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INTRODUCTION

YOUNG CHILDREN AND THEIR NEIGHBORHOODS

Place matters. Neighborhoods are particularly important for very young children, whose lives often largely revolve around the few blocks surrounding their homes. While parents remain the most important influence on and determinant of young children’s healthy growth, neighborhoods also play a significant role.

Neighborhoods vary greatly in their physical housing stock, access to family- and child-friendly gathering places and activities, and physical and environmental safety. When children live in dilapidated, poor, and unsafe neighborhoods that are barren of developmentally stimulating options, this challenges even the most resilient and persistent parent in fostering a child’s healthy growth and development.

There is increasing recognition of the need for more comprehensive and integrated approaches to support children’s healthy growth and development within such high poverty neighborhoods. At the federal level, Promise Neighborhoods and Healthy Start Initiatives have focused upon such high poverty neighborhoods. The Race to the Top–Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) emphasizes addressing “children with high needs” in a more comprehensive fashion, and a number of states receiving RTT-ELC grants have focused specific attention on developing programs and services within their most disadvantaged geographic areas. Recently, the Administration on Children and Families set aside $500 million for Early Head Start–Child Care Partnerships for new or existing Early Head Start programs to partner with local child care centers and family child care providers serving infants and toddlers from low-income families. The partnerships are designed to support full-day, full-year programs for working parents that incorporate Early Head Start standards related to family engagement, health and developmental screenings, health and safety and nutrition standards, and teacher professional development opportunities.

States as well as local programs are eligible to apply. Whether or not states choose to apply to develop these partnerships, they are in the position to provide information at both a community and neighborhood level to identify those neighborhoods where the opportunities and needs are greatest for developing such partnerships.

This Guide identifies what states can do to provide information that can support the development of partnership grants that respond to areas in their states with the greatest need.

1. The first section describes how states can use census data to identify neighborhoods with the highest needs for such partnerships.

2. The second section describes how states can help “map” existing services into neighborhoods that can be built upon in developing partnerships within those neighborhoods.

3. The third section describes additional information that states may be able to overlay in providing an even more comprehensive picture of these neighborhoods.
SECTION ONE
IDENTIFYING CENSUS TRACTS/NEIGHBORHOODS WITH HIGH NEEDS

Advances in technology have made it much more feasible to map administrative data about young children and their families to a neighborhood level than in the past. This includes vital records information (including birth data), health information (including Medicaid and CHIP data, immunization information, and such health conditions as elevated-blood lead levels), safety information (including crime data, justice system involvement data, and child abuse and neglect and foster placement data), education data (including kindergarten entry assessment data, chronic elementary absenteeism data, and early elementary reading proficiency data), and other early care and education data (including participation data about Part C and Part B, home visiting, and preschool, and data about child care subsidy and licensed and registered child care).

States usually are able to map this data to a county and/or a metropolitan/municipal area, but they vary greatly in their ability to further map this information to a sub-county/sub-metropolitan/sub-municipal level. Section Three discusses mapping these different data resources for use both for partnership grant purposes and for more generally supporting early childhood systems building.

Fortunately, the United States Census itself provides sufficient information not only to identify neighborhoods that have high poverty levels, but also to describe them in terms of the overall characteristics and conditions that exist within them that can impact young children's healthy development.

The Census provides information for both census tracts (and even smaller census blocks) and for zip codes. Most people are much more familiar with zip codes than census tracts, but census tracts have a number of advantages when it comes to conducting neighborhood-level analyses:

1. Census tracts cover well-defined geographic areas and cover all geographic areas. Zip codes can be single P.O. boxes or street addresses and do not cover some parts of the county.

2. Census tracts provide more granular information (73,000 tracts) generally ranging in size from 1,800 to 8,000 and averaging around 4,000; zip codes (43,000) range from 0 residents in size to ones exceeding 100,000.

3. Census tracts remain more constant over time and, when changed, do so in ways to continue to allow for time-series analysis; zip codes change much more frequently and re-contour boundaries.

4. Census tracts can generally be aggregated to represent neighborhoods that have been identified as neighborhoods by metropolitan planners and/or county governments (and usually almost completely aligned if disaggregated to the block level); zip codes very often include two or more neighborhoods and parts of neighborhoods, often including neighborhoods with very different underlying characteristics. ¹
The strong recommendation here is to use census tracts for state-level analyses. Whether states choose to use census tracts or zip codes, however, states can conduct an initial analysis to identify those tracts or then examine them specifically for their locations and combine them, as appropriate, to correspond with neighborhoods or service areas for special attention.

