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Part I

Children’s Well-Being: Times, They Are A-Changing!!
OLD WORLD VIEW

• BELIEFS REGARDING CHILDREN:
  – Children were to be seen and not heard.
  – Children grew into the world around them and did not contour or alter it.
  – Children learned by listening, watching, and mimicking. (Basis for the apprentice system, which dominated trade and commerce).
  – Children with special needs should be isolated and kept apart from the family.
  – Mental health challenges were not discussed.
OLD WORLD VIEW

• THESE BELIEFS LED TO:
  – Placing children in the background or periphery.
  – Molding children to the norm, so strict models of behavior conventions existed.
  – Casting aside children who deviated from what was considered the norm.
  – Sanctioning and enforcing harsh and punitive discipline.
  – Reinforcing hierarchical approach to relationships (adults were always correct).
  – Focusing on teaching the “empty vessel” -- on copying and drilling to learn existing facts, not on creating new facts or bodies of knowledge.
OLD WORLD VIEW

• THESE BELIEFS ALSO LED TO:
  – Creating services that were highly siloed
    • Children went to church to learn morality and ethics
    • Children went to school to learn facts and prepare them for labor
    • Children received their medical care from specialized personnel (doctors, nurses) in specialized places (hospitals, clinics)
  – Creating professions that were highly siloed
    • Separate institutions for training adults, depending on their future goals (e.g., Teachers in teachers colleges, nurses in health advancing institutions)
    • Separate professional organizations
    • Separate professional languages
  – Creating bureaucracies that were highly siloed
    • Separate ministries for health, education, welfare, housing, transportation
    • Separate regulations, requirements, funding streams, enforcement mechanisms
  – Creating policies that were highly siloed
    • Separate committees in legislatures
    • Separate jurisdictions
    • Separate timelines for legislative activity
    • Separate understanding about the role of government
OLD WORLD VIEW

• THESE STRUCTURES EXIST WORLDWIDE:
  – All countries seem to follow similar structures to deliver services to citizens.
    • All have departments that separate the whole child into pieces by discipline (e.g., education, health, and social services).
    • Many have departments that separate children by age (Higher education and Primary/secondary) and families by income (Welfare eligibility).
    • Such separations are reinforced by professional organizations and, in some countries, by unions.
    • Departmental divisions become more entrenched over time.
  – This is true whether a country is a democracy, dictatorship, republic, or monarchy—remarkably universal!!
We Are THINKING Differently!

- Children are active contributors to their own learning.
- Children learn in and shape their families and environments.
- Children’s well-being is contingent on many INTERRELATED factors (personal, familial and societal).
- Children’s growth occurs in many domains simultaneously:
  - Social and Emotional Development
  - Cognitive Development
  - Language Development
  - Physical Development
  - Approaches Toward Learning
- Children are extremely capable, even at the earliest years.
- Children need scaffolding to grow and thrive.
- Children have a right to quality, equitable supports, delivered in a coherent manner.
We Are ACTING Differently!

• We are learning *unprecedented* things:
  – Technology gives us access to all kinds of information, including information about the brain and how it functions.
  – New methods of statistical and econometric modeling are teaching us about efficiency and cost-efficiency.

• We are learning *faster* than ever before:
  – More is expected of all of us, faster and better: It’s a 24/7 world.

• We are *more connected* than ever before:
  – Ease of transport and technology (including social networking) enables personal and e-connectedness.

• We have far *greater global perspectives* than ever before:
  – The world is flat and getting flatter!
• Our children are *far ing far worse* than ever before.

