



Appendices

APPENDIX A. DATA ANALYSIS

This section includes data and further details supporting the analyses that are described in the main report body.

STUDY DESIGN

This discussion of the study design briefly describes the sampling of centers and the survey instruments used.

Sample of Licensed Child Care Centers

The survey sample was drawn from a list of over 9400 licensed child care centers provided by the Texas Health and Human Services Commission Child Care Regulation department (HHSC CCR) in September 2022. Head Start facilities were removed from the list before sampling because they do not charge families directly, and thus they have no true market rates. A parallel study to this one is planned for licensed and registered homes, to be fielded in Fall 2023 and completed in 2024.

The initial sampling plan sought to reach 800 or more total licensed centers, with about half dedicated to comparison groups (see below), and the other half divided among four treatment groups including nationally accredited centers and Two-Star, Three-Star, and Four-Star certified providers.

The sampling plan included a detailed over-sampling scheme targeting Two-Star and Three-Star providers, in particular, due to their relatively small numbers in comparison to Four-Star centers in the population. Unfortunately, a coding error partially defeated this sampling plan, and resulted in a sample that was essentially random, with fewer Two-Star respondents than needed to support analysis of quality centers at this tier. An additional sample was fielded in April to remedy this Two-Star shortfall, but as noted in the report, no consistent and significant pricing effect was found for Two-Star centers, and thus this group is not reported on separately.

To define the higher quality samples, TWC administrative records were used to identify Two-Star, Three-Star, and Four-Star Texas Rising Star certified facilities effective around the time of the sample date (September 2022). We further identified nationally accredited facilities by matching against lists of accredited facilities received from those organizations whose

accreditation decisions were at the time automatically accepted by the Texas Rising Star system as evidence of Four-Star rated quality.¹

These accrediting bodies include:

- National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)
- National Association for Family Child Care (NAFCC; for home-based providers)
- National Early Childhood Program Accreditation (NECPA)
- National Accreditation Commission for Early Child Care and Education (NAC)
- Council of Accreditation (COA)
- Cognia (formerly AdvancED Quality Early Learning Standards, QELS)

In addition to these DoD-recognized bodies, the accreditation decisions of the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) were also accepted by Texas Rising Star for initial Four-Star certification of Licensed Centers. As such, facilities accredited by ACSI were also included in our quality sample.²

In order to improve the comparability of providers in the comparison groups, we used propensity score matching to select, for each member of one of the treatment groups, a non-accredited, non-Texas Rising Star provider that was most similar to them on dimensions we could measure. This matching screen was applied twice: at the time the sample was drawn, and again after interviews were conducted so that non-respondents could be replaced with well-matched respondents. This represents an improvement over the 2021 study, for which the comparison group focused primarily on geographical stratification.

Survey Administration

The Cost of Quality Survey for licensed centers is presented in Appendix B.

In addition to the data elements to be used in estimating the cost of providing quality child care, the present survey also gathered child care pricing data from responding facilities, to be used as the dependent variables in pricing models. For any facilities that happen to be included in both samples, the research team administered the two surveys jointly, such that respondents to the CQS first answer the MRS survey, followed by the items specific to the CQS. The only exception to this ordering of survey items was for the ratio questions, which were found

¹ Note that for this purpose we did not rely on the self-reported accreditation or TRS certification questions that are a routine part of the Market Rate Survey.

² Under current policy as of early 2022, in lieu of automatic Four-Star certification, nationally accredited providers now receive a modified initial assessment for Texas Rising Star. See <https://texasrisingstar.org/providers/eligibility/>

to be much easier to administer when presented in the context of the section on child age and enrollment, where they provided details about each age group that a center reported serving.

Data Collection

Detailed training and supervision were provided to research staff members on survey methodology, interviewing protocols, data entry and collection, and tracking procedures by advanced graduate students and the project manager.

Before interviewing began, the research team mailed introductory letters and/or sent emails to all facilities in the sample explaining the survey purpose, goals and objectives, confidentiality policies, and the voluntary nature of participation. Information was presented in both English and Spanish unless providers' surnames suggested they were of Vietnamese origin, in which case information was presented in both English and Vietnamese. A website was also constructed to present further information about the survey to providers.

Data collection began in September 2022 and continued through March 2023, and April for the Two-Star supplemental sample. Initially, a seven-station call center at TXICFW operated Monday through Friday between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM. Research staff members maintained a tracking database containing basic provider information (facility name, LWDA, phone number, facility identification number) and call history (number of attempts, date and time of the attempt, preferred calling times, appointments, call results, final status). A minimum of two morning calls and two afternoon or evening calls were made to contact each provider. The research staff administered calls at least one week apart unless an appointment or preferred calling time was established with a provider. In these cases, the staff made up to three additional attempts to complete the survey. A toll-free number was also available for providers to return missed calls, return a message, or ask further questions about the survey.

If research staff were unable to complete the survey after all attempts had been made to reach a provider, the facility was marked as 'over dialed' and no more attempts to contact that facility were made. In cases where the phone number provided was disconnected or no longer in service, the research staff attempted to contact the facility three times at least one week apart. If the number was still not working and no additional information was available online, the staff determined the facility to be ineligible.

During the interview, research staff members screened out facilities that did not represent the true market price of child care in Texas. These facilities include those that only offered drop-in care, part-day care with no after-school care, summer camps, care provided to specific populations only (i.e. children with special needs, children of teen moms, children of staff at a company, etc.), and free/family-discounted child care services. School and kindergarten programs that did not offer regular after-school care and Head Start programs were also excluded. Finally, facilities that had closed or no longer had children enrolled were determined to be ineligible.

Survey Participation

A detailed description of the eligibility of providers sampled and response rates to the survey is included in the report for the 2023 Texas Market Rate Survey (MRS), which was fielded together with the Cost of Quality Survey for those facilities that were in both samples. Four percent of sampled facilities were determined not to meet study eligibility criteria for the MRS and were also omitted from further study in this report. For centers, the top reasons for not meeting eligibility criteria included: 1) they did not offer full, part day, or after-school care at least five days a week; or, 2) they only served a specific population, and were not open to the public.

The CQS center survey received 794 complete responses in total, as of this writing.³ The overall response rate when considering only eligible providers was 57 percent, a decent response rate, and fairly typical in comparison to prior years of the MRS.

ANALYSIS OF SURVEY AND RATE DATA

The data preparation and provider- and rate-level analysis followed very closely the procedures detailed for the 2023 Texas Market Rate Survey (TWC, 2023), using methods refined over many years. Project researchers summarized the survey data and conducted analyses at several distinct levels. The most basic analyses were done at the level of individual providers. These results document the proportion of providers responding to the survey that, for example, offer infant care, have wait lists for care, or other features.

The remaining analyses were conducted at either the rate observation level or at the level of the child care slot, as described below. Each center can contribute more than one rate observation to the analysis, and each rate observation can represent more than one slot.

