

## PRICING A MOTHER'S LOVE AND OTHER CONUNDRUMS OF THE STATE CHILD CARE BUDGET

George Hagenauer Data Manager

4-C Community Coordinated Child Care Inc.

5 Odana Ct. Madison Wi 53719

608-216-7011 george.hagenauer@4-C.org

"Serving 8 Counties for Resource and Referral and a third of Wisconsin for the Food Program"

### Introduction:

For the past 20 years part of my job has been doing the analysis that set the maximum reimbursement rate for child care paid for by the state's Wisconsin Shares' subsidy system. Every year 4-C helps several thousand parents find programs for their children. When you talk to these parents, they talk about wanting a provider who would provide the same quality of love and care for their children as their mother would. So I have always thought of the work I did related to the child care subsidy program as "Pricing a Mother's Love", figuring out how the free market and parents determined the price for skilled loving care on the part of thousands of child care workers within the part of Wisconsin served by 4-C.

The current Governor Scott Walker like his predecessor has chosen in his budget to not bother pricing a mother's love for the next two years. Unlike his predecessor he is choosing to reduce rates without a market survey, cutting over \$100 million over the next two years from child care programs and the early education they provide. These are macroeconomic decisions that affect some of the most micro and fragile lives in the state. As such it seemed important to provide some insight into how the system works, the effects of the rate freezes of the last 5 years and some suggestions for a better approach to funding child care in the coming biennia.

### How Federal and State Child Care Funds Work:

Child Care and Early Childhood Education are critical to both Wisconsin's children and its economy. Research has established that early brain development in the first five years creates an essential foundation for a child's healthy development and learning. Children's brains are developing at a rapid pace during that time of their lives. Environments rich in language and experience are critical to that process. High quality early childhood programs are a key resource for providing those environments. Research has shown they are especially important for the development of children in at risk situations where other resources may not exist to provide them with equivalent experiences.

Child care is especially important since 72% of Wisconsin's children under age six have all parents in the workforce, the 4th highest rate among states. These children are usually in the care of someone other than their extended family. For economic development to work, there needs to be high quality child care and early childhood education programs near employment centers. Half of the parents using child care want it near their work not their home usually in order to meet the demands of their jobs. Regulated child care is especially important if there is a need for people to work in an area where they do not have extended family members who can care for their children. If businesses want a flexible and mobile skilled workforce, they need to have high quality regulated child care in their communities.

The United States has a rather unique approach to addressing this need. Early Childhood Education, unlike elementary schools, is almost totally a free market process. Minimal standards (which vary from state to state) are required for some programs. Parents basically choose from a wide range of options from uninspected untrained family child care providers to for-profit and non-profit group centers to highly skilled accredited

ECCFC Handout 4/28/11

family child care homes. The quality and availability of care in these programs vary greatly- even in programs operating only a few blocks apart.

The government's role is limited. The federal government provides matching funds in the Child Care Block Grant to states to provide vouchers for low income families to purchase child care on the open market. The child care subsidy system may be the largest voucher system in the country. A small percentage of these funds are required to be used to improve the quality and accessibility of care, since the free market does not always create or maintain the quality of care needed for parents to work or for healthy child development.

The voucher system is supposed to be based on the local child care economy. Rates paid by the state are determined by a survey of existing rates paid by non-low income parents not receiving a subsidy. A maximum reimbursement rate is supposed to be set at where 75% of the families in a specific area can afford to buy care. Based on a formula, low income families pay a co-pay which is part of the cost of care. The rest is paid for by the state. **The actual cost reimbursed though is determined by what the program charges parents paying the full cost from their own funds.** In other words a maximum reimbursement rate for the weekly care for a 3 year old can be set at \$200, if the program however charges only \$175, then that is the most they can charge a parent on subsidy and the rate the state will pay part of.

Some states allow a higher maximum rate (currently 10% in Wisconsin) for programs that meet accredited documented higher quality standards than basic licensing. Higher quality programs usually have higher costs thus the need for higher rates. Even then the price is limited to what the program normally charges fee-paying families.