The census data available through the American Community Survey provide a wealth of information about children and their families – including information on child and adult race/ethnicity, age, gender, family structure, employment, poverty, wealth/resources, and education levels. Village Building and School Readiness analyzed all 65,000 census tracts in the country according to their “child-raising vulnerability,” employing ten specific indicators to identify such census tracts (and the general dimensions they collectively seek to measure):

1. (Social/family) Percent of single parent families
2. (Social/family) Percent disconnected 16-19 year-old youth (not working or in school)
3. (Social/family) Percent adult population of limited English proficiency
4. (Educational) Percent 25 and over population without a high school diploma
5. (Educational) Percent 25 and over with at least a college degree
6. (Economic) Percent of households with wage income
7. (Economic) Percent of families with children in poverty
8. (Economic) Percent of heads of households on public assistance
9. (Wealth) Percent of owner occupied housing
10. (Wealth) Percent of households with interest, rent, or dividend income

The subsequent analysis of these census tracts showed the sharp distinctions between tracts with high numbers of these vulnerability factors and the population as a whole, as shown in the Table One. It also showed their differences in terms of the size their young child population and their racial and ethnic diversity.

As Table One shows, the census tracts with three or more vulnerability factors, and particularly those with 6–10 vulnerability factors, are dramatically different on nine of the ten indicators, with only the “percent of households with wage income” being somewhat comparable. Clearly, these census tracts are substantially different not only in terms of poverty rates, but in terms of a number of other factors related to neighborhood supports for young children and their families.

THEY ALSO ARE:

- Rich in children overall, and young children in particular
- Primarily of color (which, depending on the census tract, could be primarily of one race/ethnicity or very mixed)
- Where a very substantial portion of young children live and obviously, a much higher proportion of those most vulnerable to poor outcomes

---

1 The percent of three-to-five year-olds in preschool was the initial choice for the 10th indicator, but was not available on the specific data set for the analysis, although it is available on the census.
This specific analysis has not yet been conducted on the 2010 census, but there have been several similar analyses which have focused upon neighborhoods with high rates of poverty overall, and then examined those high poverty census tracts in terms of these different indicators and characteristics.

In two states (Arizona and Iowa), this analysis has been conducted using 2010 census information, examining all census tracts with poverty rates above 30 percent, after excluding those census tracts which are primarily college or university student tracts (as measured by more than 30 percent of the population being between the ages of 18 and 24).

In addition, the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Kids Count Initiative conducted a data snapshot of high poverty neighborhoods that provides state-by-state comparisons, although it did not break-out those student census tracts from its overall analysis3 (and, therefore, did not show the concentration of 0-4 year olds in high poverty tracts: the student tracts had very few young children and

3 While 11.3 percent of the total population lives in neighborhoods with 3-5 vulnerability factors, 12.8 percent of 0-4 year olds live there; and while 6.7 percent of the overall population lives in neighborhoods with 6-10 vulnerability factors, 9.1 percent of 0-4 year olds live there – so 21.9 percent of all 0-4 year olds live in those higher vulnerability neighborhoods.

3 Race to Results (2014). The eight indicators which Race to Results uses from the census are very similar to those used in Village Building and School Readiness but contain some differences which merit review. Race to Results also uses four indicators from other sources (low birthweight, NAEP 4th grade reading, NAEP 8th grade math, and high school graduation rates).

4 In Village Building and School Readiness, there were analyses of the proportion of working age adults to non-working age adults, which speaks to the need for greater relative investments in certain neighborhoods simply due to fewer workers in relation to other children or seniors. There also was an analysis of the ratio of 16-34 males and females by race, which spoke to the issue of the impact of incarceration of African American males, in particular. There are multiple opportunities to break down different indicators by race when looking at aggregate information.
balanced out the non-student high poverty census tracts, which did include young children.\(^4\) The Kids Count Race to Results report comparing indicators of well-being for children of different racial and ethnic backgrounds in each state also includes eight of its twelve indicators (similar to eight of the ten used in the Village Building and Arizona and Iowa analysis) from the census.\(^3\)

With the caveat that states need to look to exclude or separately examine those census tracts which represent college and university student population areas, states can produce a good representation of the highest vulnerability census tracts in the state by examining those tracts by their levels of poverty (e.g., 0-20 percent in poverty; 20-30 percent in poverty; 30-40 percent in poverty; or simply 30 percent or more in poverty).

