

Appendix D

Tables & Figures

List of Tables

Table

- 4 *Comparisons of Child Capacity Between All Licensed Centers, Randomly Selected Centers and Non-Selected Centers, by Strata*
- 5 *Comparison of Street Zip Codes Between All Licensed Centers and Randomly Selected Centers, by Strata*
- 6 *Comparisons of Child Capacity Between All Licensed Homes, Randomly Selected Homes and Non-Selected Homes, by Strata*
- 7 *Comparison of Spanish Spoken in All Licensed Homes, Randomly Selected Homes and Non-Selected Homes, by Strata*
- 8 *Comparison of Zip Codes Between All Licensed Homes, Randomly Selected Homes and Non-Selected Homes, by Strata*
- 9 *Child Care Provider Survey Response Rates, by Provider Type*
- 10 *Child Care Provider Survey Response Rates, by Strata*
- 11 *Response Rates of Family Interviews*
- 12 *Language of Child Care Provider Survey Administered to Respondents Who Answered the Introductory Question, by Provider Type*
- 13 *Language of Child Care Provider Survey Administered to Respondents Who Answered the Introductory Question, by Strata*
- 14 *Proportion of Child Care Providers Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*
- 15 *Proportion of Child Care Providers Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*

Table

- 16 *Effects of Subsidy Cuts on Providers: Estimates of Population Proportions*
- 17 *Impact Ratings of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*
- 18 *Impact Ratings of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*
- 19 *Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on Staff Layoffs in Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*
- 20 *Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on Staff Layoffs in Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*
- 21 *Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on Staff Working Hour Reductions in Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*
- 22 *Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on Staff Working Hour Reductions in Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*
- 23 *Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on Program Services of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*
- 24 *Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on Program Services of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*
- 25 *Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on Imposition of New Fees in Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*
- 26 *Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on Imposition of New Fees in Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*
- 27 *Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Financial Viability of Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*
- 28 *Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Financial Viability of Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*

Table

- 29 *Impact Ratings of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Quality of Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*
- 30 *Impact Ratings of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Quality of Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*
- 31 *Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Possibility of Closing the Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*
- 32 *Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Possibility of Closing the Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*
- 33 *Rhode Island Cities/Towns of Interviewed and Non-Interviewed Families*
- 34 *Demographic Characteristics of Participating Families*
- 35 *Relationship Between Family Participant and Child(ren) Who Lost Subsidy and Did Not Lose Subsidy*
- 36 *Participating Families' Receipt of Subsidy and Co-Payments*
- 37 *Number and Ages of Children Who Lost Subsidy, and Type of Care*
- 38 *Family Participants' Perceptions of Children's Development and Home Environment*
- 39 *Impact on Family Participants' Employment*
- 40 *Impact on Family Participants' Finances*
- 41 *Family Participants' Perceptions of Current Child Care Situations*

List of Figures

Figure

- 1 *Child Care Provider Survey Response Rates, by Provider Type*

- 2 *Child Care Provider Survey Response Rates, by Strata*

- 3 *Language of Surveys Administered to Child Care Providers Who Responded to the Introductory Question, by Provider Type*

- 4 *Language of Surveys Administered to Child Care Providers Who Responded to the Introductory Question, by Strata*

- 5 *Proportion of Child Care Providers Who Responded to the Introductory Question and Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*

- 6 *Proportion of Child Care Providers Who Responded to the Introductory Question and Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*

- 7 *Estimates of Population Proportions for Licensed Centers in Rhode Island, with 95% Confidence Intervals*

- 8 *Estimates of Population Proportions for Licensed Homes in Rhode Island, with 95% Confidence Intervals*

- 9 *Impact Ratings of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*

- 10 *Impact Ratings of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents, by Provider Type*

- 11 *Impact Ratings of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*

- 12 *Impact Ratings of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents, by Strata*

Figure

- 13 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Laid Off Employees After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type*
- 14 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Laid Off Employees After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type*
- 15 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Laid Off Employees After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata*
- 16 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Laid Off Employees After the Child Care Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata*
- 17 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Reduced Staff Working Hours After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type*
- 18 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Reduced Staff Working Hours After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type*
- 19 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Reduced Staff Working Hours After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata*
- 20 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Reduced Staff Working Hours After the Child Care Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata*
- 21 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Cut Back Program Services After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type*
- 22 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Cut Back Program Services After the Child Care Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type*
- 23 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Cut Back Program Services After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata*
- 24 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Cut Back Program Services After the Child Care Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata*
- 25 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Imposed New Fees on Families After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type*

Figure

- 26 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Imposed New Fees on Families After the Child Care Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type*
- 27 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Imposed New Fees on Families After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata*
- 28 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Imposed New Fees on Families After the Child Care Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata*
- 29 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Responded "Yes" When Asked If the Financial Viability of Their Programs Was Hurt by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*
- 30 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Responded "Yes" When Asked If the Financial Viability of Their Programs Was Hurt by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*
- 31 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Responded "Yes" When Asked If the Financial Viability of Their Programs Was Hurt by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*
- 32 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Responded "Yes" When Asked If the Financial Viability of Their Programs Was Hurt by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*
- 33 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Stated Their Program Quality Had Suffered Since the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type*
- 34 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Stated Their Program Quality Had Suffered Since the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type*
- 35 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Stated Their Program Quality Had Suffered Since the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata*
- 36 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Stated Their Program Quality Had Suffered Since the Child Care Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata*
- 37 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Reported It is Possible They Will Close Their Programs Due to the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*
- 38 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Reported It is Possible They Will Close Their Programs Due to the Child Care Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*

Figure

- 39 *Proportions of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Reported It is Possible They Will Close Their Programs Due to the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*
- 40 *Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Reported It is Possible They Will Close Their Programs Due to the Child Care Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*
- 41 *Total Child Capacity of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Reported It is Possible They Will Close Their Programs Due to the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*
- 42 *Total Child Capacity of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Reported It is Possible They Will Close Their Programs Due to the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*

Table 4

Child Capacity of Provider Centers

Comparisons of Child Capacity Between All Licensed Centers, Randomly Selected Centers and Non-Selected Centers, by Strata

Child Capacity	All Licensed Centers					Randomly Selected Centers					Non-Selected Centers				
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Minimum	Maximum
Providence	68					26					42				
Infants/Toddlers		14.5	18.3	0	68		11.9	14.1	0	41		16.1	20.4	0	68
Preschoolers		30.8	35.4	0	170		28.6	29.3	0	100		32.2	38.9	0	170
School-Age		53.2	83.2	0	571		52.8	60.9	0	240		53.5	95.1	0	571
Total		98.5	76.8	19	571		93.3	58.9	20	240		101.8	86.6	19	571
6 Other Urban Areas	135					50					85				
Infants/Toddlers		14.6	20.8	0	100		14.8	20.4	0	100		14.5	21.1	0	73
Preschoolers		32.5	37.6	0	166		37.2	39.2	0	165		29.7	36.6	0	166
School-Age		32.0	41.3	0	200		33.6	46.5	0	197		31.1	38.2	0	200
Total		79.1	57.5	0	462		85.6	73.6	18	462		75.3	45.5	0	254
Rest of RI	222					83					139				
Infants/Toddlers		12.4	18.3	0	98		11.2	18.6	0	98		13.1	18.1	0	80
Preschoolers		27.8	28.5	0	124		32.4	32.6	0	124		25.1	25.6	0	111
School-Age		25.0	28.3	0	120		27.9	29.9	0	120		23.2	27.2	0	115
Total		65.2	37.7	5	218		71.5	39.2	5	218		61.4	36.4	14	191

Note. The 6 other urban areas include: Central Falls, Cranston, East Providence, Pawtucket, Warwick and Woonsocket. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation.

