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Virtual Event Objectives

- **Increase awareness** of the ECE licensing system and existing sources of licensing data
- **Identify priority policy questions** about the role of licensing in ECE that researchers could help address
- **Encourage the use** of licensing data in research
• **Joshua Borton** | NORC at the University of Chicago
• **Dionne Dobbins** | Child Care Aware of America
• **Kelly Dwyer** | Urban Institute
• **Sheri Fischer** | ICF
• **Nina Johnson** | ICF
• **Kelly Maxwell** | Child Trends
• **Rob O’Callaghan** | Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning
Purposes of TRLECE

- Identify and address gaps in our knowledge of how key features of licensing are related to quality and outcomes for children, families, and key stakeholders in the licensing system
  - Conceptual framework
  - Research synthesis
- Conduct studies to address priority questions
- Develop resources to support states and territories in evaluating and using data and research to strengthen their licensing systems
Entities that Set Standards for Early Care and Education (ECE) Providers

- Child and Adult Care Food Program
- Child Care Licensing*
- Child Care Subsidy
- Head Start / Early Head Start
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and Part B
- Pre-Kindergarten
- Quality Rating and Improvement System

*Licensing is unique because it sets the standards for legally operating a program serving young children.
Primary Functions of the ECE Licensing System

1. Set regulations
2. Monitor licensed facilities
3. Enforce compliance with regulations
4. Provide training and technical assistance
5. Educate consumers
6. *Monitor license-exempt providers (in some states)*
Licensing’s Connections to Other CCEEPRC Topics

- Family decisions about child care
- Engaging providers in quality improvement
- ECE workforce
- Decline of family child care
- Measuring and defining access
- CCDBG reauthorization implementation
- ECE coordination
- Racial/ethnic and economic segregation in ECE
- QRIS and quality improvement
Thank you!
Child Care Licensing Study

Methodology and Selected Key Findings

2020 CCEEPRC Meeting
Child Care Licensing Studies

- Studies are done by a partnership of the National Center on Early Childhood Quality Assurance (ECQA Center) and the National Association for Regulatory Administration (NARA).
- Data available in the Child & Family Data Archive.
- Their purpose is to track changes in child care licensing policies, practices, and requirements for providers.
Data Set: Licensing Practices and Policies

Licensing policies

- Facility monitoring, regulation enforcement, and licensing program staffing
- Results of the NARA survey of all licensing agencies
Survey Respondents

- NARA sent the survey to directors and managers of child care licensing agencies in all 50 states, the District of Columbia (DC), and 5 U.S. territories in March 2018.
- A full set of responses was received by January 2019.
  - The 2017 survey had 51 responses (including all states and DC).
- Respondents included licensing managers and directors (who are referred to as “states” in this presentation).
- The 2014 survey had 53 responses (including 2 territories and DC).

Source: National Association for Regulatory Administration, 2017
Data Set: Facility Requirements

Licensing regulations for child care facilities

- include requirements that programs must meet;
- are compiled from regulations posted on the National Database of Child Care Licensing Regulations; and
- include the following facility types—child care centers, family child care homes (FCCHs), and group child care homes (GCCHs).
Source of Regulations

https://childcareta.acf.hhs.gov/licensing

Source: National Center on Early Childhood Quality Assurance, n.d.
Key Findings from 2017 Study
Trends in Child Care Licensing for 2017

Key Findings and Trends, 2017

- Many states added health and safety topics to training requirements.
- More states require five types of background checks.
- More states regulate group size for centers.
- More states inspect at least once a year.

Source: ECQA Center, 2020a, 2020b, 2020c
# Health and Safety Training Topics, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health and Safety Training Topics</th>
<th>Center Staff (N = 51)</th>
<th>FCCH Providers (N = 44)</th>
<th>GCCH Providers (N = 38)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and reporting of child abuse and neglect</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency preparedness and response planning</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention and control of infectious diseases</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of sudden infant death syndrome and use of safe sleeping practices</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of shaken baby syndrome, abusive head trauma, and child maltreatment</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of medication</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precautions in transporting children</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of and response to emergencies due to food and allergic reactions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and physical premises safety</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling and storage of hazardous materials and the appropriate disposal of biocontaminants</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ECQA Center, 2020a, 2020b, 2020c
Changes in Health and Safety Training

Several states added preservice or orientation training requirements in health and safety topics from 2014 to 2017:

◆ For centers, the largest increases were in
  - reducing sudden infant death syndrome (16 states to 29) and
  - preventing shaken baby syndrome (11 states to 26).

