

UC Berkeley

Recent Work

Title

In Pursuit of Pre-K Parity: A Proposed Framework for Understanding and Advancing Policy and Practice

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/01z7k8kp>

Authors

Whitebook, Marcy
McLean, Caitlin

Publication Date

2017-04-25

BRIEF

April 2017

Pre-K Teacher
Compensation Parity Series



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

In partnership with

NIEER

National Institute for
Early Education Research,
Rutgers, State University
of New Jersey

In Pursuit of Pre-K Parity:

A Proposed Framework for Understanding and Advancing Policy and Practice

By Marcy Whitebook, Ph.D. and Caitlin McLean, Ph.D.

Project Description: This brief is the first in a series of materials on pre-K compensation parity, jointly undertaken by the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment and the National Institute for Early Education Research. This first brief evolved out of CSCCE's work for the State of the Early Childhood Workforce Initiative, a multi-year project to shine a steady spotlight on our nation's early childhood workforce on a state-by-state basis. In addition to the *Early Childhood Workforce Index*, the Initiative consists of further resources for advocates, policymakers, and other stakeholders.

Summary: Many pre-K teachers across the nation are expected to earn a bachelor's degree, similar to their peers teaching older children. Yet salaries and benefits remain consistently lower for pre-K teachers than for elementary school teachers. Increasingly, compensation parity is perceived as an achievable policy goal rather than a lofty ideal, yet there is confusion across the field about what parity means. This brief develops a framework for understanding compensation parity in contrast to other forms of compensation improvement. Applying this framework to current state efforts to move toward compensation parity reveals a great deal of variability across states. While some states approach compensation parity, at least for some pre-K teachers, and several states have pursued parity in salaries only, the majority of states do not have any explicit policies intended to move toward parity for pre-K teachers.

Key Findings:

- Compensation parity is defined as parity with K-3 teachers for salary and benefits for equivalent levels of education and experience, prorated to reflect differences in hours of work in private settings where applicable, and including payment for non-child contact hours (such as paid time for planning);
- Only Tennessee has compensation parity policies that apply to all pre-K lead and assistant teachers, but their pre-K program is delivered via public schools only;
- Ten states have compensation parity policies that include salary, benefits, and payment for professional responsibilities, at least for lead pre-K teachers in public schools;
- Eighteen states have policies in place with the goal of meeting salary parity, but only 14 states have policies that meet our criteria of salary parity, with equivalent starting salary and salary schedule, prorated.

Introduction

More than half of all state-funded pre-kindergarten (pre-K) programs now require lead teachers to earn a bachelor's degree or higher, as do many city-funded pre-K programs, yet salaries and benefits for pre-K teachers are consistently lower than the average salary for public school elementary school teachers.¹ While these differences in earnings may reflect variation in experience and educational attainment beyond a four-year degree, on average, a pre-K teacher with a bachelor's degree or higher can expect to earn about \$10,000–\$13,000 less per year than her colleagues teaching older children, even when she works in a public school setting. For a similarly educated pre-K teacher working in a community-based program, the earnings gap is even higher: approximately \$20,000–\$22,000 less per year, accompanied with fewer benefits as well.² Only a handful of states and cities have policies and practices in place to ensure that pre-K teachers in publicly funded programs, regardless of setting, can expect to earn salaries and benefits and receive payment for professional responsibilities, such as planning, on a par with teachers of children from kindergarten through 3rd grade (K-3).³

This state of affairs is hardly breaking news. For decades, it has been well documented that early care and education teachers in general, not just those teaching pre-K, earn extremely low salaries and receive few benefits and professional supports, such as paid planning time and professional development days.⁴ Today, as was the case a quarter of a century ago, early care and education (ECE) teachers who have earned bachelor's or higher degrees and work with three- to five-year-olds can expect to earn only half or two-thirds of what those who work with older children earn, even though ECE teachers often put in longer hours and more days each year. According to the 2012 National Survey of Early Care and Education, teachers with a BA or higher degree constitute nearly half (45 percent) of those working with three- to five-year-olds in center-based programs.⁵ Teacher compensation in public pre-K — as in other early care and education settings such as Head Start, other center-based care, or home-based care — reflects program design and funding levels rather than qualifications.⁶ As a consequence, job and occupational turnover continually work against efforts to build a stable ECE workforce with educational qualifications equivalent to those of K-3 teachers.

