



COLORADO
Department of Human Services

***FY 2017-18
Annual Report
on the
Colorado Child Care Assistance Program***

Submitted to

Senate Health and Human Services Committee
House Public Health Care and Human Services Committee

December 1, 2018

by

Colorado Department of Human Services
Office of Early Childhood
Division of Early Care and Learning

**Colorado Child Care Assistance Program
FY 2017-18 Annual Report**

The Department of Human Services is submitting the following report on House Bill 14-1317 and the Colorado Child Care Assistance Program (CCCAP) in accordance with 26-2-809, C.R.S.:

(1) On or before December 1, 2016, and on or before December 1 each year thereafter, the state department shall prepare a report on CCCAP. The state department shall provide the report to the public healthcare and human services committee of the House of Representatives and the health and human services committee of the Senate, or any successor committees. The report must include, at a minimum, the following information related to benchmarks of success for CCCAP:

(a) The number of children and families served through CCCAP statewide and by county;

(b) The average length of time that parents remain in the workforce while receiving CCCAP subsidies, even when their income increases;

(c) The average number of months of uninterrupted, continuous care for children enrolled in CCCAP;

(d) The number and percent of all children enrolled in CCCAP who receive care at each level of the state's quality and improvement rating system;

(e) The average length of time a family is authorized for a CCCAP subsidy, disaggregated by recipients' eligible activities, such as job search, employment, workforce training, and postsecondary education;

(f) The number of families on each county's wait list as of November 1 of each year, as well as the average length of time each family remains on the wait list in each county;

(g) The number of families and children statewide and by county that exit CCCAP due to their family incomes exceeding the eligibility limits;

(h) The number of families and children statewide and by county that re-enter CCCAP within two years of exiting due to their family incomes exceeding the eligibility limits; and

(i) An estimate of unmet need for CCCAP in each county and throughout the state based on estimates of the number of children and families who are likely to be eligible for CCCAP in each county but who are not enrolled in CCCAP.

Background and Program Description:

The Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS), Division of Early Care and Learning is the lead agency for the administration of the Colorado Child Care Assistance Program (CCCAP). The program provides child care assistance to low-income families who are income eligible and are employed, searching for employment, are in post-secondary education or training; families who receive TANF basic cash assistance and/or state diversion and need child care services to support their efforts toward self-sufficiency; and families that have an open child welfare case.

The Colorado Child Care Assistance Program is administered through local County Departments of Human Services under the direction of the CDHS, Division of Early Care and Learning. During FY 2017-18, counties set the income eligibility limits for families, but were required to serve families who had an income of 165% or less of the federal poverty level and could not serve families who had an income of over 85% of the State median income.

The funding sources for the Colorado Child Care Assistance Program are a mixture of federal, state, and county dollars. The State must adhere to federal regulations of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF). In addition to CCCAP, CCDF funds a variety of services and programs that are administered by the State. Specifically, CCDF supports child care licensing, Colorado Shines (the State's quality rating and improvement system), early childhood mental health services, and various child care quality initiatives. Additionally, CCDF funds are critical to support the maintenance of the Child Care Automated Tracking System (CHATS). The State reports how CCCAP is administered every three years to the federal government through the Colorado State Plan for CCDF Services.

Purpose:

Pursuant to House Bill 14-1317, CDHS has authored this report to the Senate Health and Human Services Committee and the House Public Health Care and Human Services Committee of the Colorado General Assembly. The purpose of this report is to provide information and data about the Department's implementation of this legislation. On December 1st of each year, CDHS is required to report on the data included below.

FY 2017-18 Utilization Data:

The numbers contained in the report were obtained from the Colorado Child Care Automated Tracking System (CHATS) and Colorado Shines Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS). Throughout this report, these will be referenced as the CHATS and QRIS, respectively.

a) The number of children and families served through CCCAP statewide and by county

- 28,662¹ = the unduplicated count of children who utilized CCCAP at any point during the fiscal year.
- 17,924 = the unduplicated count of cases² with at least one child utilizing care during the fiscal year.

