Congressional Research Service
Informing the legislative debate since 1914

# Early Childhood Care and Education Programs: Background and Funding

Updated May 16, 2016

**Congressional Research Service**
https://crsreports.congress.gov
R40212

**CRS REPORT**
Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress

# Summary

The federal government has a long history of investing in early childhood care and education. As early as the 1930s, the government was supporting nursery schools for low-income children. Over time, the federal role in early childhood care and education has evolved, and today's federal investments in this area come in many forms. For instance, such investments

- Stretch across multiple federal agencies and congressional committee jurisdictions. Agencies include the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the Department of Education (ED), the Department of the Interior (DOI), the Department of Agriculture (USDA), and the Internal Revenue Service (IRS).
- Vary from targeted to flexible funding streams, from grant programs to tax provisions. Some programs exclusively offer early childhood services (e.g., Head Start), while others are broad-based funding streams for which such services are among many allowable uses (e.g., Temporary Assistance for Needy Families).
- Often have differing policy goals, target populations, program services, and administrative rules. Some target a particular service (e.g., home visiting, child care), while others target a particular population (e.g., special needs children, working parents). Many programs target low-income families, but some programs and tax provisions benefit middle- and upper-income families.

Currently, some of the largest federal investments in targeted early childhood programs come from HHS, through programs such as Head Start ($9.2 billion in FY2016) and the Child Care and Development Block Grant ($5.7 billion in combined mandatory and discretionary funding in FY2016). Two child care-related tax provisions (combining to account for an estimated $5.5 billion in FY2016) and the USDA's Child and Adult Care Food Program (estimated at $3.3 billion in FY2016) also provide substantial financial contributions to federal early childhood initiatives. By comparison, funding for targeted early childhood programs at ED and DOI tends to be lower, on average, typically falling below the billion-dollar mark for any one program.

In recent years, both Congress and the Obama Administration have demonstrated interest in early childhood issues. The President has proposed the creation of new early childhood programs (e.g., Preschool for All), as well as reforms to existing programs. In some cases, these or other early childhood proposals have been taken up by Congress. For instance, the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-95), which was signed into law in December 2015, authorized a new Preschool Development Grants program to be administered by HHS, jointly with ED. This legislation builds on a predecessor program of the same name that has been funded (at ED, but administered jointly with HHS) in annual appropriations acts since FY2014 under broad authorities without a standalone authorization.

Of note, several early childhood care and education programs are due for possible reauthorization in the 114th Congress, including Head Start, mandatory child care funding authorized in Section 418 of the Social Security Act, and the IDEA Part C early intervention program for infants and toddlers. In addition, Congress may also take an interest in the Administration's implementation of the reauthorization law (P.L. 113-186) for the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) that was enacted in November 2014, substantively overhauling existing program rules for the first time since 1996.

# Contents

Introduction ..... 1
Report Roadmap ..... 1
Current and Historical Funding Levels ..... 2
FY2017 President's Request ..... 2
Funding History ..... 3
Program Summaries ..... 4
Targeted Programs ..... 5
Head Start ..... 5
Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) ..... 5
Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) ..... 6
Preschool Development Grants (PDG) ..... 7
IDEA Part C and Section 619 ..... 8
Child Care Access Means Parents in School (CCAMPIS) ..... 9
Indian Family and Child Education (FACE) ..... 9
Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) ..... 9
Tax Provisions ..... 10
Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit (CDCTC) ..... 10
Dependent Care Assistance Program (DCAP) ..... 10
Related Programs ..... 14
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) ..... 14
Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) ..... 14
Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I, Part A ..... 15
Striving Readers/Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants ..... 15
Promise Neighborhoods ..... 16

## Tables

Table 1. Funding Levels for Selected Early Childhood Programs, FY2016-FY2017 President's Request ..... 2
Table 2. Federal Funding for Selected Early Childhood Care and Education Programs and Tax Provisions, FY2010-FY2016 ..... 3
Table 3. Characteristics of Selected Early Childhood Care and Education Programs and Tax Provisions ..... 12

## Appendixes

Appendix A. Programs Not Currently Funded ..... 17
Appendix B. Acronyms Used in This Report ..... 19

## Contacts

Author Information ..... 20
Acknowledgments ..... 20

# Introduction

Federal investments in early childhood care and education come in many forms. These investments stretch across multiple federal agencies and congressional committee jurisdictions. They vary from targeted to flexible funding streams, from grant programs to tax provisions. Some programs primarily or exclusively provide early childhood services (e.g., Head Start), while others are broad-based, flexible funding streams for which early childhood services are among many allowable uses (e.g., Temporary Assistance for Needy Families). These federal programs often have differing policy goals, target populations, program services, and administrative rules. For instance, some programs target a particular service (e.g., child care, home visiting), while others target a particular population (e.g., special needs children, working parents). In many cases, federal programs target low-income families, but certain programs and child care-related tax provisions benefit middle- and upper-income families as well.

In recent years, both Congress and the Obama Administration have demonstrated interest in early childhood issues. The President has proposed the creation of new early childhood programs (e.g., Preschool for All), as well as reforms to existing programs. In some cases, these or other early childhood proposals have been taken up by Congress. For instance, the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA; P.L. 114-95), which was signed into law in December 2015, authorized a new Preschool Development Grants program to be administered by HHS, jointly with ED. This legislation builds on a predecessor program of the same name that has been funded (at ED, but administered jointly with HHS) in annual appropriations acts since FY2014 under broad authorities and without a standalone authorization.

Of note, several early childhood care and education programs are due for possible reauthorization in the 114th Congress, including Head Start, mandatory child care funding authorized in Section 418 of the Social Security Act, and the IDEA Part C early intervention program for infants and toddlers. In addition, Congress may also take an interest in the Administration's implementation of recent reauthorizations, including the December 2015 (P.L. 114-95) reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the November 2014 (P.L. 113-186) reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG). These laws mark the first comprehensive reauthorizations of the ESEA and the CCDBG since 2002 and 1996, respectively.

# Report Roadmap

This report begins with information on current and historical funding levels for a selection of early childhood care and education programs and tax provisions. **Table 1** presents information on the FY2017 Obama Administration's budget request for such programs, while **Table 2** provides a seven-year funding history (FY2010-FY2016) for these early childhood care and education programs and tax provisions.

