




2015 Arkansas Child Care

Market Price Summary

Lorraine McKelvey, PhD

Melanie Chapin-Critz



Prepared for Arkansas Division of Child Care and Early Childhood Education

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
Introduction	3
Market Price Study	3
<i>Data Source</i>	3
<i>Program Characteristics and Market Price Data Representativeness</i>	4
<i>Price per Child Care Slot</i>	4
Center-Based Programs	5
Family Child Care Homes	6
<i>Tiered Reimbursement Rates</i>	6
<i>Geographic Locations</i>	7
Center-Based Programs	8
Family Child Care Homes	8
Discussion.....	9
References	11
Appendix A: Average Cluster Membership by USDA Urban/Rural Classification.....	12
Appendix B: County Map of Average Cluster Membership	14

Executive Summary

This study reports the prices of child care across types of child care and age groups in Arkansas. Analysis was conducted by evaluators at the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences Research and Evaluation Division (RED) in the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine. The study provides information on the market prices for child care across child care submarkets; child age, program type, and geographic region. It also analyzes whether these prices fit well with the funding structure that the Arkansas Division of Child Care and Early Childhood Education (DCCECE) uses to reimburse child programs that serve children through the Child Care Development Fund (CCDF). The structure classifies two different rate sets based on urban and rural areas designated by USDA Economic Research Service.

DCCECE provided price data of 2447 child care programs. These data were collected by DCCECE administrative staff in 2015. The response rate calculated from the 2015 market price data is 70.8%. Because market price data were not available for at least 90% of the sample, we tested the representativeness of the data across child care submarkets. While there were no differences in having data reported from urban versus rural programs, there were significant differences in having data across the following submarkets: 1) center-based programs have more data than family child care homes; 2) programs that operate in the school year and all year have more data than summer only programs; 3) ABC programs have more data than those without ABC funding; 4) Better Beginnings programs have more data than those not in Better Beginnings; and 5) programs that take CCDF vouchers have more data than those that do not. As a result, RED weighted prices to address missing data. Prices were weighted in an effort to adjust the prices to provide more meaning to programs that were more likely to be missing data and who provide more care to private-pay children.

RED then analyzed market prices for different age groups (infant, toddler, preschool, and school age) in center based programs and family child care homes across geographic regions. In 2015, Arkansas set CCDF reimbursement rates to support programs in their efforts to provide high quality care. Accordingly, reimbursement rates are higher as quality levels increase. Findings from the market prices suggest that, at Level 2, programs are reimbursed at or very near the 75th percentile. At Level 2, programs have a quality visit which includes an environmental assessment where the state can be assured additional components of quality are present.

The second purpose of the study was to validate the use of the USDA rural/urban classifications used by the DCCECE to set market rates. RED conducted a cluster analysis for each age group and program type. For all age groups in both types of programs, clusters did not approximate the USDA rural/urban classifications but were significantly associated.

RED analyzed whether some counties were consistently misclassified. There are some urban counties that report consistently lower rates. Our conclusion is that a third rate may be warranted, but that rate would be lower for programs than what is currently implemented for reimbursement.

Introduction

In 2014-2015, the Arkansas Division of Child Care and Early Childhood Education (DCCECE) took steps to improve the quality of child care for children with high needs. These steps included:

1. **Initiating new requirements for programs that receive child care voucher reimbursements.** To receive reimbursements, programs must participate in Better Beginnings, the state's quality rating and improvement system for child care.
2. **Implementing a tiered system for voucher reimbursement rates.** Programs that are accredited at higher levels of Better Beginnings receive incrementally higher rates to provide care for children from qualifying families.
3. **Promulgating research-based regulations for state child care licensure.** The Arkansas legislature passed regulations that include lower child-teacher ratios and education requirements for child care directors. These regulations took effect January 1, 2015.

