of 28 respondents reported the ability to link some or all Head Start data with other preschool program data and three reported the ability to link Head Start data with K-12 data. Among the respondents that could link Head Start with K-12 data, they indicated data could be linked with on average 19 out of 31 data elements. All three respondents who could link Head Start with K-12 data reported being able to link demographic data related to the child's age, gender, ethnicity, and disability status as well as family characteristics including family address, housing status, income, and military status.

Supports and barriers for data coordination

Having data coordination or linking supports in place makes it easier to access and use data. Examples of supports include unique identifiers for individual people and programs in the data, a single centralized database where all data is stored, and formal relationships between groups through memoranda of understanding and data sharing agreements.

Data sharing agreements to enable linking data were the most frequently identified support for data coordination (n = 3). Eight respondents who reported the ability to link some or all Head Start data with other preschool programs were asked about current supports that facilitate their ability to coordinate data. Respondents varied in the types of supports they identified. The most frequently reported support was data sharing agreements (n = 3) followed by memoranda of understanding/agreement (MOU/A; n = 2); shared services between agencies (n = 2); and unique identifiers for child, family, program, or workforce memberss (n = 2). Respondents who reported they either do not have the ability to link all or some Head Start data with other preschool programs or were in the planning process to do so were asked about supports that *would* facilitate their ability to coordinate data (n = 20). Commonly cited potential supports included Early Childhood Integrated Data System (ECIDS, [n = 15]); MOU/A (n = 14); data sharing agreements (n = 14); and child, family, program, or workforce unique identifiers (n = 10). Respondents were asked about supports as well as barriers that either facilitate or prevent them from accessing, analyzing, or using Head Start data.

Over two thirds of respondents reported having at least one support in place to access, analyze, or use Head Start data (n = 22). Information or training provided by the Office of Head Start (n = 13) and having unique identifiers for the children, workers, or programs (n = 11) were commonly reported supports in place. See Table 7. More than one-quarter of respondents reported research partnerships (n = 9), a systematic approach to data collection (n = 9), and a team to monitor data collection and analysis activities (n = 9) as current supports in place that facilitate access, analysis, or use.

Data Element	Number of respondents
Information or training provided by the Office of Head Start	13
Unique identifiers for the children, worker, or program	11
Research partnerships	9
Systematic approach to data collection	9
Team to monitor data collection and analysis activities	9
Early Childhood Integrated Data System, or ECIDS	8
Policies facilitating access, analysis, or use	7
Dedicated sustainable funding for data infrastructure development and/or management	5
Ability to link data across multiple systems via unique identifiers	5
Sufficient staff capacity	4
Other	3

 Table 7. Reported supports to accessing, analyzing, or using Head Start data (n = 22)

Source: Child Trends' Head Start Data Survey

Over two thirds of respondents also reported challenges with data sharing or limited access to data (n = 18) and a lack of data systems or infrastructure (n = 18) as barriers to accessing, analyzing, or using Head Start data. See Table 8 for additional barriers to data access or use.

 Table 8. Reported barriers to accessing, analyzing, or using Head Start data (n = 26)

Data Element	Number of respondents
Challenges with data sharing or limited access to data	18
Lack of data systems or infrastructure	18
Data management issues	13
Lack of funding for data systems development and maintenance	12
Data quality issues	10
Antiquated data systems or infrastructure	7
Issues related to managing data disclosure risks	6
Lack of staff expertise to collect, analyze, interpret, or communicate data	4
Policies limiting access, analysis, or use	3
Other	3
Lack of public or political will or interest	2

Source: Child Trends' Head Start Data Survey

Discussion

Among 32 surveyed HSCO respondents, about half reported having access to individual level information about children and workforce members. More HSCO respondents reported having access to program-level and system-level data compared to individual child- or workforce-level data. By accessing and utilizing individual-level child and workforce member data, states can gain insights into the unique needs and experiences of children and educators, enabling them to provide targeted support and services as necessary. States with individual-level data can in turn make different informed and data-driven decisions compared to those with only aggregated data because they can answer questions about children's (or workers') experiences rather than just programs' conditions. Importantly, these data are already being collected; programs and the federal OHS have comprehensive data on children and workers (for programs) and similar data aggregated at the program level (for OHS). These data that are available for grantees and OHS to inform Head Start programs and policies could also be shared with state offices.