The funding section is followed by a series of program summaries (see **Table 3** for a comparison of basic characteristics for selected programs). The program summaries have been organized into three categories: (1) targeted programs that exclusively or primarily provide early childhood services, (2) tax provisions that support the child care expenses of working families, and (3) certain broad-based and flexible programs that may be used to support early childhood care and education. **Appendix A** of this report provides some additional information on early childhood programs that do not currently receive federal funding. **Appendix B** presents a list of abbreviations and acronyms used throughout the report.

Readers should note that program summaries in this report are not meant to be comprehensive. In many cases, other Congressional Research Service (CRS) reports are referenced as sources for more detailed information about individual programs.

**Dollar and Percentage Changes in this Report**

Funding amounts displayed in this report are typically rounded to the nearest million or billion (as labeled). Dollar changes and percentage changes discussed in the text of this report are generally based on unrounded amounts.

# Current and Historical Funding Levels

## FY2017 President's Request

The Obama Administration released its FY2017 budget request on February 9, 2016. In keeping with recent practice, the President again generally requested increases from prior-year levels for early childhood care and education programs (see **Table 1**). At the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), for instance, the request called for a $434 million (+5%) increase for Head Start and a $3.9 billion (+68%) increase in combined mandatory and discretionary funding for the CCDBG.[1] The FY2017 request also called for a $100 million (+40%) increase for the Preschool Development Grants (PDG) program, noting that this program would be based at HHS starting in FY2017, consistent with the new PDG authorization included in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA; P.L. 114-95).[2]

In addition, the Obama Administration once again requested $1.3 billion in mandatory funds to establish a new federal-state partnership to provide high-quality preschool for all four-year-olds from low- and moderate-income families. This "Preschool for All" program would incentivize state expansion of (1) publicly funded high-quality preschool for four-year-olds from families with income at or below 200% of the federal poverty line, (2) full-day kindergarten programs, and (3) other publicly funded high-quality early childhood programs for children under the age of four. Similar preschool proposals were included in the Obama Administration's budget requests for FY2014-FY2016.

**Table 1. Funding Levels for Selected Early Childhood Programs, FY2016-FY2017 President's Request**

(Dollars in millions)

| Program | Federal Agency | FY2016 Enacted | FY2017 Request | % Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Head Start | HHS | 9,168 | 9,602 | 5% |
| CCDBG | HHS | 2,761 | 2,962 | 7% |
| CCDBG—mandatory | HHS | 2,917 | 6,582 | 126% |
| MIECHV—mandatory | HHS | 400 | 400 | 0% |

[1] Under the President's request the majority of the increase for CCDBG would be provided through the program's mandatory funding stream, which is authorized by Section 418 of the Social Security Act. In general, the Social Security Act would need to be amended for the proposed increase in mandatory funds to be provided.

[2] The President's request indicates that the proposed funding level would be sufficient to issue 18 continuation grants from the pre-existing PDG program, while still leaving additional funds for new grant awards based on new program parameters established by ESSA.

| Program | Federal Agency | FY2016 Enacted | FY2017 Request | % Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Preschool Development Grants | ED/HHS[a] | 250 | 350 | 40% |
| IDEA Infants and Toddlers | ED | 459 | 504 | 10% |
| IDEA Preschool Grants | ED | 368 | 403 | 10% |
| Child Care Access Means Parents in School (CCAMPIS) | ED | 15 | 15 | 0% |
| Preschool For All Proposal—mandatory | ED | — | 1,300 | — |
| Indian Family and Child Education (FACE) | DOI | 16 | 20 | 26% |
| Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)—mandatory | USDA | 3,340 | 3,446 | 3% |
| Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit (CDCTC)—mandatory | IRS | 4,520 | 4,560 | 1% |
| Dependent Care Assistance Program Tax Exclusion (DCAP)—mandatory | IRS | 930 | 980 | 5% |

**Source:** Table prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data provided in agency budget justifications, operating plans, or Office of Management and Budget (OMB) President's budget materials. Funding levels are displayed in budget authority, except for CACFP (obligations, excluding commodities) and tax provisions (expenditures). All amounts are discretionary, unless otherwise noted.

**Notes:** HHS = U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. CCDBG = Child Care and Development Block Grant. MIECHV = Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting. IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. ED = U.S. Department of Education. DOI = Department of the Interior. USDA = U.S. Department of Agriculture. IRS = Internal Revenue Service.

a. The FY2016 omnibus appropriated these funds to ED, but directed ED to administer the program jointly with HHS. However, in keeping with provisions included in the Every Student Succeeds Act (P.L. 114-95 ), the FY2017 President's budget submission proposed funding a new Preschool Development Grants program at HHS, to be administered jointly with ED.

## Funding History

For context, **Table 2** provides historical funding levels for selected early childhood care and education programs (and related tax provisions) from FY2010 through FY2016, the most recent year for which funding has been appropriated. There have been some changes in programs receiving funding during this timeframe, with some programs receiving funding for the first time (e.g., Preschool Development Grants) and others seeing their funding terminated altogether (e.g., Even Start).

**Table 2. Federal Funding for Selected Early Childhood Care and Education Programs and Tax Provisions, FY2010-FY2016**

(Nominal dollars in millions)

| Program or Tax Provision | Federal Agency | FY2010 | FY2011 | FY2012 | FY2013 | FY2014 | FY2015 | FY2016 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Head Start | HHS | 7,234[a] | 7,560 | 7,969 | 7,573[b] | 8,598 | 8,598 | 9,168 |
| CCDBG | HHS | 2,127 | 2,223 | 2,278 | 2,206 | 2,358 | 2,435 | 2,761 |
| CCDBG—mandatory | HHS | 2,917 | 2,917 | 2,917 | 2,917 | 2,917 | 2,917 | 2,917 |
| MIECHV—mandatory | HHS | 100 | 250 | 350 | 380 | 371 | 400 | 400 |
| Preschool Development Grants | ED/HHS[c] | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 250 | 250 | 250 |

| Program or Tax Provision | Federal Agency | FY2010 | FY2011 | FY2012 | FY2013 | FY2014 | FY2015 | FY2016 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Race to the Top—Early Learning Challenge | ED/HHS[c] | n/a[d] | 500 | 133 | 370 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Even Start | ED | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| IDEA Infants and Toddlers | ED | 439 | 439 | 443 | 420 | 438 | 439 | 459 |
| IDEA Preschool Grants | ED | 374 | 373 | 373 | 353 | 353 | 353 | 368 |
| CCAMPIS | ED | 16 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| FACE | DOI | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 16 |
| CACFP—mandatory[e] | USDA | 2,543 | 2,732 | 2,846 | 3,083 | 3,112 | 3,132 | 3,340 |
| CDCTC—mandatory[f] | IRS | 3,470 | 4,200 | 3,410 | 4,160 | 4,420 | 4,510 | 4,520 |
| DCAP—mandatory[f] | IRS | 1,220 | 840 | 1,360 | 880 | 890 | 940 | 930 |

**Source:** Prepared by CRS based on data in agency budget justifications, operating plans, or President's budget materials by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). All amounts are discretionary budget authority, except as noted.