• Foundation for Child Development’s Child and Youth Well-Being Index
  – Scores American children’s well-being according to 28 key measures
  – Between 2000 and 2008, the following scores fell:
    • Family economic well-being (-6.8%)
    • Health (-6.6%)
    • Emotional and spiritual well-being (-2.2%)
    • Educational attainment rose only 1.3%
  – In 2010, 22% of American youth were below the poverty line, the highest among America’s peer nations

**Sources:**

YET…

Percentage of children in OECD countries living in poor households (Below 50% of the median income), 2005

Part II

Painting a “New Think”
Painting a “New Think”

• Two I’s

  – *Think 1: INFRASTRUCTURE* (Flowers and Gears)

  – *Think 2: INTEGRATION* (Orchestra)
THINK ONE: INFRASTRUCTURE

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AS AN EXAMPLE.
Separately funded programs, each with their own rules, regulations, and per-child expenditures.

- Head Start
- Child Care
- Pre-K
- Private
THINK ONE: INFRASTRUCTURE

Programs plus infrastructure equals a system.

Programs

Head Start

Child Care

Pre-K

Private

Infrastrucure
Gears: Need to work in all areas to move the infrastructure.
THINK ONE: INFRASTRUCTURE

8 – 1 = 0
First, individual services need to be strong.
So, we need good programs, supported by a strong infrastructure.
It is difficult to link services when some services are weak or fragile.
“The chain is only as good as its weakest link.”
THINK TWO: INTEGRATION
THINK TWO: INTEGRATION
THINK TWO: INTEGRATION

• An orchestra has four sections, each consisting of several instruments:
  – Woodwind section (flutes, clarinets, oboes, bassoons)
  – Brass section (trumpets, cornets, trombones, tubas)
  – Percussion section (bells, xylophone, triangle, drums)
  – String section (violins, violas, cellos, double basses)

• Each section has its own rules and infrastructure.

• In order to make magnificent music, all sections need to work together.
THINK TWO: INTEGRATION

• In order to serve children and families effectively, all services need to work together.
  – Early childhood education
  – K-12 education
  – Health
  – Mental Health
  – Labor
  – Protective Services
THINK TWO: INTEGRATION

Mental Health

Health

K-12 Education

Early Childhood Education
YET... 

• Throughout the world, structures are more fragmented than ever before:
  – Multiple and often overlapping public departments.
  – Segregated approaches to funding programs and services.
  – Separate professional training and credentialing processes.
  – Separate professional organizations.
  – Separate accountability structures.
  – Contentious political structures.
  – Nowhere is the situation more historically embedded than in the United States.
In America, Only Very Limited Service Integration

• Colonial/New Republic Periods (1600s – mid-1800s)
  – Poor Law of 1601: Towns and parishes provided relief when informal supports – families and friends – were unavailable or unable to respond.
  – Two debates: How much should the government do for the poor and which level of government should do it.

• Civil War & Reconstruction (1861 – early 1900s)
  – Increased sympathy for the poor led to growth of private aid charities, mutual aid societies, and settlement houses.
  – Charity Organization Societies were established in 1877 to bring order to the overlapping and uncoordinated set of charities.

• Industrial Era/World Wars (1900s-1960s)
  – Era marked by rapid expansion of social services, notably the Social Security Act of 1935, which authorized support for dependent children, aged, blind, vocational rehabilitation, public health services
In America, Only Very Limited Service Integration

• 1960s – 1970s
  – Number of federal categorical grant programs more than doubled between 1962 and 1966, but the focus was on substance, not structure
  – Chaos led to creation of Community Action Agencies: Non-governmental agencies charged with fostering local-level coordination of services

• 1970s – 1990s
  – Waxing and waning of federal initiatives
  – President Reagan emphasized devolution of authority to the states and wanted to reduce human services expenditures
  – Block grants became the norm – ostensibly to foster SI, but actually created even more chaos
Federal Approaches to Service Integration

• Research & Demonstration
  – HEW Task Forces
  – Service Integration Target of Opportunity (SITO) Projects
  – Partnership Grants Program (PGP)
  – SI Pilot Projects

• Legislation
  – Feeder Bill of 1971
  – Omnibus Reconciliation Grant of 1981
Service Integration is Hard to Do

• In the United States, there are:
  – Unresolved federalist issues
  – Abiding congressional structures and power groups that reinforce fragmentation