The purpose of this report is to provide DCCECE a 2015 Market Price Study¹. The Research and Evaluation Division of UAMS Family Medicine (RED) developed cost models for multiple child care submarkets in 2013 and 2014. These cost models were used to inform DCCECE on the rate structure for tiered reimbursement. The Market Price Study will inform DCCECE about the implemented rate structure.

Market Price Study

Data Source

DCCECE collects market price data as per day prices across multiple statuses (e.g., full-time, part-time, night and weekend care). Private tuition prices are provided at the initiation of licensing and are updated by licensing and child care development fund (CCDF) staff in the first trimester of each year². In addition to the use of prices for this and ongoing studies of private tuition rates, DCCECE publishes rates in the state child care search engine for parents³. Therefore, there is incentive for programs to reflect their current rates.

For the market price and cost modeling study, DCCECE provided RED data on all licensed facilities (including the type of program and number of children licensed to serve by child age), market prices, CCDF children by age and facility, state-funded program (e.g., Arkansas Better Chance for School Success, High Quality Preschool Program, etc.) children by age and facility. Further, RED attained data from the Head Start collaboration office on the number of children in Early Head Start and Head Start by facility. This permitted the calculation of an adjusted number of private pay slots for each facility by each childcare submarket (e.g., child age, type of care, and location).

¹Based on national recommendations (Grobe, Weber, Davis, Kreader, & Pratt, 2008), we use the terminology market price rather than market rate as this distinguishes the process of collecting/ analyzing price data from setting rates.

² In 2016, DCCECE will migrate to the licensing division as primarily responsible for the update of prices.

³ <https://dhs.arkansas.gov/dccece/cclas/facilitysearch.aspx>

Program Characteristics and Market Price Data Representativeness

The full population of programs provided to RED included 2447 programs; 407 licensed family child care homes (FCCH), 1816 center-based programs, and 20 registered child care family homes. Registered child care homes were excluded from analysis. Additionally, there were 204 programs where licensed capacity was 0, which we also excluded.

Although the data are administrative, the response rate calculated from the 2015 market price data is 70.8%. Because our market price data were not available for at least 90% of the sample, we tested the representativeness of the data across child care submarkets (Grobe, Weber, Davis, Kreader, & Pratt, 2008). Data were examined for outliers by age group. Outliers were winsorized, which rescales outliers to the next lowest or highest value in the distribution (Ghosh & Vogt, 2012).

Using data from all licensed programs, there were not significant differences in having data reported from: urban (71.3%) versus rural (70%) programs (see Geographic Locations section of report for more information); nor Early Head Start and Head Start (67.2%) versus programs with other types of funding (71.2%).

There were marginally or statistically significant differences in having data across the following submarkets:

- Center-based (71.8%) programs more likely to have data than FCCH (67.8%) programs ($\chi^2(2448,1)=3.54$; $p=.06$);
- Programs with ABC (77.3%) funding more likely to have data than ones without (69.2%; $\chi^2(2448,1)=11.93$; $p=.001$);
- Programs in Better Beginnings (77.5%) more likely to have data than ones not in the QRIS (61.4%; $\chi^2(2448,1)=74.09$; $p<.001$);
- Programs with CCDF agreements (76.9%) more likely to have data than ones without (65.3%; $\chi^2(2448,1)=39.58$; $p<.001$); and
- Programs that operate summer only programs are statistically less likely to have pricing data (13.4%) than school year (69.5%) and all year (76%) programs ($\chi^2(2448,2)=210.08$; $p<.001$).

Price per Child Care Slot

In addition to meeting national recommendations (Branscome, 2015; Grobe et al., 2008), differences in response rates for programs that receive state funding make it necessary to use sample weights. To compute sampling weights, each combination of the categories which significantly predicted having pricing data was calculated (i.e., each classification of program type, yearly schedule, ABC, Better Beginnings and voucher acceptance). Sample weights were computed as the ratio of the total percentage of programs in multiple sampling types by the percentage with pricing data.

