EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF SUBSIDIZED CHILD CARE PROGRAM REPORT TO THE 85th TEXAS LEGISLATURE JANUARY 13, 2017

Background

The Texas Workforce Commission (TWC) provides subsidized child care as a support service to help parents to become and remain employed and contribute to the Texas economy. Making affordable child care available to parents addresses a common barrier to employment. It also enhances parents' ability to participate in workforce training activities. To receive subsidized child care, parents must be employed or participating in training or education activities leading to employment.

Texas Labor Code §302.0043 charges that TWC "evaluate the effectiveness of the commission's child care program in helping parents who receive subsidized child care to maintain employment . . ."

Section 302.0043(a) directs TWC to compile the following information regarding the wage and employment status of each parent receiving TWC-funded child care:

1. If the parent receives both Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and subsidized child care, whether the parent:

- A. finds employment; and
- B. maintains the employment after one year.
- 2. If the parent receives only subsidized child care, whether the parent:
 - A. maintains the employment; and
 - B. experiences a change in earnings after one year of employment.
- 3. If the parent leaves the child care program:

A. the parent's reason for leaving the program; and

B. whether the parent returns to TANF or becomes a TANF recipient for the first time.

Senate Bill 208 (SB 208), 84th Texas Legislature, Regular Session (2015), amended Texas Labor Code §302.0043 to require that TWC report the findings regarding the effectiveness of the child care program to:

- 1. include information on employment results, disaggregated by the local workforce development area (workforce area); and
- 2. identify multi-year trends in the information collected and analyzed by TWC, including trends in the information for at least the five state fiscal years preceding the date of the report.

Section 302.0043 also requires TWC to measure the effectiveness of its child care program in:

- improving the training of child care professionals; and
- facilitating the collaboration with Head Start, the Texas Education Agency (TEA), the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS), and the Texas Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC).

TWC is required to report the results of the evaluation to the legislature no later than January 15 of each odd-numbered year.

Definitions

For this report, TWC used wage and employment records to determine the parent's employment status.

Receiving Subsidized Child Care

A parent is considered to be receiving subsidized child care if the parent's child received at least one billed unit of care during a calendar year. Parents may appear in one or multiple years.

Receiving both TANF and Subsidized Child Care

A parent is considered to be receiving both TANF and subsidized child care if the parent received both in the same month at some point during the year.

Receiving Only Subsidized Child Care (non-TANF)

A parent is considered to be receiving only subsidized child care if the parent did not receive TANF during the year.

Finding Employment

A parent is considered to have found employment if the parent became employed at any time during the four quarters following the quarter that the child entered child care that year.

Maintaining Employment

A parent is considered to have maintained employment if the parent has wages in the fourth quarter after the quarter that the child entered child care that year.

Wage Gain

The wage gain is the amount that the parents' income increased after the parents became employed in the fourth quarter after the quarter that the child entered child care compared to the quarter before the child entered child care for each year.

Leaving Child Care

A child is considered to have left child care if the child does not receive child care for one month during the year.

Returning to TANF or Receiving TANF for the First Time

A parent is considered to have returned to TANF or received TANF for the first time if the parent leaves subsidized child care and received TANF within a 12-month period.

Findings

Employment and Wage Outcomes

TANF Parents

Subsidized child care is available for parents receiving TANF in order for them to participate in workforce training and work-related activities (in TWC's Choices program). For parents receiving both TANF and TWC-subsidized child care, Texas Labor Code §302.0043(a)(1) directs TWC to report whether the parent:

- A. finds employment; and
- B. maintains the employment after one year.

The five-year statewide trends are shown in Table 1 below:

1 401		g i Aivi and Child Cale
Year	Percentage Finding	Percentage Maintaining
	Employment in the	Employment after One
	Year	Year
2010	76.16%	54.34%
2011	77.43%	56.28%
2012	81.46%	58.93%
2013	84.48%	62.07%
2014	86.47%	64.20%

Table 1 – Parents Receiving TANF and Child Care

The five-year trends by workforce areas are shown in Tables 1A and 1B in the Appendix.

Non-TANF Parents

Subsidized child care also provides a vital work support to non-TANF working parents that helps them remain in the Texas workforce. For non-TANF working parents receiving TWC-subsidized child care, Texas Labor Code §302.0043(a)(2) directs TWC to report whether the parent:

- A. maintains the employment; and
- B. experiences a change in earnings after one year of employment.

The five-year statewide trends are shown in Table 2 below:

-	2 WORKING Futerits Only R		cerving child care (110h 1
	Year	Percentage	Change in Earnings
		Maintaining	after One Year
		Employment after	
		One Year	
	2010	85.11%	\$571.71
	2011	84.67%	\$273.18
	2012	86.04%	\$445.56
	2013	86.95%	\$481.49
	2014	87.30%	\$477.15

Table 2 – Working Parents Only Receiving Child Care (Non-TANF)

The five-year trends by workforce areas are shown in Tables 2A and 2B in the Appendix.

Parents Leaving Child Care

Texas Labor Code §302.0043(a)(3) directs TWC to report:

A. the parent's reason for leaving the program; and

B. whether the parent returns to TANF or becomes a TANF recipient for the first time.

From October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016, a total of 74,956 children left TWC-subsidized child care for at least one month during the year. The reasons for leaving care are presented in the Table 3A below:

Reason for Leaving Child Care	% of Children
Parent Voluntarily Withdrew from Child Care	24.30%
Parent Missed Redetermination and/or Did Not Return Paperwork	23.78%
Parent Is No Longer Meeting Work, Training, or Education Requirements	12.47%
Termination by Choices Case Manager (Non-Cooperation/Voluntary Withdrawal)	11.49%
Excessive Absences and/or Consecutive Absences without Notice	10.07%
Termination per Workforce Center Case Manager	7.64%
Parent Failed to Report Change in Income, Work, or Family Size	5.22%
Family Is No Longer Eligible Due to Income	2.28%
Parent Did Not Pay Parent Fees	1.59%
Failure to Comply with the Child Care Parent Responsibility Agreement	1.10%
Other	0.07%

Table 3A – Reason for Leaving Child Care

The five-year statewide trends for all parents whose children left TWC-subsidized child care and received TANF within 12 months of their children leaving care are shown in Table 3B below:

Table 3B – Parents Receiving TANF within C	One Year of Leaving Child Care
--	--------------------------------

Year	Percentage Receiving TANF
	after Leaving Child Care
2010	9.94%
2011	10.77%
2012	12.00%
2013	11.39%
2014	9.5%

The five-year trends by workforce areas are shown in Table 3C in the Appendix.

