

Place and Race Matter: Head Start and CCDBG Access by Race, Ethnicity, and Location

Webinar Q&A

- 1. In the Latino community we serve, many of our families are undocumented which restricts them from registering for our programs. What can be done to address this gap and limitation to these families that are at-risk population?**

CLASP analysis on race/ethnicity does not take into account immigration status. Over 90 percent of Latino children are U.S.-born citizens; however, 53 percent of Latino children have at least one foreign-born parent. The vast majority of these young children are themselves citizens who are eligible to receive CCDBG-funded child care assistance. Head Start is available to all children based on income eligibility.

New immigrant communities may be unaware of the availability of child care assistance and their eligibility for services and families with unauthorized household members may be reluctant to access Head Start and child care even if children are eligible due to immigration-related concerns. It's important for immigrant-serving organizations and early childhood programs to understand eligibility criteria and current policies that restrict immigration enforcement actions from happening in child care and early education settings and work together to inform immigrant communities about available early childhood programs.

- 2. Slide 16 states that the percent of eligible AIAN children served by CCDBG in Virginia was 13 percent, but there are not federally recognized tribes in Virginia. How was the 13 percent identified?**

Information on race/ethnicity is self-reported data on children's backgrounds. American Indian and Alaska Native children live all across the country and often live outside of tribes. AIAN children are served in state CCDBG programs as well as tribal CCDBG programs. The number of children served by race and ethnicity in each state can be found in the appendices of the [Disparate Access paper](#).

- 3. I am surprised that the Head Start center capacity was not figured into the geographic analysis that resulted in the "1 center deficit" conclusion. Why was this not done?**

Due to data availability constraints, Head Start center capacity was not factored into the geographic analysis. For the analysis, DDK utilizes data on the location of Head Start Centers from the Head Start Centers Locations Datasets, provided by the U.S. Office of Head Start. This data source provides the location of all Head Start Centers nationally, but does not include information about the enrollment or licensed capacity of individual Head Start centers. Cross-referencing the Head Start Locations Datasets

with individual state early education and child care center licensing databases (which include capacity information about Head Start and other licensed programs) is a future direction for the work. In addition, DDK recommends that the U.S. Office of Head Start consider collecting and reporting additional information for individual Head Start centers, including capacity and enrollment characteristics, which would support more detailed analyses of local access to Head Start.

4. Do you anticipate any changes in Head Start funding with the eventual new appointments for the Department of Health and Human Services?

Head Start funding is determined by Congress during the annual appropriations process. It is possible that Head Start funding cuts will be proposed by either President Trump or Congress. The new administration's agenda [poses major threats to America's children in many respects, including uncertainty about Head Start funding priorities.](#)

5. As a TA provider, what strategies are effective for supporting program, teachers, and staff in addressing equity?

Many of the decisions that impact equity in the programs or classrooms are about policy decisions made at the state or federal level for CCDBG and Head Start. In CCDBG, because of the large number of state policies that impact access to subsidies, it is possible that particular groups of children are more or less likely to obtain child care assistance based on state policy choices. For example, particular state eligibility practices may make it difficult for families with highly variable hours or nonstandard hours of employment to participate, which are often the case for workers in low-wage jobs. The data shows that Latino workers are concentrated in low-wage industries, such as restaurants or retail. Therefore, to the extent that this is a characteristic of employment patterns of Hispanic/Latino families, such policies may disproportionately impact Latino children (to read more, see [A Closer Look at Latino Access to Child Care Subsidies](#)).

Limited English proficiency or lack of outreach to particular communities may serve as additional barriers for some families to gain access any early childhood program. Further, state verification procedures for mixed citizenship status immigrant families (where the child is a U.S. citizen eligible for CCDBG but parents are not citizens) may be confusing processes, and concerns over their own undocumented or legal status may prohibit them from interacting with government agencies. New immigrant communities may also be unaware of the availability of child care assistance, Head Start, or other early childhood programs and their eligibility for services.