Because the vast majority of programs in Arkansas receive state or federal support for children in their care (88.1%), we also weighted pricing by the number of private pay slots. For each age group and type of provider, an adjusted capacity number was estimated by reducing the licensed capacity by the number of children receiving support from state or federal funds. The purpose of calculating the price per private pay child care slot was to represent the actual prices available to

consumers in the community.

Prices were weighted in an effort to adjust the prices to provide more meaning to programs that were more likely to be missing data and who provide more care to private-pay children.

We provide full-time pricing data by age groups; however the response rates for summer only school-age programs are too small to conduct analyses. We also provide rates by provider type and geographic location as described in the geographic section below. Further, while recommendations (Branscome, 2015; Grobe et al., 2008) suggest treating large family child care homes as a separate type of care, the samples of FCCH programs in Arkansas is relatively small (N=407). RED examined the average pricing of small and large FCCH providers and there were no statistically significant differences in prices across age group by urban/rural geographic region defined by DCCECE (described in Geographic Locations section below). Therefore, small and large FCCH providers are combined for reporting.

Center-Based Programs

For center-based programs, sample weights and total age-group private pay capacity were used to weight care prices. Weighting prices by capacity is important for centers, which vary extremely by size. Total private pay age-group capacity data were used because age-group capacity used in conjunction with the prices of that age group most accurately reflects weighted prices for that particular age group. One limitation of the analyses is licensing combines capacity for infants and toddlers, so weighting of pricing for the infant and toddler full time rates are estimated off private pay capacity for both age groups.

Table 1. Center-Based Program Full-Time Prices by Submarket and Geographic Location

	Full Year Programs				School-Year Programs	
	Infant	Toddler	Preschool	School Age	Preschool	School Age
	RURAL					
Mean (SE)	19.26 (0.05)	18.69 (0.05)	17.28 (0.04)	15.64 (0.07)	14.53 (0.04)	14.20 (0.25)
Std Dev	3.79	3.96	3.51	3.23	3.09	2.54
Min	10.00	9.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	12.00
Max	30.00	34.00	28.00	25.00	26.00	20.00
50 th %ile	19.00	18.30	17.00	15.00	15.00	13.00
75 th %ile	21.00	20.00	19.00	17.00	16.50	16.00
90 th %ile	24.00	25.00	21.00	20.00	18.00	16.00
	URBAN					
Mean (SE)	24.78 (0.05)	23.66 (0.05)	21.13 (0.03)	19.83 (0.04)	17.22 (0.05)	15.30 (0.11)
Std Dev	5.63	5.19	4.42	4.22	4.59	3.57
Min	11.25	9.50	8.00	9.00	8.00	9.00
Max	35.00	34.00	28.00	27.00	28.00	25.00
50 th %ile	25.00	23.00	21.00	20.00	17.00	15.00
75 th %ile	28.40	26.40	24.00	22.30	21.00	17.00
90 th %ile	33.60	32.00	28.00	27.00	23.00	20.25

Family Child Care Homes

For FCCH providers, total capacity regardless of age of child served was used to weight care prices. Unlike centers that are licensed for a set capacity for each age group, FCCH providers are licensed for a total capacity. The vast majority (98%) of FCCH programs operate year-round.

Table 2. Family Child Care Full-Time Prices by Submarket and Geographic Location

	Infant	Toddler	Preschool	School Age
	RURAL			
Mean (SE)	17.60 (0.12)	16.94 (0.11)	16.32 (0.10)	15.54 (0.09)
Std. Dev	4.20	3.96	3.43	3.22
Min	10.00	10.00	10.00	8.00
Max	35.00	34.00	28.00	27.00
50 th %ile	17.00	16.00	15.50	15.00
75 th %ile	20.00	18.00	18.00	17.00
90 th %ile	23.00	22.00	20.00	20.00
	URBAN			
Mean (SE)	20.31 (0.13)	19.07 (0.11)	18.09 (0.10)	16.75 (0.11)
Std. Dev	4.80	4.14	3.78	3.96
Min	10.00	10.00	10.00	8.00
Max	35.00	34.00	28.00	27.00
50 th %ile	20.00	19.00	18.00	17.00
75 th %ile	25.00	20.00	20.00	19.00
90 th %ile	26.00	24.00	23.50	21.00