◆ For FCCHs, there were large increases in almost every topic.

Source: ECQA Center, 2020a, 2020b, 2020c
Types of Background Checks: Centers, 2014–2017

- Criminal history records: 96% in 2014, 100% in 2017
- State fingerprints: 62% in 2014, 75% in 2017
- Federal fingerprints: 72% in 2014, 86% in 2017
- Child abuse and neglect registry: 91% in 2014, 100% in 2017
- Sex offender registry: 72% in 2014, 84% in 2017


Source: ECQA Center, 2020a, 2020b, 2020c
Five Types of Background Checks Are Required, 2014–2017

In 2017, 1/3 more states required five types of background checks than in 2014.

Source: ECQA Center, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c, 2020a, 2020b, 2020c
More States Regulate Group Size in Centers, 2014–2017

- More states regulate group size.
- More states regulate group size for all age groups.
- Fewer states regulate group size for at least one age group.

Source: ECQA Center, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c, 2020a, 2020b, 2020c
## Frequency of Inspections, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Inspections</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>FCCH</th>
<th>GCCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than once a year</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** $N = 51$ states (including DC) in 2017.

Source: ECQA Center, 2020a, 2020b, 2020c
Frequency of Inspections, 2014

Note: N = 53 states (including DC and 2 territories) in 2014.

Sources: ECQA Center, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c
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Child Care Licensing Benchmarking Tools
Goals of Child Care Benchmarking Tool Project

Engage stakeholders throughout the process

• Update licensing benchmarks considering new policy and best practice advancements

• Develop a rubric that guides the scoring/ranking of the benchmarking tool

• Design a benchmarking tool that provides states with a point-in-time status update and opportunities to consider for future advancements in their state licensing standards
Child Care Benchmarking Work Overview

Benchmarking Workgroup
- Administrators (State and Federal)
- State Licensing Personnel
- CCR&R Leaders
- National Organizations
- Families

Review Panel
- Early Childhood and Licensing Experts

Who participated in the work group and panel?
### Program Benchmarks (7)

- Background Checks
- Provider Qualifications
- Professional Development
- Health and Safety Policies and Procedures
- Developmental Guidelines and Learning Activities
- Group Size and Ratio
- Family Engagement

### Oversight Benchmarks (7)

- Licensing
- Monitoring
- Inspection Reports
- Program/Staff Ratio
- Licensing Staff Qualifications
- Background Check Implementation
- Professional Development
# Pilot Process

## Input from Pilot States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruiting States</th>
<th>Program Benchmarking and Check-in</th>
<th>Oversight Benchmarking and Check-in</th>
<th>Verification</th>
<th>Focus Groups with Pilot States</th>
<th>Results Shared with States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory webinar &amp; states identified team members</td>
<td>State teams completed the <strong>Program</strong> section of the benchmark tool</td>
<td>State teams completed the <strong>Oversight</strong> section of the benchmarking tool</td>
<td>CCAoA verified state responses and collaborated with states to finalize their responses</td>
<td>States provided feedback on the tool process and format</td>
<td>CCAoA shared verification documentation, report drafts and scoring convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCAoA conducted bi-weekly check in calls</td>
<td>CCAoA conducted bi-weekly check in calls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rubric

CARE

Coming Along
0%-33%

Advancing
34%-66%

Really Close
67%-99%

Exciting Accomplishment
100%
Sample State Snapshot
Roll-out Plan

Approach:
Revised due to COVID-19

Release process paper and first 5 pilot state rankings
(now TBD because of COVID-19)

Recruit cohorts
Up to 10 state teams at a time, providing technical assistance until all states have been completed

Complete scoring for all states
TBD – aim is through mid 2021

Data Upkeep
Updates/confirmation yearly

Develop Advocacy Tools: NOW

Consider COVID-19 Impact: NOW

Ranking and comparisons:

A comprehensive ranking of all states will be released once all data have been collected and verified. Goal: interactive online tool

Note: CCAoA team will complete an assessment of state licensing regulations for any state team not completing the self-assessment survey.
Using the Child Care and Development Fund Policies Database to Understand Requirements for License-Exempt Providers

Kelly Dwyer
CCEEPRC
September 4, 2020
For the full database, please visit: ccdf.urban.org
License-Exempt Provider Policies in the CCDF Policies Database

• Basic Eligibility Requirements
  • Are providers required to keep immunization records?
  • Are providers required to submit a formal application?
  • Are they required to attend an orientation?
  • Is corporal punishment allowed?
  • Does the agency file parent complaints?
  • Do they participate in the Child and Adult Care Food Program?
License-Exempt Provider Policies in the CCDF Policies Database

- **Background Check Requirements**
  - Is there any type of background check requirement?
  - Who in the home has to have a check?
  - What specific type of check do they have to have? Some examples include
    - State with fingerprinting
    - NCIC/NSOR
    - Past states of residence
  - Are there any exemptions to the background check requirement?
  - How often do they have to be updated?

The database does not include information regarding licensing requirements, as this is available through other sources.
How many States/Territories added background check requirements for license exempt providers between 2010 and 2018?
License-Exempt Provider Policies in the CCDF Policies Database

- **Health & Safety Checklist Requirements**
  - Is there a list of health and safety standards that must be met?
  - Who completes that checklist?
  - Is compliance required?
  - How often checklists have to be recompleted?
  - Can providers be paid if they are not in compliance?
  - Are there ever enforcement inspections?

The database does not include information regarding licensing requirements, as this is available through other sources.
Are license-exempt subject to home inspections? (2018)

Note: Number labels represent the number of States/Territories. North Carolina does not allow unlicensed home-based providers to provide care through the subsidy program.
License-Exempt Provider Policies in the CCDF Policies Database

• Training Requirements
  • Is there a CPR or First Aid training requirement? Who has to be trained?
  • How often do certifications from trainings need to be updated?
  • Are there initial training requirements?
  • Are there ongoing training requirements? What types?
  • Are there any exemptions to the requirements?
Are license-exempt providers required to have CPR or First Aid Training? (2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPR training requirement</th>
<th>First aid training requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS AR ID IN</td>
<td>AS AR ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA AK CO CT DE</td>
<td>VA AK CO CT DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL GA IL IA KY</td>
<td>FL IL IA KY LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA ME MD MA MI</td>
<td>ME MD MA MI MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN MS MO MT NV</td>
<td>MS MO MT NV NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ MP ND OH OK</td>
<td>MP ND OH OK OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR PR SC SD TN</td>
<td>PR SC SD TN UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT VT VI WY AZ</td>
<td>VT VI WV WY AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU NE NH NM WI</td>
<td>GU IN NE NH NM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number labels represent the number of States/Territories. States/Territories not included in the graphic either do not have the training requirement or do not allow unlicensed home-based providers to receive CCDF.
License-Exempt Provider Policies in the CCDF Policies Database

- **Tuberculosis Prevention Requirements**
  - Do providers have to be TB tested?
  - Who has to be tested?
  - How often do tests have to be updated?
  - Are there any exemptions to the requirement?

The database does not include information regarding licensing requirements, as this is available through other sources.
Provider Policies in the CCDF Policies Database

- The database also captures:
  - Provider payment policies;
  - Policies on who is eligible to provide care;
  - Reimbursement rate policies; and
  - In state plan years, the annual report also publishes information about the market rate surveys.

The database does not include information regarding licensing requirements, as this is available through other sources.
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Licensing
Administrative Data

This presentation gives examples of the data elements that are often
found on state licensing websites, reported to the Federal Government, and
found in licensing data systems.

For questions about this presentation, email Nina.Johnson@ICF.com.
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### Licensing-Related Data Elements Often Found on State Licensing Websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element Examples</th>
<th>Licensed Providers</th>
<th>License-Exempt CCDF* Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZIP Code Search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The ZIP code search is usually found on the consumer education or licensing website. Users can generate a list of child care providers by location (and sometimes other parameters, such as child’s age).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of data elements include **hours of care**, **quality level**, **environmental features**, **special schedules** (e.g., overnight care), **facility capacity**, and **languages spoken** by the provider.