One reason for basing the system on market rate prices is that in most areas the subsidy system is only a small part of the early childhood market. If not tied to the local market, **the subsidy system can affect the cost and quality of care used by families not receiving a subsidy.** For instance, if a program charges \$175 a week but the state offered to pay everyone \$200 then soon fee-paying families might find themselves with higher costs or unfair competition from families on subsidies. Likewise if the program charges \$175 but the state only pays \$150 then fee paying parents could find themselves with higher rates recovering the programs' losses due to the underpayment of the cost of care for parents receiving subsidies. Sadly this has been the case in some programs the past few years in Wisconsin. Since programs already compete against each other in the free market, there is usually little space to reduce further reduce costs. Child care wages are among the lowest for workers with similar skills and the programs are labor intensive. To exist most programs, must cover losses by raising rates. The higher the losses are, the higher the rate increase.

Since the subsidy system expands the marketplace, it also often expands the availability of care for all families. This is especially true in rural areas and low income inner city neighborhoods. With the advent of welfare reform in the 1990's many rural towns and villages saw their first group center open, since for the first time there were enough families in the area able to afford regulated child care. Many of these rural centers have 20% or more low income children on subsidy. Those children provided the critical mass for a program to develop where none was. Wisconsin Shares also provided incentive for family child care providers to become trained and regulated. If the subsidy system declines, then the amount of care in these small communities, near major industrial/retail parks and inner city neighborhoods also may disappear to the detriment not only of the low income children on subsidy but all children needing care in the community. Having visible regulated child care in a community is often a critical factor in attracting new business. Half of all parents want care near their work and families new to communities want regulated care that is safe and of good quality.

#### **Economic Development and the State Child Care Budget**

Overall the budget seems to lack much understanding of how child care works or its relationship to the broader work of strengthening economic development within the state. At a time when the goal is to create 250,000 jobs, the proposed child care budget is frozen at recession levels and **with a subsidy line that declines as more people go to work.** It also

ignores the role the Wisconsin Shares subsidy program plays within the broader child care market and how changes in the shares system can impact the availability and cost of care for fee paying parents. As we deal with a very difficult budget period, we need to develop strategies that respect how the child care marketplace works and builds on it. The current proposals do not do that. The proposal to just extend the maximum reimbursement freeze two years and the standard litany of increased co-pays and waiting lists will further disrupt both the child care market as well as the stability of families dependent on the Shares system in order to get to work. Savings to the state in the child care budget can end up being just a cost shift to working parents who pay full tuition costs.

The maximum reimbursement rate in the state has not changed in most areas since 2006 and in some since 2005. The current proposal is to not change the rates for another 2 years. Since the economy and cost of living varies greatly across the state, some slow growth areas have seen little change in the cost of care or even a slight decline as programs responded to families' lower incomes. However other counties less affected by the recession have seen small or even normal increases in their child care rates. In these areas, the freeze in the Shares reimbursement rate has resulted in fee-paying parents paying more to make up losses from the Shares vouchers. In these cases the market rate also rises so that in the future the Wisconsin Shares maximum reimbursement rate will need even higher increases. Family child care especially certified family child care is especially sensitive to freezes in the reimbursement rate. Certified family child care in our 8 county area is shrinking rapidly resulting in more Wisconsin Shares children in higher priced group centers. When markets shrink, it too can often increase the cost of care from the remaining programs.

Using mostly 2010 data in our referral database we estimated what the current reimbursement rate should be in all 8 of our resource and referral counties. Looking at rates other than school age (since school attendance shifts back and forth between full time and part time, it is difficult to determine an annual change in cost) we found the following-

22% had no change – the maximum reimbursement rate was still sufficient to cover most programs cost of care. These tended to be counties where there had been higher unemployment and businesses closing.

22% had some change resulting in a difference of up to \$500 in either yearly losses per child for the program or additional costs added on to the co-pays required of the low income families using Wisconsin Shares.

27% had more severe changes resulting in a difference of \$500 -1000 in either yearly losses per child for the program or additional costs added to the co-pays required of the low income families using Wisconsin Shares. These figures are not surprising since they are near the rate of inflation for a 5-6 year period.