Today, however, this news reaches more attentive ears, spurring concern and action from both public and private stakeholders in a manner unprecedented even two or three years ago. Increasingly, “parity” is being discussed with greater urgency and seriousness — as an achievable policy goal rather than a lofty ideal. A broad group of stakeholders extending beyond teacher advocates now see parity as critical to delivering the promised returns on investment in high-quality early education.⁷

This shift can be understood in light of a convergence of influences. Current scientific evidence about children birth to age five underlies the National Academies of Sciences consensus that facilitating early learning and development requires knowledge and skills as complex as those needed to teach older children.⁸ Furthermore, a review of pre-K programs that have achieved the most lasting outcomes for children suggests that pre-K teachers must be both highly educated and well paid, on a par with educators of older children.⁹ This evidence has raised widespread concern, particularly when coupled with research documenting the extremely low pay of ECE teachers — even among those with degrees — and their attendant high levels of economic insecurity and utilization of public income supports. Recent public opinion polls suggest widespread support for public investment in ECE, including specifically for raising early educator salaries.¹⁰

Most of the current efforts to improve ECE salaries are concentrated on pre-K teachers, with the goal of equalizing earnings with K-3 teachers, not only for pre-K teachers working in public schools, but also for their counterparts working in community-based pre-K settings. And in a few instances, we rightly see attempts to extend these efforts to teachers working outside the state-funded pre-K system.¹¹

At the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment (CSCCE) and the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER), we are heartened by the increasing engagement of stakeholders across the country in efforts to reduce inequities in compensation for early care and education teachers. To facilitate communication and learning across states and communities and among different stakeholders, we have joined together to produce several resources on the subject of compensation parity. In this first brief, **In Pursuit of Pre-K Parity**, we articulate a definition of compensation parity and a common framework for

understanding where states and cities currently lie along the path to that goal. This brief also includes highlights from a longer report, *Teacher Compensation Parity Policies and State-Funded Pre-K Programs*,¹² which provides a detailed description of the current landscape of parity policies based on data collected for the NIEER 2015 *State of Preschool Yearbook*. Further materials in the series will examine a select group of states and cities in order to advance our understanding of promising practices.

What Is Parity? Same Word, Different Interpretations

"Parity," a precise term meaning "the state or condition of being equal, especially regarding status or pay," is often used as a synonym or stand-in for other terms, such as "comparable," "commensurate," "fair," or even "improved." In our interviews and discussions with policymakers and advocates across the country, we encountered this term applied to very different policy goals and outcomes. More precise terminology matters, however, because it represents the goal or objective for program design, policy implementation, and financing. A goal of narrowing the earnings gap between teachers working with younger and older children is a different goal than establishing equivalency between those groups. Similarly, establishing equivalent starting salaries for teachers working with younger and older children is not the same as establishing equivalent salary schedules that factor in equitable increases over time based on experience and continuing education.

How the goal or target outcome is defined will influence program design, policy, and financing. Is the goal pay parity with K-3 teachers or a different benchmark? Is the focus solely on lead teachers or on teachers and assistants? Does the goal apply to teachers in school-based settings only or to those in school-based and non-school settings? Does it apply to all publicly funded programs in the state if there is more than one? These differences in identified goal and target population may lead to different assessments of the current landscape. For example, NIEER's 2015 *State of Preschool Yearbook* identified whether the state had any salary parity requirements for lead teachers, whereas in CSCCE's 2016 *Early Childhood Workforce Index*, parity policy was defined more restrictively and included only states that required parity for both starting salary and ongoing salaries for all lead teachers in all settings. The federal government used far less specific guidelines for states applying for Preschool Development and Expansion Grants, referring to "instructional staff salaries that are comparable to the salaries of local K-12 instructional staff."¹³ Some may be interpreting "comparable" as "equivalent," while others may interpret "comparable" as "being similar or about the same," i.e., closer but not equivalent to one another. Despite these variations in meaning, the federal directive is typically referred to as "salary parity" by those in the ECE field and among many policymakers.