Various factors may contribute to this accessibility gap, including challenges associated with data management and sharing systems, concerns regarding data privacy, and the complexities inherent in fostering collaboration across various agencies and programs within the state. Respondents also reported slightly higher rates of individual-level data if data were collected for the PIR. In comparison, HSCOs reported greater accessibility to system-level and program-level data, perhaps because Head Start program staff are accustomed to collecting program- and system-level data.

As a bright spot, almost two thirds of HSCOs were able to disaggregate data by child, family, and community demographics. The ability to disaggregate data means that HSCOs and related state agencies are better equipped to analyze and understand patterns of Head Start use and experiences of children with diverse needs. For example, a state would be better positioned to know whether Black, Hispanic/Latino, and Indigenous children; multilingual learners; and children with disabilities or developmental delays were being equitably served by Head Start.

Data quality concerns are common across most types of data. Among states that had access to child- or educator-level data, data quality concerns for specific data elements were commonly reported. Examples of data quality issues include data entry errors, missing data, different definitions, and data integration issues. They can be a significant barrier to using data in a meaningful way. The data quality concerns may also relate to HSCOs reporting that data were commonly housed across several databases. For example, only six states reported using a single source for storing and managing data, potentially presenting challenges in maintaining consistency and accuracy in reporting for the remaining states.

Furthermore, most states reported concerns regarding workforce-level data quality. Specifically, states frequently indicated their data quality issues related to race and ethnicity of educators, as well as languages spoken by educators. The accuracy of these data is essential for evaluating Head Start's efforts in promoting diversity and equity while offering support to children and families in marginalized communities. Similarly, data on languages spoken by educators are crucial for understanding the linguistic diversity within Head Start classrooms and ensuring a match between the languages spoken by educators and the children and families they serve. Ensuring that educators can communicate effectively with children who may speak languages other than English facilitates family engagement and equitable educational outcomes.^{17, 18} Therefore, the quality issues of such workforce-level data elements may hinder HSCOs' ability to comprehensively assess the effectiveness of their services to diverse communities.

States have supports in place to access and use Head Start data, but Head Start data were not typically linked to other preschool or K-12 data. Most states reported having supports in place to facilitate accessing, analyzing, or using Head Start data. Supports included information or training provided by OHS, the implementation of unique identifiers for the children and workers, or research collaborations with program partners. HSCOs commonly use data with stakeholders to inform decisions about Head Start programs.

Despite these support mechanisms, the integration of Head Start data with other state pre-K or K-12 datasets remained a challenge. A limited number of HSCOs reported that Head Start data could be linked to other preschool or K-12 data. Two factors make linking a challenge:

- 1. Head Start grantees use a variety of software packages to collect, store, and manage Head Start data. This variety may make it challenging for states to link Head Start data with other preschool data infrastructures.
- 2. Federal reporting requirements and definitions may not align with a state's data system. The use of unique identifiers and creating data exchange standards, which transform data into similar formats so they can communicate with one another, are ways to facilitate data linking.

Difficulties in linking Head Start data to other agencies serving preschool students and the K-12 system likely limit the scope of questions that can be answered using Head Start data. In other words, it is likely that the Head Start data were used to answer Head Start policy and program questions and not in the broader context of other preschool or K-12 systems. Furthermore, the majority of states received limited support to facilitate their ability to link data. These findings underscore the need for state support to build data capacity. Such efforts could include the development of an Early Childhood Integrated Data System, the establishment of memoranda of understanding/agreement, the promotion of data sharing practices between agencies, and the creation of unique identifiers for children, families, programs, and the workforce.

Limitations

There are several limitations to note. First, the information reported here does not reflect the experiences of all HSCOs. We received survey responses from 28 of the 51 HSCOs and received partial responses from four HSCOs. Additional skip patterns then led to low response rates for some portions of the survey; findings should be interpreted with those caveats in mind.

Second, this survey was limited to HSCOs and their knowledge of Head Start data within the state. The populations Head Start programs serve are very specific, focusing on families at or below the federal poverty line, families who are experiencing homelessness, families who receive assistance like TANF or SSI, families of children with disabilities, and children who are in the foster care system. This specific focus means that the data should not be generalized to other types of care, such as state-funded pre-K. Further, this survey did not include representation from Migrant and Seasonal Head Start or American Indian and Alaska Native Head Start programs.

Third, specific data elements asked about in the survey were selected to inform the <u>System</u> <u>Transformation for Equitable Preschools (STEP Forward with Data) Framework</u>. These data elements are not an exhaustive list, and states were not asked to list any additional data elements they may collect. The survey focused on 31 child-level data elements, 17 workforcelevel data elements, and 13 system-level data elements that are typically collected by states, as well as 5 program-level data elements that are not included in the PIR but may be of interest. The survey also did not ask about respondents' access to specific data sources or systems used by grantees (e.g., ChildPlus).