Child Care Professional Development and State Agency Collaboration

Texas Labor Code §302.0043 also requires TWC to evaluate the effectiveness of its child care program in improving the training of child care professionals and in facilitating collaboration with Head Start, TEA, DFPS, and HHSC.

Beginning in 2014, TWC initiated regularly scheduled quarterly conference calls with the TEA Office of Early Childhood Education, DFPS Child Care Licensing, and the Head Start Collaboration Office, which includes the Texas Early Childhood Professional Development System. The goal of the conference calls is to improve collaboration efforts among the agencies directly involved in child care and early childhood education. During the calls, participants share information related to their specific initiatives and goals, as well as discuss opportunities for collaboration.

Professional Development for Early Childhood Education

Rider 29 of TWC's General Appropriations Act—84th Texas Legislature, Regular Session (2015)—required TWC to dedicate \$1 million over the Fiscal Years 2016–2017 (FY'16–'17) biennium for programs that encourage increased participation in continuing professional development for early childhood professionals. Funding may be used to fund teacher training programs, programs that lead to a national credential in early childhood education, or work-study programs in child care.

Through a competitive procurement process, TWC awarded \$1 million to the Texas Association for the Education of Young Children (TAEYC) to provide scholarships for child care professionals to obtain a Child Development Associate (CDA) certificate or a Certified Childcare Professional (CCP) credential. TAEYC also uses the funds to provide scholarships to child care professionals to pursue courses that will lead to an associate's degree in early childhood education.

As of November 2016:

- 141 CDA and/or CCP scholarships have been awarded; and
- 54 associate's degree scholarships have been awarded.

As of November 2016, 85 caregivers have obtained a CDA credential.

Additionally, in FY'14, TWC entered into an Interagency Contract with DFPS for \$500,000 of Rider 30 funds—83rd Texas Legislature, Regular Session (2013)—to expand the online training courses related to health and safety for child care providers and caregivers. DFPS partnered with Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Services to develop online training and technical assistance documents relating to health and safety practices in child care settings for child care providers and parents. The training courses are aligned with the recently enacted reauthorization of the Child Care and Development

Block Grant (CCDBG) Act (CCDBG). The goal of the project is to help child care providers comply with the new CCDBG.

During FY'16, Texas caregivers completed:

- 84,521 AgriLife online courses, including 12,197 infant and toddler inclusion courses;
- 4,221 preschool and school-age inclusion courses; and
- 68,103 health and safety courses.

Board Funding for Professional Development

Quality Improvement Activities

Texas Government Code §2308.317 requires each Local Workforce Development Board (Board) to:

- use at least 2 percent of the workforce area's annual allocation from TWC for quality child care initiatives; and
- hire staff to provide mentoring assistance to providers that want to meet the quality requirements for Texas Rising Star certification or increase their level of certification.

In FY'16, Boards used the quality funds to provide training on:

- the infant and toddler guidelines to:
 - ► 1,388 licensed child care centers; and
 - ➤ 515 licensed or registered child care homes; and
- the prekindergarten guidelines to:
 - > 1,005 licensed child care centers; and
 - ➤ 229 licensed or registered child care homes.

Boards also used the quality funds to provide mentoring and technical assistance services to:

- 8,982 caregivers in licensed child care centers;
- 2,430 directors or owners of licensed child care centers;
- 396 caregivers in licensed or registered child care homes; and
- 244 owners of licensed or registered child care homes.

In addition to providing training and technical assistance, the Boards used the quality funds to provide scholarships and other financial assistance for professional development to 4,089 child care providers.

Infant and Toddler Expansion

In FY'15–'16, TWC distributed additional funds to Boards to increase capacity for infants and toddlers.

Boards awarded funds to:

• 295 licensed child care centers; and

• 50 licensed or registered child care homes.

These facilities expanded infant and toddler capacity by creating:

- 1,619 slots for licensed child care centers; and
- 69 slots for licensed or registered child care homes.

Boards also used the funds to promote inclusive caregiving for infant and toddlers to:

- 957 licensed child care centers; and
- 73 licensed or registered child care homes.

Military Communities Initiative

In FY'16, TWC also distributed funds to eight Boards with military installations located in workforce areas. The purpose of the funds was to strengthen the quality of the child care services provided to the military communities by increasing the number of nationally accredited facilities available to serve military families.

Through this initiative:

- 88 child care facilities received grants and are working toward national accreditation;
- seven facilities have achieved national accreditation;
- 142 facilities received mentoring services; and
- 820 caregivers received professional development activities.

Child Care Professional Career Pathways

In FY'16, TWC awarded grants to two Boards to provide adult education and literacy services to help child care employees complete coursework to attain a CDA credential. Under this grant, 166 caregivers completed a CDA credential.

Leveraging Local Funds for Child Care and Professional Development

TWC and Boards also work closely with other state agencies and local governmental entities, especially independent school districts (ISDs), colleges, and universities, to leverage funds for quality initiatives.

In FY'16 Boards entered into 62 local match agreements with colleges and universities. Through these agreements, colleges and universities certified approximately \$14.5 million in child care and early education professional development expenses as match to draw down approximately \$27.6 million in federal Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) matching funds. Although Boards used most of the resulting federal matching funds to subsidize direct child care services, approximately \$1.1 million of the federal matching funds were used for quality improvement activities, including professional development and training for child care professionals.

Boards also work closely with local ISDs and education service centers to leverage local funds for child care services. In FY'16, Boards entered into 74 local agreements in which ISDs contributed approximately \$12.9 million in local child care funds. These local funds drew down approximately \$24.5 million in federal CCDF funds for Boards to use for

direct child care services or child care quality improvement activities. A large percentage of the federal funds is used to provide before- and after-school child care for children in the local ISDs.