**Notes:** HHS = U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. CCDBG = Child Care and Development Block Grant. MIECHV = Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program. IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. ED = U.S. Department of Education. CCAMPIS = Child Care Access Means Parents in School. FACE = Indian Family and Child Education. DOI = U.S. Department of the Interior. CACFP = Child and Adult Care Food Program. USDA = U.S. Department of Agriculture. CDCTC = Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit. IRS = Internal Revenue Service. DCAP = Dependent Care Assistance Program Tax Provision. n/a = not applicable. The table displays selected programs and tax provisions that received funding in at least one year from FY2010-FY2015. Amounts for mandatory programs were generally provided via direct spending budget authority in authorizing laws. Amounts for discretionary programs were provided by annual appropriations acts and exclude supplemental appropriations. Discretionary amounts reflect across-the-board rescissions, where appropriate, including in FY2011 (0.2%), FY2012 (0.189% for HHS and ED programs, 0.16% for DOI), and FY2013 (0.2%). Non-exempt mandatory amounts reflect sequestration in FY2013-FY2015, while non-exempt discretionary amounts reflect sequestration in FY2013 only. Amounts reflect transfers or reprogramming, where appropriate.

a. This amount reflects a $1.103 million transfer from Head Start to the HHS Health Resources and Services Administration, pursuant to the HHS Secretary's 1% transfer authority in Division D, Title II, §206 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 (P.L. 111-117).

b. In addition to amounts shown here, Head Start received $95 million, post-sequestration, from the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-2) for costs associated with the effects of Hurricane Sandy.

c. Annual appropriations acts appropriated these funds to ED, but directed ED to administer the program jointly with HHS.

d. Race to the Top (RTT) was first authorized and funded by Title XIV, §14006 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA; P.L. 111-5). However, ARRA did not initially authorize or appropriate RTT funds for early learning challenge (ELC) grants. RTT-ELC grants were first funded in FY2011.

e. CACFP amounts for FY2010-FY2015 are actual obligations (excluding commodities) reported in subsequent President's budgets (e.g., FY2015 actuals are from the *Analytical Perspectives* volume of the FY2017 budget). FY2016 reflects estimated obligations (excluding commodities), as reported in the FY2017 request.

f. Amounts reflect expenditures as reported in the *Analytical Perspectives* volumes of subsequent President's budgets (e.g., CDCTC = $3.47 billion for tax year 2009 (FY2010), as reported in the FY2012 request).

# Program Summaries

This section presents brief descriptions of a selection of early childhood and related programs and tax provisions currently receiving federal funding. (**Appendix A** presents similar summaries of

early childhood programs that were funded in the recent past, but do not currently receive federal funding.) The programs are divided into three sections:

- The "Targeted Programs" section describes programs that exclusively or primarily provide early childhood care and education services.
- The "Tax Provisions" section describes two provisions in the tax code that largely support child care expenses of working families.
- The "Related Programs" section describes several programs that are more broad-based and flexible in nature, but that may be used to support early care and education.

To allow for easier comparison across programs, **Table 3** presents some basic program data for the targeted programs and tax provisions described in this section. This table highlights how even these targeted programs experience wide variations in funding, federal eligibility rules, and participation.

# Targeted Programs

## Head Start

Head Start has provided comprehensive early childhood education and development services to low-income children since 1965. The program seeks to promote school readiness by enhancing the social and cognitive development of children through the provision of educational, health, nutritional, social, and other services. In general, children are eligible for Head Start if their family's income does not exceed the official poverty level or the family is receiving public assistance.[3] Most children served in Head Start programs are three- and four-year-olds, but in 1994 Head Start was expanded to include an Early Head Start program, which serves children from birth to three years of age. In addition, since FY2014 annual Head Start appropriations have reserved a portion of funds for Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships. Through these partnerships, Early Head Start providers partner with center-based and family child care providers who agree to meet Head Start program performance standards.

At the federal level, Head Start is administered by HHS, which awards Head Start funds directly to local grantees rather than through states. Programs are locally designed and are administered by a network of roughly 1,600 public and private nonprofit and for-profit agencies. Head Start agencies are required to comply with detailed federal performance standards. Head Start was last reauthorized by the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-134). This law authorized the program through the end of FY2012 (September 30, 2012), meaning that Head Start is currently due for possible reauthorization.

For more information on Head Start, see CRS Report RL30952, *Head Start: Background and Funding*, by Karen E. Lynch.

## Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG)

The CCDBG is the primary source of federal grant funding dedicated to child care subsidies for low-income working families. The CCDBG has two funding streams:

[3] Grantees may fill up to 35% of their slots with children whose family income is between 100% and 130% of the poverty line, *provided such children are not given higher priority* than children who are homeless or living below poverty. Grantees may also fill up to 10% of their slots with children meeting no income or other eligibility criteria.

- Discretionary funding is authorized by the CCDBG Act of 1990, which was reauthorized through 2020 by the CCDBG Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-186). There are no state maintenance-of-effort (MOE) or matching requirements associated with these discretionary CCDBG funds.
- Mandatory funding is authorized by Section 418 of the Social Security Act, which is due for possible reauthorization.[4] Mandatory (or "entitlement") child care funds are generally appropriated directly by authorizing statute, meaning that these funds are not typically part of the annual appropriations process. States must meet MOE and matching requirements to receive their full allotments.

At the federal level, these child care funding streams are jointly administered by HHS—and are commonly referred to as the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF). The funds are allocated to states, according to separate formulas, and are used to subsidize the child care expenses of low-income working families with children under age 13 (and sometimes older children in special circumstances). Federal law stipulates that eligible families are those with a family income below 85% of the state median income, but in practice most states set income eligibility levels below the federal threshold. Child care services are provided to families on a sliding fee scale basis and parents may choose to receive assistance through vouchers or certificates, which can be used with a provider of the parents' choice, including religious providers and relatives. In addition to supporting direct services for children, states must use a portion of their CCDBG funds (both mandatory and discretionary) to improve the quality and availability of child care (e.g., by supporting training and professional development).

