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Background

• There is broad bipartisan support for child care at all levels of government
• But little is known about the amount of care the country actually needs

BPC asked...

How much additional child care does the country need?
What BPC Did

Quantified the supply of, potential need for, and gaps in child care in 25 states as of 2019

The analysis gives policymakers, advocates, and stakeholders

• A baseline from which to devise strategies to strengthen the quality of and access to child care
• A critical tool for holding federal, state, and local leaders accountable for improving child care access
• An evidence base to use data rather than anecdotes to evaluate the need for care
Products of the Analysis

Interactive Mapping Tool
• Quantifies supply, potential need, and gaps by:

  - State
  - County
  - Congressional District
  - State Senate District
  - Metropolitan Area
  - Opportunity Zone

• Also includes breakdowns by:

  - Minority Population
  - Under/Above 85% of State Median Income
  - Below Poverty Line

25-State Report
• Detailed methodology / National findings
• How to properly interpret gap findings for policy purposes
• Recommendations for how states can optimize data collection
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All methodological decisions were agreed to by a committee of 12 state child care officials

Provided high-level guidance:

- Developing definitions
- Identifying data resources
- Reviewing analytics
- How to present results
Project Overview: 25 States

- Originally set out to map access in all 50 states
- 25 states were complete when the pandemic prompted stay-at-home orders in March and BPC halted the analysis

Politically and geographically diverse
25 states
**Supply:** The number of child care slots offered by legally operated and state-recognized providers

- Definition included the entire range of formal child care settings available to parents

- To build datasets of each provider's location and capacity, BPC worked with:
  - Each state's child care and education agencies
  - Federal DHHS for Head Start data, AIAN tribes for tribal data, and DOD for military data

- Data was only incorporated after state approved
Child Care Providers: 154,993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Provided</td>
<td>153,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional from Office of Head Start</td>
<td>1,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>154,993</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Need: The number of children under six with all available parents in the labor force

- Not Demand: the rate at which families actually utilize or look for formal child care
  - May seasonal/family-related factors influence demand
  - No available data by geographic area
  - Informative starting point for policy recommendations
  - But interpretations must consider data on how much and what types of care communities actually use
Need by County: 8,448,993

Children Under 6 With Parents in Labor Force - County
- 10 - 500
- 501 - 1,000
- 1,001 - 5,000
- 5,001 - 10,000
- 10,001 - 25,000
- 25,001 - 50,000
- 50,001 - 451,629
**Project Overview: Measuring the Gap**

**Gap:** The number of children who potentially need care but whose families cannot reasonably access formal care by driving.

Incorporated parent choice data: 86% of parents drive to child care; rural parents are much more likely to drive over 10 miles for child care.

**Step 1:** Each census block group was assigned a services area of a specific driving radius. Urban Areas: 3.5 mi, Rural Areas: 10 mi.

**Step 2:** Assumed families in a given block group could access the facilities within their service area.

**Step 3:** Potential need proportionally allocated to child care providers within service area until all provider capacity was filled.

**Step 4:** Quantified the number of children without access to child care by location.
Understanding Parent Choices to Interpret Findings

Any policy recommendation based on gap data must consider how much and what types of child care parents and families actually use.

Potential Need ≠ Actual Demand

Must interpret gap findings in conjunction with real parent choice data.

What proportions of parents in your community...

• Need care at non-traditional hours?
• Prefer formal vs informal care?
• Prefer certain types of formal child care?
Some communities place great value on caring for children within their families, rather than opting for formal child care.

The analysis was susceptible to estimating higher gaps in these communities:
- Some gaps may have less serious implications for families in real-life.

### Proportions of Children with Parents in Labor Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>All Parents in LF Not In Poverty</th>
<th>Some Parents Not in LF Not in Poverty</th>
<th>Some Parents Not in LF In Poverty</th>
<th>All Parents in LF In Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cultural Values Influence the Gap
This estimate orients us around the magnitude of the child care gap
But the gap is not uniform across the country
Rural areas were underserved far more often than urban areas (even after using the distance adjustment)

Urban Avg: 28.9%
Rural Avg: 35.1%

National Survey Data:
- Only 38% of rural families said finding quality child care within their budget was easy (over 50% for urban)

Still unclear about the extent to which preferences for family/friend care reduce supply in rural areas
Opportunity Zones: Low-income communities designated by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 in which investors can receive tax incentives for supporting economic development.

The availability of child care should be part of any discussion related to investments in Opportunity Zones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total State Gap</th>
<th>Total Gap in OZs</th>
<th>Number of OZs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total State Gap</th>
<th>Total Gap in OZs</th>
<th>Number of OZs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Red: gap higher across OZs than across state
Blue: gap higher across state than across OZs
Disaggregating the Data: Socioeconomic Characteristics

Investigated whether a range of socioeconomic characteristics were associated with changes in the size of the child care gap

Compared the statewide gap to the gap in block groups...
- With a high percent of minority residents
- Where the median household income is below 85% of the state median
- Where the median household income is above 85% of the state median
- Where a high percent of residents live below the federal poverty line

Socioeconomic trends are different in every state and must be closely reviewed using the interactive map
Marsha Erickson
Early Childhood Specialist
West Central Initiative Foundation
Discussion Questions

• How is your county ensuring that child care options are available for infants and toddlers?

• If your county used CARES funding or local relief for child care, how were those dollars used? What did they fund?

• What concerns or issues are you hearing from parents around child care access and affordability?

• How is your county addressing equity issues regarding barriers to child care access?

• How does your county engage and support child care providers?
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