Partnerships with the Texas Education Agency

Early Childhood Education Partnerships

Rider 25 of TWC's General Appropriations Act—84th Texas Legislature, Regular Session (2015)—requires TWC to transfer \$1 million in federal CCDF funds to TEA during the FY'16–'17 biennium for early childhood education partnership projects and teacher stipends designed to:

- facilitate increased participation in professional development by early childhood education professionals; and
- encourage those professionals to seek additional education.

In FY'15, TEA used these funds to develop the Improving Teacher Preparation project to facilitate participation in high-quality professional development opportunities for early childhood education professionals seeking completion of a bachelor's degree, an associate's degree, or a CDA certificate. In order to create a high-quality workforce, this program will be geared toward improving the quality of teacher preparation programs.

The Improving Teacher Preparation project is administered by the Children's Learning Institute (CLI) at the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston.

Four key goals:

- 1. Increase the knowledge and application of the current early childhood research base and effective pedagogical practices among faculty and staff of institutions of higher education that prepare future early childhood teachers.
- 2. Provide aspiring early childhood teachers with high-quality training in various domains of early childhood development through multiple methods supported by recent research. This includes practices in early childhood that support school readiness, including regularly scheduled mentoring using classroom-based observation and feedback tools, and video reflection and critique.
- 3. Support the development and sustainability of articulation agreements between institutions providing coursework in early childhood or child development, including high schools, and two- and four-year higher education institutions.
- 4. Encourage the development of sustainability plans and measures to continue to improve higher education's preparation of teachers for early childhood classrooms.

Improving Teacher Preparation began in spring 2014, and full implementation is expected during FY'17.

Texas School Ready! Project

The Texas legislature also requires TWC to transfer to TEA \$11.7 million of federal CCDF funds in each year of the biennium to assist providers participating in integrated school readiness models developed by CLI.

CLI uses these funds to administer the Texas School Ready! (TSR!) project, a highquality early childhood model based on proven school readiness components, including:

- high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and rigorous curriculum;
- continuous student progress monitoring;
- professional development for teachers; and
- creation and implementation of a School Readiness Integration Partnership to coordinate services among school districts, child care providers, and Head Start programs participating in TSR!

Interagency Workgroups

TWC also collaborates with Head Start, TEA, DFPS, and HHSC through a variety of interagency workgroups.

Interagency Council on Early Childhood Intervention

TWC participates in the Interagency Council on Early Childhood Intervention, which provides services for children younger than three years of age who face developmental delays in the areas of cognitive, physical, communication, social, emotional, and adaptive development.

The Texas Early Childhood Professional Development System

TWC participates in the Texas Head Start State Collaboration Office's Texas Early Childhood Professional Development System (TECPDS). The goal of TECPDS is to ensure that high-quality professional development opportunities are available statewide to individuals working in early child care and education.

Interagency Coordinating Council for Building Healthy Families

TWC participates in the Interagency Coordinating Council for Building Healthy Families. The council's purpose is to facilitate communication and collaboration concerning policies for the prevention of and early intervention in child abuse and neglect among state agencies whose programs and services promote and foster healthy families.

Assisting Boards to Disseminate Consumer Education on Quality Child Care Providers

Pursuant to Texas Government Code §2308.3171—SB 264, 82nd Texas Legislature, Regular Session (2011)—TWC assisted Boards in providing information to parents and the public on quality child care indicators for each licensed or registered child care provider in the workforce area. TWC developed reports for Boards to give to parents, listing providers that meet quality indicators.

Conclusion: Subsidized Child Care Continues to Serve as an Important Work Support Service

Subsidized child care is a support service that allows parents to become and remain employed, thereby contributing to the Texas economy. This report demonstrates that subsidized child care is an effective work support service that enables parents to participate in the workforce or in work-related activities. As reflected in the report, in 2014 approximately 86 percent of TANF parents were able to find employment within 12 months of receiving child care. Additionally, approximately 87 percent of non-TANF parents maintained employment months after receiving child care and experienced an average quarterly wage gain of \$569 at the end of the 12-month period.

Often the availability of stable and affordable child care arrangements is a determining factor in a parent's ability to obtain and retain employment. TWC strives to build upon its success, using outcome data and analyses to improve the delivery of child care services to Texas' working families.

ADDENDUM

Study on Providing Incentives to Encourage Parents to Choose Texas Rising Star Providers

The final report by the Texas Sunset Commission (Sunset Commission), Recommendation 3.8, directs TWC to conduct a study on potential methods of providing incentives to encourage parents to choose providers with a Texas Rising Star (TRS) designation and include the results in its 2017 report to the legislature on the effectiveness of the child care program.

The Sunset report requires TWC to address and report on the following:

- Any strategies that the agency could implement to increase the number of parents choosing TRS providers (such as changing the structure of reimbursements)
- The feasibility of offering a voluntary incentive program in which TRS-certified providers agree to a lower reimbursement rate in favor of offering part of the reimbursement as a financial incentive for parents to choose TRS providers
- The agency's plans, if any, for implementing any of these strategies; and
- Any statutory changes needed to implement these strategies that could be addressed by the legislature.

Use of TRS Providers

The percentage of subsidized children who are enrolled with TRS providers has remained relatively constant between 2014 and 2016, at approximately 29 percent of the total number of children receiving subsidized care annually. However, the average number of children per day enrolled in TRS-certified facilities has increased during the most recent 12-month period. In September 2015, there was an average of 30,715 children per day enrolled and receiving TWC-funded child care in a TRS-certified facility. In September 2016, an average of 35,558 children per day were enrolled in a TRS-certified facility.

Incentives to Encourage Parents to Choose a TRS Provider

TWC staff worked with technical assistance partners for the Administration for Children and Families at the National Center on Child Care Subsidy Innovation and Accountability to research potential methods to encourage parents to choose quality providers. Additionally, TWC received input from Boards regarding this issue.

Through this research, TWC identified the following strategies to encourage parents to choose quality providers:

- Reduce the parent share of cost for choosing a quality child care provider.
- Provide income tax credits to parents who choose a quality child care provider as determined by the state.
- Offer priority enrollment when a parent chooses a quality child care provider.