In order to ensure better communication, as well as clearer identification of our policy goals and outcomes, we propose the following framework and vocabulary for compensation parity.

Compensation Parity: A Proposed Definition

We define "compensation parity" as parity for salary and benefits for equivalent levels of education and experience, adjusted to reflect differences in hours of work in private settings, and including payment for non-child contact hours (such as paid time for planning).

Compensation parity should, in principle, be applied to the entire ECE workforce, regardless of the ages of children or the type of setting in which they work, not just teachers working in state-funded pre-K settings. This standard would encompass parity not only between pre-K teachers and K-3 teachers, but also parity for teachers in Head Start and other center- and home-based ECE settings.¹⁴ At the same time, care should be taken to ensure adequate pay for K-3 teachers; parity should not be achieved via low pay for teachers at any level.¹⁵ For the purposes of this brief and related documents in the series, however, we have focused on movement toward compensation parity for pre-K teachers, specifically.

COMPENSATION PARITY: A GLOSSARY

Salary parity: Equivalent starting salary and salary schedule, prorated to account for longer work days and years in private settings where applicable, and including payment for non-child contact hours (such as paid time for planning and professional development).

Salary schedule: A scale with clearly differentiated salary increments based on qualifications and years of experience, which provides guidance for salary increases over time.

Benefit parity: Equivalent paid time off from work, as well as health and retirement benefits.

Parity in payment for professional responsibilities: Payment for non-child contact time to complete professional responsibilities, such as planning, professional sharing, and reporting, as well as paid time for professional development.

Compensation Parity & Related Forms of Compensation Improvement: A Framework

We provide a framework that distinguishes between compensation parity and other forms of compensation improvement, which are commonly labeled "parity" but are, in fact, different. For simplicity, we distinguish between four types of compensation improvement: parity, partial parity, sub-parity, and other forms of compensation improvement (see **Table 1**). We also highlight three core components of compensation (salary, benefits, and payment for professional responsibilities), each of which could be set at the level of parity, just below, or at some other level of compensation improvement.

Given the daunting task of achieving compensation parity, many states and cities set their sights at an incremental step toward improving compensation levels. In practice, this could include one or more of the cells in the matrix in **Table 1**:

- Prioritizing one component of compensation parity over another: often salary parity, but not benefit parity or parity in payment for professional responsibilities;
- Prioritizing a lower level of compensation improvement for one or more components of compensation: partial parity or sub-parity, rather than parity.

Furthermore, some states are selective in their focus for parity policies. In practice, states may set parity policies for some, but not all of their state-funded pre-K programs, as some states have more than one program. Or states may set parity policies that apply only to pre-K teachers working in public schools, but not community-based organizations. Frequently, parity policies target lead teachers in pre-K programs, with no equivalent set of policies for assistant teachers in pre-K classrooms. As a result, state parity policies may only apply to part of the pre-K teacher workforce.

Table 1: Compensation Parity & Related Forms of Compensation Improvement: A Framework

Components of Compensation				
Type of Compensation Improvement	Salary		Benefits	Payment for Professional Responsibilities ¹⁷
	Starting Salary	Salary Schedule ¹⁶		
Parity (defined as equivalent)	Same, prorated for day length and number	Same, prorated for day length and number	Same package, same options for coverage for health, retirement, and vacation/holiday/sick leave	Same menu of supports and dosage for non-child contact responsibilities (e.g., planning time, professional development days)
Partial Parity (defined as equivalent for select components)	Same, prorated for day length and number	Not same or absent	Equivalent options for some benefits, but not full package of benefits	Equivalent options for some supports, but not full menu of supports
Sub-Parity (defined as similar but not equivalent)	Same, not prorated	Same, not prorated or not same/absent	Same package of benefits, not equivalent value	Same menu of supports, not equivalent value
Alternative Forms of Compensation Improvement	Strategies that improve pre-K compensation in order to close the gap with teachers of older children but fall well short of parity. In theory, compensation improvement strategies could also set goals higher than earnings of K-12 teachers in public schools, though in practice this is rare. ¹⁸			