27% had the most severe changes resulting in a difference of \$1000 -3600 in either yearly losses per child for the program or additional costs added to the co-pays required of the low income families using Wisconsin Shares. This included not only Dane County (whose rates were frozen at the 2005 level due to the new tiering system and which has one of the lowest unemployment rates and highest cost of living in the state ) but also some rates in Columbia, Dodge, and Jefferson counties..

**Note that under the current system, these differences of \$500 up to \$3600 per year are supposed to be added to the low income family's co-pay!** In many cases (especially counties with high cost of living) families can barely afford to pay their regular co-pays much less, additional costs that occur because the Maximum reimbursement rate does not accurately reflect the cost of care. In many cases low income families do not have many choices since only 16-30% of the child care market has rates lower than the maximum reimbursement rate as opposed to the 75% required by federal law.

In addition to the rate freeze however the budget proposes reductions in most rates under the new Youngstar system. Youngstar originally was conceived as an incentive system to improve the quality of care for Wisconsin's children.

Studies have shown that higher quality and especially programs that are accredited for higher quality can provide benefits for children's development who come from low income deprived homes. The idea behind Youngstar was to provide higher rates for higher quality programs so that more low income children could benefit from high quality early childhood education. The below chart compares the original Youngstar system with the one proposed in the current budget.

YoungStar Rating of Child Care Provider	Impact on WI Shares Payment:	Impact on WI Shares Payment:	DIFFERENCE
	Initial Plan	Governor's proposal	
One Star	No reimbursement	No reimbursement	No change
Two Stars	0% -No change	Up to 5% reduction	-5%
Three Stars	5% increase	No change	-5%
Four Stars	10% increase	Up to 5% increase	-5%
Five Stars	25% increase	Up to 10% increase	-15%

Two stars is basically meeting state licensing standards- the proposed change would penalize programs that become licensed. **This would especially affect the growth of safe regulated family child care homes.** In Wisconsin anyone can take care of up to 3 children without being regulated or even passing a criminal background check. The proposed system would essentially devalue meeting state licensing standards and provide a disincentive to becoming regulated.

**Remember that this additional 5% cut is in addition to what often are \$1000-5000/year losses already from frozen rates.** Four and Five Star family child care and Five Star Group centers are the categories for accredited programs. These programs which meet very high quality standards now get a 10% increase in their maximum reimbursement rate. Under the new system rates would be decreased for accredited family child care and flat for accredited programs most of which are already far over the maximum reimbursement rate. **The difference between what should be the current maximum rate in Dane County for accredited programs and the frozen rate ranges from \$3-5000 a year per child.**

There are non-profit accredited centers in Dane that already raise \$50,000 a year or more to cover losses from the Wisconsin Shares program. Under a 2 year freeze many accredited programs would reduce the amount of children on subsidies within their programs. In the 4-C database, in every one of the 8 counties, there are already many programs that will not accept Wisconsin Shares vouchers.

For low income children, losing access to high quality early childhood programs at this point in time is especially serious. **The same budget proposes major cuts in aids to local school systems. These cuts may result in fewer districts offering 4 year old kindergarten programs.** If at the same time high quality child care programs reduce services to children on the subsidy program, low income children could find themselves without access to the programs that can help them prepare for later success in school and life.

The proposals to control costs also aggravate an already problematic child care market. Increasing co-pays when some programs already are losing thousands of dollars a year per child is not a solution. Creating waiting lists for Shares vouchers is even worse as programs with children on Wisconsin Shares would not be able to replace those children when they leave. Child care programs work on very tight margins. In many, especially rural, communities in 4-C's service area there is only one child care center with often a 15-30% or more Wisconsin Shares enrollment. For economic

development to occur in those communities it is often critical for regulated group centers to exist. If programs cannot replace children on subsidies with other children their enrollment drops increasing the chance they will go out of business.