Market rates for licensed centers were captured by the survey for all categories of care offered, regardless of whether any children were currently being served in such categories. The categories consisted of all possible combinations of age group (gathered for actual age categories in which each center offered rates, then aggregated to four standard categories for reporting) by full-day status (part-day vs full-day). Thus, one center could contribute as many as eight independent rate observations, each representing any number of children (including zero). These rate observations were then weighted by the number of child care slots they represent (described below) when calculating market rate distributions.

For the analysis of center rates, the number of child care slots for each rate category was determined in one of two ways. First, for categories of care in which children were currently being served, the number of children in each category served as a proxy for the number of slots.

³ See section Characteristics of Respondents' Counties below to get a sense of context on areas are served by the different quality tiers of providers who responded.

Second, rate categories in which no children were currently being served were also included in the analysis, since they were also theoretically part of the market. This was done by estimating the number of slots for each of these rate categories with a formula that multiplies the number of children served at each facility by the average proportion of children, across all licensed centers, served in each rate category. Thus, for example, a facility that served 100 children and had an existing part-day infant rate schedule, but did not currently serve any part-day infants, would have its number of slots for this category of care estimated at two (100 child capacity X 2 percent of children served in the part-day infant category across all licensed centers). If the same facility served no part-day preschoolers, its number of slots would be estimated at seven (100 child capacity X 7 percent served in this category across all licensed centers). This method allows fuller use of the rate information gathered from centers, especially for rare forms of care in which rate observations are otherwise scarce.

After the survey data were collected, all rates that appeared extremely high or low (known as outliers) were identified, and researchers individually checked each rate report and corrected any errors they found. After these corrections, a small portion of the most extreme outliers remaining in the sample were corrected⁴ to remove their excessive influence on statistical measures of the rate distributions. In addition, similar procedures were implemented to detect instances in which the number of slots reported for a given rate was too extreme, whether too high or too low, and to correct these extremes to more reasonable values.

Prior to any estimation of rate parameters, the daily rates themselves were first transformed to make them assume a more normal distribution. This transformation was done by taking the positive square root of the daily rate. The effect of this is to minimize the influence of high-end outliers on estimates of the parameters of distributions. This transformation is reversed later, following all estimation, by squaring the rates.

In estimating models describing the typical patterns among rates of varying age group and rate type, only full-day rates were included for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers, and only part-day rates were included for school-age children. This estimation was done using a model for licensed centers that included independent predictor variables for the four age groups.

CORRECTING FOR NON-RESPONSE BIAS

To adjust for any bias due to variation in what types of facilities responded to the survey, a response model for centers was developed using logistic regression. Predictors available for this regression primarily included measures derived from Child Care Registry (CCR) data, as well as county-level measures described below in Public Data Sources. The CCR measures available for this analysis involved indicators for self-reported features of care provided, including accreditation, offers transportation, accepts subsidies, serves infants, toddlers, preschoolers,

⁴ Corrections to extreme outliers involved replacing them with the nearest non-outlier value.

school age, special needs children, special skills, field trips, get well care, as well as after school, drop in, part time, or weekend care. Additional measures included the facility age in years, based on the initial license issue date, as well as age-squared to account for potential nonlinear effects. Stepwise logistic regression was utilized to pare down the large set of predictors to only those that account for significant unique variance in the outcome. The dependent or response variable for this regression was an indicator showing whether the facility completed the survey, in whole or in part. Facilities determined to be ineligible for the survey were excluded from the regression.

The final set of predictors for the response model included CCR variables measuring whether providers serve school age children, provide afterschool care, provide drop-in care, provide part-time care, capacity, and the age of the facility. Also included were county-level measures including percentage of households with female householder and no husband present, households with children under six years, percent of population 18 to 24 with some college or Associates degree, and percent of population 18 and over who are veterans. Results indicated a moderate overall response bias (model R-squared = .073).

After the above regression analysis was conducted, weights were computed by inverting the estimated probability of response for individual providers. These weights were utilized in all analyses to allow adjustment for any measured bias at either the facility or rate level. These weights were combined with the other weights described earlier.

MODELING MINIMUM LICENSING STANDARDS

The estimated baseline costs of providing care that meets minimum licensing standards was determined by utilizing a probabilistic model using administrative records data on child care licensing deficiencies. We had determined that it would be burdensome and costly to decide with high certainty whether each facility in our survey met basic health and safety standards, mostly because the deficiency reporting system is quite complicated and the data publicly available do not supply all the information needed to perfectly model real-world license revocation decisions. The model we developed used actual reported child care licensing deficiencies to identify facilities that may not be meeting standards, and for which cost might be responsible. As detailed below, we used a formula to add up deficiencies for each facility, with those of greater weight counting more, creating a 'deficiency score' for each facility. Subsequently, those facilities with below average child care rates who had a relatively high number of licensing deficiencies were eliminated from further analysis. Facilities with excessive licensing deficiencies and low rates may not be charging enough to cover the minimum standards, and thus removing them from the cost model should improve the accuracy of the estimates.

We created 'deficiency scores' for all centers, with 'High' risk deficiencies counting as 5 points, 'Medium High' as 4, 'Medium' as 3, 'Medium Low' as 2, and 'Low' as 1. These classifications are assigned by the Texas HHSC Child Care Regulation Department (CCR) based on their assessment of the risk that a violation of a given standard presents to children. After adding up all deficiencies per center, we found the resulting 'deficiency scores' among centers ranged from 0 to 371, with an average of 49 and median of 31. The 95th percentile of deficiency scores was 147, meaning that 5% of centers statewide had scores between 147 and 371 – a group

we labeled 'deficient.' Another way of stating this is these centers determined to be 'deficient' had scores almost three times as high as the average center and at least four times as high as the median center.

When we applied this cutoff (>147) to our survey respondents, we found that 3.8% of center respondents were regarded as deficient, for a total of 30 centers. We then compared all center rates to the average for their area and age group. Since centers can contribute up to 8 rates each, it is common for centers to be above average on some rates and below average on others. Of the 30 'deficient' centers, 17 of them had half or more of their rates below the average for their area and age group. We determined these to be 'deficient facilities with below average rates,' and removed all rates reported by these 17 facilities from further analysis, for a loss of 100 rates or about 2.7% of all center rates from our cost study.

Of the 17 centers removed, two out of 17 were regarded as higher quality, with none being nationally accredited and two being Texas Rising Star. Of the two Texas Rising Star facilities in this group, one was a Two-Star and one was a Four-Star provider.

MODELING LOCAL RATE ESTIMATION

In this report, much of the analysis of rates and quality pricing is done by geographic areas of the state as divided into metropolitan, micropolitan, and rural areas that seem to best capture natural variation in child care costs. However, there is also interest in knowing the pricing of quality care in other areas defined by different geographic units, including counties and aggregations of counties such as local workforce development areas. To address this possibility, we developed an extensive statistical model based on detailed local data from a wide variety of sources to estimate pricing for quality care at the county level.

To begin, we assembled a dataset with numerous mostly county-level measures from a broad array of public data sources that are detailed in the Public Data Sources section below. These sources include the Real Estate Center, Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), American Community Survey (ACS), and Texas Education Agency (TEA). These data were linked to licensed center rate data via the county in which the providers were located.