Finally, the Head Start Data Survey is a snapshot in time of state Head Start Collaboration Offices' data capacities. Changes that were in progress while the survey was underway and were not detailed in responses or changes implemented after the survey closed would not be captured.

Future Directions and Conclusions

Head Start plays a central role in preschool systems, particularly in serving children and families from households with low incomes. As state leaders strive to use data in improving equitable access to preschool, it is important they have robust Head Start data to strengthen their understanding of the whole system, including this unique program. While states and HSCOs may have access to aggregated child-, workforce-, and program-level Head Start data through the PIR, it is crucial to recognize that they often lack access to individual-level Head Start data essential for understanding which children are being served and their unique experiences in the classroom. Improving access to individual-level Head Start data would not only help states identify the needs of children and families in marginalized communities, but also empower states to make informed, data-driven decisions regarding resource allocation and strategic investment.

Importantly, a recent AIAN Head Start strategic plan has two objectives related to data, including (1) collecting and sharing Tribal data protocols and data sharing agreements between AIAN Head Start and other state agencies, and (2) assisting and promoting longitudinal data collection.¹⁹ Data sovereignty and priorities of Tribal communities need to be centered in plans and strategies for data sharing and integration given the history of colonization and laws negatively impacting Indigenous wellbeing, among other factors.²⁰

States have collected crucial child-, workforce-, and program-level data in accordance with PIR requirements to inform policy and practice. However, the different regulatory and policy making bodies of Head Start and other preschool programs naturally result in different types of data collected in different ways and at different levels. These discrepancies may then pose challenges when attempting to link and analyze data across different preschool programs. In addition, while nationally representative data, such as the Head Start Family and Children Experiences Survey (FACES), offer a broad overview at the national level, they fall short of providing insights into the unique circumstances of individual states. Furthermore, unlike the PIR, FACES is not completed annually so data are not routinely updated. To address this gap, states should consider supporting a process that enables data to be stored or linked to allow for the analysis and use of Head Start data statewide and in parallel to other stored pre-K data. These processes may include the assignment of unique identifiers for children, programs, and staff; data management policies to standardize definitions; governance policies to ensure security and privacy requirements are met; and data sharing agreements to link Head Start data with other relevant preschool data sources.

A comprehensive understanding of each states' preschool landscape would be supported by linking Head Start with other preschool systems data. State preschool systems include multiple overlapping programs. Not all children are eligible for Head Start programming, and some states deliver targeted pre-K to similar or overlapping populations (such as families with low incomes). Further, Head Start and pre-K programs can have blended or braided funding, and children are served in the same programs and even classrooms. This patchwork system of overlapping funding and programs would suggest that centralized data on all children being served is crucial to understanding where gaps and disparities in services may be. However, results from this survey and the accompanying <u>Data Capacity of State-Funded</u> <u>Pre-K Programs Across the United States</u> report suggest this is not yet the case across the U.S. Most state leaders currently do not have access to consistent information on children served in preschool programs. This limits their ability to better design, deliver, and ensure access for children and families—especially those who may most benefit from those programs. HSCOs perform an important function of collaborating with relevant state agencies to ensure that Head Start programming is coordinated with other related public programs and children and families can receive high quality programming and supports. Having access to Head Start data across grantees that are also linked with other preschool data is an essential need in the field to better address inequities and answer key program and policy questions.

Appendix A: PIR-Related Data Elements Removed from Survey

The PIR collects aggregated data at the program-level (e.g., 'race of child' would be the total number of children that identify as a certain or multiple race and 'workforce member role' would be the total number of assistant or lead teachers). To reduce respondent burden and not duplicate known data collected through the PIR, the survey did not ask respondents about their access to the following program-level data elements:

Child data elements
Age or date of birth of child
Disability status of child
Race of child
Ethnicity of child
Multilanguage learner status of the child
Foster care status of the child
Family active military status
Family housing status
Family eligibility for state assistance programs, e.g., TANF or SNAP eligibility
Home language(s) of child
Parent education level
Family income
Referrals to other services (e.g., health or mental health services, food support)
Child eligibility status for Head Start enrollment
Child assessments conducted with child (formative and summative)
Program data elements
Site or grantee location
Ages of children served
Funding per child
Curriculum used
Family engagement (e.g., ways in which the program staff engages and includes families in education decisions) Transportation provided to Head Start
Provision of services for children with a disability or developmental delay
Provision of activities to facilitate student transition to kindergarten
Workforce data elements
Workforce member position or role (for example, assistant or lead teacher)
Ethnicity of workforce members
Highest level of education of workforce member
Language(s) spoken by workforce members
Race of workforce members