Tiered Reimbursement Rates

Tiered reimbursement rates for child care subsidies were set by DCCECE by geographic location and do not differ for center-based and family child care programs. Arkansas set CCDF reimbursement rates to support programs in their efforts to provide high quality care. Accordingly, reimbursement rates are higher as quality levels increase. Table 3 presents full-time rates for each level of the state’s child care Quality Rating and Improvement System, Better Beginnings.

Better Beginnings has three levels. Level 1 requires very limited improvement over minimum licensing with the passing of revised licensing standards in 2015. Further, Level 1 does not require additional program oversight beyond minimum licensing. Not all rates at Better Beginnings Level 1 meet the 75th percentile, however, the submarket where rates are lower are primarily preschool rates. High quality preschool for low-income families with preschoolers are available through additional funds. A recent report regarding preschool in Arkansas reported that 56% of low-income preschoolers are served in high quality settings using state or federal funds (38% and 18% are served through ABC and Head Start, respectively). At Level 2, programs have a quality visit that includes an environmental assessment. Findings from the market prices suggest that, at Level 2, programs are reimbursed at or very near the 75th percentile.

Table 3. Full-Time Rates and Full-Year Percentile* by Submarket and Geographic Location and Better Beginnings Level

Age Type	Level 1			Level 2			Level 3		
	Rate	Center %ile	FCCH %ile	Rate	Center %ile	FCCH %ile	Rate	Center %ile	FCCH %ile
RURAL									
Infant	\$21.05	75	83	\$22.11	83	84	\$24.21	90	91
Toddler	\$19.66	70	78	\$20.65	80	82	\$22.61	88	90
Preschool	\$17.40	63	71	\$18.27	74	73-80	\$20.01	78	83
School Age	\$16.53	63	66	\$17.36	75	77	\$19.01	80	86
URBAN									
Infant	\$28.56	75	95	\$29.98	82	96	\$32.84	85	98
Toddler	\$26.67	75	96	\$28.00	80	97	\$30.67	87	98
Preschool	\$23.60	72	88	\$24.78	77	91	\$27.14	83	97
School Age	\$22.42	75	91	\$23.54	79	92	\$25.78	87	98

*Approximated within the weighted distribution

Geographic Locations

In 2014-2015, DCCECE implemented an urban/rural geographic distinction for CCDF reimbursement. Counties within metro areas with populations under 250,000 (continuum codes 1, 2, or 3) were classified as urban based on the 2013 Rural-Urban Continuum Codes from the US Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service ("USDA Economic Research Service - Rural-Urban Continuum Codes," 2013). Although this method for population sampling is simple to understand and implement, market price study recommendations (Grobe, Weber, Davis, Kreader, & Pratt, 2008) note that there are limitations of using this classification (i.e., clusters are likely to contain more than one market within a geographic unit and not based on empirical evidence of price differences). This market price and cost modeling study will conduct analyses using a priori rural-urban distinctions. It will also examine whether there is empirical evidence of price differences across the regions.

RED conducted a two-step cluster analysis for each age group (IBM, 2001). The purpose of conducting a cluster analysis with the pricing data is to determine whether prices in the USDA geographic areas defined as urban and rural for the purpose of rate setting are appropriate. Cluster analysis groups programs that are similar based on the pricing structure using the pricing data themselves. To validate DCCECE's urban/rural rate structure, it would be ideal if number and membership of the clusters match the number and membership of the urban/rural classifications.

Cluster membership was determined based on the Schwarz's Bayesian Criterion or BIC. Analyses for all age groups include programs for which the number of children estimated as private pay was at least one. Further, for preschool and school age programs, year-round operation was required to be included in cluster analyses. The sample of summer only school age programs was too small to include. Goodness of fit of cluster results are reported using the average silhouette, a

measure of cohesion and separation of cluster. The higher the average silhouette, the better the model fits the data. Further, an average silhouette of .5 or greater represents a reasonable data structure.