For each tract, and for tracts as a group, the following additional indicators (beyond poverty levels) can be constructed that will be useful for developing neighborhood-level early childhood strategies:

- Total Population (0-17, 18-64, 65+)
- Number of families with young children (0-5)
- Number of very young children (0-2)
- Number of young children (0-5) by race and ethnicity (White, non-Hispanic, African American, non-Hispanic, Hispanic, etc.)
- Indicators used in Village Building and School Readiness and/or Race for Results
- Other indicators of particular state interest and concern

States can then present such information: (1) as overall state information on census tracts with different levels of poverty to show their differences on multiple factors (much as is provided in Village Building and in the Arizona analysis); and (2) as data to be used at the community/sub-community level to identify the specific neighborhoods (often a collection of several census tracts) and their characteristics for more detailed work and mapping of other information (see Sections Two and Three).

On page 8 is Table two, which includes a map from Des Moines, Iowa, showing a set of nine census tracts that collectively were part of Making Connections, along with their overall characteristics contrasted with state information.

This information has proved useful not only to identify those high vulnerability neighborhoods, but also to gain an understanding of the characteristics of those neighborhoods and what has to be taken into account in developing programs and strategies to improve children’s healthy development.

This data was developed for work generally on developing school readiness strategies and well before the establishment of the new Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships Initiative. In addition to this type of data, state analyses conducted to support the Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships should include information on the number of 0-2 year-old children and the number of those children in poverty. It should also include a breakdown of the 0-4 child population by race and ethnicity.

While different states have different poverty, education, wealth, and family demographics overall,
they all can identify particular census tracts/zip codes/neighborhoods that stand in sharp contrast with the state overall and which have different characteristics and conditions which require special attention.

---

**TABLE TWO: MAKING CONNECTIONS NEIGHBORHOODS AND THEIR CHARACTERISTICS COMPARED WITH IOWA AS A WHOLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Iowa</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>Iowa</th>
<th>MC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>31,673</td>
<td>2,926,324</td>
<td>% 25+ BA Higher</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4 Population</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>% 16-19 Not Sch./Work</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Births</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>% Household Pub.As.</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-17 Pop White, NH</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>% Households Wages</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent Fams.</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>% Households Ind/Div</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Families w/Ch</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>% 18+ Lim. Engl. Pro</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent 25+ No HS</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>% Owner Occupied</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary.** This section shows that a first step states can take is simply to use current census data to identify census tracts and the overall characteristics that are particular areas of concern in the development of early childhood initiatives which can support those young children and their families. This goes well beyond information about the number of young children and their poverty status.

As states develop this information, they also should recognize that this can be used both to describe the special conditions in higher vulnerability census tracts and to map those tracts into counties and municipalities in order to define specific geographic areas (usually a collection of several census tracts) as neighborhoods for particular
potential focus for Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships.

SECTION TWO
MAPPING KEY INFANT AND TODDLER SERVICES
INTO NEIGHBORHOODS

As indicated in Section One, most poor neighborhoods are rich in young children. They already are being served by a number of existing state and federal programs and services, including Early Head Start, WIC and SNAP, Medicaid and CHIP, Part C of IDEA, MIECHV and other state home visiting programs, and an array of licensed and registered child care centers and homes and state child care subsidy programs (generally funded with federal CCDBG and TANF funds and state funds). States and communities may also have additional parenting education and family resource center programs supporting young children and their families, as well as libraries and museums and recreation programs that focus upon young children and their parents and caregivers.

The numbers of different programs and funding streams can lead policy makers to assume that there are many services available to young children and their families and the primary need is to ensure that they are integrated and not fragmented or duplicative.

In fact, however, many of these programs and services are small and may not be available in all neighborhoods. When they do exist, they may reach and serve only a small proportion of children they are designed to serve. By nature, many are small and very localized.

Understanding and mapping these resources within and across a state can be very useful in identifying the overall extent to which services are reaching those they are designed to serve and where the need for additional services are greatest.

First, however, it is important to recognize that, particularly for children 0–2, many publicly-financed and publicly-regulated services are available for only a very small proportion of all children, even those who are living in poverty and most in need. Table Three draws from multiple sources to show, on a national level, how many children in the birth through two population in the United States are served by different programs that are supported and financed with federal support.