Appendix B: Survey Contacts

State	Department	Contact Title
Alabama	Alabama Department of Early Childhood Education	Head Start Collaboration Director
Alaska	Alaska Department of Education & Early Development	Education Specialist II
Arkansas	Northwest Arkansas Head Start	Early Head Start Director
California	California Department of Social Services	Deputy Director, Child Care and Development
Colorado	Department Of Early Childhood	Head Start Collaboration Office Director
Connecticut	Connecticut Office Of Early Childhood	Deputy Commissioner
Hawaii	Executive Office on Early Learning	Head Start State Collaboration Director
Indiana	Office Of Early Childhood and Out-Of-School Learning/FSSA	Indiana Head Start State Collaboration Director
Kentucky	Northeast Kentucky Head Start	Early Childhood Education/Mental Health Services Coordinator
Louisiana	Louisiana Department of Education	Head Start Collaboration, Director
Maine	Maine Department of Education	Maine Head Start Collaboration Director
Maryland	Maryland State Department of Education	Head Start State Collaboration Specialist
Massachusetts	Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care	Director, Head Start State Collaboration Office
Michigan	Michigan Department of Education	Head Start Collaboration Director
Mississippi	Head Start Collaboration Office	Director
Missouri	Missouri Head Start State Collaboration Office	Director
Montana	Department of Public Health and Human Services	Head Start Collaboration Director
Nebraska	Nebraska Department of Education, Office of Early Childhood	Head Start State Collaboration Office Director
Nevada	Nevada Department of Education, Office of Early Learning & Development	Head Start Collaboration Director
New Hampshire	New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services	Bureau Chief/HSCO Director
New York	New York State's Council on Children and Families	NYS Head Start Collaboration Director
North Carolina	North Carolina Head Start Collaboration Office	Collaboration Director

State	Department	Contact Title		
North Dakota	North Dakota Dept of Health & Human Services	North Dakota State Head Start Collaboration Administrator		
Oklahoma	Oklahoma Head Start Collaboration Office	Oklahoma Head Start Collaboration Director		
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania Head Start State Collaboration Office	Director		
Rhode Island	Department of Human Services	Head Start Collaboration Office Director		
South Carolina	ChesterfieldMarlboro Head Start	Program Director		
Tennessee	Southwest Human Resource Agency Head Start	Head Start Director		
Texas	Texas Head Start State Collaboration Office	Director		
Utah	Utah Head Start Association	Board Chair		
Virginia	Virginia Department of Education	Director, Head Start State Collaboration Office		
Washington	Department Of Children, Youth, and Families	Director, Head Start Collaboration Office		

Note: The Department and Contact Title fields were completed by the respondent; however, the survey link was sent to all Head Start Collaboration Office administrators. The survey contacts (HSCO administrators) were encouraged to forward the survey to other individuals who could help complete the survey and were encouraged to collaborate to complete the survey.

Appendix C: Accessibility of Child- and Workforce-Level Data by State

State	Child-level data accessible to HSCO?	Workforce-level data accessible to HSCO?	
Alabama	No	No response	
Alaska	Yes	Yes	
Arizona	No response	No response	
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	
California	No	No	
Colorado	No	Other	
Connecticut	Not yet, in the planning process	Yes	
Delaware	No response	No response	
District of Columbia	No response	No response	
Florida	No response	No response	
Georgia	No response	No response	
Hawaii	No	Other	
Idaho	No response	No response	
Illinois	No response	No response	
Indiana	No	Other	
lowa	No response	No response	
Kansas	No response	No response	
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	
Louisiana	Yes	No	
Maine	Yes	Yes	
Maryland	Yes	Yes	
Massachusetts	No	Not yet, in the planning process	
Michigan	Yes	l don't know	
Minnesota	No response	No response	
Mississippi	l don't know	No response	
Missouri	No	Other	