Next, we developed our best possible 254-county model of full-time preschooler rates, the most common rates, by including only those county-level measures that had estimates available for all 254 counties in the state. Although slightly better models were developed that included fewer counties for which richer data were available from some sources, we proceeded with the 254-county model since it provided a more parsimonious solution. Using stepwise OLS regression to isolate those predictors that explain the most unique variance in rates, we developed a model that explained over half of the variation in full-time preschooler rates ($R^2 = 0.514$). This model yielded predicted values of a typical full-time preschooler rate for all 254 counties, even those counties for which we had no respondents.

These typical preschooler rates were then included as controls in a model examining all rates, regardless of age group, along with accreditation status and a measure of external support

(described in the next section). This final model was found to account for about seventy percent of the variation in rates ($R\text{-square} = 0.692$), and its results are shown in Calculator 3 in the main report.

In addition, these county-level estimates were aggregated to the local workforce board level through weighted averaging based on county population. The resulting model yielded estimates displayed in Calculator 4, and plotted on a map as Figure 1 in the main document. As mentioned previously, the total population sizes and the availability of child care in the counties that comprise each LWDA vary widely, with the result being that for some areas, rates are estimated with far greater precision than others. In other words, in some areas the estimates are based more on actual rate data, whereas in other areas the estimates lean more heavily on modeling. Both Calculators 3 and 4 provide warnings when displaying results that rely heavily on modeling and less on actual rate data.

EXTERNAL SUPPORT ANALYSES

The external support analysis was done with the hope that we could improve the accuracy of our final pricing of quality models by statistically accounting for extraneous cost factors or supports that allow providers to charge less for care. Direct external supports to a child care facility may consist of free or reduced-cost services, and financial or other donations the facility may receive. In addition, other forms of support can be observed through affiliations or associations between a child care facility and other organizations such as churches or schools.

The survey assessed eight sources of such external supports, including four potential sources of donations and four free or reduced-cost services (for survey items see Appendix B, pp. B-6 and B-7, items 31 and 34). We developed a price model to simultaneously test all the potential external support factors discussed in this section, including financial supports, reduced cost services, and associations. In this model, we used stepwise regression to select the best set of predictors that each account for the most unique variation in daily child care rates. For centers, this yielded a model that relied on the following measures:

- Participation in the Federal Child Care Food Program
- Reduced price utilities
- Volunteer work
- Association with church or religious organization
- Reduced price building use, and
- Association with a school

For the centers external supports regression, these measures together explained about 24 percent of the variation in daily rates (R -squared = 0.239), which is impressive (note that in the 2021 report, external supports accounted for 16 percent). The purpose of the regression was to generate predicted values for each provider, which can be thought of as a composite measure representing a best guess at what a facility might charge for child care when one knows nothing else except which kinds of external supports it receives or types of associations it benefits from. In the analysis of quality factors in centers presented throughout this report, external supports are controlled statistically by the inclusion of this composite measure as a covariate in the pricing models. In effect, the result is that the estimated pricing effects are adjusted to reflect what they would be if all centers received the average amount of external support. Taken together, the analysis of external supports suggests that if we can account for the cost difference among facilities that receive services or donations, that benefit from associations, or that participate in the federal food program, we have a better chance of more precisely estimating pricing differentials for quality factors in which we are interested.

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS' COUNTIES

To get a better sense of the populations served by accredited and different tiers of Texas Rising Star providers, we computed summaries of all center respondents on several county level measures to which we linked using provider address location. The table has columns for the following centers: Accredited, Three-Star, and Four-Star Texas Rising Star.

By most measures, accredited centers appear to serve areas that are a bit more affluent than those areas served by Texas Rising Star centers, but not dramatically more affluent. Accredited centers tend to be in counties with higher incomes, larger populations, more expensive housing, and in larger metropolitan areas, whereas Texas Rising Star centers are slightly more likely to be micropolitan or rural.

Selected County-Linked Measures, Centers

	Accredited	Texas Rising Star Three-Star	Texas Rising Star Four-Star
Percent of families below poverty	10.3%	10.2%	10.9%
Household Median income (dollars)	\$69,787	\$66,714	\$66,270
Percent 25+ years with Bachelor degree or higher	35.2%	31.6%	31.6%
Unemployment Rate	5.3%	4.9%	5.5%
Total Population 15 years and over	1,626,876	1,082,368	1,196,197
Housing sales, average closing price	\$437,925	\$387,091	\$401,185
Housing sales, median closing price	\$356,756	\$324,770	\$328,376
Metropolitan county	100.0%	86.6%	89.6%
Micropolitan county	0.0%	8.8%	6.2%
Rural county	0.0%	4.6%	4.2%

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data.

PUBLIC DATA SOURCES

Data Source	Notes	Examples
American Community Survey (ACS) multiyear estimates. https://data.census.gov/	ACS 5-year estimates have a larger sample size and are therefore usually more precise than the 1-year estimates. Data extracted for all counties in Texas.	Per capita income Children under 6 by family type
Bureau of Labor Statistics - Occupational Employment Statistics (OES). https://data.bls.gov/oes/	The Occupational Employment Statistics (OES) survey is a semiannual survey measuring occupational employment and wage rates for wage and salary workers in nonfarm establishments. Data extracted for the "childcare workers" occupation for all metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas in Texas.	Median hourly wage, childcare workers Mean hourly wage, childcare workers
Real Estate Center - We contacted the Real Estate Center and our request was reviewed, approved by Texas REALTORS®, and data was sent to us via email	Texas REALTORS® Data Relevance Project, MLS Boards in Texas, Real Estate Center at Texas A&M University. Includes counties that don't have less than 36 sales in a single year from 2011 to 2019. Covers 147 counties in Texas.	Annual sale count Average sale price Median sale price
Texas Education Agency (TEA) https://www.texaseducationinfo.org/Home/Topic/Prekindergarten%20Programs?br=PK-12	Data on Texas public school district prekindergarten programs from TEA's Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) and from TEA's Early Childhood Data System (ECDS). Public prekindergarten student enrollment is defined as the number of prekindergarten enrollees ages three and four who were reported enrolled as of the Fall.	Total enrolled prekindergarten students ages three and four

DETAILED TABLES BY ACCREDITATION, CENTERS

Elements of Program Structure by Accreditation, Centers

	Non- accredited adjusted mean	Non- accredited sample size	Accredited adjusted mean	Accredited sample size	Difference Associated with Accreditation	F-value	prob
Center serves infants	78.1%	94	85.9%	106	7.8%	2.3	0.130
Center serves toddlers	85.4%	94	94.3%	106	8.9% *	5.5	0.020
Center serves preschoolers	100.0%	94	98.9%	106	-1.1%	1.8	0.177
Center serves school age children	69.5%	94	68.4%	106	-1.1%	0.0	0.871
Waitlist exists, infants	85.7%	70	75.7%	95	-10.0%	2.9	0.090
Waitlist exists, toddlers	65.8%	78	55.4%	102	-10.4%	2.3	0.130
Waitlist exists, preschoolers	44.0%	81	36.7%	105	-7.3%	1.2	0.281
Waitlist exists, school age	31.7%	59	31.2%	59	-0.5%	0.0	0.957

