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Project Purpose

To give the state and organizations serving young children a clear picture of the nature of the population of young Texans and the projected need for early education services
Project Scope

- Children ages 0 through 12
  - All children needing child care
  - Population eligible for specific programs (e.g., Head Start, CCDF, Pre-K)
- Formal early childhood education and school-age care providers and slots
- Quality programs accredited by a national or state quality measure
- State of Texas and smaller geographic areas

Project conducted by only using existing data

Research Objectives

1. Estimate total children under age 13 and those eligible for ECE and school-age care
2. Document current supply of ECE and SAC
3. Conduct a gap analysis based on these data
4. Generate a comprehensive needs assessment analyzing Texas’ early childhood education and school-age care system
Objective 1:

Understand and estimate the total number of children under age 13 and those eligible for early childhood education programs.

Objective 2:

Understand and document the current supply across the state of Texas of formal providers of early childhood education programs and services and school-age care for children under the age of 13.
Supply Data Sources

- DFPS (child care licensing)
- ERC (Pre-K, IDEA 3&4)
- TWC (CCDF)
- HHS ACF (Head Start)
- Private School Survey
- Military Child Care
- RMC (market rate data)
- DARS (IDEA 0-2)

Types of Supply Results

- Total unduplicated formal supply of early care and education and services
- Specific supply results for:
  - Child care centers and family homes
  - Pre-kindergarten (public and private)
  - Military child care
  - Head Start and Early Head Start
  - CCDF subsidies
  - IDEA services (ECI and PPCD)
  - School-age care (partial)

- Number of providers and number of slots for state, COGs, MSAs and counties if data available
Key Supply Findings

- Over 23,000 unduplicated providers of ECE in 2010 (centers, homes, public Pre-K and military) had capacity to serve nearly 860,000 children, ages 0-4
  - 35% of providers and 67% of slots in licensed child care centers
  - 13% of providers and 26% of slots in public Pre-K

- Other providers:
  - Head Start (1,260 providers serving 93,000 children)
  - Private Pre-K (1,064 providers serving 55,000 children)
  - CCDF (12,600 providers serving nearly 140,000 children)
  - ECI (56 providers serving 66,600 children)
  - PPCD (4,000 providers serving 42,000 children)

### 2010 Total Supply of Unduplicated Formal ECE Providers and Slots for Texas Children 0-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Care</th>
<th>Providers Number</th>
<th>Providers Percent</th>
<th>Slots Number</th>
<th>Slots Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23,465</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>867,628</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Centers</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>586,923</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Homes</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Homes</td>
<td>6,330</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30,557</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Homes</td>
<td>4,037</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10,155</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Pre-K</td>
<td>3,154</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>554,287</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military CDCs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3,106</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2010 Total Supply of All Formal ECE Providers and Slots for Texas Children 0-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Care</th>
<th>Providers Number</th>
<th>Slots Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Centers</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>586,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Homes</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Homes</td>
<td>6,330</td>
<td>30,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Homes</td>
<td>4,037</td>
<td>10,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Pre-K</td>
<td>3,154</td>
<td>554,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pre-K</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>54,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military CDCs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>65,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Head Start</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>7,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant/ Seasonal Head Start</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Development Fund</td>
<td>12,652</td>
<td>139,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA: Early Childhood Intervention</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA: Preschool Programs for Children with Disabilities</td>
<td>4,044</td>
<td>41,815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Head Start and CCDF

- **Head Start**
  - All but 30 counties have at least one HS provider
  - 30% located in non-MSA counties

- **CCDF Subsidies**
  - 88% served in child care centers
  - 7% in licensed or registered homes
  - <5% use informal care
  - Only two MSAs — Austin-Round Rock and Dallas-Ft. Worth — serve > 1,000 children in informal arrangements

Distribution of ECI and PPCD

- **ECI**
  - 56 grantees serving entire state
  - All COGs except Middle Rio Grande and South Texas had at least one grantee
  - All MSAs except Brownsville-Harlingen and Laredo had at least one grantee
  - 88% of children served lived in MSA counties

- **PPCD**
  - Providers in all COGs and MSAs
  - 85% of providers and 89% of children served were in MSAs
**Home Visiting Programs**