State	Child-level data accessible to HSCO?	Workforce-level data accessible to HSCO?	
Montana	No	Yes	
Nebraska	Yes	No	
Nevada	No	Yes	
New Hampshire	Other	Yes	
New Jersey	No response	No response	
New Mexico	No response	No response	
New York	No	Other	
North Carolina	Yes	Yes	
North Dakota	Not yet, in the planning process	Yes	
Ohio	No response	No response	
Oklahoma	No	Yes	
Oregon	No response	No response	
Pennsylvania	No	No	
Rhode Island	Yes	Not yet, in the planning process	
South Carolina	Yes	Yes	
South Dakota	No response	No response	
Tennessee	Yes	Yes	
Texas	No	Yes	
Utah	Yes	Yes	
Vermont	No response	No response	
Virginia	Other	Other	
Washington	No	Yes	
West Virginia	No response	No response	
Wisconsin	No response	No response	
Wyoming	No response	No response	

Appendix D: Accessibility of Disaggregated Data by State

State	Data cannot be	Child race/	Child disability	Family	Child country	Family languages	Family tribal	l don't	Other (Please
	disaggregated	ethnicity	status	income	of birth	spoken	affiliation	know	specify):
Alabama									
Alaska		Х							
Arkansas		Х	X	Х	Х	Х			
California	X								
Colorado									PIR categories
Connecticut									
Hawaii	Х								
Indiana	Х								
Kentucky		Х	Х	Х	Х	Х			
Louisiana		Х	X	Х		Х			
Maine									Individual agencies have the ability to disaggregate this information on their internal reports and could report this information to the HSCO Director.
Maryland	Х								
Massachusetts								Х	
Michigan								Х	
Mississippi									
Missouri	Х								
Montana	Х								
Nebraska	Х								
Nevada		Х	Х	Х	Х	Х			

State	Data cannot be disaggregated	Child race/ ethnicity	Child disability status	Family income	Child country of birth	Family languages spoken	Family tribal affiliation	l don't know	Other (Please specify):
New Hampshire									
New York									NA
North Carolina		Х	х	Х	х	х	х		Health and family services
North Dakota		Х	Х			Х			
Oklahoma	X								
Pennsylvania									Only what is available in PIR
Rhode Island		Х							
South Carolina		Х	Х	Х	Х	Х			
Tennessee		Х	Х			Х			
Texas								Х	
Utah	Х								
Virginia		х	х	Х					Participation in state QRIS system and other preschool efforts
Washington	X								

Appendix E: Ability to Link Head Start Data with Other Datasets

State	Ability to link pre-K programs, including Head Start	Ability to link data with K-12 data				
Alabama	No response	No response				
Alaska	For some data elements	Not yet, in the planning process				
Arkansas	l don't know	No				
California	No	No				
Colorado	Not yet, in the planning process	No				
Connecticut	No response	No response				
Hawaii	No	No				
Indiana	No	No				
Kentucky	For some data elements	Yes				
Louisiana	Not yet, in the planning process	Not yet, in the planning process				
Maine	No	No				
Maryland	No	No				
Massachusetts	Not yet, in the planning process	Not yet, in the planning process				
Michigan	Yes	Yes				
Mississippi	No response	No response				
Missouri	Not yet, in the planning process	No				
Montana	Other	Yes				
Nebraska	For some data elements	No				
Nevada	For some data elements	Not yet, in the planning process				
New Hampshire	No response	No response				
New York	No	No				
North Carolina	Not yet, in the planning process	No				
North Dakota	Not yet, in the planning process	Not yet, in the planning process				
Oklahoma	No	No				
Pennsylvania	No	No				
Rhode Island	l don't know	l don't know				
South Carolina	For some data elements	Not yet, in the planning process				

State	Ability to link pre-K programs, including Head Start	Ability to link data with K-12 data
Tennessee	l don't know	No
Texas	l don't know	l don't know
Utah	Yes	No
Virginia	Yes	Not yet, in the planning process
Washington	No	No

References

¹ Office of Head Start. (2023, June 30). *Head Start History.* The Office of the Administration for Children & Families. <u>https://www.acf.hhs.gov/ohs/about/history-head-start</u>

² U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. (2010). Head Start Impact Study. Final Report. Washington, DC.

https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/opre/executive_summary_final_508.pdf

³ Head Start Early Childhood Learning & Knowledge Center. (2023, December 11). *Head Start programs*. <u>https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/programs/article/head-start-programs</u>

⁴ Lee, R., Brooks-Gunn, J., Han, W. J., Waldfogel, J., & Zhai, F. (2014). Is participation in Head Start associated with less maternal spanking for boys and girls?. *Children and youth services review, 46,* 55-63.