For more information, see CRS Report RL30785, *The Child Care and Development Block Grant: Background and Funding*, by Karen E. Lynch

**CCDBG Reauthorized**

The CCDBG Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-186) reauthorized the CCDBG through FY2020. This law substantially amended the previous CCDBG Act, strengthening requirements related to health and safety, licensing, enforcement, and quality of care. For instance, under the reauthorized CCDBG Act

- states must establish and enforce minimum health and safety standards covering 11 broad areas, such as the prevention and control of infectious diseases, building and premises safety, and emergency preparedness;
- all providers receiving CCDF funds must complete pre-service and ongoing training on health and safety topics;
- states must set age-specific standards for group size limits and child-to-provider ratios;
- states must conduct pre-licensure and annual unannounced licensing inspections for all licensed CCDF providers, as well as annual inspections for unlicensed (or "license-exempt") CCDF providers;
- states must establish qualifications and training for licensing inspectors and set inspector-to-provider ratios;
- states must conduct criminal background checks on applicable child care providers and staff members; and
- minimum state spending on general quality activities increases incrementally from 4% of CCDF spending under prior law to 9% by FY2020, plus states must spend an additional 3% on quality activities for infants and toddlers.

## Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV)

The MIECHV program supports home visiting services for families with young children who reside in communities that have concentrations of poor child health and other risk indicators. Home visits are conducted by nurses, mental health clinicians, social workers, or

[4] Mandatory child care funding was most recently extended temporarily through the end of FY2016 by P.L. 114-113.

paraprofessionals with specialized training. Generally, they visit the homes of eligible families on a regular basis (e.g., weekly or monthly) over an extended period (e.g., six months or longer) to provide support to caregivers and children, such as guidance on creating a positive home environment and referrals to community resources. Families participate on a voluntary basis.

At the federal level, the program is jointly administered by the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) and the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) at HHS.[5] MIECHV funding is provided primarily to states and territories to administer home visiting programs, and funds are awarded on both a formula and a competitive basis. The majority of funding (a minimum of 75%) must be used to support home visiting models that have shown sufficient evidence of effectiveness.[6]

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA; P.L. 111-148) established the MIECHV program under Title V of the Social Security Act. The program receives mandatory appropriations directly from its authorizing statute. Mandatory MIECHV funding was extended through FY2017 by the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-10).

For more information, see CRS Report R43930, *Maternal and Infant Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Program: Background and Funding*, by Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara.

## Preschool Development Grants (PDG)

Starting in FY2014, annual appropriations acts have funded a PDG program that is intended to expand access to high-quality preschool for low- and moderate-income four-year-olds.[7] Funding for this PDG program has been provided under broad authorities and without a standalone authorization.[8] However, the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-95) included a standalone authorization for a new Preschool Development Grants program. There are a number of differences between the initial PDG program that has been funded from FY2014 to FY2016 and the newly authorized PDG program that is slated to begin operations in FY2017.

- **Federal Administration:** The initial PDG program (FY2014-FY2016) has been based at ED but administered jointly with HHS. Starting in FY2017, the new program will be based at HHS but administered jointly with ED.
- **Purposes:** The initial PDG program did not have a standalone authorization with explicit purpose language, but annual appropriations acts stipulated that these funds were intended to build state capacity to develop, enhance, or expand high-quality preschool programs, including comprehensive services and family engagement, for preschool-aged children from families at or below 200% of the federal poverty line. The purposes of the new PDG program are more broad-based and focus on improving coordination, collaboration, and alignment of existing federal, state, local, and non-governmental early childhood programs, while maximizing parental choice in a mixed-delivery system.

[5] HHS has located the program's main homepage at http://mchb.hrsa.gov/programs/homevisiting/ and hosts a separate website for tribal MIECHV programs at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ecd/home-visiting/tribal-home-visiting.

[6] HHS created the Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness (HomVEE) project to identify home visiting models that have shown sufficient evidence of effectiveness (see at http://homvee.acf.hhs.gov/).

[7] For more information, see http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-earlylearningchallenge/index.html.

[8] The FY2014 appropriations law funded Preschool Development Grants under broad Race to the Top authorities established by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA; P.L. 111-5), while the FY2015 and FY2016 appropriations acts funded PDG under broad authorities of Title V-D of the ESEA (as it existed before the FY2015 reauthorization law, P.L. 114-95).

- **Grants:** The initial PDG program has been divided into two grant components: (1) *Development Grants* help states with limited or no state-funded preschool to build the necessary capacity to establish high-quality preschool programs in high-need communities, and (2) *Expansion Grants* support states with existing capacity in expanding access to high-quality programs in high-need communities. The new PDG program will also have two grant components: (1) *Planning Grants* will support statewide needs assessments, strategic plans for coordination and partnership-building, family involvement and knowledge of options, sharing of best practices, and quality improvement activities, while (2) *Renewal Grants* will focus on improving overall program quality and expanding access to programs in a mixed-delivery system, including access for children who are eligible for, but not currently served by, existing early childhood programs.

Notably, the term "high-quality preschool program" was explicitly defined in the *Federal Register* for purposes of the initial PDG program. This federal definition addresses staff qualifications and professional development, child-to-staff instructional ratios, class size, length of day, inclusive classrooms, evidence-based curricula aligned with early learning standards, individualized accommodations, adequacy of staff salaries, ongoing program evaluation, on-site access to comprehensive services, and evidence-based health and safety standards.[9] However, the Every Student Succeeds Act explicitly prohibits HHS and ED from defining the term "high-quality" as it relates to "early learning, development, or care" in the context of the newly authorized PDG program.

For more information, see CRS Report R44008, *Preschool Development Grants and Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Grants: A Primer*, by Kyrie E. Dragoo and Gail McCallion.

## IDEA Part C and Section 619

IDEA is the main federal statute governing special education for children from birth through age 21. The majority of IDEA funding goes to school-age children via grants to states. However, IDEA also authorizes two state grant programs for young children:

- IDEA Part C serves infants and toddlers with disabilities; and
- IDEA Part B Section 619 serves preschool-aged children with disabilities.

The Part C Infants and Families Program serves disabled children from birth through two years of age. To receive a Part C grant, states must create and maintain a "statewide, comprehensive, coordinated, multidisciplinary, interagency system that provides early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families." Part C services focus on children experiencing developmental delay with respect to physical, mental, or other capacities, as well as the families of such children. Part C early intervention services are designed to ensure that all infants and toddlers with developmental delays are identified and evaluated. At this point, an individualized family services plan is tailored to the unique needs of the child and the child's family. Early intervention services are to be provided, to the maximum extent feasible, in "natural environments," including the child's home, and with other infants and toddlers who are not disabled.