Sources: Database of licensed child care centers in Rhode Island as of August 2007 from the RI Department of Children, Youth & Families (DCYF) and R2LP database as of February 13, 2008.

Table 5

Zip Codes of Provider Centers

Comparison of Street Zip Codes Between All Licensed Centers and Randomly Selected Centers, by Strata

Street Zip Code	All Licensed Centers		Randomly Selected Centers		Non-Selected Centers	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Providence	68	100.0	26	38.2	42	61.8
02903	3	4.4	3	11.5	0	0.0
02904	6	8.8	1	3.8	5	11.9
02905	16	23.5	4	15.4	12	28.6
02906	14	20.6	7	26.9	7	16.7
02907	11	16.2	2	7.7	9	21.4
02908	9	13.2	5	19.2	4	9.5
02909	7	10.3	4	15.4	3	7.1
02911	2	2.9	0	0.0	2	4.8
6 Other Urban Areas	135	100.0	50	37.0	85	63.0
02860	16	11.9	7	14.0	9	10.6
02861	4	3.0	2	4.0	2	2.4
02863	7	5.2	2	4.0	5	5.9
02886	26	19.3	11	22.0	15	17.6
02888	7	5.2	3	6.0	4	4.7
02889	4	3.0	2	4.0	2	2.4
02895	20	14.8	7	14.0	13	15.3
02905	3	2.2	0	0.0	3	3.5
02910	7	5.2	3	6.0	4	4.7
02914	10	7.4	2	4.0	8	9.4
02915	4	3.0	2	4.0	2	2.4
02916	5	3.7	1	2.0	4	4.7
02920	17	12.6	6	12.0	11	12.9
02921	5	3.7	2	4.0	3	3.5
Rest of RI	222	100.0	83	37.4	139	62.6
02804	2	0.9	0	0.0	2	1.4
02806	9	4.1	3	3.6	6	4.3
02807	1	0.5	0	0.0	1	0.7
02809	7	3.2	0	0.0	7	5.0
02812	1	0.5	1	1.2	0	0.0
02813	2	0.9	0	0.0	2	1.4
02814	2	0.9	2	2.4	0	0.0
02816	13	5.9	5	6.0	8	5.8
02817	3	1.4	0	0.0	3	2.2
02818	10	4.5	5	6.0	5	3.6

Street Zip Code	All Licensed Centers		Randomly Selected Centers		Non-Selected Centers	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
02825	2	0.9	0	0.0	2	1.4
02828	3	1.4	1	1.2	2	1.4
02829	1	0.5	0	0.0	1	0.7
02830	4	1.8	1	1.2	3	2.2
02832	1	0.5	1	1.2	0	0.0
02835	1	0.5	0	0.0	1	0.7
02837	1	0.5	0	0.0	1	0.7
02838	1	0.5	1	1.2	0	0.0
02840	10	4.5	6	7.2	4	2.9
02842	11	5.0	4	4.8	7	5.0
02847	1	0.5	1	1.2	0	0.0
02852	14	6.3	6	7.2	8	5.8
02857	2	0.9	0	0.0	2	1.4
02859	1	0.5	1	1.2	0	0.0
02864	10	4.5	4	4.8	6	4.3
02865	10	4.5	2	2.4	8	5.8
02871	6	2.7	2	2.4	4	2.9
02874	1	0.5	0	0.0	1	0.7
02878	5	2.3	3	3.6	2	1.4
02879	7	3.2	2	2.4	5	3.6
02881	2	0.9	0	0.0	2	1.4
02882	4	1.8	1	1.2	3	2.2
02883	2	0.9	0	0.0	2	1.4
02885	4	1.8	1	1.2	3	2.2
02891	11	5.0	5	6.0	6	4.3
02892	1	0.5	0	0.0	1	0.7
02893	10	4.5	4	4.8	6	4.3
02896	2	0.9	2	2.4	0	0.0
02898	2	0.9	2	2.4	0	0.0
02904	2	0.9	0	0.0	2	1.4
02911	7	3.2	4	4.8	3	2.2
02915	5	2.3	1	1.2	4	2.9
02916	1	0.5	0	0.0	1	0.7
02917	7	3.2	4	4.8	3	2.2
02919	16	7.2	6	7.2	10	7.2

Note. The six other urban areas include: Central Falls, Cranston, East Providence, Pawtucket, Warwick and Woonsocket.

Sources: Database of licensed child care centers in Rhode Island as of August 2007 from the RI Department of Children, Youth & Families (DCYF) and R2LP database as of February 13, 2008.

Table 6

Child Capacity of Provider Homes

Comparisons of Child Capacity Between All Licensed Homes, Randomly Selected Homes and Non-Selected Homes, by Strata

Child Capacity	All Licensed Homes					Randomly Selected Homes					Non-Selected Homes				
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Minimum	Maximum
Providence	780	6.5	1.2	0	8	188	6.5	1.2	3	8	592	6.5	1.2	0	8
6 Other Urban Areas	324	6.5	1.4	0	12	78	6.6	1.2	4	8	246	6.5	1.4	0	12
Rest of RI	233	6.6	1.6	1	12	57	6.5	1.4	3	12	176	6.6	1.6	1	12

Note. The six other urban areas include: Central Falls, Cranston, East Providence, Pawtucket, Warwick and Woonsocket. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation.

Sources: Database of licensed child care homes in Rhode Island as of October 2007 from the RI Department of Children, Youth & Families (DCYF) and R2LP database as of February 13, 2008.

Table 7

Spanish Spoken in Provider Homes

Comparison of Spanish Spoken in All Licensed Homes, Randomly Selected Homes and Non-Selected Homes, by Strata

Spanish Spoken	All Licensed Homes		Randomly Selected Homes		Non-Selected Homes	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Providence	780	100.0	188	100.0	592	100.0
Spanish spoken	599	76.8	144	76.6	455	76.9
Spanish not spoken	181	23.2	44	23.4	137	23.1
6 Other Urban Areas	324	100.0	78	100.0	246	100.0
Spanish spoken	149	46.0	34	43.6	115	46.7
Spanish not spoken	175	54.0	44	56.4	131	53.3
Rest of RI	233	100.0	57	100.0	176	100.0
Spanish spoken	16	6.9	2	3.5	14	8.0
Spanish not spoken	217	93.1	55	96.5	162	92.0

Note. The six other urban areas include: Central Falls, Cranston, East Providence, Pawtucket, Warwick and Woonsocket.

Sources: Database of licensed child care homes in Rhode Island as of October 2007 from the RI Department of Children, Youth & Families (DCYF) and R2LP database as of February 13, 2008.