Program Type	Child Count	Case Count
Low Income Child Care	22624	13807
TANF Child Care	7489	4427
Child Welfare Child Care	2514	1815

County	Low Income Child Care		TANF Child Care		Child Welfare Child Care	
	Child Count	Case Count	Child Count	Case Count	Child Count	Case Count
Adams	2592	1532	684	363	306	217
Alamosa	184	114	66	44	14	10
Arapahoe	2985	1703	1036	567	198	149
Archuleta	21	17	6	5	5	5
Baca	13	7	0	0	0	0
Bent	22	13	13	8	1	1
Boulder	1131	739	374	214	153	113
Broomfield	165	97	23	12	26	22
Chaffee	29	21	9	5	5	5
Cheyenne	8	3	1	1	0	0
Clear Creek	18	16	3	3	8	7
Conejos	43	27	5	4	0	0
Costilla	19	10	1	1	5	4

¹ This count represents all children who utilized care at least one time between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018. Care is "utilized" if it was paid for using CCCAP subsidy dollars or parental copay.

² Cases represent families/households.

County	Low Income Child Care		TANF Child Care		Child Welfare Child Care	
	Child Count	Case Count	Child Count	Case Count	Child Count	Case Count
Crowley	14	8	14	8	1	1
Custer	6	3	0	0	3	2
Delta	183	101	14	8	27	21
Denver	3802	2336	1457	874	226	166
Dolores	1	1	0	0	3	3
Douglas	299	189	28	17	27	23
Eagle	232	159	12	7	13	10
El Paso	3426	1973	1202	699	493	325
Elbert	38	30	3	2	0	0
Fremont	331	182	87	49	2	2
Garfield	224	157	24	18	6	6
Gilpin	32	22	3	2	1	1
Grand	37	23	6	3	1	1
Gunnison	33	22	10	7	7	6
Hinsdale	3	1	4	1	0	0
Huerfano	30	19	3	2	9	6
Jackson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson	1622	992	491	302	142	100
Kiowa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kit Carson	1	1	0	0	1	1
La Plata	133	88	55	38	21	16
Lake	16	11	8	6	3	3
Larimer	848	515	564	326	185	152
Las Animas	144	93	26	19	20	11
Lincoln	1	1	0	0	4	1
Logan	124	78	29	17	56	41
Mesa	1010	583	358	196	99	77
Mineral	3	2	0	0	0	0
Moffat	16	11	12	8	3	1
Montezuma	162	108	36	22	17	12
Montrose	313	193	37	27	36	28
Morgan	87	46	24	10	26	18
Otero	71	38	10	7	14	11
Ouray	7	4	0	0	0	0
Park	24	18	11	6	3	3
Phillips	24	14	2	1	0	0

County	Low Income Child Care		TANF Child Care		Child Welfare Child Care	
	Child Count	Case Count	Child Count	Case Count	Child Count	Case Count
Pitkin	38	25	3	2	0	0
Prowers	58	34	34	17	29	16
Pueblo	928	509	433	250	75	51
Rio Blanco	6	4	3	2	3	3
Rio Grande	99	48	19	12	13	10
Routt	49	43	9	7	6	3
Saguache	13	7	6	2	4	2
San Juan	0	0	2	1	0	0
San Miguel	21	13	2	1	1	1
Sedgwick	22	14	0	0	0	0
Summit	99	70	12	6	1	1
Teller	108	66	20	12	11	8
Washington	22	13	12	8	5	3
Weld	1039	624	367	197	195	133
Yuma	23	16	2	1	5	3

b) The average length of time that parents remain in the workforce while receiving CCCAP subsidies, even when their income increases

- 7 months³ = The average length of time that a parent utilized CCCAP when declaring employment as their eligible activity over the fiscal year.

c) The average number of months of uninterrupted, continuous care for children enrolled in CCCAP

- 6.75 months = The average number of months that children received continuous, uninterrupted care over the fiscal year.

d) The number and percent of all children enrolled in CCCAP who receive care at each level of the State's quality and improvement rating system

- 16,511 = The total unduplicated number of children utilizing care at least one time between June 1, 2018 and June 30, 2018.

³ This number is an average of the *total months* that parents used child care over the 12 month period. This number does not represent consecutive/continuous months of care.

- Table 3 below displays the number and percent of children utilizing care at each level of the Colorado Shines Quality Rating and Improvement System in June 2018⁴. These counts may be duplicated across rating level because children may attend multiple facilities. Percentages are based on the unique count of children utilizing care in the month.

Table 3: Care Utilization by Colorado Shines Quality Rating Level		
Colorado Shines Quality Rating Level	Child Count	Percent
Level 1	1802	10.9%
Level 2	4277	25.9%
Level 3	3258	19.7%
Level 4	5185	31.4%
Level 5	187	1.1%
No Rating ⁵	1990	12.1%

- e) The average length of time a family is authorized for a CCCAP subsidy, disaggregated by recipients' eligible activities, such as job search, employment, workforce training, and postsecondary education

Table 4 below displays the average length of authorized time disaggregated by activity. Families are able to transition between authorized activities, and they may be able to retain care during this transition. This table shows the average length of time families are *authorized for this activity*, though they may be authorized for longer periods as their activity changes.