- In 2010, 12 programs throughout the state supporting families with pregnant women and children to age 5
- In 2011, TX HHSC received Affordable Care Act funds to support evidenced-based home visiting programs in 8 counties and a ‘promising approach’ program in an additional county
  - Expected to serve 2,254 families through August 2013
  - Counties include: Cherokee, Dallas, Ector, Gregg, Hidalgo, Willacy, Nueces and Potter

**Data Sources for Measuring Quality**

- Texas School Ready!
- Texas Rising Star
- National Association for Education of Young Children
- National Association for Family Child Care
- National Early Childhood Program Accreditation
- National Accreditation Commission for Early Care and Education
- Association of Christian Schools International
- National Afterschool Association
Key Quality Findings

- Every COG and MSA has at least one provider meeting some type of quality standard
- Only 160 of 254 have at least one provider meeting any type of quality standard
- Unduplicated list of quality providers by county could not be determined due to lack of common identifiers across data sources
- Distribution by COG, MSA and county provided for TSR! And TRS
Objective 3:

Conduct a gap analysis based on the completion of objectives 1 and 2

- Compare gaps in the demand for services and the available supply
- Identify the gap between the need for high-quality services and the availability of such services
Gap Analysis Key Findings

- Unduplicated formal ECE slots could serve 45% of all Texas children 0-4 in 2010
  - Also measured by COG, MSA and county
    - Lowest in Brownsville-Harlingen and Sherman-Denison MSAs (37 slots per 100 children)
    - Highest in Texarkana MSA (78 slots per 100 children)

Proportion of ECE Slots by County per 100 Children Under Age 5 in 2010
Gap Analysis Key Findings

Unduplicated formal ECE slots could serve 78% of all Texas children 0–4 of working-parent families in 2010

- Estimated gaps in formal ECE for 0-2 in 20 largest counties
  - Largest relative supply in Brazoria, Bell and Denton counties
  - Smallest relative supply in Fort Bend and Williamson counties

- Estimated gaps in formal ECE for ages 3-4 in 20 largest counties
  - Largest relative supply in Galveston, Webb and Bell counties
  - Smallest relative supply in Brazoria and Dallas counties

Relative Supply of Current Unduplicated Early Care and Education Slots by Projected Child Population Growth for the 20 Largest Texas Counties
Gap Analysis Key Findings

- Service gaps estimated for specific programs if possible but data gaps prevented full analysis
  - Pre-K
  - Head Start
  - CCDF

- At most, 16% of child care centers and 12% of public Pre-Ks achieved any quality designation

- Biggest data gaps were in measurement of school-age care and linking quality information to provider information

Gap Analysis Key Findings

- Public Pre-K
  - Existing programs serve 85-92% of need
  - An additional 15,000 slots needed in 2010 and an additional 7,600 slots in 2015 to serve all income-eligible children

- Head Start/Early Head Start
  - 5% of 0-2-year-olds, 31% of 3-year-olds and 39% of 4-year-olds served

- CCDF subsidies
  - Difficult to estimate precise gaps because eligibility based on families and available to children ages 0-12
  - Less than 10% of eligible families served
Share of Children in Low-Income Families Served by CCDF in 2010

Distribution of Texas Rising Star Certified Sites by County
## Recommendations

### Service Improvements - State

- Identify and better articulate total array of services for young children and their families
- Assess whether creation of a separate agency for early learning would enhance the state’s efforts to improve kindergarten readiness
- Increase services for low-income children under the age of four
- Develop a more systematic approach to measuring and improving program quality
- Determine if PPCD participants are receiving the earliest possible interventions services.
- Work with relevant groups to better understand school-age care
- Determine which services have greatest impact on kindergarten readiness and other educational outcomes

### Service Improvements - Local

- Use information in needs assessment as starting point for more detailed needs assessment
- **Address following questions:**
  - Is current supply of formal ECE sufficient to meet needs
  - How prepared is this community to deal with overall projected growth
  - Are there opportunities to improve program coordination to enhance kindergarten readiness
  - How much extra funding will be needed to provide specialized services
  - What are opportunities to improve quality
Recommendations

Future Needs Assessments

- Implement common protocol to collect desired type of program data annually
- Enhance Census population surveys with periodic surveys needed to measure key variables
- Add a common program identifier code to TDPRS database and TEA school database
- Add program capacity information by child age to TDFPS registry database
- Create data archive in order to maintain access to historical program and quality data.
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