



The BUILD Initiative helps states create comprehensive early childhood systems – coordinated, effective policies that address children’s health, mental health and nutrition, early care and education, family support, and early intervention. BUILD’s vision is at the center of an emerging and vibrant state-based policy movement in the early childhood development field. We work with those who set policies, provide services and advocate for our youngest children to make sure that they are safe, healthy, eager to learn and ready to succeed in school. Visit www.buildinitiative.org.

Building Public Early Childhood Data Systems for a Multi-Ethnic Society: *Issues & Opportunities*

A BUILD BRIEF ON DIVERSITY AND EQUITY

Charles Bruner and Betty Emarita • September 2009 Draft

Introduction • • •

As states are developing early childhood systems, they also are developing data systems that provide information about young children and their families and the public services that are provided to them. Some of this information is for basic monitoring and claims processing purposes, but states increasingly seek to design data systems that can be used to evaluate program strategies, identify gaps in services, and support continuous learning and results accountability. Some leading states are attempting to ensure “data interoperability” across health, family support, and early care and education programs serving young children, even to the point of linking them with statewide longitudinal databases for students in the K-12 public education system.

The Diversity and Equity Working Group of the Build Initiative has stressed the need to examine all early childhood policies and practices through a multi-cultural lens, with particular attention to identifying and then closing five potential gaps:

- A **readiness gap** at the time of kindergarten entry (similar to and with some common etiology to income, achievement, health, safety, justice system, and wealth gaps);
- A **participation gap** in formal services (particularly health services and preschool and other formal care arrangements);
- A **cultural awareness and recognition gap** (particularly for providers serving children with different cultural and language backgrounds than their own);
- A **workforce diversity gap** (particularly among credentialed providers and within professional institutions training and accrediting the workforce); and
- A **stakeholder planning and decision-making gap** (particularly in developing public policies and recognizing the expertise of those from other backgrounds and experiences).

State efforts to build data systems to support early childhood systems development also need to be examined in this light, with a particular emphasis upon their capacity to provide information about these potential gaps. This resource brief describes some of the issues and opportunities states face in building early childhood data systems for a multi-ethnic society.

Current State and Federal Administrative Data about Very Young Children and the Services They Receive ● ● ●

Currently, most states have limited information about all very young children and the services they receive. From the time of their birth, when birth record information is collected, to the time children enter school, there are no points at which virtually all young children are seen or information is collected about them. While most young children see a primary health practitioner at least annually, that information largely remains within the practitioner's office and states have limited information on the proportion of children in the state with health insurance coverage.

While states have very limited information that applies to all young children in their states, they do maintain a great deal of information about specific programs and services and about the programs and providers of those services.

State Administrative Data Bases and Public Young Child Service Use Information. States finance a variety of services for young children, usually according to different eligibility criteria and the availability of funding, and maintain information about these services. These include:

- Child care subsidy programs;
- Preschool programs under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA);
- State-funded preschool programs;
- State-funded home visiting and family support and resource center programs;
- Early intervention services for infants and toddlers under Part C of IDEA;
- Child protective and foster care services for children in need of assistance;
- Health care services under Medicaid and the Child Health Insurance Program (CHIP), which include behavioral and mental health services;
- Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) income support participation; and
- Supplemental nutrition assistance programs (SNAP) and, of particular relevance and importance to young children, the Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) program.

In general, these all represent separate data bases within states, without common “identifiers” for children such as a unique student identifier designed to be provided to children at the time of entry into the public school system and maintained throughout public school participation. Without such an identifier determining the degree of participation of children across different services is not possible. Efforts to develop “data interoperability” involve linking individual records of young children across different systems in order to gain a broader view of which children participate in which programs, usually with a unique student identifier established well before school entry. These efforts must address issues of confidentiality and the rights of young children and their





families to provide informed consent for any release of information across systems, including federal statutory requirements under the federal Health Information Privacy Act (HIPA) for health information and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) for educational information.

In addition, the federal government directly finances and oversees the Head Start program that maintains data about those services. Every state has a Head Start Collaboration Office designed to facilitate collaboration across state and federal programs, but states do not have direct access to Head Start data bases.

