



Session 202: Maximizing CCDF Impact for Infants and Toddlers Opportunities to Advance Equity Through Child Care Assistance Policies

July 16, 2018

Cemeré James, National Black Child Development Institute

Christine Johnson-Staub, Center for Law and Social Policy

Child and Family Demographics and Participation in Child Care Assistance Programs

- Children and families of color are more likely to live in poverty or be low income. About 39 percent of Black young children and 30 percent of Hispanic young children lived in poverty, while 13 percent of white non-Hispanic young children lived in poverty.ⁱ Higher numbers of young children live in low-income households (under 200 percent of the federal poverty level): 62.4 percent of Black children, 56 percent of Hispanic children, and 28 percent of white children.ⁱⁱ
- Consideration of racial equity is especially important given the demographics of low-income families. Data shows that of children ages 0-6 from low-income families 20% are Black, 34% are Latino, and 37% are White (NBCDI)
- Certain populations face systemic barriers while navigating public programs, including immigrants, families that are low-income, families of children with disabilities, and linguistic minorities. Analysis of 2011-2013 CCDBG data show that fewer eligible American Indian and Alaskan Native, Hispanic, and Asian children received CCDBG subsidies than the national average of 13 percent. (CLASP)
- Employment challenges, including involuntary part-time and unfair scheduling practices—such as unpredictable hours—disproportionately affect workers of color. Black and Latino workers are more likely to be employed in low-wage jobs and have unstable schedules.ⁱⁱⁱ

Provider Participation

- The roots of racializing child care, along with other domestic work, predate the emergence of child care and early education as paid work. Black women have historically borne the burden of domestic work and child care—first as slaves, then as an undervalued labor force.^{iv}

- Because of the historic social and political impact of systemic racism, and an historic undervaluing of caregiving and domestic work, a large portion of the child care and early education workforce has traditionally been comprised of women of color.
- A large portion of the field has worked in poorly paid jobs with substandard or no benefits. Forty percent of today's early childhood workforce is made up of people of color, who tend to be concentrated in low-level positions with lower credential requirements and relatively low pay.^v
- A recent study in Alameda County, California found that Latina and Asian/Pacific staff were more likely to hold lower-paid assistant teacher positions, while white non-Hispanic staff were more likely to be teachers.^{vi} Teachers of color, particularly African American women, also experience wage inequity compared to their white counterparts, receiving 84 cents on the dollar.^{vii}

The greatest diversity in the ECE workforce was associated with the job titles that are subject to the lowest educational qualifications and other requirements.

Table 1. Ethnicity of California ECE Workforce, K-12 Teachers and Children Birth to Five

	Family Child Care Providers	Center Teachers	Assistant Teachers	Directors	K-12 Teachers	CA Children 0-5 Years
White, Non-Hispanic	42%	53%	37%	63%	74%	30%
Latina	35%	27%	42%	16%	14%	50%
African American	15%	7%	8%	9%	5%	6%
Asian/Pacific Islander	5%	5%	8%	6%	6%	10%
Other	3%	8%	5%	7%	1%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	n=24,924	n=43,290	n=20,833	n=6,852		

Note. Center staff: Based on a sample of 1,921 centers, weighted to represent the population of licensed centers.

Note. Family child care homes: Based on a sample of 1,800 providers, weighted to represent the population of licensed family child care providers.

Source: K-12 Teachers: California Department of Education (2004)

Source: Children 0-5 Years: California Department of Finance (2004)

Table 2. Percentages of Providers and Teachers with a BA or Higher Degree, By Ethnicity, Compared to the Total Population of Providers and Teachers

	All licensed family child care providers	Licensed family child care providers with BA degree or higher	All center teachers	Center teachers with BA degree or higher
White, Non-Hispanic	42%	47%	53%	59%
Latina	35%	15%	27%	13%
African American	15%	17%	7%	6%
Asian/Pacific Islander	5%	16%	8%	15%
Other	3%	5%	5%	7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
	n=24,906	n=3,412	n=43,289	n=10,999

Note. Center teachers: Based on a sample of 1,921 centers, weighted to represent the population of licensed centers.

Note. Family child care homes: Based on a sample of 1,800 providers, weighted to represent the population of licensed family child care providers.