[9] Department of Education and Department of Health and Human Services, "Application for New Awards; Preschool Development Grants—Development Grants," 79 *Federal Register* 48858-48859, August 18, 2014. See also ED and HHS, "Applications for New Award; Preschool Development Grants—Expansion Grants," 79 *Federal Register* 48879, August 18, 2014.

For more information, see CRS Report R43631, *The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part C: Early Intervention for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities*, by Kyrie E. Dragoo.

IDEA Part B authorizes services to school-aged children with disabilities as young as age three. States receiving IDEA Part B state grants are also eligible for additional Section 619 Preschool Grants if they offer free appropriate public education to all disabled children ages three to five within the state. (That is to say, Section 619 is not so much a separate program as it is a supplemental funding stream for children in the preschool age group.) In recent years, all states have qualified for and received preschool grants under this section. In general, the provisions, requirements, and guarantees under the Part B state grants program for school-age children also apply to Section 619 preschool-aged children.

For more information, see CRS Report R41833, *The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part B: Key Statutory and Regulatory Provisions*, by Kyrie E. Dragoo.

## Child Care Access Means Parents in School (CCAMPIS)

CCAMPIS is authorized by Section 419N of the Higher Education Act.[10] The program is designed to support the participation of low-income parents in postsecondary education through campus-based child care services. Discretionary grants of up to four years in duration are awarded competitively to institutions of higher education, to either supplement existing child care services, or to start a new program.

## Indian Family and Child Education (FACE)

The Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) at the U.S. Department of the Interior administers an early childhood development program, commonly called FACE.[11] The FACE program provides grants to tribes and tribal organizations for services to Indian children under the age of six and their parents. FACE programs may serve children and families in home- and center-based settings. Activities may include parenting skills-building, adult education, home visiting, and preschool services. FACE grants are distributed by formula among applicant tribes and tribal organizations with 500 or more members.

## Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)

The CACFP provides federal funds (and in some cases commodity foods) for meals and snacks served in licensed child care centers, family and group day care homes, afterschool programs, and Head Start centers.[12] Children under age 12, children under 18 in eligible afterschool programs, migrant children under age 15, and children with disabilities of any age may participate, although most participants are preschoolers. Subsidies provided to day care *centers*, including Head Start centers, vary according to the child's family income. Subsidies provided to family and group day care *homes* vary according to the care provider's income or the average income of the community in which the home is located. The CACFP is an annually appropriated open-ended entitlement, administered by the Department of Agriculture.

---

[10] For more information, visit http://www2.ed.gov/programs/campisp/index.html.

[11] BIE's early childhood development program is authorized at 25 U.S.C. 2019. More information about the program can be found on the BIE website at http://bie.edu/Programs/FACE/.

[12] As the program name indicates, CACFP also provides meals for adults. However, the majority of funding is spent in child care settings. In FY2015, roughly 96% of funds were used for child care and 4% for adult daycare, based on calculations using the USDA Food and Nutrition Service Keydata Report, January 2016.

For more information on CACFP, see CRS Report R43783, *School Meals Programs and Other USDA Child Nutrition Programs: A Primer*, by Randy Alison Aussenberg. See also CRS In Focus IF10266, *An Introduction to Child Nutrition Reauthorization*, by Randy Alison Aussenberg.

## Tax Provisions

### Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit (CDCTC)

The CDCTC, which is authorized by Section 21 of the Internal Revenue Code, is a non-refundable tax credit for employment-related expenses incurred for the care of a dependent child under age 13 or a disabled dependent or spouse. As a tax *credit*, the CDCTC directly reduces the amount of income tax owed. However, *non-refundable* tax credits cannot be greater than the taxpayer's income tax liability, meaning that low-income taxpayers with little or no income tax liability generally receive little or no benefit from the credit.

Under current law, the maximum credit rate equals 35% of expenses up to $3,000 for one child (for a credit of $1,050) and up to $6,000 for two or more children (for a credit of $2,100).[13] The maximum credit rate applies to taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of $15,000 or less. The credit rate decreases by one percentage point for each additional $2,000 increment (or portion thereof) in income until the rate reaches the floor of 20% for taxpayers with incomes over $43,000.[14]

For more information, see CRS Report RS21466, *Dependent Care: Current Tax Benefits and Legislative Issues*, by Julie M. Whittaker.

### Dependent Care Assistance Program (DCAP)

Under Section 129 of the Internal Revenue Code, taxpayers can exclude from their income up to $5,000 of dependent care expenses associated with an employer-provided dependent care assistance program (DCAP). As with the CDCTC, expenses must be employment-related and for the care of a dependent child under age 13 or a disabled dependent or spouse.

Payments may be made directly by employers, may be reimbursable to employees, or may be made through salary reduction agreements.[15] Under a salary reduction agreement, the employee agrees that a specified amount be set aside for the employer's DCAP.

The exclusion from income for employer-provided DCAPs does not directly reduce tax liability but instead reduces a taxpayer's taxable income, thereby reducing both income taxes and payroll taxes. The reduction in tax liability equals the qualifying expenses multiplied by the taxpayer's marginal tax rate. For example, if a taxpayer's marginal tax rate (the highest tax rate that applied to taxable income) was 25% and $1,000 of qualifying expenses were excluded from taxable income, the tax liability would be reduced by $250.

---

[13] The current parameters were originally set by the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (EGTRRA; P.L. 107-16) and became effective in 2003. These parameters were later made permanent by the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (ATRA; P.L. 112-240), which was signed into law by President Obama on January 3, 2013. Before 2003, the maximum credit rate was 30% instead of 35%; the limits on qualifying expenses were $2,400 for one dependent and $4,800 for two or more dependents.

[14] These provisions were also made permanent by ATRA (P.L. 112-240).

[15] For instance, employers may include dependent care assistance as a nontaxable benefit available through a "cafeteria" plan authorized by Section 125 of the Internal Revenue Code. In such cases, employees agree to set aside a portion of their salary on a pre-tax basis to pay for dependent care expenses.

For more information, see CRS Report RS21466, *Dependent Care: Current Tax Benefits and Legislative Issues*, by Julie M. Whittaker.