As Table Three Shows, while there are multiple programs and services available for young children and their families, with the exception of Medicaid and WIC, these programs and services actually reach a very small percentage of young children and their families, even for children and families who are living at levels below the federal poverty level. While more than one in four children birth through two lives in poverty, only one in thirty receives a child care subsidy (and many of these may have incomes above 100 percent of poverty). Less than two in one hundred is a current Early Head Start participant, and the majority of these are served in home-based programs.

While there may be need for more alignment and coordination across services that do exist within a neighborhood, community, or state, there are many more gaps in service than there likely are areas where there are duplications in service. As states go forward in developing information useful for neighborhood-level analysis, they need to recognize that there are overall very small public investments being made today in the education and development of infants and toddlers, when con-
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TABLE THREE: PROGRAMS SERVING VERY YOUNG CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES AND THE PROPORTION OF CHILDREN SERVED (U.S. TOTAL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children Birth through Two Years of Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of All Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children Birth through Two Years of Age in Poverty</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children Birth through Two Below 200% of Poverty</td>
<td>6,300,000</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Birth through Two Receiving Medicaid</td>
<td>6,800,000</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Birth through Two Receiving WIC</td>
<td>3,400,000</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Birth through Two Receiving Part C Services</td>
<td>336,000</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Birth through Two in Formal Child Care</td>
<td>2,140,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Birth through Two Receiving Child Care Subsidies</td>
<td>422,000</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Birth through Two Receiving Subsidies in Formal Care</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Birth through Two in Early Head Start</td>
<td>167,600</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Birth through Two in MIECHV</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Birth through Two in Foster Care</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data on children from birth to age two and their poverty status is from the census. Children birth to two receiving Medicaid is from 416 forms from CMMS. Children birth through two receiving WIC is from USDA. Children birth through two in Part C is from ECTAC. Children birth through two in formal child care is from the census report Whose Minding the Kids (2011 survey) and not available on a state level. Children birth through two receiving child care subsidies is from CLASP. Children birth to two in Early Head Start is from ACS. Children birth to two in foster care is from AFCARS. Rates of participation in many of these programs vary substantially across the states.

In mapping what does exist for programs and services, in many instances – such as existing Early Head Start programs and existing child care slots for children or child care subsidy payments – states most likely will be able to obtain and report the location of different programs and the number of children served by those programs, but will not be able to determine the particular neighborhoods from which the children being served live. Still, locating the program service delivery points within neighborhoods can give a good idea of the extent to which there are services available within the neighborhood.

With particular respect to the Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships, mapping the following into counties/municipalities/metropolitan areas and then into neighborhoods will be a very useful place to start in identifying neighborhoods where partnerships are most needed:

1. Current Early Head Start program locations and the number of children each location serves (ideally broken out by whether these services are home-based services or include child care)

2. Current registered/licensed child care centers and family child homes and the number of slots/spaces they have, including those that serve infants and toddlers (0-2 year olds), ideally broken out by measures that would indicate whether they meet Head Start performance standards, including what their ratings may be on the state’s QRIS, if the state has a QRIS

Available information regarding the former should be available or obtainable through the state Head Start Coordinating Office. Information on the latter should be available through the state’s child care licensing and registration offices, although that information may not be able to provide information on the ages of children being served or the degree to which the slots/spaces that are
1. Birth record information showing the location of new births, including low-birthweight rates, prenatal care use rates, and other information available from birth records.

2. Information from health registries, including screening for elevated blood-lead levels and childhood immunizations.

3. Child abuse and foster care data showing the prevalence of confirmed child abuse reports for young children and placement of children into foster care.

4. Part C data on the current use of Part C services.

5. Longitudinal student record data bases, which may provide information on kindergarten assessments, early elementary absenteeism, and early literacy by school and that school’s attendance area (and potentially, through address information, to specific neighborhood, if states can conducting such geo-mapping of data).

In addition to this information, since MIECHV and other home visiting programs may serve very similar populations and provide similar services to those provided by Early Head Start, mapping home visiting programs by neighborhood also can contribute to the work. Knowing the home office of a home visiting program, however, does not necessarily provide much information on where families being served through home visiting live. To the extent that those programs can provide more information on the location of the children and families they serve, it may be possible to add additional detail on service penetration by neighborhood.

**Summary.** Specific to the Early Head State-Child Care Partnerships, mapping the locations of existing Early Head Start program offices and licensed and registered child care centers and family child care homes – along with as much information as possible about the number of children they serve – can assist in identifying what the level of need is for additional services and partnerships within the high poverty and need areas identified through census information.