Table 8

Zip Codes of Provider Homes

Comparison of Zip Codes Between All Licensed Homes, Randomly Selected Homes and Non-Selected Homes, by Strata

Zip Code	All Licensed Homes		Randomly Selected Homes		Non-Selected Homes	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Providence	780	100.0	188	24.1	592	75.9
02903	9	1.2	1	0.5	8	1.4
02904	16	2.1	5	2.7	11	1.9
02905	134	17.2	30	16.0	104	17.6
02906	11	1.4	3	1.6	8	1.4
02907	277	35.5	67	35.6	210	35.5
02908	110	14.1	31	16.5	79	13.3
02909	216	27.7	49	26.1	167	28.2
02910	2	0.3	1	0.5	1	0.2
02911	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.2
02920	1	0.1	1	0.5	0	0.0
02940	3	0.4	0	0.0	3	0.5
6 Other Urban Areas	324	100.0	78	24.1	246	75.9
02806	1	0.3	1	1.3	0	0.0
02860	62	19.1	9	11.5	53	21.5
02861	24	7.4	6	7.7	18	7.3
02863	51	15.7	15	19.2	36	14.6
02886	17	5.2	1	1.3	16	6.5
02888	10	3.1	4	5.1	6	2.4
02889	11	3.4	6	7.7	5	2.0
02895	29	9.0	8	10.3	21	8.5
02905	24	7.4	7	9.0	17	6.9
02910	32	9.9	7	9.0	25	10.2
02914	13	4.0	3	3.8	10	4.1
02920	48	14.8	10	12.8	38	15.4
02921	2	0.6	1	1.3	1	0.4
Rest of RI	233	100.0	57	24.5	176	75.5
02804	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.6
02806	8	3.4	1	1.8	7	4.0
02809	5	2.1	1	1.8	4	2.3
02812	2	0.9	0	0.0	2	1.1
02813	3	1.3	1	1.8	2	1.1
02814	4	1.7	1	1.8	3	1.7
02816	18	7.7	4	7.0	14	8.0

Zip Code	All Licensed Homes		Randomly Selected Homes		Non-Selected Homes	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
02818	4	1.7	1	1.8	3	1.7
02822	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.6
02825	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.6
02828	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.6
02830	5	2.1	1	1.8	4	2.3
02831	3	1.3	1	1.8	2	1.1
02832	5	2.1	1	1.8	4	2.3
02835	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.6
02837	1	0.4	1	1.8	0	0.0
02838	2	0.9	1	1.8	1	0.6
02840	4	1.7	1	1.8	3	1.7
02842	5	2.1	1	1.8	4	2.3
02852	8	3.4	3	5.3	5	2.8
02857	3	1.3	1	1.8	2	1.1
02859	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.6
02864	24	10.3	8	14.0	16	9.1
02865	10	4.3	0	0.0	10	5.7
02871	5	2.1	2	3.5	3	1.7
02874	2	0.9	0	0.0	2	1.1
02876	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.6
02878	6	2.6	2	3.5	4	2.3
02879	13	5.6	4	7.0	9	5.1
02883	2	0.9	0	0.0	2	1.1
02885	4	1.7	1	1.8	3	1.7
02892	2	0.9	0	0.0	2	1.1
02893	14	6.0	2	3.5	12	6.8
02894	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.6
02896	5	2.1	0	0.0	5	2.8
02898	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.6
02904	17	7.3	4	7.0	13	7.4
02911	6	2.6	0	0.0	6	3.4
02915	6	2.6	4	7.0	2	1.1
02916	2	0.9	1	1.8	1	0.6
02917	4	1.7	0	0.0	4	2.3
02919	20	8.6	7	12.3	13	7.4
02927	1	0.4	1	1.8	0	0.0

Note. The six other urban areas include: Central Falls, Cranston, East Providence, Pawtucket, Warwick and Woonsocket.

Sources: Database of licensed child care homes in Rhode Island as of October 2007 from the RI Department of Children, Youth & Families (DCYF) and R2LP database as of February 13, 2008.

Table 9

Response Rates of Providers

Child Care Provider Survey Response Rates, by Provider Type

	Selected	Noncontact ^a	Answered Introductory Question ^b	Refusal	Respondents	Response Rate (%)
All	482	100	378	12	366	75.9
Centers	159	11	148	6	142	89.3
Providence	26	1	25	0	25	96.2
6 Other Urban	50	4	46	3	43	86.0
Rest of RI	83	6	77	3	74	89.2
Homes	323	89	230	6	224	69.3
Providence	188	54	133	2	131	69.7
6 Other Urban	78	17	60	3	57	73.1
Rest of RI	57	18	37	1	36	63.2

^aNoncontacted providers included 62 providers (13%) who could not be reached even though their phone numbers appeared to be valid, and 38 providers (8%) whose phone numbers were not in service.

^bFour home-based providers did not answer the introductory question and refused to participate in the survey.

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 10

Response Rates of Providers

Child Care Provider Survey Response Rates, by Strata

	Selected	Noncontact ^a	Answered Introductory Question ^b	Refusal	Respondents	Response Rate (%)
All	482	100	378	12	366	75.9
Providence	214	55	158	2	156	72.9
Centers	26	1	25	0	25	96.2
Homes	188	54	133	2	131	69.7
6 Other Urban	128	21	106	6	100	78.1
Centers	50	4	46	3	43	86.0
Homes	78	17	60	3	57	73.1
Rest of RI	140	24	114	4	110	78.6
Centers	83	6	77	3	74	89.2
Homes	57	18	37	1	36	63.2

^aNoncontacted providers included 62 (13%) providers who could not be reached even though their phone numbers appeared to be valid, and 38 providers (8%) whose phone numbers were not in service.

^bFour home-based providers did not answer the introductory question and refused to participate in the survey.

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 11

Response Rates of Families

Response Rates of Family Interviews

	<i>n</i>	%
Total	252	100.0
Interviewed	127	50.4
Willing to participate?		
Yes	111	44.0
No	16	6.3
Lost subsidy?		
Yes	93	36.9
No	16	6.3
Don't know	2	0.8
Survey language		
English	111	87.4
Spanish	16	12.6
Not interviewed	125	49.6
Not in service	70	27.8
Cannot be reached	47	18.7
Could not be completed	1	0.4
Not applicable	6	2.4
Mistakenly not interviewed	1	0.4

Note. At least 10 phone call attempts were made to each prospective family respondent before considering the family as unreachable. The prospective respondent labeled as "Could not be completed" was due to the person speaking a language other than English or Spanish that could not be readily identified for follow-up contact. The prospective respondents labeled "Not applicable" either never received the child care subsidy or lost it more than one year before September 1, 2007. The prospective respondent labeled "Mistakenly not interviewed" did not lose the subsidy as of September 1, 2007 and should have been interviewed.

Source: R2LP database as of July 1, 2008.

Table 12

Provider Survey Language

Language of Child Care Provider Survey Administered to Respondents Who Answered the Introductory Question, by Provider Type

	Answered Introductory Question ^a	English	% Answered Introductory Question	English & Spanish	% Answered Introductory Question	Spanish	% Answered Introductory Question
All	378	237	62.7	1	0.3	140	37.0
Centers	148	147	99.3	1	0.7	0	0.0
Providence	25	24	96.0	1	4.0	0	0.0
6 Other Urban	46	46	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Rest of RI	77	77	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Homes	230	90	39.1	0	0.0	140	60.9
Providence	133	20	15.0	0	0.0	113	85.0
6 Other Urban	60	33	55.0	0	0.0	27	45.0
Rest of RI	37	37	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

^aFour home-based providers did not answer the introductory question and refused to participate in the survey.