States determine what information is required for collection about young children within most of these administrative data systems. This can, but does

not necessarily, include information about the child's ethnicity, culture, language, or economic or social background.

Service Provider Information. States also set regulatory guidelines for service providers and establish record-keeping systems on eligible service providers and their qualifications. These include:

- Child care resource and referral center information on registered and licensed child care providers in centers and family and child development homes, including any designations by quality rating and improvement systems (QRIS);
- Pediatric practitioners and specialty care providers in the state, including maternal and child health and community health centers;
- Credentialed teachers, including those with early childhood certifications and those providing special education services;
- Current enrollment in schools of education (universities and community colleges) in early care and education programs and credentialing systems;
- Child protective service workers and foster care providers; and
- Other state workers or those under contract providing specific services to young children.

In addition, the federal Head Start office collects information on Head Start employees, their backgrounds and qualifications.

These information sources will not provide child-specific data, but they can provide additional information about the overall size of the formal provider network and its capacity to serve young children in the state. It also can provide locational information that can help to identify particular geographic areas where there may be gaps in service. Illinois has developed its Illinois Early Childhood Asset Map of early childhood programs that provides for such neighborhood-level analysis. (<http://iecam.crc.uiuc.edu/>)

Again, states determine what information is required for collection in these data systems. This can, but does not necessarily, include information about providers' ethnicities, multi-cultural training, and ability to speak languages other than English.

Closing Participation, Cultural Awareness and Recognition, and Workforce Diversity Gaps: Gathering Information on Ethnicity, Culture, and Language within these Data Systems ● ● ●



Clearly, these different state and federal data systems can be useful in addressing many questions regarding potential diversity and equity gaps – particularly related to **participation, cultural awareness and recognition**, and **workforce diversity**. States largely determine what information will be collected within these different data systems, both in terms of young children and the services they receive and in terms of the workforce and its characteristics and qualifications.

At a young child level, however, this involves having basic information about the child's ethnicity and home language background, and ideally having information about the child's economic and social background, as well. At a cultural awareness and recognition level, it

requires having basic information about the program's capacity to respond to young children and their families from different ethnic and language backgrounds, including offering dual language services, and the degree to which the program serves children of different cultures, languages, and ethnicities. At the provider level, it requires having information about the ethnicity of the workforce, its dual language capacity, and the multi-cultural training the workforce has received.

“ Many states do not have even data on the ethnic composition of young children being served...”

Most state data systems at best only include some of this information. Many states do not have even data on the ethnic composition of young children being served as a part of many of their data systems (and those that do may use different racial and ethnic categories). Some states, like Pennsylvania, have been pioneers in seeking to incorporate such information into all their data systems, as they develop an Early Learning Network that incorporates most of the different publicly-funded programs and services referenced above (http://www.pakeys.org/pages/get.aspx?page=EarlyLearning_Network). A more extensive review of two states' early learning data systems for three to five year-olds, New York and Massachusetts, conducted for the Schott Foundation, identified many gaps in data collection around these issues even in those states, which have more sophisticated data systems than many.¹

¹ Emarita, Betty, with data analysis by Bruner, Charles, and Mills, Linda (forthcoming 2009). *Data matters in early education*. NY: Schott Foundation for Public Education.



If states want to be able to address questions about racial disparities in the early care and education they provide young children, data systems will need to be developed that include this information. While states may be leery about developing a data system that could highlight gaps in these areas, having this information is needed to call attention to gaps, develop effective strategies to address the gaps, and monitor progress and continuously improve on those strategies to close the gaps.

Simply put, state administrative data systems can help to answer very important issues about access to, use of, and impacts from public early childhood services. At the same time, however, it also is important to recognize that such data systems cannot convey many of the assets that children, families, and communities bring to child development. Too often, data can be used to focus upon deficits without recognizing strengths, particularly those related to diversity. Survey data, focus groups, and the participation of diverse stakeholders in planning are important to ensure that these assets are recognized and used to close disparities and improve programs and services for all children.