State law focuses on low income families and Wisconsin Shares. Good quality child care is equally critical for reversing the brain drain and attracting back highly skilled younger workers in the tech fields that Wisconsin trains and loses to other states. While based on the Shares system, the Youngstar rating system and its technical assistance programs are critical to the larger issue of creating and maintaining high quality care in order to attract and keep these highly skilled workers. **The babies who have died or been injured in our service area have all been from middle class families forced to use low quality unregulated infant care.**

So to keep child care and early childhood education programs viable in these tight economic times we need to have a Wisconsin Shares subsidy system that works within the real child care economy in a way that maintains good quality care for all. This will require an additional investment in the child care budget- but investing in high quality early childhood programs has been shown to be the best investment that can be made in the future of our state

#### Recommendations:

- 1) Child Care rates are complex and the formula is based on census data. Have the department do a full rates analysis before deciding on the budget levels for Wisconsin Shares. Have economists from the university and others with experience with service sector markets to review the data and provide input to the final product. I expect there will need to be increased funding for Wisconsin Shares- the actual format though may be quite different than a rate freeze. Ignoring the rate data for another 2 years will slow economic development and just push back the problem while making it more difficult to solve. If the system can not be fully funded, it should at least be based on an equitable system of rates with similar impacts across the state as opposed to the current situation where some counties are at a rate covering 75% of the children in care and adjacent counties are at a rate that covers only 22%.
- 2) Youngstar can not be implemented as a payment system if it penalizes programs that become regulated or attain high quality standards. Delay implementation of Youngstar tiered reimbursement rates until year 2 and find funds to ensure that the rates provided under Youngstar support the growth of early childhood programs that support both strong economic and early childhood development within the state.
- 3) Do not pass various strategies now to control costs. Those strategies have a major impact on the lives of children. Keep that decision in the legislature and not the department and base it on a detailed analysis of the market. There are other solutions that can be used in addition to the ones proposed by the department. Some savings can be had through excluding infant care which is scarce, costs more, but which programs can more easily fill through the private pay market. Another option may be to create a two year old rate and a 3 year old rate. Likewise there could be a ban on supporting care for low wage part time or irregular hour jobs. These are not only subsidies for families to go to work but also subsidies that reduce the cost of labor for many companies. **As such in tight times, we should prioritize the use of subsidies to full time permanent jobs that are most likely to lift families out of poverty.** There may be other strategies that come out of the field or from additional analysis of the numbers.
- 4) Develop a formula so that when tax revenue and employment increases, income available to the Shares system also increases, eliminating or reducing the need for other arcane strategies to control costs.
- 5) It may be possible by melding labor, birth, child care Resource and Referral data, and other data to more accurately predict what is needed to support a system of regulated early childhood programs to support low income families going back to work using Wisconsin Shares subsidies. This will depend on the quality of the data available but would enable the state to make budget projections based on real market trends.

To succeed we need to increase the Shares budget to a reasonable base level, develop a formula to grow that line item if the economy turns around, while maintaining the child care infrastructure and improving it while linking it to the state's economic development efforts

### **The Child Care Infrastructure:**

While the United States bases its early childhood system on programs in the free market, the free market on its own does not necessarily create the type or quality of care needed to address community's needs. Part of this is because the nurturing and educating of very young children is a labor intense human process that does not necessarily translate well as an economic activity. As a result the federal and state government has invested in a series of support programs to improve the availability and quality of care.

In Wisconsin these include:

- 1) **Child Care Resource and Referral programs** like 4-C (mandated in the federal legislation)
- 2) **Teach Reward**, a program to improve wages in the child care field in order to improve quality
- 3) **Youngstar**, a new strategy that evaluates and ranks the quality of programs, provides additional training and technical assistance to improve quality and helps parents select better programs for their children. Youngstar for the first time has provided significant resources to improve the quality of early childhood programs in the state.

Because 4-C is a resource and referral agency, I will focus more on those programs in this section.

Resource and referral agencies are non-profit programs under boards of directors that include parents, representatives of early childhood programs and members of the broader community including the corporate sector. This oversight derives from the fact that early childhood programs address a variety of needs in the community. While the core goal is supporting the family in the proper development of the child, the needs of the work place also need to be addressed so families can work and businesses can have workers. The key to this is of course the programs in the community providing child care and various types of early childhood education. However to exist , the complex early childhood system , created and maintained in the free market needs to meet the needs of parents, children and the workplace. It also needs to do that on a very slim profit margin for those programs that are providing quality services.