Reductions in the Parent Share of Cost:

As of June 2016, five states (Arkansas, Georgia, Hawaii, Oregon, Vermont) allowed for reductions in the parent share of cost for choosing quality child care providers, as determined by the state. In most of these states, the parent share of cost is reduced by a certain percentage based on the provider's quality level. In one state (Georgia), the parent share of cost is reduced only for families who live in one of the four Early Education Empowerment Zones.

Income Tax Credits:

In 2008, Louisiana began making the School Readiness Tax Credit for Parents/Families available to parents who purchase child care services at a child care center that has at least a two-star quality rating. The amount of the credit increases if the parent selects a center with a higher quality rating. The amount of the tax credit is also used as CCDF state matching funds. In 2016, Nebraska enacted a similar tax credit.

Priority Enrollment for Parents Choosing a TRS Provider

During the public comment period of the proposed amendments to TWC's Child Care Services rules, a commenter recommended incentivizing parents to choose quality-rated programs by placing them on a priority waiting list to receive care when space is available at a priority program. The commenter recommended that parents commit to keeping their child in that program for at least six months. Program types would include TRS quality-rated programs and programs participating in the Early Head Start–Child Care Partnership grant.

Change the Reimbursement Structure to Increase the Number of Parents Choosing TRS

The Sunset report required that TWC identify:

- any strategies, such as changes to the current structure of reimbursements, that the agency could implement to increase the number of parents choosing TRS providers; and
- the feasibility of offering a voluntary incentive program in which TRS-certified providers agree to receive a lower reimbursement in favor of offering part of the reimbursement as a financial incentive for parents to choose TRS providers.

TWC reviewed the possibility of changing the reimbursement structure and the feasibility of offering a voluntary incentive program in which a TRS provider would agree to a lower reimbursement in favor of offering part of the reimbursement as a financial incentive for parents.

Effective October 1, 2016, TWC's three-member Commission amended its Child Care Services rules to reimburse all child care providers based on the child's authorized enrollment, rather than based on daily attendance (with a certain number of allowed absences). This change was made as part of the CCDBG Act of 2014 (CCDBG), which requires states to establish for child care providers who serve subsidized children payment policies that are based on the payment practices that reflect generally accepted payment practices for child care providers who do not serve subsidized children. TWC chose to apply this change to pay on enrollment to all providers serving subsidized children, rather than to TRS providers, as applying the practice to all providers is more in agreement with the intent of the CCDBG.

Analysis of the Feasibility of the Potential Strategies

Reductions in the Parent Share of Cost

To emphasize the importance of quality care, the Commission included in the rule amendments effective October 1, 2016, that Boards may reduce the assessed parent share of cost based on the parent's choice of a TRS-certified provider.

Income Tax Credits

Texas does not have an individual state income tax; therefore, this option is not feasible for Texas.

Priority Enrollment for Parents Choosing a TRS Provider

45 CFR §98.46(a) requires states to prioritize direct child care services to children:

- of families with very low family income;
- with special needs; and
- experiencing homelessness.

Additionally, state statute requires that TWC give priority for workforce services to qualified veterans and spouses and to foster youth.

TWC rules reflect these federal and state priorities as listed below:

- 1. The first priority group is assured child care services and includes children of parents who are eligible for the following (that is, families with very low income):
 - (A) Choices child care
 - (B) TANF Applicant child care;
 - (C) Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Employment and Training (SNAP E&T) child care
 - (D) Transitional child care
- 2. The second priority group is served subject to the availability of funds and includes, in the order of priority children with special needs and children who are homeless); that is:

(A) children who need to receive protective services child care;

(B) children of a qualified veteran or qualified spouse;

(C) children of a foster youth;

(D) children who are homeless;

(E) children of parents on military deployment whose parents are unable to enroll in military-funded child care assistance programs;

- (F) children of teen parents; and
- (G) children with disabilities.

3. The third priority group includes any other priority adopted by the Board, as long as a Board does not establish a priority group based on the parent's choice of an individual provider or provider type.

The new CCDF regulations, issued in September 2016, also added the following regarding investments in and increasing access to quality programs in §98.46(b):

Lead Agencies shall prioritize increasing access to high-quality child care and development services for children of families in areas that have significant concentrations of poverty and unemployment and that do not have a sufficient number of such programs.

TWC and the Boards prioritize quality funds to increase the supply of TRS providers. The quality improvement initiatives described in this report regarding the effectiveness of professional development activities are designed to help child care providers become TRS certified and to help TRS providers achieve higher levels of quality.

Therefore, with existing quality investments targeted toward increasing the availability of quality child care services, TWC chooses to continue direct enrollment priorities to children in families with very low income (parents who receive Choices benefits, who receive SNAP E&T benefits, and who are transitioning off of TANF) and children in special populations (that is, children who are receiving protective services, the children of veterans and foster youth, children who are homeless, the children of deployed military and teen parents, and children who have disabilities) without adding additional priority groups based on the selection of a TRS provider.

Conclusion

As required by the Sunset Commission final report, TWC studied potential methods of providing incentives to encourage parents to choose providers awarded with a TRS. The results of the study show that there is a potential to incentivize parents to choose a TRS provider by allowing Boards to reduce the parent share of cost if a parent chooses a TRS-certified provider. TWC has modified its Child Care Services rules to implement this strategy.

Table of Contents

Table 1A: TANF Parents Who Find Employment Within One Year of Receiving Child Care

Table 1B: TANF Parents Maintaining Employment One Year After Entering Child Care

Table 2A: Non-TANF Parents Maintaining Employment One Year After Entering Child Care

Table 2B: Average One-Year Wage Gain of Non-TANF Parents Receiving Child Care

 Table 3C: Percent of Parents Leaving the Child Care Program and Receiving TANF Within a