Consequently, the current status of state efforts to move toward compensation parity reveals a great deal of variability across states as highlighted in the following section and detailed in the full report, *Teacher Compensation Parity Policies and State-Funded Pre-K Programs*.

Applying the framework of compensation parity, we find that on one end of the spectrum are ten states with policies that meet the criteria for compensation parity policies, including salary prorating where applicable and benefits and payment for professional responsibilities, at least for lead pre-K teachers in public schools: Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri,¹⁹ New Jersey, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Tennessee (for one of their two state pre-K programs).²⁰ Only Tennessee has set compensation parity policies that apply to all pre-K lead and assistant teachers across all settings and programs in the state; however, their pre-K system only serves children in public schools.

At the other end of the spectrum are any states that are not actively attempting to improve compensation for pre-K or other ECE teachers, whether through explicit parity policies or otherwise. These states would therefore not be able to locate themselves anywhere on the compensation improvement framework described above.

In the middle, there are some states focused on compensation improvement, striving to narrow the gap between pre-K and K-3 teacher salaries by boosting some aspect of pre-K teacher compensation but not at the level of parity. Other states have secured parity with respect to one or more components of compensation — salaries, benefits, or paid time for professional activities — but not for all three. As above, these states usually limit their parity policies to particular groups (e.g., lead teachers but not assistant teachers), some settings (school-based but not community-based organizations) or select programs (one of several state pre-K programs or pre-K but not all other ECE settings). Where states have concentrated their efforts on only one component of compensation parity, it is usually salary rather than benefits or payment for professional responsibilities.

States with Salary Parity Policies: A Closer Look

Given that very few states have explicit parity policies that include all three components of compensation (salary, benefits, and paid time for professional responsibilities), our partners at NIEER have examined in further detail those states with salary parity policies, as reported in the 2015 *State of Preschool Yearbook*. In total, 18 states reported that they had such policies for lead teachers (see **Table 2**).

If we apply our framework to those 18 states with self-reported salary parity policies, we find that only 14 states meet our criteria of salary parity as described above, that is, parity that includes both starting salaries and salary schedules, as well as prorating for variability in days and hours of work in private settings, where applicable. Furthermore, only four of these states require parity for lead pre-K teachers in both public and private settings. The remaining four states instead meet our criteria for sub-salary parity rather than full or partial salary parity because they are not required to be prorated in line with working time.

Policy Category	States	Number of States
States with self-reported salary parity policies for lead teachers	Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia	18 states
YES: Salary parity (same starting salary and salary schedule) at least for teachers in public schools	Hawaii, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia ²¹	14 states
For public and private settings (prorated)	New Jersey (2 out of 3 state programs), Oklahoma, Tennessee, West Virginia	4 states
NO: Partial salary parity (same starting salary only, prorated)		0 states
NO: Sub-parity (same starting and ongoing salary, not prorated; or same starting, not prorated and not same salary schedule)	Georgia, Louisiana, Rhode Island, Virginia	4 states

Source: Barnett, W.S. & Kasmin, R. (2017). *Teacher Compensation Parity Policies and State-Funded Pre-K Programs*. New Brunswick, NJ: the National Institute for Early Education Research and Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California, Berkeley.

These findings mean that while 18 of the 44 total states (including the District of Columbia) with state-funded pre-K programs have explicit policies in place with the goal of meeting parity, only 14 states (or less than one third of those with pre-K programs) have policies that actually meet the criteria of salary parity, with the same starting salary and salary schedule, prorated for day length and number.