Closing the Readiness Gap: Linking to the K-12 Public Education System ● ● ●

The early childhood data systems discussed in the previous section all apply to children before they enter kindergarten. The opportunity also exists to link these data systems with school data and even to conduct longitudinal analyses of children participating in early childhood programs and their school experiences and performance.

Under No Child Left Behind legislation, states are charged with developing statewide longitudinal data systems that provide unique student identifiers for children in the state's public school system that can then track those students throughout their educational careers, even when they move from one school or school district to



Measure What You Treasure: Questions an Early Childhood Data System Needs to Answer

- What is the level of participation of four-year olds in quality, publicly-funded pre- school programs by child ethnicity and language background? Where are there specific gaps, geographically and statewide, that need to be addressed?
- What is the ethnic background and dual language ability of the preschool teacher (and early elementary) workforce and how does this match with the young child population?
- What is the level of participation of young children in registered and licensed child care and in subsidized child care by ethnicity and language background?
- What is the extent and geographic location of early childhood and preschool programs which can provide dual language instruction and care?
- What is the ethnic background, educational background, and language ability of the early care and education workforce, and how does this match with the young child population?
- What is the relative participation level, by ethnicity and language background, of children in Part C, Part B, child protective services, and foster care and where is there under-representation and over-representation?
- What is the composition of the student population seeking credentialing or certification in early care and education by ethnicity and language, and how are any public scholarship or other programs addressing any gaps in diversity?

Other Young Child Data Systems

While this brief focuses upon data systems related to early care and education, the same issues need to be addressed regarding other elements of an early learning system – health, mental health and nutrition; family support, and special needs.

National data show that children from immigrant and minority backgrounds have significantly poorer outcomes (achievement gap) than their White, non-Hispanic peers in all these areas.² Hispanic and immigrant children are very much less likely to have health insurance coverage that can provide even basic care; African American children are very disproportionately involved in the child welfare system. Moreover, when these systems do serve children from different racial, language, and cultural backgrounds, they frequently lack adequate translation services and their staff lack backgrounds in the language and culture of the children and families they serve. The same issues and

recommendations apply regarding data system development for all systems serving young children and their families.



another. Further, there has been substantial funding provided, through the Department of Education’s Institute for Education Sciences, to provide grants to states to develop these data systems. Additional new funding was made available to states through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, with particular consideration to expanding the statewide longitudinal data systems to cover children even before they enter the school system.

New federal funding affords the opportunity to states to track children from early childhood programs and services into school, which can be helpful in identifying potential impacts of program or service participation on a variety of measures of school performance (including kindergarten assessments, where states have those in the longitudinal data bases).

In addition, the statewide longitudinal data systems include identifying information on all school-aged children by race, free-and-reduced meal (FRM) status, English-language learning status, and special education status. If early childhood program and service records can be matched with the statewide longitudinal data system, it allows for analysis of those programs by race, FRM, and other student characteristics even if those are not incorporated into the early childhood program and service data base. BUILD has produced a paper providing a brief history of statewide data systems and the opportunities to incorporate early childhood data within those systems that can provide some guidance to states in making use of this resource to augment early childhood data system development (<http://www.buildinitiative.org/content/ec-data-systems>).

“National data show that children from immigrant and minority backgrounds have significantly poorer outcomes...”

² See: Bruner, C. & Schor, E. (2009). *Clinical health care and community building: Addressing racial disparities in healthy child development*. National Center for Service Integration Clearinghouse and Child and Family Policy Center: Des Moines, IA. This paper speaks to the health practitioner’s role in addressing racial and ethnic disparities in health, but also provides data showing indicators of the existing gaps in the health, education, and social and economic welfare of children by race, indicating that these gaps should not solely be addressed as individual outcomes but rather responded to in the context of underlying conditions and opportunities.