 Year

2 S 3 N 4 N 5 T 6 G 7 N 8 E 9 V 10 B	Board Name Panhandle South Plains North Texas North Central Texas Farrant County Greater Dallas North East Texas East Texas Vest Central	2010* 88.17% 88.00% 83.13% 82.52% 75.31% 72.41% 74.34%	2011 84.35% 89.27% 77.19% 81.36% 76.34% 75.67%	2012 85.03% 90.29% 84.24% 82.20% 80.70%	2013 87.74% 92.86% 80.23% 82.66% 85.86%	2014 94.90% 93.55% 88.81% 85.58%	2015** n/a n/a n/a n/a
2 S 3 N 4 N 5 T 6 G 7 N 8 E 9 V 10 B	South Plains North Texas North Central Texas Farrant County Greater Dallas North East Texas East Texas	88.00% 83.13% 82.52% 75.31% 72.41% 74.34%	89.27% 77.19% 81.36% 76.34% 75.67%	90.29% 84.24% 82.20% 80.70%	92.86% 80.23% 82.66%	93.55% 88.81% 85.58%	n/a n/a
3 N 4 N 5 T 6 C 7 N 8 E 9 V 10 B	lorth Texas lorth Central Texas arrant County Greater Dallas lorth East Texas ast Texas	83.13% 82.52% 75.31% 72.41% 74.34%	77.19% 81.36% 76.34% 75.67%	84.24% 82.20% 80.70%	80.23% 82.66%	88.81% 85.58%	n/a
4 N 5 T 6 G 7 N 8 E 9 V 10 B	Iorth Central Texas Farrant County Greater Dallas Iorth East Texas Fast Texas	82.52% 75.31% 72.41% 74.34%	81.36% 76.34% 75.67%	82.20% 80.70%	82.66%	85.58%	
4 N 5 T 6 G 7 N 8 E 9 V 10 B	arrant County Greater Dallas Jorth East Texas East Texas	75.31% 72.41% 74.34%	76.34% 75.67%	80.70%			n/
5 T 6 G 7 N 8 E 9 V 10 B	arrant County Greater Dallas Jorth East Texas East Texas	72.41%	75.67%		85.86%		
7 N 8 E 9 V 10 B	lorth East Texas East Texas	74.34%		00.100/	22.00/0	87.02%	n/
8 E 9 V 10 B	ast Texas			82.16%	86.45%	88.79%	n/
9 V 10 B			71.17%	78.65%	77.64%	78.95%	n/
10 B	Vest Central	87.70%	84.00%	82.48%	87.15%	89.47%	n/
		93.68%	88.89%	82.52%	84.54%	85.00%	n/
	Borderplex	72.15%	69.76%	72.56%	76.14%	76.71%	n/
11 P	Permian Basin	81.16%	87.39%	88.68%	89.47%	88.24%	n/
12 C	Concho Valley	87.18%	91.21%	92.94%	90.74%	91.49%	n/
13 H	leart of Texas	75.00%	78.17%	83.33%	87.94%	95.28%	n/
14 C	Capital Area	75.85%	78.32%	85.42%	89.92%	92.68%	n/
15 R	Rural Capital	87.24%	83.50%	87.26%	87.50%	88.14%	n/
	Brazos Valley	78.72%	85.19%	85.59%	89.69%	86.25%	n/
17 D	Deep East Texas	75.00%	77.33%	81.56%	88.00%	89.00%	n/
18 S	Southeast Texas	85.61%	82.89%	84.02%	87.10%	89.26%	n/
19 G	Golden Crescent	90.70%	91.18%	86.84%	100.00%	86.36%	n/
20 A	lamo	75.32%	76.88%	83.53%	88.17%	89.26%	n/
21 S	South Texas	78.61%	76.87%	85.47%	89.74%	81.25%	n/
22 C	Coastal Bend	76.17%	80.26%	82.28%	82.07%	85.60%	n/
23 L	ower Rio Grande	73.82%	72.62%	74.04%	75.34%	77.25%	n/
	Cameron County	71.30%	74.76%	79.47%	81.57%	88.45%	n/
	exoma	79.31%	73.33%	81.58%	83.61%	86.00%	n/
	Central Texas	74.33%	74.60%	81.37%	82.54%	85.91%	n/
27 №	1iddle Rio Grande	80.85%	80.56%	84.76%	90.00%	89.83%	n/
	Gulf Coast	74.88%	78.94%	80.99%	83.70%	85.68%	n/
	System a available for Sept - Dec	76.16%	77.43%	81.46%	84.48%	86.47%	n/

**2015 wage data used to indicate employment not yet available. ¹Labor Code, Section 302.0043(a)(1)(A)

<u>TANF Parents Maintaining Employment One Year after Entering Child Care¹</u> <u>Table 1B</u>								
<u>Board #</u>	Board Name	2010*	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015**	
<u>1</u>	Panhandle	59.14%	64.63%	59.18%	68.87%	69.39%	n/	
2	South Plains	65.60%	70.06%	60.19%	75.00%	70.97%	n/	
3	North Texas	54.22%	47.95%	58.15%	58.76%	66.43%	n/	
4	North Central Texas	63.11%	59.83%	56.96%	60.69%	64.07%	n/	
5	Tarrant County	54.47%	54.48%	59.57%	63.11%	64.67%	n/	
6	Greater Dallas	50.17%	54.23%	59.03%		66.46%	n/	
7	North East Texas	44.25%	49.10%	54.69%	54.66%	58.77%	n/	
8	East Texas	68.03%	61.60%	65.38%	63.69%	66.45%	n/	
9	West Central	68.42%	72.22%	60.14%	58.76%	58.33%	n/	
10	Borderplex	49.65%	51.03%	51.82%	56.36%	53.42%	n/	
11	Permian Basin	53.62%	64.86%	61.32%	68.42%	61.76%	n/	
12	Concho Valley	61.54%	61.54%	67.06%	62.96%	68.09%	n/	
13	Heart of Texas	51.79%	56.85%	60.12%	62.41%	70.08%	n,	
14	Capital Area	52.79%	57.91%	65.72%	68.85%	75.17%	n,	
15	Rural Capital	62.24%	63.83%	65.09%	63.11%	67.37%	n/	
16	Brazos Valley	63.83%	66.67%	61.86%	68.04%	61.25%	n/	
17	Deep East Texas	58.33%	56.98%	62.41%	65.60%	70.00%	n,	
18	Southeast Texas	59.71%	57.41%	59.82%	63.23%	71.90%	n,	
19	Golden Crescent	60.47%	80.88%	76.32%	57.89%	72.73%	n,	
20	Alamo	54.78%	57.26%	61.40%	64.51%	67.54%	n,	
21	South Texas	59.89%	54.48%	64.53%	64.10%	68.75%	n/	
22	Coastal Bend	51.06%	52.37%	54.65%	59.31%	64.20%	n/	
23	Lower Rio Grande	51.22%	54.55%	54.39%	53.45%	60.59%	n,	
24	Cameron County	54.26%	56.31%	53.22%	61.33%	62.45%	n,	
25	Texoma	51.72%	45.00%	51.32%	54.10%	54.00%	n,	
26	Central Texas	53.33%	52.00%	58.54%		62.87%	n,	
27	Middle Rio Grande	58.51%	59.72%	61.90%	68.75%	66.10%	n,	
28	Gulf Coast	55.19%	56.77%	58.48%	61.80%	61.79%	n,	
Total	System	54.34%	56.28%	58.93%	62.07%	64.20%	n/	
2010 da	ta available for Sept - De	c 2010 only.			•			
	age data used to indicate		not yet av	ailable.				