Center-Based Programs

Infant Full-Time Prices. Cluster analysis returned 4 clusters (average silhouette=.7); groups with a lowest (M=15.56, SD=2.26), low-middle (M=20.18, SD=1.03), high-middle (M=25.18, SD=1.67), and high (M=32.35, SD=2.41) mean price structure. While the clusters did not replicate the urban/rural USDA classifications adopted by DCCECE, the two classifications were significantly associated ($\chi^2(604,2)=111.69$; $p<.001$). Cluster analysis results were stronger for rural than urban programs, with 84.4% of rural programs identified within the two lower infant full-time price groups (39.2% and 45.2% in lowest clusters), but only 61% of urban programs identified within the higher infant full-time price groups.

Toddler Full-Time Prices. Cluster analysis returned four clusters (average silhouette=.7); groups with a lowest (M=15.16, SD=2.24), low-middle (M=19.56, SD=0.99), high-middle (M=24.42, SD=1.77), and high (M=31.85, SD=1.90) mean price structure.. The clusters did not approximate the urban/rural USDA classifications adopted by DCCECE, but were significantly associated ($\chi^2(643,3)= 108.360$; $p<.001$). Again, results were stronger for rural than urban programs, with 86.6% of rural programs identified within the two lower infant full-time price groups (39.3% and 47.3% in lowest clusters), but only 56.5% of urban programs identified within the higher infant full-time price groups.

Preschool Full-Time Prices. Again, two-step cluster analysis returned two clusters (average silhouette=.7); a group with a low (M=18.04, SD=2.54) and high (M=25.91, SD=1.99) mean price structure. Again, clusters did not completely replicate the urban/rural USDA classifications adopted by DCCECE, but the two classifications were significantly associated ($\chi^2(685,1)=56.63$; $p<.001$). Cluster analysis results were stronger for rural than urban programs, where 93.5% of rural programs were identified within the lower preschool full-time price group, while 30.9% of urban programs were identified within the higher preschool full-time price group.

School-Age Full-Time Prices. Two-step cluster analysis returned three clusters (average silhouette=.7); a group with a low (M=15.73, SD=2.13), middle (M=20.27, SD=1.21), and high (M=26.04, SD=1.24) mean price structure. Again, the two classifications, the results from the cluster analysis and the DCCECE urban/rural distinction from the USDA, were significantly associated ($\chi^2(281,3)= 42.93$; $p<.001$). Cluster analysis results were stronger for rural than urban programs, where 75.9% of rural and 45.6% of urban programs were identified within the lowest price cluster.

Family Child Care Homes

Infant Full-Time Prices. Cluster analysis returned two clusters (average silhouette=.7); with low and high mean price structures. The clusters did not approximate the urban/rural USDA classifications adopted by DCCECE, but were significantly associated ($\chi^2(298,2)=23.10$; $p<.001$). Results were stronger for rural programs, where 72.8% were identified within the low price group. There was a greater variability with FCCH pricing in urban counties with 46% and 53% in the low and high price clusters.

Toddler Full-Time Prices. Cluster analysis returned three clusters (average silhouette=.7); a group with a low (M=14.94, SD=1.79), middle (M=19.29, SD=1.3), and high (M=24.74, SD=2.14) mean price structures. The clusters did not approximate the urban/rural USDA classifications adopted by DCCECE, but were significantly associated ($\chi^2(302,2)=37.34$; $p<.001$). For rural programs, 65.5% were identified within the lowest price group and another 26.4% were identified in the middle price cluster. In urban counties, the largest percentage (47%) was identified in the middle price cluster, with another 32% and 21% in the low and high price groups, respectively.