Resource and Referral agencies are the support programs that work to make the system succeed. They do this while balancing the needs of the diverse groups served by the system. R&R services include :

- 1) Referrals for parents which in turn create data on the needs and preferences in the community.
- 2) Creation of economic data needed by programs to plan their budgets.
- 3) Assistance in starting child care programs- everything from recruiting programs for areas of high need , to technical assistance on rules and market data for business plans.
- 4) Low cost training both to improve programs as well as to help them meet new and existing state regulations. When shaken baby prevention training was added as a state requirement, 4-C trained several thousand of the child care programs in its service area.
- 5) Other programs required by federal or state legislation. 4-C does the Certification of small family child care homes for the state in 3 counties and the federal child and adult food program in 21.
- 6) A wide range of thousands of technical assistance- everything from answering questions on the phone to loaning or gifting equipment each year.

The multiple focus of R&Rs provides a systems perspective as they address some of the issues in early childhood.

1) They were among the groups that warned from 1995 on that splitting the regulators into a separate department from the subsidy program would lead to problems managing Wisconsin Shares. Sadly this predication came true with the multi-million dollar child care fraud scandal .

2) They provided suggestions for modifying the rates formula that increased the accuracy of the maximum reimbursement rate, slowing its escalation and saving the state millions in the process.

4-C Madison is unique insofar as we offer both the certification and child and adult food program – and now Youngstar within 3 of our counties. When providers are in both programs the number of on site inspections increases greatly. By having staff from both programs housed in the same organization (and now with Youngstar added) information is easily shared enabling not only better monitoring for program quality and fiscal integrity but better support for providers. **I would strongly recommend subcontracting certification to the resource and referral programs, especially in counties where a full time staff person with a background in early childhood education otherwise would not be funded.**

Linking that person to the local food program further improves the effectiveness of the process.

Using R&R rate data (as in Dane County) when determining the maximum reimbursement rate for Wisconsin Shares provides more accurate market data because the data is also used when referring parents to programs.

Resource and referral agencies like 4-C now are needed more than ever. The child care field has been battered by the recession and the Shares rate freeze. It is critical that the R&R structure, Youngstar and the Teach Reward program be kept intact during the next two years to help early childhood education get back on a stable footing throughout the state. As the economy recovers there will need to be more care developed to support the economic development that is needed. The R&R system is critical for that work. I would develop linkages between it and the new office of Economic Development. Improvements in the child care and early childhood education system through Youngstar will pay off for years in the future as these children succeed in later life – it is an investment we need to make today for a better right to life for Wisconsin's youngest and most fragile citizens.

<b>4-C Madison 2010 Services</b>	<b>2010 Total</b>		
<b>REFERRAL</b>			
In House Referrals	1338		
Online Referrals	1331		
Parent Consultations	5233		
<b>PROVIDER TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ALL DEPTS</b>			
Technical Assistance Consultations	14399		
<b>DATA (survey sent around April 1st)</b>			
Surveys Returned Dane County	460		
Surveys Returned Other County	299		
<b>TRAINING</b>			
Workshops	88		
Participants Trained	2449		
Quality Initiatives Visits	121		
Quality Initiative Participants	135		
<b>PUBLIC OUTREACH/COORDINATION</b>			
Media Contacts	27		
Collaborative Leadership Meetings	105		
Cross Systems Leadership Meetings	65		
<b>CERTIFICATION 3 COUNTIES</b>			
Total Regulated by 4C at Qtr. End	259		
Home Visits Completed	645		
Consultations/Calls	3574		
<b>CACFP</b>			
Providers Active in Program	620	Monthly Average	
Children Enrolled at QTR.END	5117		
Home Visits Completed	1728		
Meals/Snacks Served	Almost 2 million		



## APPENDIX – Data related to Wisconsin Shares and the Child Care Market in 4-C's County Service area 2010

By

George Hagenauer Data Manager

4-C Community Coordinated Child Care Inc.