Board Name anhandle outh Plains orth Texas orth Central Texas arrant County reater Dallas ortheast Texas ast Texas /est Central Texas orderplex ermian Basin oncho Valley eart of Texas	2010* 85.09% 87.82% 85.21% 86.61% 84.94% 85.62% 82.60% 84.51% 87.52% 86.11% 85.64% 87.62%	ble 2A 2011 83.94% 87.21% 85.17% 85.35% 84.54% 85.86% 82.66% 84.13% 84.47% 84.47% 84.47% 84.50% 84.50%	2012 84.56% 86.68% 87.02% 86.77% 86.63% 87.30% 82.78% 85.01% 87.00% 84.43% 86.96% 87.24%	2013 86.00% 87.67% 87.38% 87.19% 87.73% 88.30% 83.93% 86.67% 87.46% 85.60% 87.38%	2014 86.14% 86.97% 88.13% 87.91% 87.52% 89.20% 87.31% 87.31% 87.81% 87.43% 85.25% 85.61%	2015** n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a
outh Plains orth Texas orth Central Texas arrant County reater Dallas ortheast Texas ast Texas /est Central Texas orderplex ermian Basin oncho Valley	87.82% 85.21% 86.61% 84.94% 85.62% 82.60% 84.51% 87.52% 86.11% 85.64% 87.62%	87.21% 85.17% 85.35% 84.54% 85.86% 82.66% 84.13% 84.47% 84.07% 84.07%	86.68% 87.02% 86.77% 86.63% 87.30% 82.78% 85.01% 87.00% 84.43% 86.96%	87.67% 87.38% 87.19% 87.73% 88.30% 83.93% 86.67% 87.46% 85.60% 87.38%	86.97% 88.13% 87.91% 87.52% 89.20% 87.31% 87.81% 87.81% 87.43% 85.25% 85.61%	n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a
orth Texas orth Central Texas arrant County reater Dallas ortheast Texas ast Texas /est Central Texas orderplex ermian Basin oncho Valley	85.21% 86.61% 84.94% 85.62% 82.60% 84.51% 87.52% 86.11% 85.64% 87.62%	85.17% 85.35% 84.54% 85.86% 82.66% 84.13% 84.47% 84.47% 84.07% 84.50%	87.02% 86.77% 86.63% 87.30% 82.78% 85.01% 87.00% 84.43% 86.96%	87.38% 87.19% 87.73% 88.30% 83.93% 86.67% 87.46% 85.60% 87.38%	88.13% 87.91% 87.52% 89.20% 87.31% 87.81% 87.81% 87.43% 85.25% 85.61%	n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a
orth Central Texas arrant County reater Dallas ortheast Texas ast Texas /est Central Texas orderplex ermian Basin oncho Valley	86.61% 84.94% 85.62% 82.60% 84.51% 87.52% 86.11% 85.64% 87.62%	85.35% 84.54% 85.86% 82.66% 84.13% 84.47% 84.07% 84.07% 84.50%	86.77% 86.63% 87.30% 82.78% 85.01% 87.00% 84.43% 86.96%	87.19% 87.73% 88.30% 83.93% 86.67% 87.46% 85.60% 87.38%	87.91% 87.52% 89.20% 87.31% 87.81% 87.43% 85.25% 85.61%	n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a
arrant County reater Dallas ortheast Texas ast Texas /est Central Texas orderplex ermian Basin oncho Valley	86.61% 84.94% 85.62% 82.60% 84.51% 87.52% 86.11% 85.64% 87.62%	85.35% 84.54% 85.86% 82.66% 84.13% 84.47% 84.07% 84.07% 84.50%	86.77% 86.63% 87.30% 82.78% 85.01% 87.00% 84.43% 86.96%	87.19% 87.73% 88.30% 83.93% 86.67% 87.46% 85.60% 87.38%	87.52% 89.20% 87.31% 87.81% 87.43% 85.25% 85.61%	n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a
arrant County reater Dallas ortheast Texas ast Texas /est Central Texas orderplex ermian Basin oncho Valley	85.62% 82.60% 84.51% 87.52% 86.11% 85.64% 87.62%	84.54% 85.86% 82.66% 84.13% 84.47% 84.07% 84.07%	87.30% 82.78% 85.01% 87.00% 84.43% 86.96%	87.73% 88.30% 83.93% 86.67% 87.46% 85.60% 87.38%	87.52% 89.20% 87.31% 87.81% 87.43% 85.25% 85.61%	n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a
reater Dallas ortheast Texas ast Texas /est Central Texas orderplex ermian Basin oncho Valley	85.62% 82.60% 84.51% 87.52% 86.11% 85.64% 87.62%	85.86% 82.66% 84.13% 84.47% 84.07% 84.07%	87.30% 82.78% 85.01% 87.00% 84.43% 86.96%	88.30% 83.93% 86.67% 87.46% 85.60% 87.38%	89.20% 87.31% 87.81% 87.43% 85.25% 85.61%	n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a
ast Texas /est Central Texas orderplex ermian Basin oncho Valley	84.51% 87.52% 86.11% 85.64% 87.62%	84.13% 84.47% 84.07% 84.50%	85.01% 87.00% 84.43% 86.96%	86.67% 87.46% 85.60% 87.38%	87.81% 87.43% 85.25% 85.61%	n/a n/a n/a