⁴ This count is a monthly utilization count because quality ratings change over the course of the year. The count reflects the rating level at the time of service.

⁵ Some child care providers are not currently eligible for Colorado Shines ratings including (but not limited to): School Age Child Care facilities and Qualified Exempt Child Care Providers.

<u>Table 4: Average Length of Care Authorization by Eligible Activity</u>	
Activity	Average Number of Months
Employed	7
Education	6
Job Search	3.5
Workforce Training	4.5

- f) The number of families on each county's wait list as of November 1 of each year, as well as the average length of time each family remains on the wait list in each county
- Table 5 displays the number of children and families who were on a waitlist as well as the average number of days that families had been on the waitlist as of November 1, 2018.

<u>Table 5: Waitlist Data by County (November 1, 2018)</u>		
County	Case Count	Average number of days on waitlist
Boulder	456	265
Douglas	21	389
El Paso	1	244
Grand	5	501
Gunnison	5	97
Larimer	116	165
Routt	10	87
Summit	10	154
Statewide	624	247

g) The number of families and children statewide and by county that exit CCCAP due to their family income exceeding the eligibility limits

- Table 6 displays the number of cases that have closed during FY 2017-18 due to the family exceeding income eligibility limits (i.e. county limits or federal limit)

Table 6: Case Closures by County			
County	Case Closures	County	Case Closures
Adams	115	Larimer	127
Alamosa	4	Las Animas	8
Arapahoe	323	Logan	8
Archuleta	2	Mesa	45
Bent	1	Moffat	4
Boulder	81	Montezuma	5
Broomfield	32	Montrose	15
Chaffee	6	Morgan	9
Clear Creek	1	Otero	3
Conejos	1	Park	7
Delta	9	Phillips	1
Denver	189	Pitkin	8
Douglas	77	Prowers	3
Eagle	40	Pueblo	19
El Paso	260	Routt	8
Elbert	1	Saguache	1
Fremont	15	San Miguel	1
Garfield	22	Sedgwick	1
Grand	12	Summit	16
Gunnison	4	Teller	4
Jefferson	225	Weld	117
La Plata	13	Yuma	1
Lake	3		
		Grand Total	1850

- h) The number of families and children statewide and by county that re-enter CCCAP within two years of exiting due to their family incomes exceeding the eligibility limits
- Table 7 displays the number of cases that closed during FY 2015-16 (i.e. between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016) due to income ineligibility⁶ and reopened within two years of the closure date (i.e. between July 2016-June 2018).
 - 941 cases closed between July 2015 and June 2016 for income ineligibility.
 - Of those, 57 cases utilized CCCAP care within 2 years after the closure date.

Table 7: Number of Cases that Closed due to Income Ineligibility & Reopened within Two Years of Closure Date	
County	Case Count
Adams	1
Alamosa	1
Arapahoe	38
Boulder	8
Broomfield	1
Denver	5
Douglas	4
El Paso	2
Fremont	1
Jefferson	9
Mesa	5
Weld	2
Total	77

- i) An estimate of unmet need for CCCAP in each county and throughout the state based on estimates of the number of children and families who are likely to be eligible for CCCAP in each county but who are not enrolled in CCCAP.

⁶ The family's income exceeded the (county and/or federal) income eligibility requirement.

HB18-1335 substantially changed the way that CCCAP defines the unmet need by setting criteria for income eligibility thresholds at the State level, rather than allowing counties to determine their own eligibility levels within Federal and State defined ranges. The Department is currently in the process of promulgating rules per HB18-1335. As of the drafting of this report, the proposed rules include three income eligibility thresholds: 185% FPL, 225% FPL and 265% FPL.

This approach is intended to standardize income eligibility while recognizing that poverty looks different in different communities as some areas are more expensive than others. To do so, it expresses the Self-Sufficiency Standard (SSS) (excluding child care expenses) as a percentage of the Federal Poverty Level. The Self-Sufficiency Standard defines the amount of income necessary to meet basic needs, including taxes, without public subsidies and without private or informal supports. As such, this approach attempts to standardize the entry level to families' experience of poverty as it relates to the amount of money it takes to be self-sufficient in a given county, an amount that varies with the costs of basic needs. Counties are then grouped into three levels that resemble natural breaks in the data: 185% FPL, 225% FPL and 265% FPL.