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-accredited at $p < .01$, *= at $p < .05$

External Supports: Donations and Reduced Cost Services by Accreditation, Centers

	Non-accredited adjusted mean	Non-accredited sample size	Accredited adjusted mean	Accredited sample size	Difference Associated with Accreditation	F-value	prob
Financial donations							
Federal Child Care Food Program	24.1%	101	42.4%	110	18.3% **	8.1	0.005
Local, state or federal government funding	26.3%	98	46.4%	105	20.1% **	9.1	0.003
Private or individual donations	22.6%	98	28.4%	105	5.8%	0.9	0.349
Other donations	4.3%	98	7.7%	105	3.4%	1.0	0.308
Reduced cost services							
Building use	25.1%	95	17.0%	106	-8.1%	2.0	0.160
Utilities	12.9%	95	9.8%	106	-3.1%	0.5	0.478
Volunteer work	2.8%	95	8.0%	106	5.2%	2.6	0.111
Other	0.8%	95	0.9%	106	0.1%	0.0	0.945

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-accredited at p<.01, *= at p<.05

Associations or Affiliations by Accreditation, Centers

Associations	Non-accredited adjusted mean	Non-accredited sample size	Accredited adjusted mean	Accredited sample size	Difference Associated with Accreditation	F-value	prob
Church or religious organization	54.4%	102	19.4%	110	-35.0% **	31.9	<.0001
School	12.5%	101	9.3%	110	-3.2%	0.6	0.459

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-accredited at p<.01, *= at p<.05

Child and Teacher Ratios by Accreditation, Centers

Associations	Non- accredited adjusted mean	Non- accredited sample size	Accredited adjusted mean	Accredited sample size	Difference Associated with Accreditation	F-value	prob
Children per teacher ratio, infants	4.1	71	4.1	94	0.0	0.0	0.900
Children per teacher ratio, toddlers	4.1	71	4.1	94	0.0	0.0	0.900
Children per teacher ratio, preschoolers	9.4	82	10.7	104	1.3 *	3.9	0.049
Children per teacher ratio, school age	13.9	60	17.8	59	3.9 **	8.8	0.004
Teachers per classroom ratio, infants	2.0	71	2.1	94	0.1	0.5	0.483
Teachers per classroom ratio, toddlers	1.7	79	1.8	101	0.1	1.4	0.237
Teachers per classroom ratio, preschoolers	1.7	82	1.6	104	-0.1	1.4	0.246
Teachers per classroom ratio, school age	1.5	60	1.4	59	-0.1	1.5	0.218

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-accredited at p<.01, *= at p<.05

Staffing Patterns by Accreditation, Centers

Associations	Non-accredited adjusted mean	Non-accredited sample size	Accredited adjusted mean	Accredited sample size	Difference Associated with Accreditation	F-value	prob
Part-time staffing ratio: Percent of staff members that are part-time	35.7%	92	21.2%	98	-14.5% **	13.2	0.000
Turnover ratio: percent of teachers leaving in the last year	30.7%	82	35.6%	99	4.9%	1.0	0.326
Director provides direct care on a regular basis (as opposed to filling in)	15.5%	93	9.0%	105	-6.5%	1.9	0.165
Cover for absent staff: director substitutes	4.8%	93	11.5%	105	6.7%	2.8	0.095
Cover for absent staff: existing staff member substitutes	78.1%	93	73.8%	105	-4.3%	0.5	0.485

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-accredited at p<.01, *= at p<.05

Director Education and Experience by Accreditation, Centers

	Non- accredited adjusted mean	Non- accredited sample size	Accredited adjusted mean	Accredited sample size	Difference Associated with Accreditation	F-value	prob
Director highest degree - High school or GED	15.5%	92	8.0%	101	-7.5%	2.6	0.110
Director highest degree - Associates or some college	32.5%	92	28.4%	101	-4.1%	0.4	0.544
Director highest degree - Bachelors	33.6%	92	43.3%	101	9.7%	1.9	0.170
Director highest degree - Masters or above	18.5%	92	20.3%	101	1.8%	0.1	0.755
Director has a CDA	35.1%	91	36.3%	103	1.2%	0.0	0.863
Director has Child Care Administrator certificate or credential	85.6%	90	85.5%	104	-0.1%	0.0	0.991
Director years of experience	24.0	91	22.0	103	-2.0	1.6	0.204

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-accredited at $p < .01$, *= at $p < .05$

Staff Education and Experience by Accreditation, Centers

	Non- accredited adjusted mean	Non- accredited sample size	Accredited adjusted mean	Accredited sample size	Difference Associated with Accreditation	F-value	prob
Staff with highest degree - High school or GED	72.1%	68	56.6%	91	-15.5% **	11.0	0.001
Staff with highest degree - Associates	7.6%	68	16.7%	91	9.1% **	15.3	0.000
Staff with highest degree - Bachelors	17.3%	70	21.1%	94	3.8%	1.2	0.286
Staff with highest degree - Masters or above	2.5%	71	2.3%	94	-0.2%	0.1	0.827
Direct care staff with a CDA	9.0%	77	20.9%	98	11.9% **	18.8	<.0001
Staff with 8 or more years of experience working in ECE	46.1%	93	46.2%	105	0.1%	0.0	0.986
Staff with less than 3 years of experience working in ECE	25.4%	93	25.6%	105	0.2%	0.0	0.959

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-accredited at p<.01, *= at p<.05

Staff Training by Accreditation, Centers

	Non- accredited adjusted mean	Non- accredited sample size	Accredited adjusted mean	Accredited sample size	Difference Associated with Accreditation	F-value	prob
Conference or workshop fees	60.3%	90	51.2%	104	-9.1%	1.6	0.206
Online training fees	65.2%	92	58.5%	104	-6.7%	1.0	0.332
Onsite training fees	72.5%	92	64.4%	103	-8.1%	1.5	0.229
Payments to substitutes to cover the classroom while staff are in training	21.3%	92	19.0%	105	-2.3%	0.2	0.679
Travel costs for off-site training	19.9%	92	28.2%	103	8.3%	1.9	0.175

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-accredited at $p < .01$, *= at $p < .05$

Wages and Benefits by Accreditation, Centers

	Non-accredited adjusted mean	Non-accredited sample size	Accredited adjusted mean	Accredited sample size	Difference Associated with Accreditation	F-value	prob
Hourly wage for full-time teacher	\$14.13	68	\$16.23	94	\$2.10 **	12.9	0.000
Hourly wage for full-time assistant teacher	\$12.71	34	\$14.49	62	\$1.78 **	10.3	0.002
Hourly wage for full-time lead teacher	\$15.31	34	\$17.74	62	\$2.43 **	7.0	0.010
Difference in hourly wage between highest and lowest paid teachers	\$3.41	68	\$3.76	94	\$.35	0.4	0.534
Benefits - Retirement programs such as annuity, 401(k) or 403(b) plan	35.4%	92	86.9%	102	51.5% **	74.4	<.0001
Benefits - Reduced tuition for staff children enrolled in your program	93.4%	91	94.0%	105	0.6%	0.0	0.856
Benefits - Tuition assistance for college/CDA courses	48.1%	87	87.7%	104	39.6% **	41.8	<.0001
Benefits - Health insurance	43.2%	92	84.0%	105	40.8% **	42.3	<.0001
Benefits - Paid time off for vacation, holidays, or other	80.7%	93	96.5%	105	15.8% **	13.2	0.000