- ✓

### Inspection Reports

*States typically have at least 3 years of inspection reports for different types of visits (e.g., renewal and complaint investigations). Inspection reports are typically accessed through the provider profile on the ZIP code search or through a separate search.*

Examples of data elements on inspection reports include the inspection **date**, **corrective actions** taken by the child care program and state, **violations**, and **fatalities or serious injuries** that happened as a result of violations.

- ✓
- ✓

*Child Care and Development Fund*
Results of Arizona’s Child Care ZIP Code Search

Child care ZIP code search information and provider profiles vary by state. This image provides an example of the type of information that can be included in a ZIP code search and provider profile.

https://azchildcareprovidersearch.azdes.gov/
Example of an Inspection Report from Massachusetts

The way states display information in an inspection report varies. Massachusetts includes the requirements that were met, level of compliance, program area reviewed, regulations, statement of noncompliance, and corrective action plan.

### Licensing-Related Data Elements Often Found on State Licensing Websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element Examples</th>
<th>Licensed Providers</th>
<th>License-Exempt CCDF Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information about Serious Incidents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This information is typically found on the licensing or consumer education website, under the section for families or the section dedicated to reports or data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual aggregate data on the number of child fatalities and serious injuries must be included for each provider category and licensing status. The annual aggregate number of instances of substantiated child abuse is included for all types or categories of care combined.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Information about Child Care Licensing

This information is usually included on the licensing website, under the section for families or providers.

Examples of information about child care licensing include the background check requirements, types of care, inspection checklist, and monitoring process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Licensed Providers</th>
<th>License-Exempt CCDF Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Child Care and Development Fund, 45 C.F.R. § 98.33(a)(5) (2016)
Example of **Utah’s** Serious Incidents Report

States display this information in different ways. Utah presents the information in one table.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Reportable Injuries (# of Children Injured)</th>
<th>Serious Injuries (# of Children Injured)</th>
<th>Substantiated Child Abuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Centers</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Hourly Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Out of School Time Program</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Family</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Friend and Neighbor (FFN)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWS Approved License Exempt After School Programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other License Exempt programs</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

**Licensing-Related Data Elements Reported to the Federal Government**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element Examples</th>
<th>Licensed Providers</th>
<th>License-Exempt CCDF Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACF-218 (Quality Progress Report)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Some data elements are reported for license-exempt CCDF providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>This report collects information from states and territories to describe investments to improve the quality of care. These data are not made publicly available by the Federal Government. However, individual states or territories may make these data available.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lead Agencies must report on the following:
- Alignment of health and safety standards
- Training
- Complaints
- Coaching and technical assistance
- Spending
- Progress
- Serious injuries

Licensing-Related Data Reported to the Federal Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element Examples</th>
<th>Licensed Providers</th>
<th>License-Exempt CCDF Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACF-801 Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This report includes case-level data on providers, families, and children receiving CCDF funds. Data are collected monthly and reported either monthly or quarterly. Some of the data reported through the ACF-801 are compiled on the Office of Child Care’s CCDF Statistics page (<a href="https://www.acf.hhs.gov/occ/resource/ccdf-statistics">https://www.acf.hhs.gov/occ/resource/ccdf-statistics</a>).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of **provider information** include quality rating and improvement system rating, subject to Head Start or Early Head Start standards, and accreditation standards.

- ✓
- ✓

Examples of information on dependent **children** include race and ethnicity, child disability, and type of care.

- N/A
- N/A

Examples of information on the **head of family** receiving assistance include primary language spoken at home.

- N/A
- N/A

Licensing-Related Data **Reported to the Federal Government**

### Data Element Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element Examples</th>
<th>Licensed Providers</th>
<th>License-Exempt CCDF Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACF-800 Report</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is an annual aggregate report. Some of the data reported through the ACF-800 are compiled on the Office of Child Care’s CCDF Statistics page ([https://www.acf.hhs.gov/occ/resource/ccdf-statistics](https://www.acf.hhs.gov/occ/resource/ccdf-statistics)).*

Examples of information include the **number of families and children** receiving child care services by type of care.