Nevertheless, even these policies that fall somewhat short of the criteria of full salary parity seem to be having an impact. Initial exploration of states' self-reported salary parity policies suggests several key findings (for further details, see the full report, *Teacher Compensation Parity Policies and State-Funded Pre-K Programs*). Compared to states without such policies, states that report having a salary parity policy in place are:

1. More likely to have higher pre-K teacher wages: the median earnings for all preschool teachers in states with parity policies is \$46,121, 13 percent higher than the median \$40,825 earnings in states without parity policies;²²

2. More likely to score higher on other measures of pre-K quality as measured by the NIEER quality benchmarks;²³
3. More likely to have higher child enrollment in pre-K: the median enrollment rate for four-year-olds in states with parity policies is 39 percent, 5 percentage points higher than for states without parity policies.

Additionally, states with self-reported salary parity policies are also more likely to spend higher amounts on pre-K and are more likely to fund their pre-K programs via school funding formulas,²⁴ compared to states without salary parity policies, although financing mechanisms among states with parity policies vary.

Conclusion

Whether a state has yet to embark on the road to parity, is edging forward incrementally, or is making substantial headway toward this goal, advocates and other stakeholders can play a proactive role in advancing efforts to improve compensation for pre-K teachers and all early educators.

An essential first step is understanding and educating others about what compensation parity means and requires, in order to spark further discussion about possible options for moving toward parity. Stakeholders in each state can participate in a variety of ways, including: exploring how the compensation parity framework could be applied within a particular state context; developing champions for moving this agenda forward; and contributing to community education about the need for adequate compensation for pre-K teachers.

Another essential step is gathering data that describes the current disparities among pre-K and K-3 teachers, including pre-K teachers in different settings or programs, and among pre-K teachers and all early educators.²⁵ Such data has helped to bring increased attention to why the ECE wage structure requires reform. Additionally, baseline data with regular updates on teacher compensation across settings and roles is critical for spurring intentional policies aimed at bringing about needed changes. It is also essential for answering pressing policy questions related to parity strategies, such as whether the disparity in wages is diminishing over time, whether turnover among programs is increasing or decreasing in response to wage changes, and how changes in policy contribute to building a stable pool of skilled early educators or create unintended consequences for certain sectors of the workforce. Data can also help to inform the strengths and challenges associated with different approaches to parity. And, notably, workforce data, combined with program assessment data, can identify the contribution of better compensation to improvements in program quality.

From our preliminary investigation of states, we are beginning to learn how states are pursuing varied pathways toward parity. Some states built compensation parity, at least for some settings, into their initial program design, while others are engaged in reforming their programs to address compensation in a new way. In both circumstances, states are utilizing different mechanisms to shape compensation, turning to legislation, regulatory guidance, or contractual obligation. In some situations, funding has allowed programs to approach parity without specific policy or regulatory guidance. Furthermore, compensation parity has gained traction in some states as a result of pressure from unions representing pre-K teachers. The source of funding for these various strategies, whether it is ongoing or grant-based, as well as funding levels and financing mechanisms similarly vary across states. Further materials in our series on pre-K compensation parity will explore the challenges and opportunities embedded in various approaches, with the goal of spurring the innovation necessary to place early educators on a par with teachers of older children, aligning our expectations with their earnings.

Endnotes

¹ Barnett, W.S., Friedman-Krauss, A.H., Gomez, R.E., Horowitz, M., Weisenfeld, G.G., Brown, K.C., Squires, J.H. (2016). *The State of Preschool 2015: State Preschool Yearbook*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research. Retrieved from <http://nieer.org/research/state-preschool-2015>; Whitebook, M., McLean, C., & Austin L.J.E. (2016). *Early Childhood Workforce Index – 2016*. Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California, Berkeley.

² Whitebook, M., Phillips, D., & Howes, C. (2014). *Worthy Work, STILL Unlivable Wages: The Early Childhood Workforce Years after the National Child Care Staffing Study*. Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California, Berkeley, especially “Chapter 3: Then and Now: Trends in Wages, Education, and Turnover Among Early Childhood Teachers” (pp.13-40).