5 Odana Ct. Madison Wi 53719

608-216-7011 [george.hagenauer@4-C.org](mailto:george.hagenauer@4-C.org)

I have done the survey work that determines the maximum reimbursement rate for Wisconsin Shares in Dane County since 1991. The analysis on the following pages is based as much as possible on the standard procedures used in the annual rate survey. There were limitations. When possible I excluded off market rates from the analysis – this however was limited as I only had March 2010 data on Wisconsin Shares enrollments in each program. In Dane county where 4-C does the rate survey, the rate data matched or exceeded the standards set by the state because there was extra funding for follow up calls. Completeness of data in the other counties varied. Likewise Jefferson Sauk, Columbia and Dodge counties had capacity data dating back several years. Green, Rock and Walworth were added recently and thus did not have the same range of longitudinal data.

Still the data shows the wide differences in market rates throughout 4-C's region. This is understandable as it encompasses both one of the fastest growing economies Dane with a very low unemployment rate and Beloit in Rock county with one of the highest unemployment rates in the state. It should not be surprising then that rates increased in some areas and stayed very flat in others- making using Wisconsin Shares easier in some places and harder for others. A key factor here is variations in cost of living. Looking at a scale with a median at 100% - the cost of living in the state varies from a low of 75% of median to a high of 148% of median. Using essentially one eligibility scale thus inevitably leads to more failure in families becoming self sufficient in high cost of living areas.

Since our goal is to increase economic development throughout the state like in Dane County and other high growth areas, we need to develop a child care policy that properly responds to and supports that growth. That can only come from payment and policy decisions that respect the child care market and not ignore it.

Chart Explanations:

**The Maximum Reimbursement Rate should be set where 75% of the market can access care**

These charts compare the current state frozen state rate with the actual 75th percentile where it should be today. The column labeled "Current Maximum State rate" is the maximum rate in use by the state today. The next column indicates what percent of the market that actually covers.

The Current Actual 75<sup>th</sup> percentile rate column is the price the Maximum rate should be based on the rates data we had available.

The amount in the weekly difference is what often is required in addition to the co-pay. It is the difference between the maximum paid and what many programs are actually charging

If the parent is not able to pay the full co-pay the program takes it as a loss

I also took the difference and created an annualized amount.

An annual school age difference was not computed because time in care varies during the year.

**Note major market variances often between adjacent counties.** These are due differences in the local economies and increases caused by rates increasing to cover lost income from Shares.



## 2010 Dane County Early Childhood Education Demographic Report

Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C)  
5 Odana Ct., Madison, WI 53719  
608-271-9181 (george.hagenauer@4-C.org)

2010 Enrollment Trends													%change
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2009-2010
Infant Toddler	2123	2266	1914	2712	2330	2183	2360	2272	3143	2658	2533	2537	0%
Preschool	10988	11193	10554	11104	10610	10856	11393	12121	10679	11202	11312	11037	-2%
School Age	4394	3852	5035	5094	4686	4750	4997	6022	5934	5560	4785	4560	-5%
Total	17505	17311	17503	18910	17626	17789	18750	20415	19756	19420	18630	18134	-3%
Full Day	9023	8747	9255	9440	8946	9214	9265	10840	10512	10672	10983	10,703	-3%
Family Child Care	3950	4016	3638	4680	3582	3224	3853	3790	3969	3377	3064	2509	-18%
Part Day													
Preschools	2454	2173	2130	2100	2728	2675	2674	2598	2316	2455	2205	2273	3%
After School	2078	2375	2480	2693	2370	2676	2958	3187	2959	2916	2378	2649	11%
Total	17505	17311	17503	18913	17626	17789	18750	20415	19756	19420	18630	18134	-3%
Wisconsin Shares			2759	3270	3303	3321	3586	3902	3962	4268	3960	3742	-6%
% Shares			16%	17%	19%	19%	19%	19%	20%	22%	21%	21%	

Note above the large drop in family child care between the rate freeze in 2006 and 2010.