6. Do the data sets allow for disaggregated intersectional analysis of kids-learners in the various programs-centers - re. Gender identity, (dis)ability, sexuality, etc ?

Unfortunately, the publicly available administrative data does not allow for this.

7. How much is language access in the application process for CCDBG a problem?

For many low-income families, complex application, enrollment, and redetermination procedures can be difficult to navigate. This is especially true for families with language barriers. For clients who are Limited English Proficient (LEP), effective outreach requires linguistically and culturally competent resources as well as culturally responsive staff within state child care agencies and programs. Fifty-three percent of Latino children who live with both parents have at least one parent who does not speak English very well. These application policies are state decisions in CCDBG. To address their needs, states should offer their materials in languages other than English, employ bilingual caseworkers or translators, and accept applications in a variety of ways, such as internet submissions and paper forms at community-based locations. States can also make redetermination documents available in other languages and clearly define requirements.

8. How does federal funding affect this access issue?

Federal funding has not kept pace with changing demographics. Over time, where low-income young children live has changed geographically, yet historic patterns of funding have not kept up with demographic shifts. The data suggest that relatively flat funding has particularly restricted access in states with a growing population of young children for particular racial/ethnic groups.

Because federal Head Start and CCDBG funding has only achieved relatively small gains in recent years, and because the funding formula reflects past state allotments, areas with new populations in need tend not to get additional resources except when there is an expansion of funding. Thus, states with growing populations of eligible children will be less able to serve them; because the new populations of children are disproportionately Hispanic/Latino, flat federal funding translates into lack of access for Hispanic/Latino children across the growing states of the South and Southwest. While the federal government provides the bulk of funding for Head Start and CCDBG services, increased state investments to expand the number of children accessing Head Start services and child care assistance could also result in a higher share of eligible children served and potentially reduce disparities across groups.

9. There has been a recent influx of data findings related to child care deserts, how does this data correlate with children in high poverty communities, or does it have a correlation at all

While research about childcare “deserts” and local access to early childhood programs is increasing, our understanding of the connection between local access and other community factors, including poverty, is still evolving.

The Center for American Progress recently released a report analyzing the supply of child care centers by US ZIP Code (Malik, R. et al. (2016). Child Care Deserts: An Analysis of Child Care Centers by ZIP Code in 8 States). The report found that ZIP Code poverty rates were not well correlated with the presence

of child care deserts--areas experiencing child care supply shortages. ZIP Codes with moderate poverty rates of between 10 and 20 percent, were most likely to be classified as childcare deserts, and 55% of moderate poverty ZIP Codes were categorized as child care deserts. ZIP Codes with extreme poverty rates of over 30 percent, were the least likely to be child care deserts, with 34% of extreme poverty ZIP codes categorized as child care deserts. It is hypothesized that the increased presence of child care centers in areas of concentrated poverty is due to public investments in early childhood programs that target children in high poverty communities. This finding is consistent with past studies that have found that community poverty level is not always a good predictor of the presence of child care and early education programs (For example: Small, Mario and Stark, Laura. (2005). Are Poor Neighborhoods Resource Deprived? A Case Study of Childcare Centers in New York. *Social Science Quarterly*, 86(s1), pp. 1013–1036).

Moreover, DDK has also conducted research on the percent of young children living in what DDK terms [“Double Jeopardy” neighborhoods](#)--neighborhoods where children face adverse conditions (e.g. high levels of neighborhood poverty) coupled with a lack of protective resources (like high-quality early education programs). DDK did an analysis of Double Jeopardy neighborhoods, defined as census tracts with high poverty rates at or above 20%, and no quality early childhood centers in the census tract, measured by centers with national accreditation). The DDK analysis found that large numbers of children across the 100 largest U.S. metro areas live in Double Jeopardy neighborhoods. Stark racial/ethnic disparities were found with 44% of non-Hispanic black children and 39% of Hispanic children living in Double Jeopardy neighborhoods, compared to 16% of non-Hispanic white children. This type of analysis is important as it speaks not only to the presence of early education programs in high poverty communities, but also examines important characteristics of those programs (like quality) that speak to the potential of local programs to help lift children out of poverty.