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-accredited at p<.01, *= at p<.05

Curriculum by Accreditation, Centers

	Non-accredited adjusted mean	Non-accredited sample size	Accredited adjusted mean	Accredited sample size	Difference Associated with Accreditation	F-value	prob
Use a curriculum or prepared set of learning and play activities	92.1%	81	98.3%	105	6.2% *	4.2	0.041
Purchase curriculum	58.4%	89	28.6%	104	-29.8% **	18.6	<.0001
Get curriculum from corporate office / organization	4.2%	88	41.3%	104	37.1% **	44.2	<.0001
Develop curriculum in-house	30.6%	88	16.2%	104	-14.4% *	6.0	0.015
Get curriculum through Texas Rising Star (TRS)	1.0%	88	4.4%	104	3.4%	2.0	0.163
Get curriculum through Texas School Ready (TSR)	1.9%	88	2.9%	104	1.0%	0.2	0.645
Get curriculum somewhere else	5.4%	88	8.2%	104	2.8%	0.6	0.449

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-accredited at p<.01, *= at p<.05

Planning Time and Assessment by Accreditation, Centers

	Non-accredited adjusted mean	Non-accredited sample size	Accredited adjusted mean	Accredited sample size	Difference Associated with Accreditation	F-value	prob
Total paid hours each week direct care staff are given for planning children's activities	2.2	89	3.3	104	1.1 **	8.2	0.005
Use formal assessments to measure children's developmental progress	54.3%	92	90.2%	105	35.9% **	37.7	<.0001
Use informal assessments to measure children's developmental progress	27.6%	92	8.9%	105	-18.7% **	12.6	0.001

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-accredited at p<.01, *= at p<.05

DETAILED TABLES BY TEXAS RISING STAR, CENTERS

Elements of Program Structure by Texas Rising Star, Centers

	Non-Certified	Non-certified N	Texas Rising Star 3 Star	Texas Rising Star 3 Star N	3 Star Difference	F-value	prob	Texas Rising Star 4 Star	Texas Rising Star 4 Star N	4 Star Difference	F-value	prob
Center serves infants	54.1%	188	70.3%	45	+16.2% *	5.3	0.022	82.6%	175	+28.5% **	42.3	<.0001
Center serves toddlers	76.8%	188	78.0%	45	+1.2%	0.1	0.822	90.8%	175	+14.0% **	18.7	<.0001
Center serves preschoolers	100%	188	100.1%	45	0%	0.0	0.978	98.7%	175	-1.4%	3.5	0.062
Center serves school age children	81.1%	188	88.1%	45	+7.0%	1.0	0.320	70.8%	175	-10.3% *	5.5	0.020
Waitlist exists, infants	77.8%	98	66.3%	30	-11.5%	1.8	0.186	76.6%	149	-1.2%	0.1	0.821
Waitlist exists, toddlers	62.5%	133	45.7%	33	-16.8%	3.4	0.065	61.6%	165	-0.9%	0.0	0.861
Waitlist exists, preschoolers	43.9%	142	36.8%	35	-7.1%	0.6	0.423	43.8%	170	-0.1%	0.0	0.985
Waitlist exists, school age	34.9%	137	34.7%	37	-0.2%	0.0	0.978	38.7%	118	+3.8%	0.4	0.538

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-certified at p<.01, *= at p<.05

External Supports: Donations and Reduced Cost Services by Texas Rising Star, Centers

	Non-Certified	Non-certified N	Texas Rising Star 3 Star	Texas Rising Star 3 Star N	3 Star Difference	F-value	prob	Texas Rising Star 4 Star	Texas Rising Star 4 Star N	4 Star Difference	F-value	prob
Financial Donations												
Federal Child Care Food Program	28.7%	202	60.5%	47	+31.8% **	16.5	<.0001	61.0%	180	+32.3% **	44.5	<.0001
Local, state or federal government funding	33.8%	192	54.5%	45	+20.7% *	6.2	0.013	45.5%	171	+11.7% *	5.3	0.022
Private or individual donations	26.8%	192	17.8%	45	-9.0%	1.6	0.209	19.6%	171	-7.2%	2.7	0.102
Other donations	5.1%	192	2.4%	45	-2.7%	0.4	0.530	9.4%	171	+4.3%	2.8	0.094
Reduced cost services												
Building use	27.0%	191	25.9%	45	-1.1%	0.0	0.873	20.3%	175	-6.7%	2.3	0.134
Utilities	24.0%	191	20.5%	45	-3.5%	0.3	0.592	12.4%	175	-11.6% **	8.2	0.004
Volunteer work	3.0%	191	2.4%	45	-0.6%	0.0	0.857	5.2%	175	+2.2%	1.2	0.280
Other	0.4%	191	0.0%	45	-0.4%	0.1	0.762	1.1%	175	+0.7%	0.7	0.406

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-certified at p<.01, *= at p<.05

Associations or Affiliations by Texas Rising Star, Centers

	Non-Certified	Non-certified N	Texas Rising Star 3 Star	Texas Rising Star 3 Star N	3 Star Difference	F-value	prob	Texas Rising Star 4 Star	Texas Rising Star 4 Star N	4 Star Difference	F-value	prob
Church or religious organization	41.1%	207	14.0%	47	-27.1% **	13.3	0.000	21.5%	180	-19.6% **	18.4	<.0001
School	23.2%	207	22.4%	47	-0.8%	0.0	0.896	10.4%	180	-12.8% **	11.1	0.001

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-certified at p<.01, *= at p<.05

Child and Teacher Ratios by Texas Rising Star, Centers

	Non-Certified	Non-certified N	Texas Rising Star 3 Star	Texas Rising Star 3 Star N	3 Star Difference	F-value	prob	Texas Rising Star 4 Star	Texas Rising Star 4 Star N	4 Star Difference	F-value	prob
Children per teacher ratio, infants	4.3	98	4.0	29	-0.3	1.5	0.222	4.3	148	0.0	0.0	0.904
Children per teacher ratio, toddlers	7.0	132	7.1	32	0.1	0.0	0.861	7.2	164	0.2	0.2	0.645
Children per teacher ratio, preschoolers	10.1	141	11.5	34	1.4	3.9	0.050	10.7	169	0.6	1.9	0.175
Children per teacher ratio, school age	13.3	138	15.0	36	1.7	1.8	0.176	15.6	117	2.3 **	6.9	0.009
Teachers per classroom ratio, infants	1.9	99	1.9	29	0.0	0.5	0.473	1.9	148	0.0	0.5	0.489
Teachers per classroom ratio, toddlers	1.7	134	1.7	32	0.0	0.0	0.944	1.7	164	0.0	0.0	0.842
Teachers per classroom ratio, preschoolers	1.5	143	1.6	34	0.1	0.9	0.337	1.5	169	0.0	0.2	0.662
Teachers per classroom ratio, school age	1.6	138	1.4	36	-0.2	1.6	0.201	1.4	117	-0.2	2.9	0.088