/est Central Texas orderplex ermian Basin oncho Valley	87.52% 86.11% 85.64% 87.62%	84.47% 84.07% 84.50%	87.00% 84.43% 86.96%	87.46% 85.60% 87.38%	87.43% 85.25% 85.61%	n/a n/a
orderplex ermian Basin oncho Valley	86.11% 85.64% 87.62%	84.07% 84.50%	84.43% 86.96%	87.46% 85.60% 87.38%	85.25% 85.61%	n/a
ermian Basin oncho Valley	85.64% 87.62%	84.50%	86.96%	87.38%	85.61%	
oncho Valley	87.62%					<u>n/a</u>
		87.17%	87.24%	04070/		
eart of Texas	94 6 20/		0/121/0	84.97%	87.59%	n/a
	84.62%	82.76%	86.01%	87.37%	88.98%	n/a
apital Area	89.98%	88.32%	88.55%	89.99%	89.54%	n/a
ural Capital	86.10%	87.60%	88.29%	89.09%	89.15%	n/a
razos Valley	90.11%	86.03%	86.39%	87.07%	88.55%	n/a
eep East Texas	83.97%	85.16%	87.39%	85.32%	86.99%	n/a
outheast Texas	85.96%	84.94%	86.30%	87.38%	89.84%	n/
olden Crescent	84.65%	84.95%	84.42%	86.46%	86.47%	n/
lamo	87.77%	87.69%	87.83%	87.67%	88.66%	n/:
outh Texas	88.04%	86.70%	85.06%	85.41%	85.46%	n/:
oastal Bend	84.88%	83.62%	85.22%	86.40%	84.72%	n/a
ower Rio Grande Valley	84.50%	84.88%	85.58%	86.51%	87.64%	n/a
ameron	86.53%	84.76%	86.12%	86.89%	87.73%	n/:
exoma	86.62%	85.07%	83.65%	88.21%	88.04%	n/:
entral Texas	81.44%	81.34%	81.29%	80.92%	82.97%	n/
iddle Rio Grande	86.02%	84.20%	85.35%	85.92%	87.28%	n/
ulf Coast	82.55%	82.46%	85.09%	86.76%	86.23%	n/a
ystem	85.11%	84.67%	86.04%	86.95%	87.30%	n/a
	azos Valley eep East Texas outheast Texas olden Crescent amo outh Texas oastal Bend ower Rio Grande Valley ameron exoma entral Texas iddle Rio Grande ulf Coast /stem available for Sept - Dec 2	azos Valley90.11%eep East Texas83.97%outheast Texas85.96%olden Crescent84.65%amo87.77%outh Texas88.04%oastal Bend84.88%ower Rio Grande Valley84.50%ameron86.53%exoma86.62%entral Texas81.44%iddle Rio Grande86.02%ulf Coast82.55%ystem85.11%available for Sept - Dec 2010 only.	azos Valley 90.11% 86.03% eep East Texas 83.97% 85.16% outheast Texas 85.96% 84.94% olden Crescent 84.65% 84.95% amo 87.77% 87.69% outh Texas 88.04% 86.70% outh Texas 84.88% 83.62% ower Rio Grande Valley 84.50% 84.88% ameron 86.53% 84.76% exoma 86.62% 85.07% entral Texas 81.44% 81.34% iddle Rio Grande 86.02% 84.20% ulf Coast 82.55% 82.46% ystem 85.11% 84.67% available for Sept - Dec 2010 only. 85.11%	azos Valley90.11%86.03%86.39%eep East Texas83.97%85.16%87.39%outheast Texas85.96%84.94%86.30%olden Crescent84.65%84.95%84.42%amo87.77%87.69%87.83%outh Texas88.04%86.70%85.06%outh Texas84.88%83.62%85.22%ower Rio Grande Valley84.50%84.88%85.58%ameron86.62%85.07%83.65%exoma86.62%85.07%83.65%entral Texas81.44%81.34%81.29%iddle Rio Grande86.02%84.20%85.35%ulf Coast82.55%82.46%85.09%ystem85.11%84.67%86.04%	azos Valley90.11%86.03%86.39%87.07%eep East Texas83.97%85.16%87.39%85.32%outheast Texas85.96%84.94%86.30%87.38%olden Crescent84.65%84.95%84.42%86.46%amo87.77%87.69%87.83%87.67%outh Texas88.04%86.70%85.06%85.41%outh Texas88.04%83.62%85.22%86.40%ower Rio Grande Valley84.50%84.88%85.58%86.51%ameron86.53%84.76%86.12%86.89%exoma86.62%85.07%83.65%88.21%entral Texas81.44%81.34%81.29%80.92%iddle Rio Grande86.02%84.20%85.35%85.92%ulf Coast82.55%82.46%85.09%86.76%ystem85.11%84.67%86.04%86.95%available for Sept - Dec 2010 only.84.67%86.04%86.95%	azos Valley90.11%86.03%86.39%87.07%88.55%eep East Texas83.97%85.16%87.39%85.32%86.99%outheast Texas85.96%84.94%86.30%87.38%89.84%olden Crescent84.65%84.95%84.42%86.46%86.47%amo87.77%87.69%87.83%87.67%88.66%outh Texas88.04%86.70%85.06%85.41%85.46%outh Texas88.04%86.70%85.06%85.41%85.46%ower Rio Grande Valley84.50%84.88%85.58%86.51%87.64%ameron86.53%84.76%86.12%86.89%87.73%exoma86.62%85.07%83.65%88.21%88.04%entral Texas81.44%81.34%81.29%80.92%82.97%iddle Rio Grande86.02%84.20%85.35%86.76%86.23%ulf Coast82.55%82.46%85.09%86.76%86.23%ystem85.11%84.67%86.04%86.95%87.30%available for Sept - Dec 2010 only.84.67%86.04%86.95%87.30%