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 13

Provider Survey Language

Language of Child Care Provider Survey Administered to Respondents Who Answered the Introductory Question, by Strata

	Answered Introductory Question ^a	English	% Answered Introductory Question	English & Spanish	% Answered Introductory Question	Spanish	% Answered Introductory Question
All	378	237	62.7	1	0.3	140	37.0
Providence	158	44	27.8	1	0.6	113	71.5
Centers	25	24	96.0	1	4.0	0	0.0
Homes	133	20	15.0	0	0.0	113	85.0
6 Other Urban	106	79	74.5	0	0.0	27	25.5
Centers	46	46	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Homes	60	33	55.0	0	0.0	27	45.0
Rest of RI	114	114	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Centers	77	77	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Homes	37	37	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

^aFour home-based providers did not answer the introductory question and refused to participate in the survey.

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 14

Providers Who Served Families Affected by Cuts

Proportion of Child Care Providers Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type

	Selected	Answered Introductory Question ^a	Served Families Affected by Subsidy Cuts	% Selected	% Answered Introductory Question	Did Not Serve Families Affected by Subsidy Cuts	% Selected	% Answered Introductory Question
All	482	378	209	43.4	55.3	169	35.1	44.7
Centers	159	148	110	69.2	74.3	38	23.9	25.7
Providence	26	25	17	65.4	68.0	8	30.8	32.0
6 Other Urban	50	46	40	80.0	87.0	6	12.0	13.0
Rest of RI	83	77	53	63.9	68.8	24	28.9	31.2
Homes	323	230	99	30.7	43.0	131	40.6	57.0
Providence	188	133	63	33.5	47.4	70	37.2	52.6
6 Other Urban	78	60	31	39.7	51.7	29	37.2	48.3
Rest of RI	57	37	5	8.8	13.5	32	56.1	86.5

^aFour home-based providers did not answer the introductory question and refused to participate in the survey.

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 15

Providers Who Served Families Affected by Cuts

Proportion of Child Care Providers Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts, by Strata

	Selected	Answered Introductory Question ^a	Served Families Affected by Subsidy Cuts	% Selected	% Answered Introductory Question	Did Not Serve Families Affected by Subsidy Cuts	% Selected	% Answered Introductory Question
All	482	378	209	43.4	55.3	169	35.1	44.7
Providence	214	158	80	37.4	50.6	78	36.4	49.4
Centers	26	25	17	65.4	68.0	8	30.8	32.0
Homes	188	133	63	33.5	47.4	70	37.2	52.6
6 Other Urban	128	106	71	55.5	67.0	35	27.3	33.0
Centers	50	46	40	80.0	87.0	6	12.0	13.0
Homes	78	60	31	39.7	51.7	29	37.2	48.3
Rest of RI	140	114	58	41.4	50.9	56	40.0	49.1
Centers	83	77	53	63.9	68.8	24	28.9	31.2
Homes	57	37	5	8.8	13.5	32	56.1	86.5

^aFour home-based providers did not answer the introductory question and refused to participate in the survey.

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 16

Estimates of Population Proportions*Effects of Subsidy Cuts on Providers: Estimates of Population Proportions*

	Licensed Centers in RI				Licensed Homes in RI			
	Estimated Population Proportion	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Estimated Population Proportion	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval	
Providers who served families affected by subsidy cuts	0.744	0.028	0.688	0.799	0.431	0.028	0.376	0.486
Providers who experienced an extreme or major impact	0.528	0.033	0.463	0.594	0.371	0.028	0.316	0.426
Providers who laid off employees	0.162	0.024	0.114	0.209	0.121	0.019	0.083	0.158
Providers who reduced staff working hours	0.374	0.032	0.310	0.437	0.143	0.020	0.103	0.183
Providers who cut back services	0.176	0.025	0.126	0.226	0.174	0.022	0.131	0.218
Providers who imposed new fees on families	0.183	0.026	0.132	0.234	0.094	0.017	0.060	0.127
Providers whose financial viability was hurt by subsidy cuts	0.528	0.033	0.463	0.593	0.353	0.027	0.299	0.407
Providers whose program quality suffered	0.225	0.027	0.171	0.279	0.264	0.025	0.214	0.314
Providers whose programs might close due to subsidy cuts	0.134	0.023	0.089	0.179	0.282	0.026	0.231	0.333

Note . Proportions were estimated using SAS PROC SURVEYMEANS, which uses the Taylor expansion method to estimate sampling errors of figures based on complex sample designs (e.g., stratified random sampling). Responses were weighted by the inverse of the probability of selection. Descriptive statistics were adjusted to account for nonrespondents (i.e., missing values).

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 17

Impact Ratings*Impact Ratings of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*

	No. Served Families	No. Respondents	Extreme			Major			Minor			No Impact		
			<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents
All	197	366	63	32.0	17.2	95	48.2	26.0	31	15.7	8.5	8	4.1	2.2
Centers	104	142	21	20.2	14.8	54	51.9	38.0	26	25.0	18.3	3	2.9	2.1
Providence	17	25	5	29.4	20.0	9	52.9	36.0	3	17.6	12.0	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	37	43	10	27.0	23.3	17	45.9	39.5	9	24.3	20.9	1	2.7	2.3
Rest of RI	50	74	6	12.0	8.1	28	56.0	37.8	14	28.0	18.9	2	4.0	2.7
Homes	93	224	42	45.2	18.8	41	44.1	18.3	5	5.4	2.2	5	5.4	2.2
Providence	61	131	26	42.6	19.8	31	50.8	23.7	3	4.9	2.3	1	1.6	0.8
6 Other Urban	28	57	14	50.0	24.6	8	28.6	14.0	2	7.1	3.5	4	14.3	7.0
Rest of RI	4	36	2	50.0	5.6	2	50.0	5.6	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0

Source : R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 18

Impact Ratings*Impact Ratings of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*

	No. Served Families	No. Respondents	Extreme			Major			Minor			No Impact		
			<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents
All	197	366	63	32.0	17.2	95	48.2	26.0	31	15.7	8.5	8	4.1	2.2
Providence	78	156	31	39.7	19.9	40	51.3	25.6	6	7.7	3.8	1	1.3	0.6
Centers	17	25	5	29.4	20.0	9	52.9	36.0	3	17.6	12.0	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	61	131	26	42.6	19.8	31	50.8	23.7	3	4.9	2.3	1	1.6	0.8
6 Other Urban	65	100	24	36.9	24.0	25	38.5	25.0	11	16.9	11.0	5	7.7	5.0
Centers	37	43	10	27.0	23.3	17	45.9	39.5	9	24.3	20.9	1	2.7	2.3
Homes	28	57	14	50.0	24.6	8	28.6	14.0	2	7.1	3.5	4	14.3	7.0
Rest of RI	54	110	8	14.8	7.3	30	55.6	27.3	14	25.9	12.7	2	3.7	1.8
Centers	50	74	6	12.0	8.1	28	56.0	37.8	14	28.0	18.9	2	4.0	2.7
Homes	4	36	2	50.0	5.6	2	50.0	5.6	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0

Source : R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 19

Staff Layoffs

Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on Staff Layoffs in Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type