Closing the Stakeholder Planning and Decision-Making Gap: Involving Diverse Voices in Developing Data ● ● ●

The collection and analysis of data easily can appear to be a technical activity—one not requiring a great deal of attention to issues of ethnicity, language, and culture. In fact, however, there is a history of the use of research and data that has been harmful to minority groups. Even non-identifying data collection and analysis can be used in culturally insensitive ways. Representatives from minority groups may be rightfully suspicious of how data will be employed. Leaders have often seen their poor, minority communities studied and reports produced showing a prevalence of poor outcomes in those communities, without seeing positive actions to address these disparities as a result.



From a political perspective, involving diverse stakeholders in the planning and decision-making process around a state’s early childhood data system development, with representation from all ethnic, cultural, and language groups, can help ensure that data-related ethnic and cultural issues are addressed and resolved early. It helps to build political support across multiple constituencies for continued development of an early childhood system that improves outcomes for all children while reducing disparities.

In addition to stakeholder involvement in planning and decision-making, states can make a commitment to transparency and “democratizing information” so that it can be used beyond those within state government and public systems. When individuals and community groups have access to this information, with suitable controls to protect confidentiality of identifying information about children or families, state data systems often can be mined for additional information beneficial to planning and action. The National Neighborhood Indicators Project (NNIP), a network of over thirty metropolitan organizations maintaining broad census and administrative data down to a neighborhood level, has made part of its effort “democratizing that information” so that residents can make use of it in their own planning efforts. These NNIP partners often provide training and technical assistance to community groups in accessing and using information. NNIP has found that resident groups and their leaders contribute greatly both to better understanding of the conditions surrounding their communities and to developing plans and policy proposals to improve their neighborhoods and communities. When data is transparent and “democratized,” the suspicions that minority groups may have held about the use of information by public systems about themselves dissolve.

As states develop their early learning data systems, involving diverse stakeholders in planning, making the data systems available and transparent, and “democratizing” their use by providing technical assistance and support, when needed, can help ensure that data system development addresses issues of ethnicity, language, and culture in an appropriate way.

Additional Information Needed to Inform State Policy • • •

While state administrative data systems can provide a wealth of information about young children and their families, they do not contain all important and relevant information.

When examining care arrangements for young children, for instance, states need to look well beyond formal, registered and licensed care, subsidized care, and preschool programs to all care that is provided. At a national level, the U.S. Census Bureau has conducted surveys regarding the child care arrangements for young children, based upon parental reports (<http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/child/ppl-2005.html>). The latest of these reports, Who's Minding the Kids, shows that the most common form of care arrangement for young children (0-4) other than the parent is a relative, usually a grandparent – and a very significant proportion of parents solely rely upon themselves or their spouses to provide care. As part of its Assessing the New Federalism work in the 1990's, the Urban Institute conducted similar surveys in selected states and also found a strong use of such family, friend, and neighbor (FFN) care, but with wide variations across different states. Such child care surveys also show very significant variations in the use of care by child age (0-2 versus 3-5), ethnicity, and home language. Studies in Minnesota of family, friend, and neighbor care have shown the high quality of much of that care, the greater cultural consonance it provides with the children being served, and the reasons families chose such care.

Some states, including Minnesota, Washington, Hawaii, Iowa, and Pennsylvania, have used information about these informal FFN caregivers in their state to develop public policies that can support them (see BUILD's policy brief on FFN care at <http://www.buildinitiative.org/content/family-friend-and-neighbor-care>). Ultimately, states need survey information to determine the full spectrum of child care that families of young children use; and having that information can help to inform and develop policies to better support young children in all their caregiving settings. If information pertinent to different ethnic, cultural, and language groups is to be gathered, however, statistical over-sampling by income, ethnicity, and language may be required. Again, the more diverse the planning groups involved in data collection, the more likely that these surveys will provide policy relevant information.

Clearly, survey data also should be collected to answer important information about the health and nutrition, special needs, and family support components of an early learning system. Some states have adapted the National Survey of Child Health, conducted at the federal level in 2003-4 and 2007-8, to do annual state surveys on child health in their states (<http://www.nschdata.org>). This national survey provides valuable information about child health and well-being that can be compared across populations and across states, and includes parental reporting on the prevalence of many important child health and well-being issues that cannot be secured through existing data sources.