⁵ Anastasio, R. J., Leventhal, T., & Amadon, S. (2022). High residential mobility and young children's healthy development in low-income families: Exploring the moderating role of Head Start. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 59,* 96-108.

⁶ Friedman-Krauss, A. H., Barnett, W. S., & Duer, J. K. (2022). *The State(s) of Head Start and Early Head Start: Looking at Equity.* National Institute for Early Education Research. <u>https://nieer.org/wp-</u> <u>content/uploads/2022/12/HS_FullReport.pdf</u>

⁷ Friedman-Krauss, A. H., Barnett, W. S., & Duer, J. K. (2022). *The State(s) of Head Start and Early Head Start: Looking at Equity.* National Institute for Early Education Research. <u>https://nieer.org/wp-</u> <u>content/uploads/2022/12/HS_FullReport.pdf</u>

⁸ Friedman-Krauss, A. H., Barnett, W. S., & Duer, J. K. (2022). *The State(s) of Head Start and Early Head Start: Looking at Equity.* National Institute for Early Education Research. <u>https://nieer.org/wp-</u> <u>content/uploads/2022/12/HS_FullReport.pdf</u>

⁹ Thompson, J., Bredeson, M., & Boddicker-Young, P. (2022). *Pre-K data on children, families, and workforce members from focal populations can help decision makers create more equitable systems*. Child Trends. https://doi.org/10.56417/6271a6086a

¹⁰ Friedman-Krauss, A. H., Barnett, W. S., & Duer, J. K. (2022). *The State(s) of Head Start and Early Head Start: Looking at Equity*. National Institute for Early Education Research. <u>https://nieer.org/wp-</u> content/uploads/2022/12/HS_FullReport.pdf

¹¹ Office of Head Start. (2023, November 8). *Data and Ongoing Monitoring.* Early Childhood Learning & Knowledge Center. <u>https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/data-ongoing-monitoring/article/program-information-report-pir</u>

¹² Office of Head Start. (2023, November 8). *Data and Ongoing Monitoring.* Early Childhood Learning & Knowledge Center. <u>https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/data-ongoing-monitoring/article/program-information-report-pir</u>

¹³ Office of Head Start. (2022, September 26). *Head Start Collaboration Offices and State Systems*. The Administration for Children & Families. <u>https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/state-collaboration/article/head-start-collaboration-offices-state-systems</u>

¹⁴ Office of Head Start. (2021). *Head Start Collaboration Office Briefs*. The Administration for Children & Families. <u>https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/head-start-collab-office-briefs-2021.pdf</u>

¹⁵ Office of Head Start. (2022, September 26). *Head Start Collaboration Offices and State Systems*. The Administration for Children & Families. <u>https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/state-collaboration/article/head-start-collaboration-offices-state-systems</u>

¹⁶ Office of Head Start. (2021). *Head Start Collaboration Office Briefs*. The Administration for Children & Families. <u>https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/head-start-collab-office-briefs-2021.pdf</u>

¹⁷ Downer, J. T., Goble, P., Myers, S. S., & Pianta, R. C. (2016). Teacher-child racial/ethnic match within prekindergarten classrooms and children's early school adjustment. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 37*(4), 26-38. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresg.2016.02.007</u> ¹⁸ Markowitz, A. J., Bassok, D., & Grissom, J. A. (2020). Teacher-child racial/ethnic match and parental engagement with Head Start. *American Educational Research Journal, 57*(5), 2132-2174. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831219899356

¹⁹ Downer, J. T., Goble, P., Myers, S. S., & Pianta, R. C. (2016). Teacher-child racial/ethnic match within prekindergarten classrooms and children's early school adjustment. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 37*(4), 26-38. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresg.2016.02.007</u>

²⁰ Markowitz, A. J., Bassok, D., & Grissom, J. A. (2020). Teacher-child racial/ethnic match and parental engagement with Head Start. American Educational Research Journal, 57(5), 2132-2174. <u>https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831219899356</u>

¹⁹ National American Indian/Alaska Native Head Start Collaboration Office. (2016). *Strategic Plan 2015-2020*. Administration for Children & Families. <u>https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/aian-strategic-plan-2015-2020.pdf</u>

²⁰ Gordon, H.S.J., Around Him, D., Martinez, D.N., & Yamane, C.Y.E.W. (2023). *A resource to help researchers and funders understand Indigenous children, youth, and families.* Child Trends. <u>https://doi.org/10.56417/7763a5472r</u>