	No. Served Families	No. Respondents	Laid Off Employees			Did Not Lay Off Employees			Missing		
			<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents
All	197	366	50	25.4	13.7	141	71.6	38.5	6	3.0	1.6
Centers	104	142	23	22.1	16.2	80	76.9	56.3	1	1.0	0.7
Providence	17	25	7	41.2	28.0	10	58.8	40.0	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	37	43	9	24.3	20.9	27	73.0	62.8	1	2.7	2.3
Rest of RI	50	74	7	14.0	9.5	43	86.0	58.1	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	93	224	27	29.0	12.1	61	65.6	27.2	5	5.4	2.2
Providence	61	131	20	32.8	15.3	41	67.2	31.3	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	28	57	6	21.4	10.5	17	60.7	29.8	5	17.9	8.8
Rest of RI	4	36	1	25.0	2.8	3	75.0	8.3	0	0.0	0.0

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 20

Staff Layoffs

Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on Staff Layoffs in Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata

	No. Served Families	No. Respondents	Laid Off Employees			Did Not Lay Off Employees			Missing		
			<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents
All	197	366	50	25.4	13.7	141	71.6	38.5	6	3.0	1.6
Providence	78	156	27	34.6	17.3	51	65.4	32.7	0	0.0	0.0
Centers	17	25	7	41.2	28.0	10	58.8	40.0	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	61	131	20	32.8	15.3	41	67.2	31.3	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	65	100	15	23.1	15.0	44	67.7	44.0	6	9.2	6.0
Centers	37	43	9	24.3	20.9	27	73.0	62.8	1	2.7	2.3
Homes	28	57	6	21.4	10.5	17	60.7	29.8	5	17.9	8.8
Rest of RI	54	110	8	14.8	7.3	46	85.2	41.8	0	0.0	0.0
Centers	50	74	7	14.0	9.5	43	86.0	58.1	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	4	36	1	25.0	2.8	3	75.0	8.3	0	0.0	0.0

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 21

Staff Working Hour Reductions

Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on Staff Working Hour Reductions in Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type

	No. Served Families	No. Respondents	Reduced Staff Working Hours			Did Not Reduce Staff Working Hours			Missing		
			<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents
All	197	366	85	43.1	23.2	106	53.8	29.0	6	3.0	1.6
Centers	104	142	53	51.0	37.3	50	48.1	35.2	1	1.0	0.7
Providence	17	25	9	52.9	36.0	8	47.1	32.0	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	37	43	21	56.8	48.8	15	40.5	34.9	1	2.7	2.3
Rest of RI	50	74	23	46.0	31.1	27	54.0	36.5	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	93	224	32	34.4	14.3	56	60.2	25.0	5	5.4	2.2
Providence	61	131	25	41.0	19.1	36	59.0	27.5	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	28	57	6	21.4	10.5	17	60.7	29.8	5	17.9	8.8
Rest of RI	4	36	1	25.0	2.8	3	75.0	8.3	0	0.0	0.0

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 22

Staff Working Hour Reductions

Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on Staff Working Hour Reductions in Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata

	No. Served Families	No. Respondents	Reduced Staff Working Hours			Did Not Reduce Staff Working Hours			Missing		
			<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents
All	197	366	85	43.1	23.2	106	53.8	29.0	6	3.0	1.6
Providence	78	156	34	43.6	21.8	44	56.4	28.2	0	0.0	0.0
Centers	17	25	9	52.9	36.0	8	47.1	32.0	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	61	131	25	41.0	19.1	36	59.0	27.5	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	65	100	27	41.5	27.0	32	49.2	32.0	6	9.2	6.0
Centers	37	43	21	56.8	48.8	15	40.5	34.9	1	2.7	2.3
Homes	28	57	6	21.4	10.5	17	60.7	29.8	5	17.9	8.8
Rest of RI	54	110	24	44.4	21.8	30	55.6	27.3	0	0.0	0.0
Centers	50	74	23	46.0	31.1	27	54.0	36.5	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	4	36	1	25.0	2.8	3	75.0	8.3	0	0.0	0.0

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 23

Cutting Back Services

Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on Program Services of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type

	No. Served Families	No. Respondents	Cut Back Services			Did Not Cut Back Services			Missing		
			<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents
All	197	366	64	32.5	17.5	127	64.5	34.7	6	3.0	1.6
Centers	104	142	25	24.0	17.6	78	75.0	54.9	1	1.0	0.7
Providence	17	25	6	35.3	24.0	11	64.7	44.0	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	37	43	11	29.7	25.6	25	67.6	58.1	1	2.7	2.3
Rest of RI	50	74	8	16.0	10.8	42	84.0	56.8	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	93	224	39	41.9	17.4	49	52.7	21.9	5	5.4	2.2
Providence	61	131	30	49.2	22.9	31	50.8	23.7	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	28	57	8	28.6	14.0	15	53.6	26.3	5	17.9	8.8
Rest of RI	4	36	1	25.0	2.8	3	75.0	8.3	0	0.0	0.0

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 24

Cutting Back Services

Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on Program Services of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata

	No. Served Families	No. Respondents	Cut Back Services			Did Not Cut Back Services			Missing		
			<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents
All	197	366	64	32.5	17.5	127	64.5	34.7	6	3.0	1.6
Providence	78	156	36	46.2	23.1	42	53.8	26.9	0	0.0	0.0
Centers	17	25	6	35.3	24.0	11	64.7	44.0	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	61	131	30	49.2	22.9	31	50.8	23.7	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	65	100	19	29.2	19.0	40	61.5	40.0	6	9.2	6.0
Centers	37	43	11	29.7	25.6	25	67.6	58.1	1	2.7	2.3
Homes	28	57	8	28.6	14.0	15	53.6	26.3	5	17.9	8.8
Rest of RI	54	110	9	16.7	8.2	45	83.3	40.9	0	0.0	0.0
Centers	50	74	8	16.0	10.8	42	84.0	56.8	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	4	36	1	25.0	2.8	3	75.0	8.3	0	0.0	0.0

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 25

New Fees for Families

Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on Imposition of New Fees in Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type

	No. Served Families	No. Respondents	Imposed New Fees on Families			Did Not Impose New Fees on Families			Missing		
			<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents
All	197	366	47	23.9	12.8	144	73.1	39.3	6	3.0	1.6
Centers	104	142	26	25.0	18.3	77	74.0	54.2	1	1.0	0.7
Providence	17	25	4	23.5	16.0	13	76.5	52.0	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	37	43	9	24.3	20.9	27	73.0	62.8	1	2.7	2.3
Rest of RI	50	74	13	26.0	17.6	37	74.0	50.0	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	93	224	21	22.6	9.4	67	72.0	29.9	5	5.4	2.2
Providence	61	131	11	18.0	8.4	50	82.0	38.2	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	28	57	7	25.0	12.3	16	57.1	28.1	5	17.9	8.8
Rest of RI	4	36	3	75.0	8.3	1	25.0	2.8	0	0.0	0.0

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 26

New Fees for Families

Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on Imposition of New Fees in Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata