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-certified at p<.01, *= at p<.05

Staffing Patterns by Texas Rising Star, Centers

	Non-Certified	Non-certified N	Texas Rising Star 3 Star	Texas Rising Star 3 Star N	3 Star Difference	F-value	prob	Texas Rising Star 4 Star	Texas Rising Star 4 Star N	4 Star Difference	F-value	prob
Part-time staffing ratio: Percent of staff members that are part-time	43.1%	187	30.4%	45	-12.7% *	6.0	0.014	22.4%	165	-20.7% **	40.8	<.0001
Turnover ratio: percent of teachers leaving in the last year	38.3%	154	64.3%	39	+26.0% **	10.0	0.002	37.0%	161	-1.3%	0.1	0.788
Director provides direct care on a regular basis (as opposed to filling in)	18.2%	188	18.0%	45	-0.2%	0.0	0.982	17.3%	173	-0.9%	0.1	0.821
Cover for absent staff: director substitutes	20.5%	188	17.9%	45	-2.6%	0.2	0.684	11.3%	172	-9.2% *	5.5	0.019
Cover for absent staff: existing staff member substitutes	60.0%	188	73.1%	45	+13.1%	2.8	0.093	77.8%	172	+17.8% **	13.4	0.000

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-certified at p<.01, *= at p<.05

Director Education and Experience by Texas Rising Star, Centers

	Non-Certified	Non-certified N	Texas Rising Star 3 Star	Texas Rising Star 3 Star N	3 Star Difference	F-value	prob	Texas Rising Star 4 Star	Texas Rising Star 4 Star N	4 Star Difference	F-value	prob
Director highest degree - High school or GED	14.6%	187	15.9%	44	+1.3%	0.1	0.821	10.5%	167	-4.1%	1.3	0.256
Director highest degree - Associates or some college	37.0%	187	30.1%	44	-6.9%	0.7	0.406	40.4%	167	+3.4%	0.4	0.512
Director highest degree - Bachelors	30.5%	187	45.3%	44	+14.8%	3.3	0.072	36.8%	167	+6.3%	1.5	0.217
Director highest degree - Masters or above	17.9%	187	8.8%	44	-9.1%	2.3	0.132	12.3%	167	-5.6%	2.2	0.140
Director has a CDA	34.5%	186	29.4%	42	-5.1%	0.4	0.544	41.9%	167	+7.4%	2.0	0.158
Director has Child Care Administrator certificate or credential	80.7%	188	94.2%	45	+13.5% *	5.2	0.023	87.9%	172	+7.2%	3.8	0.053
Director years of experience	23.4	187	19.0	45	-4.4% *	5.3	0.022	24.3	169	0.9	0.6	0.440

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-certified at p<.01, *= at p<.05

Staffing Education and Experience by Texas Rising Star, Centers

	Non-Certified	Non-certified N	Texas Rising Star 3 Star	Texas Rising Star 3 Star N	3 Star Difference	F-value	prob	Texas Rising Star 4 Star	Texas Rising Star 4 Star N	4 Star Difference	F-value	prob
Staff with highest degree - High school or GED	71.7%	147	74.6%	42	+2.9%	0.3	0.561	68.8%	153	-2.9%	0.8	0.382
Staff with highest degree - Associates	8.6%	147	13.6%	42	+5.0%	3.0	0.083	15.0%	153	+6.4% **	11.6	0.001
Staff with highest degree - Bachelors	15.6%	149	9.2%	42	-6.4%	3.3	0.069	11.9%	157	-3.7%	2.6	0.105
Staff with highest degree - Masters or above	3.0%	150	1.8%	42	-1.2%	0.9	0.348	1.7%	157	-1.3%	2.5	0.116
Direct care staff with a CDA	9.1%	165	15.9%	42	+6.8%	3.6	0.059	25.2%	163	+16.1% **	50.2	<.0001
Staff with 8 or more years of experience working in ECE	39.3%	188	27.5%	45	-11.8% **	7.2	0.008	45.7%	172	+6.4% *	5.5	0.019
Staff with less than 3 years of experience working in ECE	35.5%	188	38.4%	45	+2.9%	0.4	0.530	26.6%	172	-8.9% **	9.6	0.002

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-certified at p<.01, *= at p<.05

Staff Training by Texas Rising Star, Centers

	Non-Certified	Non-certified N	Texas Rising Star 3 Star	Texas Rising Star 3 Star N	3 Star Difference	F-value	prob	Texas Rising Star 4 Star	Texas Rising Star 4 Star N	4 Star Difference	F-value	prob
Conference or workshop fees	61.9%	187	58.7%	45	-3.2%	0.2	0.701	52.5%	171	-9.4%	3.3	0.071
Online training fees	71.3%	186	74.1%	45	+2.8%	0.1	0.729	54.3%	170	-17.0% **	11.4	0.001
Onsite training fees	70.7%	187	61.2%	45	-9.5%	1.5	0.224	63.7%	170	-7.0%	2.0	0.157
Payments to substitutes to cover the classroom while staff are in training	19.4%	184	7.7%	45	-11.7%	3.2	0.073	19.6%	170	+0.2%	0.0	0.960
Travel costs for off-site training	33.6%	187	36.6%	42	+3.0%	0.1	0.714	33.0%	167	-0.6%	0.0	0.910

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-certified at p<.01, *= at p<.05

Wages and Benefits by Texas Rising Star, Centers

	Non-Certified	Non-certified N	Texas Rising Star 3 Star	Texas Rising Star 3 Star N	3 Star Difference	F-value	prob	Texas Rising Star 4 Star	Texas Rising Star 4 Star N	4 Star Difference	F-value	prob
Hourly wage for full-time teacher	\$13.65	120	\$13.07	31	-\$0.58	0.9	0.354	\$14.16	151	\$0.51	1.9	0.169
Hourly wage for full-time assistant teacher	\$13.05	50	\$12.23	13	-\$0.82	0.9	0.357	\$13.27	81	\$0.22	0.2	0.658
Hourly wage for full-time lead teacher	\$15.78	50	\$14.20	13	-\$1.58	1.7	0.194	\$15.28	81	-\$0.50	0.5	0.464
Difference in hourly wage between highest and lowest paid teachers	\$3.50	120	\$3.03	31	-\$0.47	0.6	0.425	\$3.28	151	-\$0.22	0.4	0.540
Benefits - Retirement programs such as annuity, 401(k) or 403(b) plan	31.3%	188	55.2%	45	+23.9% **	8.9	0.003	59.2%	171	+27.9% **	30.7	<.0001
Benefits - Reduced tuition for staff children enrolled in your program	91.1%	186	95.1%	45	+4.0%	0.8	0.388	92.4%	172	+1.3%	0.2	0.651
Benefits - Tuition assistance for college/CDA courses	43.4%	176	80.9%	45	+37.5% **	24.6	<.0001	82.3%	164	+38.9% **	64.4	<.0001
Benefits - Health insurance	38.1%	188	67.8%	45	+29.7% **	13.5	0.000	68.7%	172	+30.6% **	36.5	<.0001
Benefits - Paid time off for vacation, holidays, or other	75.0%	188	94.3%	45	+19.3% **	10.6	0.001	92.7%	172	+17.7% **	22.9	<.0001