³ Barnett et al. (2016); Whitebook et al. (2016).

⁴ Whitebook, M., Howes, C., & Phillips, D. (1989). *The National Child Care Staffing Study: Who cares? Child care teachers and the quality of care in America. Executive Summary*. Oakland, CA: Child Care Employee Project; Whitebook et al. (2014); Whitebook et al. (2016).

⁵ National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team (2013). *Number and Characteristics of Early Care and Education (ECE) Teachers and Caregivers: Initial Findings, National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)*. OPRE Report #2013-38. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved from <http://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/26496/pdf>.

⁶ ECE teachers in centers and homes outside the state-funded pre-K system make up the bulk of the ECE teaching workforce, yet they are consistently paid even less than pre-K teachers, even when they have similar qualifications, see Whitebook et al. (2014).

⁷ For example, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation included compensation parity as one of their essential elements of a high-quality pre-K program, see: <http://www.gatesfoundation.org/What-We-Do/US-Program/Washington-State/Early-Learning>. A joint report from the U.S. Departments of Education and Health and Human Services examined the low earnings in the ECE field and recommended pay parity across settings and that lead preschool teachers be paid comparably with kindergarten and elementary school teachers, see: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services & U.S. Department of Education (2016). *High-Quality Early Learning Settings Depend on a High-Quality Workforce: Low Compensation Undermines Quality*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services & U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/earlylearning/files/ece-low-compensation-undermines-quality-report-2016.pdf>. Additionally, a recent report by the Council of Chief State School Officers recommended that chiefs act as champions for compensation parity between early educators and teachers of older children, see: Stark, D. (2016). *Equity Starts Early: How Chiefs Will Build High-Quality Early Education*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved from www.ccsso.org/documents/2016/EquityStartsEarly3242016.pdf.

⁸ Institute of Medicine (IOM) & National Research Council (NRC) (2015). *Transforming the Workforce for Children Birth Through Age 8: A Unifying Foundation*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalacademies.org/hmd/Reports/2015/Birth-To-Eight.aspx>.

⁹ Minervino, J. (2014). *Lessons from Research and the Classroom: Implementing High-Quality Pre-K That Makes a Difference for Young Children*. Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Retrieved from https://docs.gatesfoundation.org/documents/lessons%20from%20research%20and%20the%20Classroom_September%202014.pdf.

¹⁰ Results from national and several state-level polls from the First Five Years Fund in 2016 demonstrated widespread support for making early education and care a policy priority with increased public funding, see: First Five Years Fund (2016). *2016 National Poll: A Divided Electorate is United on Early Childhood Education*. Washington, DC: First Five Years Fund. Retrieved from <http://ffyf.org/2016-poll/>. Support for higher wages for ECE teachers is also high. At the national level, NAEYC market research found that the majority of voters think early educators are paid too little and support increased funding for ECE, including funding specifically dedicated to teacher wages, see: National Association for the Education of Young Children (2015). *Early Childhood Educators: Advancing the Profession*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children. Retrieved from https://www.naeyc.org/files/naeyc/Key%20Findings%20Presentation.NAEYC_.pdf. Similarly, in Nebraska, a 2016 survey estimated that nearly half of all Nebraskans and more than half of parents of children in ECE believe that early educators are paid too little, see Buffett Early Childhood Institute and Gallup. (2016). *Nebraskans Speak about the Early Care and Education Workforce: Buffett Early Childhood Institute/Gallup Survey on Early Childhood Education and Care in Nebraska*. Omaha, NE: Buffett Early Childhood Institute. Retrieved from <http://buffettinstitute.nebraska.edu/-/media/beci/docs/nebraskans-speak-about-the-early-care-and-education-workforce-report-final.ashx?la=en>.

¹¹ For example, in New York City, collective bargaining by the Day Care Council of New York successfully renegotiated a contract with the city to raise salaries for early educators outside the pre-K system, with the goal of reaching parity with pre-K teachers by 2020, see: New York Early Childhood Professional Development Institute (2016). *Stabilizing New York City's Child Care Services*.