Preschool Full-Time Prices. Cluster analysis returned three clusters (average silhouette=.7); a group with a low (M=14.74, SD=1.7), middle (M=19.26, SD=1.17), and high (M=25.44, SD=1.64) mean price structures. The two classification systems were significantly associated ($\chi^2(312,2)=19.36$; $p<.001$). Results were stronger for rural programs, where 67.8% were identified within the lowest price group. There was more variability with FCCH pricing in urban counties with 43.1%, 44.4%, and 12.5% in the low, middle, and high price clusters.

School-Age Full-Time Prices. Two-step cluster analysis returned three clusters (average silhouette=.5); groups with a low (M=13.33, SD=1.95), middle (M=16.7, SD=0.59), and high (M=20.08, SD=2.33) mean price structure. Again, clusters did not completely replicate the urban/rural USDA classifications adopted by DCCECE, but the two classifications were significantly associated ($\chi^2(274,2)=9.34$; $p=.02$). Cluster analysis results were stronger for rural than urban programs, where 56.4% of rural programs were identified within the lower price group. Again, pricing in urban FCCH seems more variable with nearly half one-third identified in each group (38%, 30%, and 31% in low, middle, and high price clusters).

To determine whether counties were consistently misclassified, we created an average across the infant/toddler, preschool, and school age cluster memberships. It was necessary to create a meaningful scale across the age groups that differed in numbers of cluster returned. Therefore, we rescaled the groupings by dividing the score by the number of groupings. For recoded clusters 0 represents the lowest mean and 1 represents the highest mean. Therefore, by county, a score over 0.5 indicates that the majority of clusters were in the higher range. Appendix A provides a report of all counties, their urban/rural USDA membership and average cluster membership. Appendix B provides the same information provided as a map of the state with shading; the more concentrated the color, the higher the average pricing cluster. Taken together, it would appear that there are some urban counties that report consistently lower rates across center-based and family child care home program types. For example, programs in Craighead, Crawford, Crittenden, Jefferson, Miller, and Sebastian counties all report price structures that are more similar to rural than urban programs. It may be that a third rate was warranted. Unfortunately, there are multiple counties with very programs for verification.

Discussion

The purpose of this study is to provide information on the market prices for child care across child care submarkets; child age, program type, and geographic region. It also analyzes whether these prices fit well with the funding structure that the Arkansas DCCECE uses to reimburse child programs that serve children receiving care subsidies funded with CCDF.

DCCECE provided price data of 2447 child care programs which were collected by DCCECE administrative staff in 2015. The response rate is 70.8%. The representativeness of the data across

child care submarkets was analyzed and the sample was weighted to adjust for missingness. Prices were also weighted by private pay slot in an effort to provide more meaning to programs that provide more care to private-pay children.

In 2015, Arkansas set CCDF reimbursement rates to support programs in their efforts to provide high quality care. Accordingly, reimbursement rates are higher as quality levels increase. With the passing of revised licensing standards in 2015, Better Beginnings' Level 1 requires very minimal improvement over minimum licensing. Many, but not all rates at Better Beginnings Level 1 meet the 75th percentile; however, the submarket where rates are lower are primarily preschool rates. High quality preschool for low-income families with preschoolers are available through additional funds. Fifty-six percent of low-income preschoolers are served in high quality settings using state or federal funds (38% and 18% are served through ABC and Head Start, respectively) (ISP-2013-050, 2014). Findings from the market prices suggest that, at Level 2, programs are reimbursed at or very near the 75th percentile. At Level 2, programs have a quality visit which includes an environmental assessment where the state can be assured additional components of quality are present.