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-certified at p<.01, *= at p<.05

Curriculum by Texas Rising Star, Centers

	Non-Certified	Non-certified N	Texas Rising Star 3 Star	Texas Rising Star 3 Star N	3 Star Difference	F-value	prob	Texas Rising Star 4 Star	Texas Rising Star 4 Star N	4 Star Difference	F-value	prob
Use a curriculum or prepared set of learning and play activities	90.6%	143	96.4%	35	+5.8%	2.0	0.154	98.8%	169	+8.2% **	11.3	0.001
Purchase curriculum	51.4%	178	57.8%	43	+6.4%	0.6	0.458	42.8%	170	-8.6%	2.5	0.112
Get curriculum from corporate office / organization	4.9%	179	21.2%	45	+16.3% **	8.0	0.005	25.2%	170	+20.3% **	30.8	<.0001
Develop curriculum in-house	35.3%	179	2.7%	45	-32.6% **	26.9	<.0001	11.1%	170	-24.2% **	37.1	<.0001
Get curriculum through Texas Rising Star (TRS)	1.7%	179	12.6%	45	+10.9% *	5.4	0.020	15.2%	170	+13.5% **	20.9	<.0001
Get curriculum through Texas School Ready (TSR)	1.7%	179	0.1%	45	-1.6%	0.4	0.550	4.0%	170	+2.3%	1.8	0.185
Get curriculum somewhere else	9.0%	179	7.9%	45	-1.1%	0.1	0.808	6.4%	170	-2.6%	0.8	0.360

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-certified at p<.01, *= at p<.05

Planning Time and Assessment by Texas Rising Star, Centers

	Non-Certified	Non-certified N	Texas Rising Star 3 Star	Texas Rising Star 3 Star N	3 Star Difference	F-value	prob	Texas Rising Star 4 Star	Texas Rising Star 4 Star N	4 Star Difference	F-value	prob
Total paid hours each week direct care staff are given for planning children's activities	2.5	181	2.7	42	0.2	0.1	0.727	3.2	167	0.7 *	6.0	0.015
Use formal assessments to measure children's developmental progress	52.0%	186	94.7%	45	+42.7% **	40.6	<.0001	89.0%	172	+37.0% **	77.7	<.0001
Use informal assessments to measure children's developmental progress	22.3%	186	2.8%	45	-19.5% **	12.0	0.001	6.2%	172	-16.1% **	20.7	<.0001

Source: RMC statistical analysis of cost of quality data. Note: **=significantly different from non-certified at p<.01, *= at p<.05

APPENDIX B. COST OF QUALITY SURVEY

1. Hi. Can I please speak to the director of (CENTER NAME)? Hi, my name is _____and I'm calling from The University of Texas at Austin on behalf of the Texas Workforce Commission to conduct the annual child care market rate survey. The purpose of this survey is to estimate the price of child care across the state of Texas.

The survey takes between 5-10 minutes to complete. Any information we collect specifically about your center will not be shared with anyone outside the research team. Once you finish, we will enter your center into a weekly drawing for a gift card. Is now a good time to start?

- Accept - Continue with survey
 - Refusal
 - Overdial
 - Not eligible
 - Wrong number - New number is available _____
 - Withdrew
2. Does your facility offer full-time child care, five days a week at least six hours per day?
 3. If no, does your facility offer after school care or part-day child care, five days a week less than six hours per day?
 4. Is your facility any of the following?
 - Only a drop-in care center (no regular rates; i.e., gym, hospital, mall)
 - A Head Start program
 - A free child care service
 - A facility not open to the public/only serves specific groups
 - A facility offering only summer camps
 - A kindergarten or school not offering regular child care or after-school care
 - None of the above- Continue Survey

Hours of Operation, Vacation and Holidays

5. What are your hours of operation (M-F)?

Weekday	Open	Close
Monday		
Tuesday		
Wednesday		
Thursday		
Friday		

6. What are your hours of operation on Saturday and Sunday, if any?

Weekday	Open	Close
Saturday		
Sunday		

7. How many days out of the year do you close for national, state, or religious holidays?

8. Outside of weekends and holidays, how many days out of the year do you close for personal vacation, summer, or any other reasons?

9. Do you regularly offer drop-in care?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Enrollment

10. Altogether, how many children are enrolled at your center?

Number of Children Enrolled: _____

Number of Age Groups: _____

11. What are the age groups on which your rate structure is based?

Ask about each age group:

How many children come full-day?

How many children come part-day or afterschool?

Group	Age Range in Months		Total Enrolled		Comments about age group
	Min	Max	Full-time 5 days, 6+hrs	Part-day 5 days, <6 hrs	

12. Ratios: Ask about each group:

How many classrooms do you have for this age group?

How many children are typically in a classroom for this age group?

How many teachers are typically in a classroom for this age group?

Rates

13. Full-Day Rates: Ask about each age group

What are your standard full-day rates for children in Age Group__?

Is that rate per hour, day, week, month, or year?

How many days of care per week does this rate cover?

14. Part-Day Rates: Ask about each age group

What are your standard part-day rates for children in Age Group__?

Is that rate per hour, day, week, month, or year?

How many days of care per week does this rate cover?

15. Additional Weekend Rates

What are your standard Additional weekend rates for children in Age Group ___?

Is that rate per hour, day, week, month, or year?

16. Rate Comments

17. Do you typically have a waitlist for any of your age groups?

Additional Fees

18. Fees: In addition to your regular rate, do you charge a _____?

	Amount
One-time registration fee	
Yearly or semester enrollment fee	
Additional activity or supply fee	

19. If enrollment fee is Yes: Is your enrollment fee per _____?

- Semester
- Academic Year
- Calendar Year

20. If activity fee is Yes: Is your activity or supply fee per _____?

- Month
- Trimester
- Semester
- Academic Year
- Calendar Year

21. Comments about additional rates

22. Do you provide any discounts in the form of a sliding scale? (Note: If offer scholarships to some children, count as sliding scale)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

CCS Children

23. Do you accept CCS children (children receiving subsidies)? How many slots do you allocate for CCS children?

- Do not accept CCS children
- Accept CCS children, do NOT allocate a specific number of slots
- Accept CCS children, allocate specific number or percent of slots: ____
- Don't Know

24. If no-> Is there a reason you do not accept CCS children?

- Not currently caring for CCS children but do accept
- In process of setting up
- Families have not requested or needed
- Paperwork/reporting requirements
- Reimbursement rates too low
- Not receiving/receiving late parent co-pays
- Not receiving/receiving late CCS payments
- Facility is full/fills too quickly
- Facility is new/too small
- Need more information/training
- Not a Texas Rising Star Provider
- Other_____
- No reason provided