Example of Data **Reported to the Federal Government**  
Office of Child Care’s CCDF Statistics from the ACF-801 Report

This data table provides an example of the type of data available on the Office of Child Care’s website.

**FY 2017 Final Data Table 3 - Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served by Types of Care**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE/TERRITORY</th>
<th>CHILD’S HOME</th>
<th>FAMILY HOME</th>
<th>GROUP HOME</th>
<th>CENTER</th>
<th>INVALID/NOT REPORTED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Licensing-Related Data Elements Found in Licensing Data Systems

The data included in licensing data systems varies from state to state, but these elements are likely to be included in most licensing data systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element Examples</th>
<th>Licensed Providers</th>
<th>License-Exempt CCDF Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General provider information (e.g., capacity)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement (e.g., type of action, whether it was appealed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring (e.g., technical assistance provided)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints (e.g., whether a complaint was substantiated or unsubstantiated)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providers no longer licensed (e.g., reason for revocation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal care (e.g., reports of illegal care)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data on license-exempt providers may be housed in the licensing or subsidy data systems.
Beyond Licensed Capacity:
Measuring the Availability of Child Care by Age
Using Licensing Data in Georgia

Rob O’Callaghan
Often use *licensed capacity* of a facility as proxy for the supply of child care

- Based on square footage
- Easily accessible at the facility level
- Does not reflect classroom counts or children’s ages
- Does not indicate “slots”
Policy Questions

1. What ratios are being practiced in real life?
   - How prevalent are ratios that are better than required by licensing?
   - How might observed ratios inform quality improvement efforts?

2. What does the availability of child care, and of high-quality child care, look like for specific ages in Georgia?
   - Are there areas of the state with an inadequate supply of child care or of high-quality child care, particularly for infants and toddlers? [PDG emphasis]
Obtain data set (all visits July 2018 to June 2019) from database administrators. (Multiple iterations testing results of queries.)

Match providers over time; unique identifiers change with changes of ownership.

Calculate maximum allowable capacity at classroom level based on youngest child present, number of staff, and the classroom square footage.

Filter out visit types where children not present or where all classrooms not observed.
  • 8,484 visits to 4,441 distinct providers

Average data points for multiple visits to same provider.

Aggregate data points for age groups statewide, by county, by quality rating, and by provider type.
### Staff:Child Ratios in Georgia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Licensing</th>
<th>Quality Rated (QRIS)</th>
<th>NAEYC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infants</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ones</td>
<td>1:8</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twos</td>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>1:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threes</td>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>1:8</td>
<td>1:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fours</td>
<td>1:18</td>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>1:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GA Pre-K 1:11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fives</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>1:13</td>
<td>1:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Age</td>
<td>1:25</td>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>1:15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most classrooms operate at better than required ratios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Over Ratio</th>
<th>At Ratio</th>
<th>Under Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infants</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ones</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twos</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threes</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fours</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Infant Toddler Capacity

• Georgia has an observed 7,052 classrooms serving infants and toddlers in licensed centers.

• Including family child care, Georgia has capacity to serve 95,989 infants and toddlers at licensing ratios. → a licensed “slot” for every 4.1 children ages 0-2

• Georgia has capacity to serve 65,295 infants and toddlers at high-quality ratios. → a high-quality “slot” for every 6 children ages 0-2
Many counties may have an inadequate supply of infant and toddler care.

Of Georgia’s 159 counties:

**15 counties** have a licensed slot for every 3 or fewer infants and toddlers.

**23 counties** (all rural) have more than 9 infants/toddlers per licensed slot.
Data Challenges

• Data must be interpreted cautiously.
• Actual enrollment and desired enrollment remain unknown.
• Before- and after-school care for school-age children is often not observed.
• Widespread use of mixed age classrooms introduces some guesswork.
• Counting staff in family child care was problematic.
• Changes of ownership risk double-counting the same location.
• Need to better understand discrepancies in classroom counts across multiple visits to same provider.
• Repeatability
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