National Data Sources to Inform State Policy and Practice ●●●

In addition to state administrative data sources and state-sponsored surveys and other state sources of information, states can draw upon national data sources that provide state-level information to provide insights into early childhood systems in their states.

The United States Census and American Community Survey can be used at the state level to provide information on the number of young children in the state, by age and by race, ethnicity, and language (whether they live in a linguistically isolated household). This data can further be disaggregated to the county and city levels, and estimates soon will be available even at the census tract level annually. Census data provides the best source of information for the number of young children, by race and ethnicity, poverty status, and other factors within and across a state. As states seek to identify the degree to which their programs reach and serve



their intended populations, state administrative data can provide the numerator for the number of children served, and appropriate census data can provide the denominator in order to estimate the percentage of children served.

In addition, the Census Bureau provides, through the public use microdata sample file (PUMS), additional opportunities for state-level analysis of the questions posed by the census, where additional breakdowns of the data may be made. As an example, the Census and the American Community Survey ask a question about 3-5 year-olds, “Did your child participate in a preschool program?” While what constitutes a preschool program is up to the interpretation of the adult respondent in the household, the question provides good comparative information on preschool participation in formal early care and education programs.

By providing individual, non-identifying responses, PUMS allows much more detailed breakdowns of data than provided through general Census reporting – for instance breakdowns by both child ethnicity and household income level.³ Table One in the Appendix provides a national breakdown of responses to this question focused on four year-olds (some three year-olds and some five year-olds are not eligible for preschool programs or are already in school, so designated four year-olds better reflects overall involvement), broken down both by race/ethnicity and household income level. Table One clearly shows that children of Hispanic descent are much less likely to participate

³ Census data is not the only national data source that provides state-level breakdowns. Under No Child Left Behind, states must report on student performance in a variety of categories and further report by student ethnicity, language status, special education involvement, and participation in the free- and reduced-meals program (FRM, a measure of family economic self-sufficiency). This reporting does not require further breakdowns by multiple factors, such as Hispanic children participating in FRM compared with White, non-Hispanic children participating in FRM. The statewide longitudinal data bases that are being developed will allow for such additional comparisons, but it will require state initiative, with the involvement of diverse stakeholder communities, to use them in this way.

in formal preschool programs than are other groups, but when looked at by income level, African American children participate at least on the same level as the population as a whole (likely because the federal Head Start program has a long history of engaging the African American community). Such Tables can be developed for any state in the country, although it may be necessary to combine several years of PUMS data to have a sufficient sample size to obtain good estimates for different subgroups of children.

In addition to these data, through separate data sources the Bureau of Labor Statistics provides national information on the composition of the workforce by different job classifications by gender and race and detailed state and municipal information on the actual numbers of workers in each job classification and their compensation. These job classifications include child care workers, preschool teachers, and elementary school teachers, as well over 400 other job classifications. The national level information on race and gender shows that these job classifications all are female-dominated, but the racial composition of child care workers is very different than that of elementary school teachers. Unfortunately, the national data on race and gender combines preschool and kindergarten teachers, so it is not possible to provide information specifically on preschool teachers.

The data on compensation clearly shows the low compensation of child care workers and only relatively higher compensation of preschool teachers, in comparison with other job classifications and elementary school teachers, in particular. Table Two in the Appendix further shows national employment and trend data on wages for these job classifications, showing that child care workers have expanded in terms of employment over the last six years, but their compensation has fallen further behind. Since these constitute jobs that are disproportionately held by minorities, declining relative compensation not only has implications for providing quality care, it also has implications for the self-sufficiency of families who are in child care as an occupation.

Getting Started ●●●

Data is important to policy development and early childhood systems building – for identifying need, for tracking progress in achieving goals, and for assessing the impact of services on young children’s and their families’ lives. State early childhood data systems need to be structured in ways to provide important information – for children as a whole but also for children of different racial, ethnic, cultural, and language backgrounds.