All counties in our service area have accredited high quality centers- which usually cost more than non-accredited

Dane County had enough to analyze

	Current maximum state rate	Percent of market available under that rate	current actual 75th percentile	Weekly Difference	Annual difference per child
All prices are weekly					

#### Dane County

##### Full Day Group Centers

Infant Toddler under 2	\$ 232	24%	\$ 285	\$53	\$2,756
Ages 2-3	\$ 200	16%	\$ 248	\$48	\$2,496
Ages 4-5	\$ 180	21%	\$ 226	\$46	\$2,392
Ages School Age	\$ 175	27%	\$ 210	\$35	

#### Dane County Accredited

##### Full Day Group Centers

##### % accepting shares

Infant Toddler under 2	\$ 232	24%	\$ 309	\$77	\$4,004
Ages 2-3	\$ 200	16%	\$ 257	\$57	\$2,964
Ages 4-5	\$ 180	21%	\$ 242	\$62	\$3,224
Ages School Age	\$ 175	27%	\$ 220	\$45	

#### Difference between Accredited and non Accredited Group Centers

	Weekly	Annual
Infant Toddler under 2	\$24	\$1,248
Ages 2-3	\$9	\$468
Ages 4-5	\$16	\$832
Ages School Age	\$10	

#### Family Child Care

All prices are weekly	Current maximum	Percent of market	current 75th percentile	Difference	Annual difference per child
Infant Toddler under 2	\$ 190	41%	\$ 260	\$70	\$3,640
Ages 2-3	\$ 176	34%	\$ 225	\$50	\$2,574
Ages 4-5	\$ 165	26%	\$ 200	\$35	\$1,820
Ages School Age	\$ 158	19%	\$ 200	\$43	

#### Accredited Family Child Care

All prices are weekly

Infant Toddler under 2	\$ 190	41%	\$ 290	\$100	\$5,200
Ages 2-3	\$ 176	34%	\$ 250	\$75	\$3,874
Ages 4-5	\$ 165	26%	\$ 250	\$85	\$4,420
Ages School Age	\$ 158	19%	\$ 235	\$78	

#### Difference between Accredited and non Accredited

Infant Toddler under 2	\$30	\$1,560
Ages 2-3	\$25	\$1,300
Ages 4-5	\$50	\$2,600
Ages School Age	\$35	

**MARCH 2010 - CHILDREN FUNDED BY WISCONSIN SHARES  
BY LOCATION/CERTIFICATION**

This chart does not include cases in which the parent was reimbursed.

	2010 NUMBER OF SHARES FUNDED CHILDREN	2009 NUMBER OF SHARES FUNDED CHILDREN	2010 PERCENT OF SHARES FUNDED CHILDREN	PERCENT % CHANGE 2009-2010	#CHILDREN CHANGE 2009-2010
<b>Full-day Centers</b>	2557	2544	68%	1%	13
In Madison	1510	1580	40%	-4%	-70
Outside Madison	1024	964	27%	6%	60
Outside Dane	23	18	1%	28%	5
City Accredited	545	530	14%	3%	15
All accredited	596	581	16%	3%	15
<b>Part Day Preschools</b>	15	15	0%	0%	0
<b>School-Age Programs</b>	322	355	9%	-9%	-33
City Accredited PD	152	141	4%	8%	11
MSCR Safehaven	97	99	3%	-2%	-2
<b>Family Child Care</b>	886	1043	23%	-15%	-157
In Madison	542	864	14%	-37%	-322
Outside Madison	331	174	9%	90%	157
City Accredited	75	61	2%	23%	14
* Licensed	428	436	11%	-2%	-8
County Certified	358	483	9%	-26%	-125
Provisional	87	124	2%	-30%	-37
Outside Dane	13	5	0%	160%	8
<b>Total</b>	3780	3960	100%	-5%	-180
In Accredited	827	790	22%	5%	37
In City Accredited	772	732	20%	5%	40
In NAEYC Accredited	55	58	1%	-5%	-3
In Madison	2303	2609	61%	-12%	-306
In Dane Outside Madison	1440	1328	38%	8%	112
Outside Dane	37	23	1%	na	14