	No. Served Families	No. Respondents	Imposed New Fees on Families			Did Not Impose New Fees on Families			Missing		
			<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents
All	197	366	47	23.9	12.8	144	73.1	39.3	6	3.0	1.6
Providence	78	156	15	19.2	9.6	63	80.8	40.4	0	0.0	0.0
Centers	17	25	4	23.5	16.0	13	76.5	52.0	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	61	131	11	18.0	8.4	50	82.0	38.2	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	65	100	16	24.6	16.0	43	66.2	43.0	6	9.2	6.0
Centers	37	43	9	24.3	20.9	27	73.0	62.8	1	2.7	2.3
Homes	28	57	7	25.0	12.3	16	57.1	28.1	5	17.9	8.8
Rest of RI	54	110	16	29.6	14.5	38	70.4	34.5	0	0.0	0.0
Centers	50	74	13	26.0	17.6	37	74.0	50.0	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	4	36	3	75.0	8.3	1	25.0	2.8	0	0.0	0.0

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 27

Impact on Financial Viability

Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Financial Viability of Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type

	No. Served Families	No. Respondents	Hurt Program's Financial Viability			Did Not Hurt Program's Financial Viability			Missing		
			<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents
All	197	366	154	78.2	42.1	34	17.3	9.3	9	4.6	2.5
Centers	104	142	75	72.1	52.8	27	26.0	19.0	2	1.9	1.4
Providence	17	25	16	94.1	64.0	1	5.9	4.0	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	37	43	26	70.3	60.5	9	24.3	20.9	2	5.4	4.7
Rest of RI	50	74	33	66.0	44.6	17	34.0	23.0	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	93	224	79	84.9	35.3	7	7.5	3.1	7	7.5	3.1
Providence	61	131	55	90.2	42.0	5	8.2	3.8	1	1.6	0.8
6 Other Urban	28	57	21	75.0	36.8	1	3.6	1.8	6	21.4	10.5
Rest of RI	4	36	3	75.0	8.3	1	25.0	2.8	0	0.0	0.0

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 28

Impact on Financial Viability

Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Financial Viability of Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata

	No. Served Families	No. Respondents	Hurt Program's Financial Viability			Did Not Hurt Program's Financial Viability			Missing		
			<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents
All	197	366	154	78.2	42.1	34	17.3	9.3	9	4.6	2.5
Providence	78	156	71	91.0	45.5	6	7.7	3.8	1	1.3	0.6
Centers	17	25	16	94.1	64.0	1	5.9	4.0	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	61	131	55	90.2	42.0	5	8.2	3.8	1	1.6	0.8
6 Other Urban	65	100	47	72.3	47.0	10	15.4	10.0	8	12.3	8.0
Centers	37	43	26	70.3	60.5	9	24.3	20.9	2	5.4	4.7
Homes	28	57	21	75.0	36.8	1	3.6	1.8	6	21.4	10.5
Rest of RI	54	110	36	66.7	32.7	18	33.3	16.4	0	0.0	0.0
Centers	50	74	33	66.0	44.6	17	34.0	23.0	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	4	36	3	75.0	8.3	1	25.0	2.8	0	0.0	0.0

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 29

Impact on Program Quality

Impact Ratings of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Quality of Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type

	No. Served Families	No. Respondents	Program Quality Has Suffered			Program Quality Has Not Suffered			Missing		
			<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents
All	197	366	91	46.2	24.9	100	50.8	27.3	6	3.0	1.6
Centers	104	142	32	30.8	22.5	71	68.3	50.0	1	1.0	0.7
Providence	17	25	8	47.1	32.0	9	52.9	36.0	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	37	43	14	37.8	32.6	22	59.5	51.2	1	2.7	2.3
Rest of RI	50	74	10	20.0	13.5	40	80.0	54.1	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	93	224	59	63.4	26.3	29	31.2	12.9	5	5.4	2.2
Providence	61	131	43	70.5	32.8	18	29.5	13.7	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	28	57	15	53.6	26.3	8	28.6	14.0	5	17.9	8.8
Rest of RI	4	36	1	25.0	2.8	3	75.0	8.3	0	0.0	0.0

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 30

Impact on Program Quality*Impact Ratings of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Quality of Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*

	No. Served Families	No. Respondents	Program Quality Has Suffered			Program Quality Has Not Suffered			Missing		
			<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents	<i>n</i>	% Served Families	% Respondents
All	197	366	91	46.2	24.9	100	50.8	27.3	6	3.0	1.6
Providence	78	156	51	65.4	32.7	27	34.6	17.3	0	0.0	0.0
Centers	17	25	8	47.1	32.0	9	52.9	36.0	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	61	131	43	70.5	32.8	18	29.5	13.7	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	65	100	29	44.6	29.0	30	46.2	30.0	6	9.2	6.0
Centers	37	43	14	37.8	32.6	22	59.5	51.2	1	2.7	2.3
Homes	28	57	15	53.6	26.3	8	28.6	14.0	5	17.9	8.8
Rest of RI	54	110	11	20.4	10.0	43	79.6	39.1	0	0.0	0.0
Centers	50	74	10	20.0	13.5	40	80.0	54.1	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	4	36	1	25.0	2.8	3	75.0	8.3	0	0.0	0.0

Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 31

Possibility of Program Closure*Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Possibility of Closing the Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type*

	No. Served Families	No. Respondents	Yes, It's Possible the Program Will Close				Maybe It's Possible the Program Will Close				No, It's Not Possible the Program Will Close				Missing		
			n	% Served Families	% Respondents	Total Child Capacity	n	% Served Families	% Respondents	Total Child Capacity	n	% Served Families	% Respondents	Total Child Capacity	n	% Served Families	% Respondents
All	197	366	52	26.4	14.2	897	30	15.2	8.2	886	109	55.3	29.8	7469	6	3.0	1.6
Centers	104	142	8	7.7	5.6	602	11	10.6	7.7	755	84	80.8	59.2	7305	1	1.0	0.7
Providence	17	25	2	11.8	8.0	209	1	5.9	4.0	32	14	82.4	56.0	1658	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	37	43	0	0.0	0.0	0	6	16.2	14.0	502	30	81.1	69.8	2783	1	2.7	2.3
Rest of RI	50	74	6	12.0	8.1	393	4	8.0	5.4	221	40	80.0	54.1	2864	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	93	224	44	47.3	19.6	295	19	20.4	8.5	131	25	26.9	11.2	164	5	5.4	2.2
Providence	61	131	30	49.2	22.9	198	17	27.9	13.0	119	14	23.0	10.7	94	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	28	57	12	42.9	21.1	82	2	7.1	3.5	12	9	32.1	15.8	58	5	17.9	8.8
Rest of RI	4	36	2	50.0	5.6	15	0	0.0	0.0	0	2	50.0	5.6	12	0	0.0	0.0

Source : R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 32

Possibility of Program Closure*Impact of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Possibility of Closing the Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata*