These thresholds define the population that is income eligible for CCCAP. To estimate the need, a target population is set at 31.1% of the total population reflecting the percentage of the general population served in an organized care facility or a family child care home (Laughlin, 2013). In other words, by providing child care subsidies we hope to help low income families overcome the price of care as a barrier and to access care at a level equal to the general population - approximately 31.1%.

To identify the unmet need, these targets are compared to the unique number of children served. For this analysis, CDHS identified all children who received any CCCAP care at least once during FY 2017-18 as a child served. These data, along with the total fiscally eligible population and the target population are provided by county in Table 6 below, with the percentage of each county's target number approximating the percentage of the need met.

Table 6: Estimated Portion of Need Met

County	SSS Tier	Total Fisc. Elig. Pop.	Target Pop @ 31.1%	Unique Children Served	% Target Served (Est. Need Met)	County	SSS Tier	Total Fisc. Elig. Pop.	Target Pop @ 31.1%	Unique Children Served	% Target Served (Est. Need Met)
Adams	225%	46,335	14,410	3,264	22.7%	Kit Carson	185%	522	162	2	1.2%
Alamosa	185%	1,612	501	232	46.3%	La Plata	185%	2,263	704	196	27.8%
Arapahoe	225%	41,422	12,882	3,673	28.5%	Lake	225%	600	187	25	13.4%
Archuleta	185%	876	272	28	10.3%	Larimer	185%	12,121	3,770	1,318	35.0%
Baca	185%	332	103	13	12.6%	Las Animas	185%	564	175	179	102.1%
Bent	185%	349	109	34	31.3%	Lincoln	185%	279	87	5	5.8%
Boulder	265%	14,791	4,600	1,490	32.4%	Logan	185%	1,420	442	199	45.1%
Broomfield	265%	2,667	829	202	24.4%	Mesa	185%	10,362	3,223	1,293	40.1%
Chaffee	185%	857	267	40	15.0%	Mineral	185%	13	4	3	74.2%
Cheyenne	185%	151	47	9	19.2%	Moffat	185%	767	239	30	12.6%
Clear Creek	225%	308	96	28	29.2%	Montezuma	185%	2,273	707	191	27.0%
Conejos	185%	788	245	46	18.8%	Montrose	185%	3,202	996	347	34.8%
Costilla	185%	364	113	25	22.1%	Morgan	185%	2,477	770	129	16.7%
Crowley	185%	313	97	29	29.8%	Otero	185%	1,926	599	90	15.0%
Custer	185%	328	102	9	8.8%	Ouray	225%	161	50	7	14.0%
Delta	185%	1,814	564	209	37.0%	Park	265%	872	271	38	14.0%
Denver	225%	50,750	15,783	4,936	31.3%	Phillips	185%	362	113	24	21.3%
Dolores	185%	207	64	3	4.7%	Pitkin	265%	473	147	40	27.2%
Douglas	265%	10,229	3,181	316	9.9%	Prowers	185%	1,100	342	108	31.6%
Eagle	225%	3,059	951	246	25.9%	Pueblo	185%	13,093	4,072	1,248	30.6%
Elbert	225%	657	204	39	19.1%	Rio Blanco	185%	366	114	12	10.5%
El Paso	185%	39,308	12,225	4,260	34.8%	Rio Grande	185%	809	252	115	45.7%
Fremont	185%	2,391	744	394	53.0%	Routt	265%	870	271	59	21.8%
Garfield	225%	5,293	1,646	235	14.3%	Saguache	185%	635	197	17	8.6%
Gilpin	225%	230	72	36	50.3%	San Juan	185%	10	3	2	64.3%
Grand	185%	455	142	42	29.7%	San Miguel	225%	349	109	24	22.1%
Gunnison	225%	802	249	45	18.0%	Sedgwick	185%	157	49	22	45.1%
Hinsdale	185%	48	15	4	26.8%	Summit	265%	1,070	333	111	33.4%
Huerfano	185%	373	116	36	31.0%	Teller	185%	662	206	128	62.2%
Jackson	185%	87	27	-	0.0%	Washington	185%	269	84	34	40.6%
Jefferson	225%	23,245	7,229	2,068	28.6%	Weid	185%	18,922	5,885	1,439	24.5%
Kiowa	185%	125	39	-	0.0%	Yuma	185%	1,130	351	30	8.5%
STATEWIDE							n/a	330,665	102,837	29,456	28.6%