Percentiles are particularly high for Better Beginnings programs that serve infants and toddlers, especially in FCCH settings, where Level 3 reimbursements reach the 98th percentile. This is particularly encouraging given emerging findings from the state of North Carolina Race to the Top evaluation that parents continue to choose less formal care settings for infants and toddlers despite increased reimbursement for center-based programming (BUILD, 2015). At present, infants and toddlers are the state's most underserved population of children in quality child care settings. Arkansas has a well-established network of care for the prekindergarten age group. The state's public pre-K and Head Start networks have raised the bar for what parents and child care professionals expect from pre-K. Formal study of these programs' influence has not been conducted, but DCCECE-contracted trainers and technical assistants report that child care providers outside of their funded networks feel the expectation to compete with similar opportunities for learning, such as through activity centers and curriculum. Arkansas has not yet built a similar network of influence for infant-toddler care. In general, quality of care for infant-toddlers in Arkansas is lower than for pre-K, and we expect that market prices reflect this. The RED team's earlier work to model the costs of providing child care showed that it is impossible to operate quality infant-toddler care at market prices identified in this price study (McKelvey & Chapin-Critz, 2014). Arkansas should invest in well-organized networks of professional preparation and development for infant-toddler care and ongoing support for quality improvement in infant-toddler classrooms, as it has done for prekindergarten.

Finally, the study attempted to validate the urban/rural reimbursement structure designated by USDA Economic Research Service which was adopted by DCCECE for reimbursement. While not an exact replication, price clusters for different age groups in this study are associated with the urban and rural designations. Because some urban counties report consistently lower private pay prices than others, implementation of a third designation is plausible. It may be difficult to implement, however, as programs in those counties are already being reimbursed at higher rates. It would likely require DCCECE implementing different rates for new programs coming into and up through Better Beginnings.

References

- Branscome, K. (2015). *Adapting child care market price surveys to support state quality initiatives*. Retrieved from <http://www.icfi.com/insights/white-papers/2015/adapting-child-care-market-price-surveys-to-support-state-quality-initiatives>
- BUILD. (2015). Dec 15, 2015 *Webinar: Overcoming challenges and improving quality in your 2016 CCDF plan*. Retrieved from <https://cc.readytalk.com/cc/playback/Playback.do?id=18dm5m>
- Ghosh, D., & Vogt, A. (2012). Outliers: An evaluation of methodologies. *Joint Statistical Meetings*. Retrieved from http://www.amstat.org/sections/SRMS/Proceedings/y2012/files/304068_72402.pdf
- Grobe, D., Weber, R., Davis, E., Kreader, J. L., & Pratt, C. C. (2008). *Study of market prices: Validating child care market rate surveys*. Corvallis, OR: Oregon Retrieved from <http://health.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/sbhs/pdf/Validity-Study-FINAL-1-27-09.pdf>
- ISP-2013-050 sponsored by Arkansas Rep. David Kizzia (2014). *The effective use of state resources and coordination of programs to improve educational outcomes for children birth to age five*. Retrieved from <http://www.aradvocates.org/wp-content/uploads/Pre-K-ISP-Final-Oct-2014.pdf> January 28, 2016.
- McKelvey, L. & Chapin-Critz, M. (2014). *Making quality ends meet*. Little Rock, AR: University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences.