	No. Served Families	No. Respondents	Yes, It's Possible the Program Will Close				Maybe It's Possible the Program Will Close				No, It's Not Possible the Program Will Close				Missing		
			n	% Served Families	% Respondents	Total Child Capacity	n	% Served Families	% Respondents	Total Child Capacity	n	% Served Families	% Respondents	Total Child Capacity	n	% Served Families	% Respondents
All	197	366	52	26.4	14.2	897	30	15.2	8.2	886	109	55.3	29.8	7469	6	3.0	1.6
Providence	78	156	32	41.0	20.5	407	18	23.1	11.5	151	28	35.9	17.9	1752	0	0.0	0.0
Centers	17	25	2	11.8	8.0	209	1	5.9	4.0	32	14	82.4	56.0	1658	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	61	131	30	49.2	22.9	198	17	27.9	13.0	119	14	23.0	10.7	94	0	0.0	0.0
6 Other Urban	65	100	12	18.5	12.0	82	8	12.3	8.0	514	39	60.0	39.0	2841	6	9.2	6.0
Centers	37	43	0	0.0	0.0	0	6	16.2	14.0	502	30	81.1	69.8	2783	1	2.7	2.3
Homes	28	57	12	42.9	21.1	82	2	7.1	3.5	12	9	32.1	15.8	58	5	17.9	8.8
Rest of RI	54	110	8	14.8	7.3	408	4	7.4	3.6	221	42	77.8	38.2	2876	0	0.0	0.0
Centers	50	74	6	12.0	8.1	393	4	8.0	5.4	221	40	80.0	54.1	2864	0	0.0	0.0
Homes	4	36	2	50.0	5.6	15	0	0.0	0.0	0	2	50.0	5.6	12	0	0.0	0.0

Source : R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Table 33

Cities/Towns of Families*Rhode Island Cities/Towns of Interviewed and Non-Interviewed Families*

	Interviewed Families		Non-Interviewed Families	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Barrington	0	0.0	1	0.8
Bristol	1	0.8	0	0.0
Central Falls	2	1.6	3	2.4
Coventry	5	3.9	3	2.4
Cranston	24	18.9	20	16.0
Cumberland	1	0.8	0	0.0
E. Providence	17	13.4	12	9.6
Harrisville	1	0.8	0	0.0
Hope Valley	2	1.6	2	1.6
Jamestown	0	0.0	1	0.8
Johnston	1	0.8	3	2.4
Middletown	4	3.1	0	0.0
N. Kingstown	4	3.1	1	0.8
N. Providence	0	0.0	1	0.8
N. Scituate	0	0.0	1	0.8
Newport	4	3.1	10	8.0
Oakland	1	0.8	0	0.0
Pascoag	1	0.8	0	0.0
Pawtucket	14	11.0	12	9.6
Portsmouth	0	0.0	1	0.8
Providence	21	16.5	23	18.4
Richmond	0	0.0	1	0.8
Riverside	3	2.4	3	2.4
Rumford	1	0.8	1	0.8
Scituate	1	0.8	0	0.0
Warwick	2	1.6	7	5.6
W. Warwick	3	2.4	9	7.2
Westerly	3	2.4	1	0.8
Woonsocket	6	4.7	3	2.4
Missing	5	3.9	6	4.8
Total	127	100.0	125	100.0

Source : R2LP database as of July 1, 2008.

Table 34

Families' Characteristics*Demographic Characteristics of Participating Families*

	<i>n</i>	%
Total	111	100.0
Education		
Grade 7 through 9	3	2.7
Grade 10 or 11	6	5.4
High school diploma/GED	54	48.6
Vocational less than 2 years	5	4.5
Associate (AA, AS)	16	14.4
Baccalaureate (BA, BS)	12	10.8
Master's (MA, MS)	3	2.7
Professional (MD, DDS, JD)	1	0.9
Other	10	9.0
Missing	1	0.9
Spanish, Hispanic or Latino		
Yes	28	25.2
No	80	72.1
Missing	3	2.7
Race		
African-American or Black	15	13.5
Asian	0	0.0
Native American, American Indian or Alaska Native	4	3.6
Native Hawai'ian or Other Pacific Islander	1	0.9
White	64	57.7
Other	28	25.2
Marital Status		
Married	10	10.5
Living in marriage-like relationship	8	8.4
Separated	19	20.0
Divorced	12	12.6
Never married	45	47.4
Missing	1	1.1

Note. Participants could identify their race using as many categories as they wished. Marital status questions were posed only to respondents who lost some or all of their child care subsidy ($n = 95$).

Source: R2LP database as of July 1, 2008.

Table 35

Family Relationships

Relationship Between Family Participant and Child(ren) Who Lost Subsidy and Did Not Lose Subsidy

	<i>n</i>	%
Total	111	100.0
Lost some or all of subsidy		
Aunt	1	0.9
Father	3	2.7
Foster mother	1	0.9
Mother	86	77.5
Uncle	1	0.9
Missing	3	2.7
Did not lose subsidy		
Cousin	1	0.9
Foster mother	1	0.9
Grandmother	1	0.9
Mother	13	11.7

Source : R2LP database as of July 1, 2008.

Table 36

Families' Subsidies and Co-Payments*Participating Families' Receipt of Subsidy and Co-Payments*

		<i>n</i>	%
Total		95	100.0
Receive any subsidy now?			
	Yes	21	22.1
	No	73	76.8
	Missing	1	1.1
Pay a co-payment now?			
	Yes	20	21.1
	No	1	1.1
Co-payment changed?			
	Increased	17	17.9
	Decreased	0	0.0
	Stayed the same	4	4.2

Source : R2LP database as of July 1, 2008.

Table 37

Children Who Lost Subsidy

Number and Ages of Children Who Lost Subsidy, and Type of Care

	Sum	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum
No. children in care before subsidy cut	165	1.75	0.84	1	5
Ages (years) of children in care before cut		5.97	3.29	1	16
No. children in full-time care <i>before</i> cut	86	0.92	0.77	0	3
No. children in full-time care <i>after</i> cut	53	0.56	0.70	0	2
No. children in part-time care <i>before</i> cut	12	0.13	0.37	0	2
No. children in part-time care <i>after</i> cut	20	0.21	0.46	0	2
No. children in after-school care <i>before</i> cut	75	0.80	0.91	0	4
No. children in after-school care <i>after</i> cut	55	0.58	0.82	0	3
No. children in child care center <i>before</i> cut	115	1.22	0.88	0	4
No. children in child care center <i>after</i> cut	76	0.81	0.82	0	4
No. children in home-based care <i>before</i> cut	26	0.28	0.81	0	5
No. children in home-based care <i>after</i> cut	22	0.23	0.69	0	5
No. children in Head Start <i>before</i> cut	4	0.04	0.25	0	2
No. children in Head Start <i>after</i> cut	2	0.02	0.14	0	1
No. children with paid other <i>before</i> cut	1	0.01	0.10	0	1
No. children with paid other <i>after</i> cut	6	0.06	0.32	0	2
No. children with unpaid other <i>before</i> cut	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
No. children with unpaid other <i>after</i> cut	9	0.09	0.36	0	2
No. children at home with parent <i>before</i> cut	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
No. children at home with parent <i>after</i> cut	6	0.06	0.32	0	2
No. children at home alone <i>before</i> cut	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
No. children at home alone <i>after</i> cut	1	0.01	0.10	0	1
No. children in other care <i>before</i> cut	20	0.21	0.60	0	3
No. children in other care <i>after</i> cut	16	0.17	0.52	0	3

Note. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation.

Source: R2LP database as of July 1, 2008.