- According to one study, increasing educational requirements and salaries for early childhood teachers leads to a higher percentage of white workers. For example, the study found that while 16.5 percent of child care teachers were Latino, only 6 percent of teachers in the early elementary grades (which required higher degrees) were Latino.^{viii}

Policy Option: Consumer Outreach

- There is a need to stop using “hard to reach” when speaking about communities of color. Communities of color are reachable and willing to engage when diligent outreach is attempted. Outreach attempts need to keep the populations and communities in mind, and meet them where they are at **(Examples from Washington state below)**
 - If you want to take the notion of building relationships in your community a step further, think in terms of partnerships.
 - Build trust with communities and be aware of how/ where people show up
 - Find out if other barriers exist, such as language, perception of being welcome, etc.
 - Go beyond minimum legal requirements for meeting by using community meetings, consultation, engaging community organizations, or provide different ways for people to engage
 - Be transparent about how feedback will be used
- We must find a way to engage communities that don’t speak English as their first language as well as parents who have disabilities that might prevent them from being actively engaged in community events.
 - Contact local organizations that represent these groups and create a partnership with them, to ensure that outreach is being made to all families.
 - Partner with trusted intermediaries, such as immigrant-serving organizations, faith-based institutions, and other community-based organizations.

Policy Option: Eligibility

- CCDBG now requires 12-month eligibility periods for children receiving child care assistance, with few exceptions. We recommend states implement those exceptions judiciously and avoid early termination of assistance whenever possible
- After a job loss, states are required to ensure that all parents/caregivers receive child-care assistance for at least 3-months before terminating assistance. We recommend that all states go beyond the 3-month requirement and allow families to have full 12-month eligibility after job loss, while parents and caregivers are engaged in job searches, which is permissible under the law.

One additional reason to extend eligibility beyond the 3-month job search period is to facilitate a longer job search. Retention of eligibility during a longer job search period can make it easier for parents to apply for jobs and ensures that they have child care in place when they find one that supports children’s development by maintaining continuity in their early learning placement (HHS).

- As a new CCDBG requirement, parents and caregivers whose pay fluctuates frequently can submit the pay stubs that most accurately reflect their income instead of strictly requiring them to submit their most recent. In addition, states can choose to support parents who are managing fluctuating work schedules by allowing them to choose the child-care setting that is best for their children without limiting them to child care that strictly matches their work schedule (NBCDI).
- Stable child care is critical to strengthening parents' ability to go to work, improve their prospects in the job market, and increase their earning potential (HHS).

Policy Option: Supply

Rates and Contracts

- CCDBG allows states to consider using contracted slots for child care services in particular communities to increase access for underserved populations.
 - Rate differentials for infant-toddler providers are also critical as current rates do not adequately cover the incremental costs for the provision of care that meets the needs of vulnerable young children. For example, the average cost of infant-toddler care is almost double the average subsidy payment in CCDBG.
 - Quality funds may be used for direct services, in particular when they are tied to quality improvement efforts such as contracting directly with providers to build the supply of high-quality infant-toddler care.

Nontraditional hours

- The child care law confirms that providers can be paid different rates if they provide child care during nontraditional hours.
- The law says that providers should be paid for days when the child has an unexpected absence.
- Consumer education on availability of child care during nontraditional hours through child care resource and referral is an option.
- Nontraditional hour care is provided by a range of providers. Supports for those providers should be designed to meet their needs, and support providers who meet families' needs, including cultural and linguistic needs as well as geographic location.

Policy Option: Quality Care

In developing and changing program quality policies, states should reflect racial equity in both content and process, bringing a variety of stakeholders to the table to ensure an understanding of families' needs. To meet increasing quality expectations, support children and families appropriately, and respect cultural and linguistic identities, early childhood providers must reflect the diversity of the young child population and be skilled in developmentally appropriate practice that meets the needs of all children.^{ix}

- In partnership with communities of color, state and local policymakers should review and revise their quality rating and improvement systems (QRIS), as well as quality

standards, to address racial, ethnic, and linguistic diversity and reflect community perspectives on quality. By revising their indicators, states can support home language and best practices in dual language learning, engage extended families and parents from culturally and linguistically diverse communities, and support diverse and multilingual staff.^x

- In implementing the QRIS particular attention should be paid to the availability of resources up front to providers so they can reach higher levels of quality, with intentional resourcing and developing of providers of color and those serving communities of color. Leaving providers out leaves children out, and limits the effectiveness of QRIS.
- State policymakers should assess child care and early education policies for their impact on communities of color and immigrant communities. This can include analyzing patterns of state policy and funding choices within the child care subsidy program. For example, policymakers could identify state policies that restrict or expand access for diverse children and families.