**Table 3. Characteristics of Selected Early Childhood Care and Education Programs and Tax Provisions**

| Program or Provision | Federal Agency | Type of Funding | FY2016 (millions) | Target Population (Federal Eligibility Rules) | Age Group Served | Participants |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Head Start (incl. EHS) | HHS | Discretionary | $9,168 | In general, family income may not exceed 100% FPL. Child is categorically eligible if homeless, in foster care, or on public assistance. | HS = children from birth to compulsory school age and their parents; EHS = children ages 0-2 and pregnant women | FY2015: 912,156 funded enrollment slots (87% in HS, 13% in EHS) |
| CCDBG | HHS | Mandatory & Discretionary | $2,917<br>$2,761 | Under federal law, family income may not exceed 85% SMI, but states may set this lower. In general, parents must be working or in school or training. | Children ages 0-12 (in general) | FY2014: 1.40 million children in average month (66% ages 0-5) |
| MIECHV | HHS | Mandatory | $400 | States must prioritize families meeting certain criteria (e.g., low-income), but the law does not require that all participants meet these criteria. | Children from birth to kindergarten entry and their parents or caregivers; pregnant woman and expectant fathers | FY2015: 145,500 parents and children |
| PDG | ED/HHS | Discretionary | $250 | In general, family income may not exceed 200% FPL. | Children age 4 (in general) | FY2015: 33,000 children |
| IDEA Part C: Infants/Toddlers | ED | Discretionary | $459 | Child must meet IDEA's definition of *infant or toddler with a disability* and state's definition of *developmental delay*. | Children ages 0-2 (in general) | FY2015: 352,000 children |
| IDEA §619: Preschool | ED | Discretionary | $368 | Child must meet IDEA's definition of *child with a disability* and require special services to benefit from a public education. | Children ages 3-5 | FY2015: 753,038 children |
| CCAMPIS | ED | Discretionary | $15 | Children of low-income postsecondary students. Parent must be eligible for a federal Pell grant. | Not specified (funds may support care for infants through school-age) | FY2013: 7,566 students |
| FACE | DOI | Discretionary | $16 | Indian parents and children served through a Bureau of Indian Education-funded school. | Prenatal through age 5 (in general) | 2015: 2,129 children and 2,042 adults |
| CACFP | USDA | Mandatory | $3,340 | Children in certain child care settings. Elderly or disabled in adult day care. Generally low-income. | Children ages 0-11 (child care), ages 0-18 (eligible afterschool), ages 0-15 (migrant); elderly or disabled adults | FY2014: 3.86 million children in average day |
| CDCTC | IRS | Mandatory | $4,520 | Taxpayers with dependent care expenses. | Dependent children 0-12; spouse or dependent who is incapable of self-care | 2013: 6.3 million tax filers |
| DCAP | IRS | Mandatory | $930 | Taxpayers with expenses associated with employer-provided dependent care assistance. | Dependent children 0-12; spouse or dependent who is incapable of self-care | 2010: 1.2 million tax filers |

**Source:** Prepared by CRS. Funding is shown in budget authority, except for CACFP (estimated obligations) and tax provisions (estimated expenditures). Participation data are from FY2017 budget justifications or IRS Statistics of Income, except for Preschool Development Grants (estimate from an ED press release, dated 10-2-15).

**Notes:** HS = Head Start. FPL = Federal Poverty Line. EHS = Early Head Start. CCDBG = Child Care and Development Block Grant. SMI = State Median Income. MIECHV = Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program. PDG = Preschool Development Grants. IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. CACFP = Child and Adult Care Food Program. CDCTC = Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit. DCAP = Dependent Care Assistance Program. Federal eligibility rules and target populations identified in this table are meant to be illustrative, not comprehensive. Several programs have additional eligibility requirements (or exceptions to requirements identified here) and several programs allow older children to be served in certain circumstances. PDG data are based on the program as in operation for FY2014-FY2016 and have not been adjusted to reflect changes to the program starting in FY2017, as authorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act (P.L. 114-95).

# Related Programs

## Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

TANF was created by the 1996 welfare reform law, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-193) as a broad-based block grant to states. At the federal level, the program is administered by HHS. TANF funds are intended to help states address the root causes and effects of childhood economic disadvantage. States use these funds to provide a wide range of benefits and services. The program is most commonly associated with basic cash assistance for needy families with children. (Such benefits are generally subject to time limits and work requirements.) In addition, states use TANF funds for a number of other activities, including child care, preschool, and child welfare-related services.

Since its inception, mandatory federal funding for the basic TANF block grant has totaled $16.5 billion annually. TANF spending on child care is tracked separately from other TANF expenditures (this is not true for TANF spending on preschool). In FY2014, the most recent year for which data are available, HHS reported that states spent about $1.2 billion in federal funds and $2.5 billion in state maintenance-of-effort or related funds to support child care directly within TANF programs. In addition, the law gives states the authority to transfer up to 30% of their TANF allotments to the CCDBG. Such transfers must be spent according to CCDBG Act rules (as opposed to TANF rules). In FY2014, states transferred nearly $1.4 billion in federal TANF funds to the CCDBG, representing about 8% of the FY2013 TANF allotment.[16]

For more background information, see CRS Report R40946, *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Block Grant: An Overview*, by Gene Falk. See also, CRS Report RL32760, *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: Responses to Frequently Asked Questions*, by Gene Falk. For more information on states' use of TANF funds, see CRS Report RL32748, *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: A Primer on TANF Financing and Federal Requirements*, by Gene Falk.

## Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)

The SSBG is an annually appropriated entitlement to states, with allocations based on population size.[17] The SSBG is administered by HHS and is permanently authorized by Title XX, Subtitle A, of the Social Security Act. The SSBG is a flexible source of funding that states use to support a wide variety of social services activities. States have broad discretion over the use of these funds. In general, there are no federal income eligibility requirements, targeting provisions, service mandates, or match requirements.

Since FY2002, annual appropriations laws have funded the SSBG at $1.7 billion, though this amount has been reduced by sequestration in FY2013-FY2016.[18] In FY2014, the most recent year for which SSBG expenditure data are available, the largest expenditures for services under the

[16] FY2013 TANF financial data are available http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/resource/tanf-financial-data-fy-2013.

[17] Note that the SSBG also provides grants to Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and Northern Mariana Islands based on their share of Title XX funds in FY1981. Grants to American Samoa are based on the relative size of their population compared to the population of the Northern Mariana Islands.

[18] Sequestration is a spending reduction process by which certain budgetary resources are canceled to enforce budget policy goals. Under the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA; P.L. 112-25), as amended, nonexempt nondefense mandatory spending programs, like the SSBG, are scheduled to be sequestered annually through FY2025.