Table 38

Perceptions of Children's Development

Family Participants' Perceptions of Children's Development and Home Environment

	<i>n</i>	%
Total	95	100.0
Change in child(ren)'s nutrition?		
Yes	25	26.3
No	69	72.6
Missing	1	1.1
Change in child(ren)'s friendships?		
Yes	47	49.5
No	47	49.5
Missing	1	1.1
Change in child(ren)'s emotional well-being?		
Yes	33	34.7
No	59	62.1
Don't know	1	1.1
Missing	2	2.1
Change in child(ren)'s learning?		
Yes	31	32.6
No	63	66.3
Missing	1	1.1
Change in readiness for kindergarten?		
Total possible respondents	60	100.0
Yes	22	36.7
No	34	56.7
Don't know	2	3.3
Missing	2	3.3
Change in preparedness to succeed in school?		
Total possible respondents	59	100.0
Yes	18	30.5
No	37	62.7
Don't know	1	1.7
Missing	3	5.1
Change in quality of time?		
Better	13	13.7
Worse	24	25.3
Has not changed	54	56.8
Don't know	1	1.1
Missing	3	3.2
Change in level of stress at home?		
Better	3	3.2
Worse	69	72.6
Has not changed	22	23.2
Missing	1	1.1

Source : R2LP database as of July 1, 2008.

Table 39

Impact on Families' Employment*Impact on Family Participants' Employment*

	Participant		Participant's Spouse or Partner	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Total	95	100.0	18	100.0
In paid job before subsidy cut?				
Yes	87	91.6	16	88.9
No	7	7.4	2	11.1
Missing	1	1.1		
Stopped working after cut?				
Total possible respondents	87	100.0	16	100.0
Yes	11	12.6	0	0.0
No	76	87.4	16	100.0
Changed work hours after cut?				
Total possible respondents	76	100.0	16	100.0
Yes	39	51.3	6	37.5
No	37	48.7	10	62.5
Got additional job after cut?				
Total possible respondents	76	100.0	16	100.0
Yes	17	22.4	2	12.5
No	58	76.3	14	87.5
Missing	1	1.3		
Started working for pay after cut?				
Total possible respondents	7	100.0	2	100.0
Yes	1	14.3	0	0.0
No	5	71.4	2	100.0
Missing	1	14.3		
Experienced stress at work after cut?				
Total possible respondents	77	100.0	16	100.0
Yes	51	66.2	8	50.0
No	24	31.2	8	50.0
Don't know	2	2.6		

Note. Questions were posed about the participant's spouse or partner's employment if the participant responded to the question about marital status by stating s/he was married or living in a marriage-like relationship as of September 1, 2007.

Source: R2LP database as of July 1, 2008.

Table 40

Impact on Families' Finances

Impact on Family Participants' Finances

	<i>n</i>	%
Total	95	100.0
Had trouble meeting important living expenses after cut?		
Yes	62	65.3
No	31	32.6
Missing	2	2.1
Paid for health insurance before cut?		
Yes	44	46.3
No	50	52.6
Missing	1	1.1
Paid for health insurance after cut?		
Yes	56	58.9
No	38	40.0
Missing	1	1.1
Pay for health insurance now?		
Yes	56	58.9
No	38	40.0
Missing	1	1.1
Change in health insurance payments from before to after cut?		
Yes	22	23.2
No	69	72.6
Missing	4	4.2

Source: R2LP database as of July 1, 2008.

Table 41


Perceptions of Child Care

Family Participants' Perceptions of Current Child Care Situations

	<i>n</i>	%
Total	95	100.0
Safety of current child care situation		
Safer	8	8.4
Less safe	18	18.9
No different	68	71.6
Missing	1	1.1
Stability of current child care situation		
More stable	7	7.4
Less stable	29	30.5
No different	57	60.0
Missing	2	2.1
Reliability of current child care situation		
More reliable	7	7.4
Less reliable	25	26.3
No different	60	63.2
Missing	3	3.2
Child(ren)'s relationship with provider		
Better	10	10.5
Worse	10	10.5
No different	68	71.6
Missing	7	7.4
Overall quality of current child care situation		
Better	8	8.4
Worse	23	24.2
No different	60	63.2
Don't know	1	1.1
Missing	3	3.2

Source : R2LP database as of July 1, 2008.


Figure 1. Child Care Provider Survey Response Rates, by Provider Type



Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Child Care Provider


Figure 2. Child Care Provider Survey Response Rates, by Strata



Source: R2LP CCSC database as of May 8, 2008.


Stratum

Figure 3. Language of Surveys Administered to Child Care Providers Who Responded to the Introductory Question, by Provider Type




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 4. Language of Surveys Administered to Child Care Providers Who Responded to the Introductory Question, by Strata



Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.


Figure 5. Proportion of Child Care Providers Who Responded to the Introductory Question and Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type



Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.


Child Care Provider

Figure 6. Proportion of Child Care Providers Who Responded to the Introductory Question and Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts, by Strata



Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.


Figure 7. Estimates of Population Proportions for Licensed Centers in Rhode Island, with 95% Confidence Intervals



Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.


Provider Survey Question

Figure 8. Estimates of Population Proportions for Licensed Homes in Rhode Island, with 95% Confidence Intervals




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 9. Impact Ratings of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 10. Impact Ratings of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents, by Provider Type




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 11. Impact Ratings of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 12. Impact Ratings of the Child Care Subsidy Cuts on the Programs of Child Care Provider Respondents, by Strata




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 13. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Laid Off Employees After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 14. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Laid Off Employees After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type




Source: CCSC database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 15. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Laid Off Employees After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 16. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Laid Off Employees After the Child Care Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata



Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.


Figure 17. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Reduced Staff Working Hours After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type



Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.


Child Care Provider

Figure 18. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Reduced Staff Working Hours After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 19. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Reduced Staff Working Hours After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 20. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Reduced Staff Working Hours After the Child Care Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 21. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Cut Back Program Services After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 22. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Cut Back Program Services After the Child Care Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 23. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Cut Back Program Services After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 24. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Cut Back Program Services After the Child Care Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 25. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Imposed New Fees on Families After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 26. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Imposed New Fees on Families After the Child Care Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 27. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Imposed New Fees on Families After the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 28. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Imposed New Fees on Families After the Child Care Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata



Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.


Figure 29. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Responded "Yes" When Asked If the Financial Viability of Their Programs Was Hurt by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type



Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Child Care Provider


Figure 30. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Responded "Yes" When Asked If the Financial Viability of Their Programs Was Hurt by the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type



Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.


Child Care Provider

Figure 31. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Responded "Yes" When Asked If the Financial Viability of Their Programs Was Hurt by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 32. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Responded "Yes" When Asked If the Financial Viability of Their Programs Was Hurt by the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 33. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Stated Their Program Quality Had Suffered Since the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type




Source: R2LP CCSC database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 34. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Stated Their Program Quality Had Suffered Since the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Provider Type




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 35. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Stated Their Program Quality Had Suffered Since the Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 36. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Stated Their Program Quality Had Suffered Since the Child Care Subsidy Cuts Went Into Effect, by Strata




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 37. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Reported It is Possible They Will Close Their Programs Due to the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 38. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Reported It is Possible They Will Close Their Programs Due to the Child Care Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 39. Proportions of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Reported It is Possible They Will Close Their Programs Due to the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 40. Proportion of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Reported It is Possible They Will Close Their Programs Due to the Child Care Subsidy Cuts, by Strata




Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 41. Total Child Capacity of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Reported It is Possible They Will Close Their Programs Due to the Subsidy Cuts, by Provider Type



Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.

Figure 42. Total Child Capacity of Child Care Provider Respondents Who Served Families Affected by the Child Care Subsidy Cuts and Who Reported It is Possible They Will Close Their Programs Due to the Subsidy Cuts, by Strata



Source: R2LP database as of May 8, 2008.