Brooklyn, NY: New York Early Childhood Professional Development Institute. Retrieved from <http://earlychildhoodnyc.org/newswatch/stabilizing-new-york-citys-child-care-services-by-nilesh-patel-director-dccny-labor-relations-and-mediation-service/>.

¹² Barnett, W.S. & Kasmin, R. (2017). *Teacher Compensation Parity Policies and State-Funded Pre-K Programs*. Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California, Berkeley.

¹³ U.S. Department of Education & U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2014). *2014 Preschool Development Grants*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education & U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/preschooldevelopmentgrants/executivesummary-419a.pdf>.

¹⁴ Additionally, this would include not only those ECE teachers with bachelor's degrees, but would also establish parity among teachers at other levels of education.

¹⁵ There are also concerns that K-12 teacher pay is too low to sufficiently attract and retain skilled educators, see Sutchter, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2016). *A Coming Crisis in Teaching? Teacher Supply, Demand, and Shortages in the U.S.* Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.

¹⁶ Defined as a scale with clearly differentiated salary increments based on qualifications and years of experience, which provides guidance for salary increases over time.

¹⁷ Defined as non-child contact time to complete professional responsibilities, such as planning, professional sharing, and reporting, as well as paid time for professional development.

¹⁸ For example, in San Antonio, see: Lantigua-Williams, J. (2016, March 8). *How San Antonio is Navigating the Tricky Politics of Pre-K*. The Atlantic. Retrieved from: <http://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/03/san-antonio-pre-k/472821/>.

¹⁹ Note that Missouri does not report pro-rating; however, children in Missouri pre-K are overwhelmingly served in public schools.

²⁰ In some cases, these policies apply at the school district level.

²¹ Note that Missouri and Mississippi do not report prorating and West Virginia and Maryland do not have explicit requirements on prorating because they do not serve children in private settings.

²² Salary data comes from the Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Employment Survey, which does not allow identification of teachers within state-funded pre-K programs specifically. Earnings are adjusted for regional differences using the Bureau of Economic Analysis Index of Regional Price Parity.

²³ See Barnett et al. (2016) for further information on quality benchmarks.

²⁴ For more information about this funding mechanism, see National Conference of State Legislatures (2015). *Funding Pre-K Through the School Funding Formula*. Washington, DC: National Conference of State Legislatures Retrieved from <http://www.ncsl.org/research/human-services/funding-pre-k-through-the-school-funding-formula.aspx>.

²⁵ See Whitebook et al. (2016), especially section 4.5 on important elements of workforce data collection.

Acknowledgments

This brief could not have been written without the extensive contribution of CSCCE staff:

Lea J.E. Austin
Tyler Spencer

Special thanks to Harriet Dichter for serving as a crucial thought partner in this work.

This brief is generously supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Foundation for Child Development.

The views presented in this report are those of the authors and may not reflect the views of the report's funders or those acknowledged for lending their expertise or providing input.

© 2017 Center for the Study of Child Care Employment and the National Institute for Early Education Research.
All rights reserved.

Suggested Citation:

Whitebook, M. and McLean, C. (2017). *In Pursuit of Pre-K Parity: A Proposed Framework for Understanding and Advancing Policy and Practice*. Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California, Berkeley and New Brunswick, NJ: the National Institute for Early Education Research.

Center for the Study of Child Care Employment
Institute for Research on Labor and Employment
University of California, Berkeley
2521 Channing Way #5555, Berkeley, CA 94720
(510) 643-8293
cscce.berkeley.edu

National Institute for Early Education Research
Rutgers, State University of New Jersey
73 Easton Avenue, New Brunswick, NJ 08901
(848) 932-4350
nieer.org

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

The National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) conducts academic research to inform policy supporting high-quality early education for all young children. NIEER provides independent research-based analysis and technical assistance to policymakers, journalists, researchers, and educators.

Design: BerlinRosen
Editor: Deborah Meacham
Printer: Autumn Press



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