SSBG were for child welfare-related services (e.g., adoption, foster care, protective services, special services for at-risk youth), child care services, prevention and intervention services, and special services for the disabled.[19] Approximately 11% of total SSBG expenditures ($300 million) went toward child care services in that year.

For more information, see CRS Report 94-953, *Social Services Block Grant: Background and Funding*, by Karen E. Lynch.

## Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I, Part A

Title I, Part A, of the ESEA is the largest federal education program serving disadvantaged children. Most local educational agencies (LEAs) in the nation receive Title I-A grants, which may be used to provide supplementary educational and related services to low-achieving and other students attending schools with relatively high concentrations of students from low-income families. Title I-A primarily serves school-age children, but LEAs may choose to use some of their Title I-A funds for preschool services. Reliable data on Title I-A preschool expenditures are not available because spending on preschool services is not tracked separately from spending on other program activities. However, ED has previously estimated that spending on preschool instruction accounted for roughly 2% of Title I-A spending.[20] As a point of reference, 2% of the FY2016 Title I-A appropriation ($14.9 billion) would be $298 million. Data from consolidated state performance reports suggest that preschoolers account for less than 3% of the children served by Title I-A annually.[21] Title I-A was reauthorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA; P.L. 114-95) on December 10, 2015.

For more background on ESEA Title I-A, see CRS Report R44297, *Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act: Highlights of the Every Student Succeeds Act*, by Rebecca R. Skinner and Jeffrey J. Kuenzi. See also CRS Report R44486, *FY2016 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, by Rebecca R. Skinner.

## Striving Readers/Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants

Historically, the Striving Readers program has provided competitive grants to eligible entities to improve literacy instruction in high-need schools.[22] The program has been administered by ED and—through FY2016—has been funded under broad authorities within Title I-E of the ESEA (§1502, as it existed prior to the December 2015 reauthorization). The first appropriation for this program was provided in FY2005 ($25 million) and explicitly targeted literacy skills of middle school and high school students. Starting in FY2010, annual appropriations laws expanded the

[19] U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Office of Community Services (OCS), *Social Services Block Grant Program Annual Report 2014* http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/resource/ssbg-annual-report-fy-2014. Amounts reported here reflect expenditures from SSBG allotments as well as transfers from TANF.

[20] This estimate was calculated based on data on pp. 65-66 of U.S. Department of Education, *State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act: Volume VI – Targeting and Uses of Federal Education Funds*, 2009, http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/nclb-targeting/nclb-targeting.pdf. ED notes that this report may underestimate the amount actually spent on preschool services, as the totals do not include non-personnel expenditures.

[21] Calculated by CRS using data in Consolidated State Performance Reports available at http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/index.html. Note that this estimate includes preschool-aged children participating in the following Title I-A programs, as reported by states: (1) public targeted assistance programs, (2) public schoolwide assistance programs, (3) private programs, and (4) local neglected programs. Typically, children in schoolwide assistance programs represent the largest share of preschool children "participating" in Title I-A. This is important because schools receiving schoolwide assistance typically report all students as "participating" in the Title I-A program, though not all students necessarily benefit directly from Title I-A services.

[22] For more information, visit http://www2.ed.gov/programs/strivingreaders-literacy/index.html.

program to support comprehensive literacy development, including pre-literacy skills, for students from birth through grade 12. In addition, annual appropriations acts since FY2010 have required state educational agencies that receive Striving Readers grants to ensure that at least 15% of funds be reserved for children from birth through age five. In FY2016, the Striving Readers program received a total of $190 million.

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA; P.L. 114-95) authorized a new Comprehensive Literacy Development Grant program in Title II-B of the ESEA (§2222), which is expected to replace Striving Readers starting in FY2017. As authorized by ESSA, this program will consist largely of competitive grants to state educational agencies. Of total amounts received by a state, at least 15% must go toward early literacy services for children from birth through age five. Most of the remaining funds are to be evenly divided (40% apiece) between programs serving students in kindergarten through grade five and programs serving students in grades six through twelve. States may reserve up to 5% of their funds for additional activities (e.g., provision of technical assistance, dissemination of best practices).

## Promise Neighborhoods

The Promise Neighborhoods program provides competitive grants to support communities in developing and implementing comprehensive neighborhood plans to combat poverty and improve educational and life outcomes for children. These neighborhood plans may support a continuum of services from early learning to college and career.[23] They may cover a range of issues, from improving a neighborhood's health, safety, and stability to expanding access to learning technology and Internet connectivity and boosting family engagement in student learning. At present, it is not entirely clear how much of the funding for Promise Neighborhoods has been directed toward early childhood care and education activities. The Promise Neighborhoods program is administered by ED and has been funded since FY2010 under broad authorities within Title V of the ESEA. However, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA; P.L. 114-95), which reauthorized the ESEA in December 2015, included a new explicit authorization for the Promise Neighborhoods program under Title IV, Part F, Subpart 2 of the ESEA. In FY2016, Promise Neighborhoods received a total of $73 million.

[23] Promise Neighborhoods grantees are not required to focus specifically on early childhood, but many of the current grantees selected "comprehensive local early learning networks" as a competitive priority on their applications.

# Appendix A. Programs Not Currently Funded

## Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC)

Race to the Top (RTT) was first authorized in FY2009 under the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA; P.L. 111-5). Initially, the RTT program was designed to provide competitive grants to states implementing certain specified K-12 education reforms. The FY2009 law did not explicitly authorize or designate RTT funding for early childhood activities. However, the FY2011 appropriations law (P.L. 112-10) subsequently amended the initial RTT program, authorizing ED to reserve a portion of RTT funds for competitive grants to states for the improvement of early childhood care and education.[24] The appropriations law specified that ED should jointly administer this new program with HHS. Under this new authority, ED established the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant program to support states in (1) establishing statewide data systems; (2) aligning high-quality standards across programs; (3) implementing statewide early learning standards; (4) improving the early childhood workforce; and (5) measuring children's outcomes and progress across developmental domains. In each of FY2011-FY2013, ED reserved a portion of its total RTT funds for RTT-ELC grants, including $500 million in FY2011, $133 million in FY2012, and $370 million in FY2013. Over the course of this three-year period, 20 states received one or more RTT-ELC grant. No new funding has been provided for the RTT-ELC since FY2013.

For more information, see CRS Report R44008, *Preschool Development Grants and Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Grants: A Primer*, by Kyrie E. Dragoo and Gail McCallion.