Appendix A: Average Cluster Membership by USDA Urban/Rural Classification

	Number of Licenses	Centers			Family Child Care		
		Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
RURAL							
Arkansas	21	0.17	0.14	6	0.60	0.20	6
Ashley	20	0.12	0.11	8	0.00	.	1
Baxter	31	0.32	0.17	6	0.60	0.09	3
Boone	25	0.26	0.05	5	0.38	0.32	6
Bradley	14	0.04	0.08	4			
Calhoun	4				0.00	.	1
Carroll	17	0.10	0.17	3	0.13	0.25	4
Chicot*	28	0.42	0.39	7	0.53	0.32	8
Clark	21	0.01	0.04	9	0.00	0.00	2
Clay	13	0.00	.	1	0.00	0.00	3
Cleburne	11	0.22	0.36	7	0.00	.	1
Columbia	19	0.15	0.12	6			
Conway	20	0.10	0.13	9	0.14	0.22	6
Cross	23	0.31	0.29	9	0.25	0.35	2
Dallas	8	0.00	0.00	2	0.38	.	1
Desha	22	0.15	0.08	5	0.06	0.09	2
Drew	32	0.32	0.43	7	0.50	0.33	3
Franklin	15	0.00	0.00	2	0.00	0.00	3
Fulton	7	0.29	.	1	0.38	.	1
Greene	29	0.03	0.07	12	0.50	.	1
Hempstead	14	0.22	0.22	3	0.00	0.00	2
Hot Spring	22	0.33	0.08	5	0.42	0.12	2
Howard	16	0.00	0.00	2	0.03	0.07	6
Independence	24	0.10	0.12	9	0.00	0.00	2
Izard	9	0.00	.	1	0.00	.	1
Jackson	8	0.00	0.00	2			
Johnson	18	0.30	0.06	3	0.04	0.08	4
Lafayette	8	0.00	0.00	2	0.13	.	1
Lawrence	16	0.00	0.00	2	0.00	.	1
Lee	9	0.44	0.51	3	0.00	.	1
Logan	20	0.00	0.00	3	0.25	0.40	6
Marion	10	0.00	.	1	0.00	0.00	2
Mississippi	48	0.09	0.11	6	0.20	0.34	8
Monroe	14	0.00	.	1	0.56	0.52	4
Montgomery	7				0.06	0.09	2
Nevada	6	0.07	0.13	3			

	Number of Licenses	Centers			Family Child Care		
		Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
Newton	10	0.00	0.00	2			
Ouachita	33	0.20	0.45	5	0.12	0.26	16
Phillips*	27	0.45	0.35	9	0.46	0.35	5
Pike	11				0.00	.	1
Polk	11	0.00	0.00	2			
Pope	41	0.18	0.11	18	0.41	0.28	4
Prairie	6	0.00	.	1			
Randolph	12	0.06	0.10	5			
Saint Francis	20	0.22	0.39	6	0.60	0.55	5
Scott	6	0.00	0.00	2	0.00	.	1
Searcy	6	0.00	.	1			
Sevier	15	0.17	0.24	2	0.04	0.07	3
Sharp	15	0.07	0.13	3	0.27	0.30	6
Stone	11	0.11	0.16	2	0.13	0.00	3
Union	35	0.16	0.24	11	0.00	.	1
Van Buren	11	0.00	0.00	2	0.00	.	1
White	51	0.13	0.14	23	0.28	0.35	9
Woodruff	7	0.08	.	1	0.19	0.27	2
Yell	15	0.07	0.11	6	0.38	0.53	2
URBAN							
Benton (Code 2)	173	0.62	0.39	56	0.63	0.25	14
Cleveland (Code 3)	9				0.00	0.00	5
Craighead (Code 3)*	87	0.27	0.25	32	0.34	0.32	12
Crawford (Code 2)*	40	0.19	0.16	10	0.32	0.30	7
Crittenden (Code 1)*	57	0.24	0.23	20	0.31	0.30	8
Faulkner (Code 2)	75	0.31	0.31	28	0.57	0.29	15
Garland (Code 3)*	63	0.36	0.26	23	0.44	0.36	4
Grant (Code 2)	7	0.36	0.12	2	0.88	.	1
Jefferson (Code 3)*	83	0.27	0.35	36	0.44	0.40	14
Lincoln (Code 3)	6	0.00	.	1			
Little River (Code 3)	8	0.00	.	1	0.06	0.09	2
Lonoke (Code 2)*	56	0.40	0.26	27	0.36	0.28	7
Madison (Code 2)*	14	0.24	0.02	2	0.38	0.31	5
Miller (Code 3)*	42	0.20	0.24	13	0.21	0.20	7
Perry (Code 2)	5	0.00	.	1			
Poinsett (Code 3)	20	0.50	0.38	5			
Pulaski (Code 2)	399	0.47	0.31	170	0.64	0.35	24
Saline (Code 2)*	55	0.39	0.30	21	0.46	0.39	7
Sebastian (Code 2)*	108	0.29	0.36	34	0.27	0.31	8
Washington (Code 2)	168	0.72	0.29	49	0.53	0.33	23

Appendix B: County Map of Average Cluster Membership