• Internationally, there are:
  – Structural uncertainties
  – Embedded traditions (e.g., parliamentary democracies to post-tribal kingdoms)
  – Few effective service integration models
Service Integration Challenges Internationally

• **Australia** – 27 Ministries, including:
  – Ministry for Families, Community Services, and Indigenous Affairs
  – Ministry for School Education, Early Childhood, and Youth
  – Ministry for Health

• **Greece** – 18 Ministries, including:
  – Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs
  – Ministry of Employment and Social Protection
  – Ministry of Health and Social Solidarity

• **United Kingdom** – Numerous departments, both ministerial and non-ministerial, including:
  – Department for Education
  – Department for Work and Pensions
  – Department of Health

Painting a “New Think”

- The “new think” needs:
  - SUPPORTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE
  - SERVICES INTEGRATION
Part III

Creating Integrated Services
Creating Integrated Services

• Service integration means many different things!
• Easiest to understand using a framework based on the work of Agranoff & Pattakos (1979), which suggests four dimensions:
  – Client-centered integration
  – Program-centered integration
  – Policy-centered integration
  – Organizationally centered integration
• Each of the four dimensions affirms the complexity and adds to the richness of creating integrated services.
Client-Centered Integration

- Regards clients as complex individuals with multiple needs
- Acknowledges that client problems generally are intertwined
- Client needs transcend any single department
- Primary mechanism is case management
Client-Centered Integration

• Strategies: Case Management Approaches
  – Via the individual – A generalist takes full responsibility for providing core management services from intake to termination
  – Via an interdisciplinary team – Specialists work together to assess client need and plan a service strategy
  – Sequential approach – Responsibility for creating linkages shifts as client progresses through stages of service delivery (e.g., from diagnosis to referral)
  – Coordination approach – Responsibility divided according to needs of individual family members rather than by sequence
Client-Centered Integration

• Individual Educational Plans
  – Began as a provision of Special Education in US
  – Now being considered for all children to help individualize instruction
  – Calls for Case Conferencing around a child

• Case consolidation around integrated services for TANF recipients

The Unit of Analysis is the INDIVIDUAL.
Program-Centered Integration

- Attempts to link discrete programs and services into a multifaceted delivery system
- Links autonomous agencies so their activities can be blended in service to clients
- Does not typically change structure of the programs, but establishes linking mechanisms among diverse programs
- Does not apply to large groups of programs, often model or demonstration efforts.
Strategies:

- Co-location: Coordinate programs by joining them physically in one all-purpose facility
- Integrated staffing: Make collective decisions on staff management issues, including reassignment and sharing staff across programs
- Planning and programming linkages
- Fiscal linkages: Joint purchase of services.
Program-Centered Integration

United States

• Within A Single Agency/Program
  – HEAD START: Combines comprehensive services for children and families
  – HIPPY: Links supports for children and their families

• Across Two Agencies/Programs
  – SCHOOL-BASED HEALTH CLINICS
  – CHILD CARE TO SCHOOL TRANSITIONS
    • Joint professional development
    • Record transfer

The Unit of Analysis is the PROGRAM.
**Program-Centered Integration**

**Internationally**

- **Within Program/Agency**
  - **Balwadies (India)**
    - Provides comprehensive services (child care, education, health, and nutrition services) for young children and families from marginalized communities

- **Across Program/Agency**
  - **Communities for Children (Australia)**
    - Part of government’s Family Support Program, providing comprehensive services to disadvantaged children and families
  - **Toronto First Duty (Canada)**
    - Provides comprehensive services (education, childcare, parenting programs, pre-natal and post-natal care, health screening)
  - **Regional Initiative Central America (RICA)**
    - Facilitates smooth transitions to school by providing parental support and aligned teacher training
Policy-Centered Integration

- Sees that SI is too complex and too pervasive to be solved program by program
- Solution requires wider, multilevel perspective
- Policy is the best tool to instantiate a comprehensive, continuing course of action
- Involves conducting policy-level assessments, setting policy priorities, and monitoring the service system
- Transcends individual programs
Policy-Centered Integration