25. If yes-> Do you charge families an additional amount if their total CCS subsidy plus parent co-pay is less than your established rate?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

26. Does your center offer regular transportation? (Excludes field trips)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

27. Is your child care center a for-profit or non-profit facility (501.C3 status)?

- For-Profit
- Non-Profit
- Don't Know

Program Information

28. Is your child care facility _____?

- Part of a local or regional chain
- Part of a national chain
- Independently owned
- Other _____
- None of the above
- Don't know

29. Is your child care associated with a church or religious organization?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

30. Is your child care associated with a public school?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

31. Does your center receive any of the following services for free or at a reduced cost?

- Building use
- Utilities
- Volunteer work
- Other
- None
- Don't know

32. Does your center participate in the federal child care food program? (Child and Adult Care Food Program – CACFP)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

33. If no -> Is there a reason you do not participate? _____

34. Does your facility receive any donations from...?

- Local, state or federal government funding
- Private or individual donations
- Other
- No donations
- Don't know

35. Is your center certified as a Texas Rising Star provider?

- Yes, number of stars: _____
- No
- Don't know

36. If no -> Is there a reason your program does not participate in Texas Rising Star?

- Too much paperwork / administrative burden
- Enhanced reimbursement rates do not cover high costs to participate
- Don't know enough about Texas Rising Star
- Staff would not support / participate
- Other: _____
- No reason provided

37. Is your center nationally accredited?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

38. If yes -> By whom?

- NAEYC - National Association for the Education of Young Children
- NECPA - National Early Childhood Program Accreditation
- NAC - National Accreditation Commission for Early Care and Education Programs
- COA - Council on Accreditation
- Cognia Accreditation (Formerly AdvancED Quality Early Learning Standards, QELS)
- Montessori Accreditation (AMS American Montessori Society or AMI)
- ACSI - Association of Christian Schools International Accreditation
- Other
- Don't know

If yes -> What is your estimated annual fee to maintain your center's national accreditation?

\$ _____

Director Qualifications and Experience

39. How many years of experience do you (the director) have working in childcare or early childhood education?

Number of Years: _____

40. What is your (director's) highest level of education?

- High school diploma or GED
- Associate's degree
- Some college
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree or higher
- Prefer not to answer

41. Do you (the director) have a Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

42. Do you (the director) have a Child Care Administrator Certificate or credential?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

43. Do you (the director) provide direct care on a regular basis (as opposed to filling in)?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

Staff Qualifications and Experience

44. How many direct care staff work at your center?

Number of Direct Care Staff: _____

Number of Full-Time Direct Care Staff: _____

45. How many of your direct care staff have a highest degree of a _____?

Degree	Total Staff
High school diploma or GED	
Associate's degree	
Bachelor's degree	
Master's degree or higher	

46. How many of your direct care staff have a Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential?

Number of Direct Care Staff: _____

47. How many of your direct care staff have less than **three** years of experience working in early childhood education?

Number of Direct Care Staff: _____

48. How many of your direct care staff have **eight** or more years of experience working in early childhood education?

Number of Direct Care Staff: _____

49. Do your hourly wages differ based on what age group a teacher is teaching?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

50. What is the hourly wage for your highest paid full-time **lead** teacher?

\$_____ per hour

51. What is the hourly wage for your lowest paid full-time **lead** teacher?

\$_____ per hour

52. What is the hourly wage for your highest paid full-time **assistant** teacher?

\$_____ per hour

53. What is the hourly wage for your lowest paid full-time **assistant** teacher?

\$_____ per hour

54. Do you offer _____?

	Yes	No	Unknown
Reduced tuition for staff children enrolled in your program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Retirement programs such as annuity, 401(k) or 403(b) plan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Health insurance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Paid time off for vacation, holidays, or other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tuition assistance for college/CDA courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Training

55. In the past 12 months, did your center have any of the following training expenses?

	Yes	No	Unknown
Conference or workshop fees	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Onsite training fees	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Online training fees	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Travel costs for off-site training	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Payments to substitutes to cover the classroom while staff are in training	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Staff Turnover and Absenteeism

56. How many direct care staff left your center in the last 12 months?

Number of Direct Care Staff: _____

Number of Full-Time Direct Care Staff: _____

57. When direct care staff are absent or there are vacancies in classrooms, are you most likely to cover for them by _____?

- Having the director substitute
- Substituting with other current staff
- Substituting temporary or outside staff
- Other
- Prefer not to say

Curriculum

58. Do you use a curriculum or prepared set of learning and play activities for infants, toddlers, or pre-K?

- Infants (0-17 months)
- Toddlers (18-35 months)
- Preschool/Pre-K (36-71 months)
- None of the above

59. If infants, toddlers, or preschool/pre-k is selected-> Do you purchase your curriculum?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

60. If no -> Where do you get your curriculum or prepared set of learning activities?

- Get it through Texas Rising Star (TRS)
- Get it through Texas School Ready (TSR)
- Obtain it through your corporate office / organization
- Develop it in-house
- Obtain it from somewhere else
- Prefer not to say

61. If yes -> What is the name of the curricula or prepared set of activities that you use? (Select all that apply)

- ABC Jesus Loves Me
- Ascend Curriculum (Cadence Education)
- Abeka
- Appelbaum
- Balanced Learning (Primrose)
- Big Day for Pre K
- CATCH
- Champions for children / All Ready Curriculum
- CLI Engage / CIRCLE – Children’s Learning Institute
- Creative Curriculum / Teaching Strategies – Includes Foundation and Learning Games
- DIG Develop. Inspire. Grow by Frog Street
- Early Foundations (KinderCare)
- First Class, Steam Ahead or Brain Waves (Kids R Kids)
- Frog Street Infants / Toddlers / Pre-K Curriculum

- Funshine Express – Buttercups / Fireflies
- Galileo Pre-K
- Handwriting Without Tears / Learning Without Tears
- High Reach / Childcare Network
- HighScope Curriculum
- Innovations Curriculum
- Investigator's Club / Investigators
- Learn from the Start / Learn as we Grow / Learning Care System (La Petite)
- Learn Every Day
- Life Essentials: Ready Set Go (Kiddie Academy)
- Little Texans, Big Futures – Children's Learning Institute
- Montessori Curriculum
- Mother Goose Time / Experience Learning Curriculum
- OWL Opening the World of Learning
- Pinnacle Curriculum
- Scholastic Pre K On My Way / Early Childhood Program
- Teachers Pay Teachers
- Wee Learn
- Young Achievers (Children's Courtyard)
- Other
- Don't know

Assessments

62. Does your center use formal assessments to measure children's developmental progress?

- Yes
- No

63. If no -> Does your center use informal assessments to measure children's developmental progress?

- Yes
- No

Planning and Nutrition

64. How many paid hours each week are direct care staff given for planning children's activities?

Number of hours: _____

65. Does your center provide free meals and snacks?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer

If yes -> How many snacks per day?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 or more
- Prefer not to answer

If yes -> How many meals per day?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 or more
- Prefer not to answer

66. Lastly, are there any other costs associated with providing quality care that we did not ask about?

Thank you for your time.