DANE COUNTY PROGRAMS ONLY	% Shares		% Shares		% Shares			% Shares
By Age	Under 2	Market	age2-5	Market	Age 6 up	Market	Total	Market
<b>Full Day</b>	500	13%	1526	41%	508	14%	2534	68%
<b>Part Day Preschools</b>	0	0%	15	0%	0	0%	15	0%
<b>After Schools</b>	0	0%	28	1%	294	8%	322	9%
<b>Family Child</b>	194	5%	431	12%	248	7%	873	23%
<b>License</b>	93	2%	239	6%	96	3%	428	11%
<b>Certified</b>	70	2%	163	4%	125	3%	358	10%
<b>Provisional</b>	31	1%	29	1%	27	1%	87	2%
<b>Total on Shares</b>	694	19%	2000	53%	1050	28%	3744	
<b>2009 on shares</b>	719		2038		1203		3960	
<b>Change 2009-2010</b>	-25		-38		-153		-216	

# **Child Care Enrollments in Dane County March 2010** **By Type of Program**

Note: Children whose care is subsidized by Wisconsin Shares but in programs outside Dane County are not included on this chart.

	Zip	Full Day Center	Part Day Preschools	After School	Family Child Care	2010 Total	2009 Total	Change	% Change	Wisconsin Shares	Shares as % enrolled
Belleville	53508	102	27	39	8	176	253	-77	-30%	12	7%
Black Earth	53515	28	0	0	8	36	38	-2	-5%	7	19%
Blue Mounds	53517	24	0	0	0	24	26	-2	-8%	11	46%
Brooklyn	53521	45	0	0	5	50	25	25	100%	13	26%
Cambridge	53523	80	0	43	11	134	122	12	10%	5	4%
Cottage Grove	53527	484	0	0	12	496	440	56	13%	42	8%
Cross Plains	53528	117	0	20	22	159	159	0	0%	22	14%
Dane	53529	14	0	0	37	51	71	-20	-28%	3	6%
Deerfield	53531	83	30	0	6	119	87	32	37%	19	16%
Deforest	53532	398	114	95	99	706	756	-50	-7%	76	11%
Edgerton	53534	37	0	0	0	37	37	0	0%	4	11%
McFarland	53558	354	21	26	23	424	429	-5	-1%	49	12%
Marshall	53559	79	0	45	22	146	144	2	1%	33	23%
Mazomanie	53560	9	0	0	5	14	10	4	40%	6	43%
Middleton	53562	407	48	151	122	728	757	-29	-4%	116	16%
Mt. Horeb	53572	167	147	30	69	413	462	-49	-11%	19	5%
Oregon	53575	261	129	352	98	840	868	-28	-3%	77	9%
Sauk city	53583	0	0	0	19	19	14	5	36%	0	0%
Stoughton	53589	245	99	71	157	572	585	-13	-2%	110	19%
Sun Prairie	53590	766	153	264	146	1329	1251	78	6%	347	26%
Verona	53593	680	84	200	87	1051	894	157	18%	60	6%
Waunakee	53597	484	18	114	83	699	709	-10	-1%	43	6%
Windsor	53598	68	0	26	35	129	130	-1	-1%	14	11%
Madison-Ishtmus	53703	314	0	125	9	448	538	-90	-17%	66	15%
Madison-East	53704	752	183	72	299	1306	1293	13	1%	570	44%
Madison-West	53705	507	236	252	32	1027	1133	-106	-9%	124	12%
Madison-Midwest	53711	781	263	214	286	1544	1820	-276	-15%	441	29%
Madison-South	53713	502	0	45	174	721	758	-37	-5%	528	73%
Madison-East	53714	345	23	107	123	598	632	-34	-5%	214	36%
Madison-Central	53715	461	18	37	33	549	512	37	7%	32	6%
Madison-East	53716	211	285	77	141	714	753	-39	-5%	215	30%
Madison-Far West	53717	265	120	83	8	476	363	113	31%	109	23%
Madison-Far East	53718	405	0	0	85	490	510	-20	-4%	94	19%
Madison-Southwest	53719	1,193	275	161	240	1869	1960	-91	-5%	256	14%
Madison-central	53726	35	0	0	0	35	35	0	0%	5	14%
	53925	0	0	0	5	5	6	-1	-17%	0	0%
2010 Total		10703	2273	2649	2509	18134	18630	-496	-3%	3742	21%
2009 Total		10983	2205	2378	3064	18630		-336	-2%	3926	21%
Difference		-280	68	271	-555	-496				-184	
%change		-3%	3%	11%	-18%	-2%				8%	