- Strategies:
  - Generate policy mechanisms that demand coordination (e.g., congressional committee structure; policy impact statements)
  - Generate concrete policies:
    - Create comprehensive data bases
    - Create common standards
    - Support the infrastructure across diverse program types (QRIS)
    - Refinance – Share of services currently paid for by state and local dollars refinanced with federal resources
    - De-categorize – Allows greater discretion in use of funds at both policy and program/provider levels
United States

• Early Learning Challenge Fund – Race to the Top
  – Government wanted to encourage certain efforts (standards and QRIS)
  – Called for services to be integrated across sectors, departments, and providers

• Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards
  – Supports a smooth transition for children from birth to first grade
  – Aligned with Wisconsin Model Academic Standards
Policy-Centered Integration

Internationally

• Conditional Cash Transfers (Mexico)
  – Transformed maternal behaviors by incentivizing mothers to get their children to school
  – Created need for ministries of labor/education to work together

• Primary School Cycle System (France)
  – National curriculum for children ages 3 to end of primary school.

The Unit of Analysis is the POLICY.
Organizationally Centered Integration

• Strategies:
  – Reorganization of governmental structures to facilitate execution of strategies in other domains
  – Incorporation of formerly independent agencies under a single new organizational entity
  – Often accompanied by broad-based structural changes
United States

Governance of Early Childhood Services

– Stand-Alone Administrative Integration
  (Massachusetts Department of Early Learning and Care)

– Blended Administrative Integration
  (Pennsylvania Office of Child Development and Early Learning)

– Subsumed Administrative Integration
  (Maryland Department of Education, Division of Early Childhood Development)

The Unit of Analysis is the ORGANIZATION.
Internationally

• “Educare” Approach
  – All forms of ECE under one ministry to create policy coherence
  – Pioneered by Nordic countries
  – Denmark: Ministry of Social Affairs; Finland: Ministry of Social Affairs and Health; Sweden and Norway: Ministry of Education
  – This approach has been adopted by other countries, most of whom designate education as the lead ministry for children’s services.

• Interministerial Body
  – Promotes national coordination of policies and actions
  – Jamaica: Early Childhood Commission brings together all policies, standards, and regulations pertaining to ECE
  – South Africa: Ministry of Education houses a National Coordinating Committee composed of representatives from Ministries of Health, Education, and Welfare; universities; and NGOs

Part IV
Moving Ahead: Ideas for Integration
Moving Ahead: Ideas for Integration

Contemporary services integration calls for painting a **NEW THINK**.  

*Infrastructure PLUS Integration*
Moving Ahead: Ideas for Integration

It calls for an integrated Mindset and Mechanisms
Moving Ahead: Ideas for Integration

• AN INTEGRATIVE MINDSET:
  – Service integration as a *philosophy or belief*
    • Set of ideas that frame how we think and act
    • While philosophies guide us, others may not understand what we believe and honor.
  – Service integration as *knowledge*
    • New understandings about different disciplines (e.g., health, education, social services)
    • Organizational theory and development.
Moving Ahead: Ideas for Integration

- INTEGRATIVE MECHANISMS:
  - Client-centered integration
  - Program-centered integration
  - Policy-centered integration
  - Organizationally centered integration
1. CREATE THE MINDSET REGARDING THE NEED FOR SERVICES INTEGRATION
   • Research
   • Public Awareness
   • Policy Briefing

2. CONSTRUCT CLEAR DEFINITIONS
   • Clarify and define different types of service integration
3. DESIGN IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISMS FOR EACH TYPE OF SERVICES INTEGRATION

- New governmental structures
- New interagency agreements
- New policies
- Create incentivization schemes
Moving Ahead: Ideas for Integration

4. DETERMINE IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM IN A SINGLE AREA

- Develop a GOVERNANCE mechanism
- Develop comprehensive DATA/ACCOUNTABILITY systems
- Elaborate LEGISLATIVE strategies that support service integration