Policy Option: Professional Development/Workforce

- State and local policymakers should ensure all child care and early education workers and providers receive ongoing training in cultural competence, anti-bias, and effective strategies for teaching dual language learners. Trainings should be designed based on available research and in partnership with community-based organizations or representatives of diverse communities.
- State policymakers should support the education, training, and professional development of racially, culturally, and linguistically diverse child care workers through scholarships and stipends; professional development; and information, curricula, and other materials in multiple languages.
- State and local policymakers and administrators should ensure accessible, language-appropriate training and technical assistance opportunities for LEP child care workers and providers.

Policy Option: Suspension/expulsion

- State policymakers should adhere to provisions in CCDBG that require written guidance to prevent suspensions and expulsions of children birth to age 5 in early childhood education programs. These solutions should be focused on systems-level change needed to address this issue not solely focused on placing tight controls on child behavior.
 - In California, policymakers are implementing behavior management strategies, including positive behavior interventions and support models that promote positive social-emotional development and early childhood mental health and reduce challenging behaviors, including reducing expulsions of preschool-aged children from birth to five for such behaviors. The Infant/Toddler and Preschool

Curriculum Frameworks and Program Guidelines provide guidance on addressing positive social and emotional development as well as strategies for challenging behaviors.

- The legislation in District of Columbia prohibits the suspension or expulsion of a student of pre-Kindergarten age from any publicly funded pre-Kindergarten program, unless a school administrator determines that the student has willfully caused or attempted to cause bodily injury, or threatened serious bodily injury to another person, excluding self-defense.
- State and local policymakers should review and revise their quality rating and improvement systems (QRIS) to review and rate the discipline practices and policies based on development-appropriate practice and use of positive guidance.
- The Expulsion Policy Strategy Tool lays out a rubric for a range of policy options to promote young children’s social-emotional development and reduce the likelihood of expulsion and suspension in early learning settings. It takes a comprehensive approach and has a focus on equity in considering strategies across child care assistance, workforce, QRIS, and early childhood mental health, among others. See <https://childcareta.acf.hhs.gov/resource/building-comprehensive-state-policy-strategy-prevent-expulsion-early-learning-settings>

ⁱ Center for Law and Social Policy, *Maintaining the Momentum to Reduce Child and Family Poverty*, 2016, <https://www.clasp.org/sites/default/files/publications/2017/04/2016-Maintaining-the-Momentum.pdf>.

ⁱⁱ Center for Law and Social Policy analysis of 2016 U.S. Census data.

ⁱⁱⁱ Ziliak Michel et al., *Good Jobs for All*.

^{iv} Sonya Michel, *The History of Child Care in the U.S.*, Virginia Commonwealth University: Social Welfare History Project, 2011, <https://socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/programs/child-care-the-american-history/>.

^v Marcy Whitebook, Caitlin McLean, Lea J.E. Austin, *Early Childhood Workforce Index 2016*, Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California Berkeley, 2016, <http://cscce.berkeley.edu/files/2016/Early-Childhood-Workforce-Index-2016.pdf>.

^{vi} Lea J.E. Austin, Laura Sakai, Devika Dhamija, *2016 Alameda County Early Care and Education Workforce Study*, Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, 2016, <http://cscce.berkeley.edu/files/2017/03/Alameda-County-Workforce-Study-2016.pdf>.

^{vii} Rebecca Ullrich, Katie Hamm, Rachel Herzfeldt-Kamprath, *Underpaid and Unequal: Racial Wage Disparities in the Early Childhood Workforce*, Center for American Progress, 2016, <https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/01073800/NSECE-report2.pdf>.

^{viii} Hedy Chang, *Getting Ready for Quality: The Critical Importance of Developing and Supporting a Skilled, Ethnically and Linguistically Diverse Early Childhood Workforce*, California Tomorrow, 2006, <http://www.buildinitiative.org/TheIssues/DiversityEquity/Toolkit/ToolkitResourceList/ViewToolkit/tabid/224/ArticleId/242/Getting-Ready-for-Quality-The-Critical-Importance-of-Developing-and-Supporting-a-Skilled-Ethnically.aspx>.

^{ix} National Association for the Education of Young Children, *Responding to Linguistic and Cultural Diversity Recommendations for Effective Early Childhood Education*, 1995, <https://www.naeyc.org/files/naeyc/file/positions/PSDIV98.PDF>.

^x For more information, see: http://www.migrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/publications/StateQRIS-Diversity_FINAL_WEB.pdf; <http://www.clasp.org/resources-and-publications/publication-1/0467.pdf>; http://www.clasp.org/resources-and-publications/files/qrs_cultural_competency.pdf; <http://www.naeyc.org/files/naeyc/file/policy/state/QBBCpercent20Toolpercent20FINALpercent20609.pdf>.