**2015 wage data used to indicate employment not yet available.
 ¹Labor Code, Section 302.0043(a)(2)(A)

Average One-Year Wage Gain of Non-TANF Parents Receiving Child Care ¹ <u>Table 2B</u>								
Board #	Board Name	2010*	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015**	
1	Panhandle	\$479.53	\$247.96	\$429.80	\$500.01	\$586.93		
2	South Plains	\$584.26	\$366.48	\$375.15	\$439.83	\$589.85	n/a	
3	North Texas	\$420.41	\$362.74	\$329.29	\$367.70	\$204.55	n/a	
4	North Central	\$616.28	\$360.96	\$516.81	\$713.96	\$541.37	n/a	
5	Tarrant County	\$607.02	\$277.47	\$577.24	\$403.54	\$557.77	n/a	
6	Greater Dallas	\$625.77	\$272.08	\$574.36	\$400.84	\$531.69	n/a	
7	North East Texas	\$362.67	\$201.56	\$288.78	\$279.45	\$421.40	n/a	
8	East Texas	\$402.12	\$298.66	\$349.78	\$419.65	\$451.43	n/a	
9	West Central Texas	\$583.66	\$267.60	\$456.18	\$443.61	\$468.79	n/a	
10	Borderplex	\$431.74	\$113.55	\$267.48	\$239.61	\$288.94	n/a	
11	Permian Basin	\$725.37	\$501.84	\$789.10	\$755.49	\$471.36	n/a	
12	Concho Valley	\$369.93	\$315.72	\$505.32	\$606.75	\$549.58	n/a	
13	Heart of Texas	\$672.18	\$158.61	\$312.84	\$485.76	\$389.40	n/a	
14	Capital Area	\$545.86	\$198.08	\$416.66	\$524.79	\$467.51	n/a	
15	Rural Capital	\$594.00	\$323.72	\$452.92	\$652.65	\$658.12	n/a	
16	Brazos Valley	\$550.10	\$265.14	\$521.91	\$477.08	\$366.36	n/a	
17	Deep East Texas	\$465.00	\$365.54	\$431.80	\$331.44	\$436.92	n/a	
18	Southeast Texas	\$584.93	\$23.09	\$276.44	\$294.04	\$279.95	n/a	
19	Golden Crescent	\$720.13	\$252.41	\$329.08	\$516.48	\$669.12	n/a	
20	Alamo	\$643.26	\$146.32	\$439.94	\$401.13	\$554.16	n/a	
21	South Texas	\$479.52	\$189.38	\$243.25	\$375.26	\$413.73	n/a	
22	Coastal Bend	\$397.36	\$310.46	\$358.72	\$450.14	\$518.39	n/a	
23	Lower Rio Grande	\$508.72	\$147.96	\$240.81	\$242.74	\$295.16	n/a	
24	Cameron County	\$485.05	\$178.96	\$228.96	\$279.97	\$308.66	n/a	
25	Texoma	\$443.33	\$240.63	\$429.98	\$514.53	\$698.89	n/a	
26	Central Texas	\$583.98	\$301.45	\$524.85	\$333.02	\$484.10	n/a	
27	Middle Rio Grande	\$448.11	\$182.19	\$291.03	\$147.86	\$250.82	n/a	
28	Gulf Coast	\$621.77	\$365.67	\$526.01	\$680.38	\$501.32	n/a	
Total	System	\$571.71	\$273.18	\$445.56	\$481.49	\$477.15	n/a	

¹Labor Code, Section 302.0043(a)(2)(B)

<u>Percent of Parents Leaving the Child Care Program and Receiving TANF within a Year¹</u> <u>Table 3C</u>								
Board #	Board Name	2010*	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015**	
<u>1</u>	Panhandle	4.50%	3.96%	5.25%	4.04%	3.66%	n/a	
2	South Plains	5.45%	5.45%	7.66%	6.01%	3.72%	n/a	
3	North Texas	9.15%	11.35%	18.50%	16.91%	13.00%	n/	
4	North Central	5.91%	7.72%	7.43%	6.63%	5.19%	n/	
5	Tarrant County	7.19%	13.17%	13.60%	12.99%	11.32%	n/	
6	Greater Dallas	20.21%	19.69%	20.92%	20.33%	18.94%	n/	
7	Northeast Texas	9.31%	10.38%	9.99%	8.46%	6.91%	n/	
8	East Texas	8.33%	4.96%	4.90%	4.36%	4.63%	n/	
9	West Central Texas	10.00%	7.01%	5.10%	6.60%	4.30%	n/	
10	Borderplex	15.93%	14.23%	17.54%	15.60%	13.14%	n/	
11	Permian Basin	4.51%	2.79%	3.53%	1.83%	1.14%	n/	
12	Concho Valley	6.59%	5.12%	8.51%	5.50%	4.52%	n/	
13	Heart of Texas	7.12%	9.19%	9.95%	8.47%	9.12%	n/	
14	Capital Area	24.44%	25.40%	21.24%	17.54%	12.00%	n/	
15	Rural Capital	12.31%	12.78%	10.04%	9.02%	5.69%	n/	
16	Brazos Valley	5.56%	6.60%	8.47%	8.03%	3.78%	n/	
17	Deep East Texas	13.73%	6.80%	6.81%	5.58%	5.18%	n/	
18	Southeast Texas	14.71%	10.90%	12.58%	8.76%	9.23%	n/	
19	Golden Crescent	4.69%	2.84%	3.39%	2.55%	2.22%	n/	
20	Alamo	14.78%	11.36%	13.25%	12.86%	8.94%	n/	
21	South Texas	13.90%	8.38%	7.63%	5.97%	5.84%	n/	
22	Coastal Bend	12.41%	9.83%	9.54%	9.32%	8.28%	n/	
23	Lower Rio Grande Valley	12.58%	9.90%	10.05%	7.58%	6.28%	n/	
24	Cameron	6.68%	8.25%	13.01%	10.73%	8.35%	n/	
25	Texoma	6.11%	6.34%	8.68%	5.72%	6.05%	n/	
26	Central Texas	13.36%	15.29%	12.86%	12.47%	9.44%	n/	
27	Middle Rio Grande	6.07%	9.83%	8.84%	7.81%	6.30%	n/	
28	Gulf Coast	6.69%	9.43%	12.43%	14.53%	11.67%	n/	
Total	System	9.94%	10.77%	12.00%	11.39%	9.50%	n/	

¹Labor Code, Section 302.0043(a)(3)(B)