## The William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs (Even Start)

The 2015 ESEA reauthorization law (ESSA; P.L. 114-95) eliminated the authorization for Even Start programs, which had previously been authorized under ESEA Title I, Part B, Subpart 3. The Even Start programs were intended to integrate early childhood education, adult basic education, and parenting skills education into a unified family literacy program. When funded, these programs provided grants to states, which then distributed the funds to eligible entities (consisting of a local education agency (LEA) in collaboration with a community based organization). Even Start generally served children ages 0-7 and their parents. Even Start services were required to include adult literacy instruction, early childhood education, instruction to help parents support their child's education, participant recruitment, screening of parents, staff training, and home-based instruction.

Even Start was first authorized in 1989 and grew rapidly in its early years. However, evaluations suggested the program had not been effective in improving child and adult learning outcomes. Even Start funding subsequently declined from a high of $250 million in FY2002 to $66 million in FY2010, the last year in which the program received annual appropriations.[25]

[24] For more information, see http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-earlylearningchallenge/index.html.

[25] The Obama Administration requested no funding for Even Start in its FY2010 and FY2011 budget proposals. The first four continuing resolutions for FY2011 (P.L. 111-242, P.L. 111-290, P.L. 111-317, and P.L. 111-322) temporarily maintained pro-rated Even Start funding at the FY2010 rate of $66 million. However, the fifth FY2011 CR (P.L. 112-4) provided no funding for Even Start and no funding for this program has been appropriated since.

For more information, see CRS Report RL30448, *Even Start Family Literacy Programs: An Overview*, by Gail McCallion.

## Early Reading First

The 2015 ESEA reauthorization law (ESSA; P.L. 114-95) eliminated the authorization for the Early Reading First program, which had previously been authorized by ESEA Title I, Part B, Subpart 2. The Early Reading First program supported local efforts to enhance the school readiness of young children—particularly those from low-income families—through scientific research-based strategies and professional development designed to enhance the verbal skills, phonological awareness, letter knowledge, and pre-reading skills of preschool age children. When funded, this program authorized ED to award competitive grants for up to six years at a time to eligible LEAs or to public or private organizations located within eligible LEAs.

The Early Reading First program received $113 million from the FY2009 Omnibus (P.L. 111-8), which is the last time the program was funded. President Obama's FY2010 budget requested $163 million for the program, an increase of $50 million over FY2009 funding. However, the FY2010 Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 111-117) provided no funding for Early Reading First. Instead, Congress expanded the mission of the Striving Readers program from focusing solely on improving adolescent literacy, to improving the literacy and pre-literacy skills of students from preschool through high school.[26] The FY2010 Consolidated Appropriation increased funding for Striving Readers to $250 million (an increase of about $215 million from FY2009) and reserved about 15% (or $37.5 million) for children ages 0-5. No funding has been requested for Early Reading First since the FY2010 President's budget, and no funding has been appropriated for this program since FY2009.

## Early Childhood Educator Professional Development

The Department of Education has provided competitive grants to partnerships to improve the knowledge and skills of early childhood educators who work in communities that have high concentrations of children living in poverty.[27] Funding in FY2006 and FY2007 remained stable at approximately $14.5 million, but FY2007 was the last year in which funds were appropriated.

## Early Learning Fund/Early Learning Opportunities Act Program

This HHS program (referred to by both names), authorized by the FY2001 Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-554), was last funded in FY2005 at $36 million. When funded, the program provided grants to communities to enhance school readiness for children under five, specifically supporting efforts to improve children's cognitive, physical, social, and emotional development. Although authorized at $600 million, FY2003 funding for the program was set at $25 million; FY2004 funding was set at $34 million (despite President Bush's FY2003 budget proposal to eliminate the program); and in FY2005, P.L. 108-199 included $36 million for the Early Learning Fund. FY2005 was the last year in which this program received funding.

[26] The Striving Readers program began as a competitive grant literacy program for students in middle school, but was refocused on broader literacy programs for preschool through 12th grade as part of the reorganization in FY2010.

[27] For more information, visit http://www2.ed.gov/programs/eceducator/index.html.

# Appendix B. Acronyms Used in This Report

| | |
|---|---|
| **ACA** | Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (P.L. 111-148) |
| **ACF** | Administration for Children and Families (at HHS) |
| **ARRA** | American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (P.L. 111-5) |
| **ATRA** | American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-240) |
| **BIE** | Bureau of Indian Education (at DOI) |
| **CACFP** | Child and Adult Care Food Program |
| **CCAMPIS** | Child Care Access Means Parents in School |
| **CCDBG** | Child Care and Development Block Grant |
| **CCDF** | Child Care and Development Fund |
| **CDCTC** | Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit |
| **CRS** | Congressional Research Service |
| **DCAP** | Dependent Care Assistance Program (in context of tax exclusion) |
| **DOI** | U.S. Department of the Interior |
| **ED** | U.S. Department of Education |
| **EGTRRA** | Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (P.L. 107-16) |
| **EHS** | Early Head Start |
| **ESEA** | Elementary and Secondary Education Act |
| **ESSA** | Every Student Succeeds Act |
| **FACE** | Indian Family and Child Education Program |
| **FPL** | Federal Poverty Line |
| **HHS** | U.S. Department of Health and Human Services |
| **HRSA** | Health Resources and Services Administration (at HHS) |
| **HS** | Head Start |
| **IDEA** | Individuals with Disabilities Education Act |
| **IRS** | Internal Revenue Service (at U.S. Department of the Treasury) |
| **LEAs** | Local Educational Agencies |
| **MIECHV** | Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program |
| **MOE** | Maintenance-of-Effort (spending requirements) |
| **OMB** | Office of Management and Budget |
| **PDG** | Preschool Development Grants |
| **RTT** | Race to the Top |
| **RTT-ELC** | Race to the Top—Early Learning Challenge Grants |
| **SMI** | State Median Income |
| **SSBG** | Social Services Block Grant |
| **TANF** | Temporary Assistance for Needy Families |
| **USDA** | U.S. Department of Agriculture |

## Author Information

Karen E. Lynch
Specialist in Social Policy

## Acknowledgments

This report greatly benefited from the review and thoughtful comments of Randy Alison Aussenberg, Cassandria Dortch, Kyrie E. Dragoo, Gene Falk, Adrienne Fernandes-Alcantara, Libby Perl, Rebecca R. Skinner, and Julie M. Whittaker. Parts of this report were previously authored by Gail McCallion, former CRS Specialist in Social Policy.

## Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.