### SECTION THREE

**MAPPING OTHER INFORMATION ONTO NEIGHBORHOODS**

While identifying neighborhoods with the highest need or child raising vulnerability and then identifying the degree to which there are gaps in Early Head Start and high quality infant and toddler care programs in these neighborhoods is the most important work specific to the Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships grants and applications, there is other information that states also may be able to provide on a neighborhood level that can further inform work in those neighborhoods under those grants and can inform other early childhood systems building generally. Existing Head Start programs often have a wealth of information from prior community assessments they have conducted.

In addition, states are repositories of a lot of data that also can inform this work. With specific respect to young children and their families, this includes:

1. Birth record information showing the location of new births, including low-birthweight rates, prenatal care use rates, and other information available from birth records.
2. Information from health registries, including screening for elevated blood-lead levels and childhood immunizations.
3. Child abuse and foster care data showing the prevalence of confirmed child abuse reports for young children and placement of children into foster care.
4. Part C data on the current use of Part C services.
5. Longitudinal student record data bases, which may provide information on kindergarten assessments, early elementary absenteeism, and early literacy by school and that school’s attendance area (and potentially, through address information, to specific neighborhood, if states can conducting such geo-mapping of data).
In some instances, there also are local entities which have geo-mapped these or other data sets (often including housing, crime, and economic activity data) to the neighborhood level. In fact, many of the 35 cities with members in the National Neighborhood Indicators Project have done extensive geo-mapping of their major metropolitan areas, including early childhood data. NNIP has produced its own guide and toolkit for conducting such analyses related to the needs and supports for young children. Similarly, more than thirty communities and several states are working with United Way Worldwide and the UCLA’s Center for Healthier Children under the Transforming Early Childhood Community Systems (TECCS) Initiative. That initiative makes use of the Environmental Development Inventory (EDI) to assess children at kindergarten entry and to map the results, with other information, at a neighborhood level.

Obviously, one of the strengths of this neighborhood mapping is that it not only can show specific service use, but it also can locate museums, libraries, faith institutions, parks, and other community spaces which have the potential of supporting young children and their families. Inventoring these often is part process and part product, as it can both identify potential sources of support and enlist new allies in offering information and services for young children and their families. At the community level, such mapping can be conducted by youth as part of Youth Mapping Initiatives and by residents or community-school-family partnerships in mapping community resources and services. While states themselves generally cannot do such mapping, they can provide support to communities to do so. In addition, community assessments are required of nonprofit hospitals every three years and also can contribute to mapping such community assets. Pioneering work on such mapping was conducted by John McKnight and Jody Kretzmann, and the Asset-Based Community Development Institute at Northwestern University represents a resource for both research and tools in conducting such asset mapping.

**Summary.** States do not necessarily have to do all the potential mapping of data and information to the community level, but they can inventory what they do have available and determine what information they are able to disaggregate to what geographic levels and do so. They also can be partners in providing information to community groups to do so and provide support for more work. While this information may not be necessary to identify neighborhoods of highest need, it can be essential, particularly at the community level, in developing strategies and identifying those who are best able to develop and deliver new or expanded services.

**CONCLUSION:**

**STATE OPPORTUNITIES FOR LEADERSHIP**

States have much to offer to communities in providing information that can inform service providers and residents of the need and opportunities for early childhood systems development at both the community and neighborhood level.

This includes providing overall information at the neighborhood level which can help to determine where the needs and opportunities for early childhood services are greatest – much of which can be provided through detailed reporting of information from the U.S. census on a census tract level.
This also includes providing specific information on programs and services provided through state and federal funds or regulated by the state on young children and their families, again broken down as much as possible to the sub-state and the neighborhood level. With respect to the Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships, existing Early Head Start, MIECHV and other home visiting programs, and registered and licensed child care providers serving infants and toddlers are key sources to mine.

On a broader level, states also can either themselves map other key data sets (particularly birth record information and statewide student longitudinal data base information) to the substate and neighborhood levels.

In addition, states can be partners with local organizations that are doing such mapping by making data, with appropriate safeguards for confidentiality, available for their use. In addition, they can support local efforts to go beyond gathering service and administrative data to also map community assets.

States do not need to do everything at once, but they can start this process and learn, along with communities and neighborhoods, as they go forward. The Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships’ emphasis on identifying and giving priority to high poverty neighborhoods represents another opportunity to take steps forward in this work.
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