Indicators are also available for the 100 largest U.S. Metro areas that estimate the number of children, of different race/ethnicities, that living in high poverty neighborhoods with no licensed child care and early education centers. Indicators are available [here](#).

10. Do the #'s separate out documented children vs non-documented?

CLASP analysis on race/ethnicity does not take into account immigration status. However, the vast majority of young children in immigrant families are themselves US citizens.

It is important to note that DDK’s analysis considers the nativity of parents, not children. This is because the vast majority of children (88%) in immigrant families (i.e. children of foreign-born parents) are U.S.-born, and are therefore U.S. citizens (Source: Migration Policy Institute (MPI) tabulation of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey). The analysis does not take into account immigration status of parents. In the DDK analysis, a child is considered a child of immigrants if he/she has one or more foreign-born parents, regardless of parent’s immigration status. It is also important to

note, as mentioned in Question 1 above, for Head Start services, verification of immigrant status is not required. Therefore, any child who is otherwise eligible for Head Start may enroll without regard to their immigration status or citizenship or their parents' immigration status or citizenship.

11. Are most of the immigrant children Hispanic? If not, can we get a little deeper about the heterogeneity within immigrant children and families about access?

CLASP analysis on race/ethnicity does not take into account immigration status, but it is an important piece of context. See question 1 for additional information on the context of immigration. See also CLASP's [recent brief on Latino Access to CCDBG](#).

DDK analysis for children of immigrants does not disaggregate results by race/ethnicity. However, the racial and ethnic heterogeneity of children of immigrants is important to understanding disparities in local access and is a future direction of the analysis. While Hispanic children represent the largest share of children of immigrants in the U.S. (over 55%), other groups, such as Asian children, comprise substantial shares (19%), and importantly, the racial/ethnic composition of children of immigrants can vary widely in different states, places, and communities across the U.S. (Data source: The Urban Institute. Data from the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series datasets drawn from the 2014 American Community Survey). It is also important to note, that there are increased methodological and data reliability challenges to estimating the number of Head Start income-eligible children of immigrants in a census tract by race/ethnicity. These challenges are typical ones that come with trying to estimate characteristics for (often times) small population sizes at small/granular levels of geography based on survey data. So, while it is a planned future direction of the work, the feasibility of obtaining reliable estimates for this purpose is the first step, and is currently being assessed.

12. Given that these analyses each is looking at only one or two of the publicly-funded ECE options available in different communities. It doesn't take into account the other potential options that may be serving children, such as the growing state pre-k programs, TANF funded child care, among others. In some communities, these other programs are currently serving sizeable numbers of children. Are the conclusions a bit overstated if not all of the care options are being accounted for?

Children may be served in other early childhood programs and it is a shortcoming of the data that we cannot look at unduplicated access to early childhood programs. While understanding the reach of early childhood programs in communities is useful, it was not the focus of CLASP's report. Our analysis is intended to showcase the reach of two federal programs: CCDBG and Head Start. In many cases, families may need access to more than one program. For example, families accessing state-funded pre-kindergarten may still need child care assistance to afford care when parents are working outside of pre-k hours. CCDBG is also the only program designed to support working families with children ages birth to

13, while state pre-k generally reaches children who are 3 or 4 years old. Poor children served in state pre-kindergarten programs may not be getting full array of comprehensive services that Head Start provides and in other cases, Head Start may provide state pre-kindergarten services.

13. Access does not necessarily equate quality and this is especially pronounced for Black children. Is there a future companion piece about access and quality, and subsequently outcomes?

Our analysis was measuring access to federal programs and not quality issues, though the latter is clearly important in particular for low-income children. Neither CLASP nor diversitydatakids.org are planning to write a companion piece specifically about quality at this time.