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Types of Care Used by Subsidized Cook County Parents, by Work Schedule
Random sample, n = 485

- Weekdays 6 AM - 6 PM only
  - Center: 56%
  - Licensed Home: 23%
  - FFN Home: 21%

- Nonstandard Schedules
  - Center: 18%
  - Licensed Home: 18%
  - FFN Home: 64%
Cook County Children in Subsidized FFN Care, April 2006 - February 2019
(Subsidy payment data)

- April 2006: 50,430
- August 2006: 41,044
- December 2006: 34,353
- April 2007: 25,124
- August 2007: 18,165
- December 2007: 12,000

—-
Illinois Requires at least 11 Hours of Training for Subsidized FFN Providers (2017)

1. **CPR/First Aid Training** (5 hours)
2. **Child Abuse & Neglect/Mandated Reporter Training** (1-2 hours)
3. **What is CCAP Training?** (2 hours)
4. And: **Child Development, Health and Safety Basics** (3-4 hours)
   Or: **ECE Credential Level 1, Tier 1** (8-12 hours)

Providers who complete the ECE Level 1, Tier 1 receive a 10% CCAP reimbursement add-on. Tiers 2 and 3 to receive 15% and 20% add-ons.

*Exempted:* Providers who care only for school-age children to whom they are related.
Illinois Lessons for Supporting Quality in FFN Care

- It appears that FFN providers as a whole have a fragile attachment to the Illinois subsidy program in Cook County.

- (What does this mean for families with nonstandard work schedules?)

- Next: What do we know about FFN providers in the subsidy program that can inform supports?
Age Distribution of Cook County FFN Providers in Subsidy Program, May 2017 (N = 9,257)

- 18-29: 24%
- 30-39: 14%
- 40-49: 15%
- 50-59: 25%
- 60-69: 16%
- 70 and older: 6%
Age Distribution Varies with Type of Subsidized FFN Care (N = 9,257)

**Nonrelative, provider's home**
- 18-29: 29%
- 30s: 18%
- 40s: 17%
- 50s: 20%
- 60s: 12%
- 70 and older: 5%

**Relative, provider's home**
- 18-29: 15%
- 30s: 10%
- 40s: 16%
- 50s: 31%
- 60s: 20%
- 70 and older: 8%

**Non-relative child's home**
- 18-29: 25%
- 30s: 22%
- 40s: 17%
- 50s: 20%
- 60s: 11%
- 70 and older: 5%

**Relative child's home**
- 18-29: 34%
- 30s: 14%
- 40s: 11%
- 50s: 21%
- 60s: 14%
- 70 and older: 6%
Age Distribution of FFN Providers Who Completed Required Trainings in First 18 Months of Program

- Under 30: 9%
- 30's: 14%
- 40's: 23%
- 50's: 26%
- 60's: 27%
- 70's or older: 24%
Length of Subsidy Spells of Cook County FFN Providers in, 2010 – 2016
(N = 94,609)

- 1 to 5 months, 31%
- 6 months, 11%
- 7 to 12 months, 22%
- 13 to 24 months, 19%
- 25 or more months, 16%
Subsidy Spells of FFN Providers Who Participated in a Given Month (N = 17,963)

- 1 to 6 months, 7%
- 7 to 12 months, 15%
- 13 to 24 months, 27%
- 25 or more months, 51%
FFN Providers in Subsidy Program by the Ages of the Children They Serve, March 2018 (N = 6,063)

- Serve birth through 2: 37%
- Serve ages 3 & 4: 28%
- Serve school age: 82%
- Serve school age only: 44%
Percentage of FFN Providers Who Work at Least 1 Nonstandard Hour, by Shift

- Any Nonstandard Hours: 72%
- Evenings (6 PM - 12 AM): 58%
- Weekends: 35%
- Overnight (12 AM - 6 AM): 19%
Characteristics Associated with Likelihood That a FFN Provider Will Stay in Subsidy Program Longer than 1 Year. 64,094 FFNs who entered subsidy program Apr. 2010 through Sept. 2015. Cox-Snell $R^2 = .06$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider Characteristic</th>
<th>Odds ratio (compared to provider without the characteristic)</th>
<th>$\rho = .05$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serves working parent (vs. student or trainee parent)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves multiple families (vs. just one)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cares for children full-time (≥ 16 FT days / month)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 40 or older</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cares for a school-age child</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative of child</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cares for more than one child</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves in the child’s home (vs. provider’s home)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What We Infer from the Data

1. There is a tradeoff between regulation and retention of FFN providers— we need to balance quality supports with supporting other needs of families who need or want to use FFN care.
   - For many FFN providers, providing support in small steps and with frequent incentives may be the best approach.

2. Data suggest which types of FFN providers will participate longer or shorter, but currently we cannot predict which individuals will.

3. In supporting quality for the diverse group of FFN providers, one size of support will not fit all. We have to engage providers to
   - Understand their motives and interests in providing care – now and beyond – and their planning horizons.
   - Determine which types of supports to develop and offer.

4. Our staff should be trained to engage FFN providers to learn their circumstances and interests. Staff also need to have the skill and authority to propose options for training or other supports to the provider.
NEW RESEARCH ON SUBSIDIZED FAMILY, FRIEND AND NEIGHBOR PROVIDERS:

IMPLICATIONS FOR INVESTING IN QUALITY