As states develop their data systems, they can start by convening a diverse group to oversee conducting an inventory of existing administrative data systems and other program and survey information to review the degree to which those systems provide pertinent information about race, ethnicity, culture, and language. The matrix in the Appendix was used as a starting point for conducting this inventory for Schott Foundation research project led by the authors of this brief.

This is likely to be a long-term process; keeping issues of ethnicity, language, and culture in the forefront requires intentionality. No state has a fully developed state early childhood data system. All are engaged in some work in building that system. Every state has the opportunity to build that system in ways that recognize and value the diversity of their young child population and provide the information needed to address current and professional gaps in readiness, participation, cultural awareness and recognition, workforce diversity, and stakeholder participation.



2005

United States Population				
	Total	White Non-Hispanic	African American	Hispanic
Age 0-4	20,267,176	11,159,474	2,948,241	4,524,572
%		55.1%	14.5%	22.3%
Age 5-17	52,864,512	31,300,523	7,883,234	9,849,789
%		59.2%	14.9%	18.6%
Age 18-64	180,485,922	121,958,788	21,246,353	25,281,789
%		67.6%	11.8%	14.0%
Age 65+	34,760,527	28,196,776	2,884,741	2,214,553
%		81.1%	8.3%	6.4%
TOTAL	288,378,137	192,615,561	34,962,569	41,870,703
		66.8%	12.1%	14.5%

2025

United States Population				
	Total	White Non-Hispanic	African American	Hispanic
Age 0-4	23,518,395	11,803,762	3,620,219	6,011,524
%		50.2%	15.4%	25.6%
Age 5-17	59,579,953	30,957,280	9,219,974	14,369,283
%		52.0%	15.5%	24.1%
Age 18-64	202,817,119	117,710,319	28,681,046	39,693,384
%		58.0%	14.1%	19.6%
Age 65+	63,523,732	47,335,651	6,313,679	6,116,720
%		74.5%	9.9%	9.6%
TOTAL	349,439,199	207,807,012	47,834,918	66,190,911
		59.5%	13.7%	18.9%

2005-2025

2005 - 2025 Percent Change				
	Total	White Non-Hispanic	African American	Hispanic
Age 0-4	16.0%	5.8%	22.8%	32.9%
Age 5-17	12.7%	-1.1%	17.0%	45.9%
Age 18-64	12.4%	-3.5%	35.0%	57.0%
Age 65+	82.7%	67.9%	118.9%	176.2%
TOTAL	21.2%	7.9%	36.8%	58.1%

Source: United States Census Bureau, 2005 American Community Survey and 2025 United States Interim Population Projections

2005

3 to 5-year-olds in Preschool					
	Total	White Non-Hispanic	African American	Asian	Hispanic
Less Than Poverty	2,454,532	788,621	691,685	53,952	819,857
In Preschool	770,335	233,862	265,609	15,941	218,290
Percent	31.4%	29.7%	38.4%	29.5%	26.6%
100-199% of Poverty					
100-199% of Poverty	2,717,174	1,229,653	435,453	87,267	854,022
In Preschool	858,636	389,255	171,415	25,143	237,622
Percent	31.6%	31.7%	39.4%	28.8%	27.8%
200+% of Poverty					
200+% of Poverty	6,806,657	4,638,850	618,231	359,957	940,774
In Preschool	3,043,220	2,165,398	280,982	155,418	331,315
Percent	44.7%	46.7%	45.4%	43.2%	35.2%
TOTAL					
	11,978,363	6,657,124	1,745,369	501,176	2,614,653
In Preschool	4,672,191	2,788,515	718,006	196,502	787,227
Percent	39.0%	41.9%	41.1%	39.2%	30.1%

Source: United States Census Bureau, 2005 American Community Survey, Public Use Microdata Sample

Wages for Select Occupational Codes—Bureau of Labor Statistics				
	# Empl	Median H	Mean H	Mean Ann
All Occupations -- 00-0000				
May, 2006	132,604,980	\$14.61	\$18.84	\$39,190
May, 2005	130,307,840	\$14.15	\$18.21	\$37,870
May, 2004	128,127,360	\$13.83	\$17.80	\$37,020
May, 2003	127,567,910	\$13.53	\$17.41	\$36,210
May, 2002	127,523,760	\$13.31	\$17.10	\$35,560
May, 2001	127,980,410	\$13.01	\$16.35	\$34,020
May, 2000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Wage Change 2001-6		12.3%	15.2%	15.2%
Empl. Change 2001-6	3.6%			
Preschool -- 25-2001				
May, 2006	361,600	\$10.91	\$12.45	\$25,900
May, 2005	348,690	\$10.57	\$12.09	\$25,150
May, 2004	354,800	\$10.09	\$11.51	\$23,940
May, 2003	368,870	\$9.53	\$10.67	\$22,190
May, 2002	367,300	\$9.26	\$10.45	\$21,730
May, 2001	377,540	\$8.96	\$10.07	\$20,940
May, 2000	357,220	\$8.56	\$9.66	\$20,100
Wage Change 2001-6		21.8%	23.6%	23.7%
Empl. Change 2001-6	-4.2%			
Elementary -- 25-2021				
May, 2006	1,509,180			\$48,700
May, 2005	1,486,650			\$46,990
May, 2004	1,422,840			\$45,670
May, 2003	1,432,800			\$44,350
May, 2002	1,443,160			\$44,080
May, 2001	1,452,160			\$43,320
May, 2000	1,409,140			\$41,980
Wage Change 2001-6				12.4%
Empl. Change 2001-6	3.9%			
Child Care -- 39-9011				
May, 2006	572,950	\$8.48	\$9.05	\$18,820
May, 2005	557,680	\$8.20	\$8.74	\$18,180
May, 2004	513,110	\$8.06	\$8.57	\$17,830
May, 2003	469,150	\$7.90	\$8.37	\$17,400
May, 2002	456,260	\$7.86	\$8.32	\$17,310
May, 2001	418,540	\$7.71	\$8.16	\$16,980
May, 2000	398,090	\$7.43	\$7.86	\$16,350
Wage Change 2001-6		10.0%	10.9%	10.8%
Empl. Change 2001-6	36.9%			

Retrieved on December 29 2007 from <http://www.bls.gov/oes/>.

Appendix Four ●●●

CHILD Characteristics	Explicit, Publicly Funded Preschool				Child Care Subsidy Program			Child Care Information Gen.		
	State Pre K	Head Start	Part B	Other	Center	Reg. Family	Other Paid	Centers	Homes	FFN
# of Children Served										
3- to 5-year-olds total										
4-year-olds										
Racial Composition										
White, Non-Hispanic										
Hispanic										
Black										
Asian										
Other										
Home Language										
English										
Other than English										
Income Level										
Under 100% Poverty										
100-185% Poverty										
Above 185% Poverty										
Notes:										



TEACHER Characteristics	Explicit, Publicly Funded Preschool				Child Care Subsidy Program			Child Care Information Gen.		
	State Pre K	Head Start	Part B	Other	Center	Reg. Family	Other Paid	Centers	Homes	FFN
Educational Background										
Certified Teachers										
BA Degree in Child Development/ Related Field										
AA Degree										
None of Above										
Racial Composition										
White, Non-Hispanic										
Hispanic										
Black										
Asian										
Other										
Bilingual Capacity										
English Only										
English + Other Proficiency										
Other Only										

Notes:

PROGRAM Characteristics	Explicit, Publicly Funded Preschool				Child Care Subsidy Program			Child Care Information Gen.		
	State Pre K	Head Start	Part B	Other	Center	Reg. Family	Other Paid	Centers	Homes	FFN
Pre-K Programs (only)										
Full-Day										
Half-Day										
Less than Half-Day										
Staff Ratios										
1:8 or Less										
1:8 to 1:10										
1:11 or More										
Classroom Size										
17 or More										
9 – 16										
8 or Less										
Notes:										



Other briefs in this series can be found at
www.buildinitiative.org/content/diversity-and-equity

