

Evaluation of R.E.E.T.A.I.N. Minnesota's Child Care Workforce Retention Program

Technical Appendix

Rowan Hilty, Katherine Paschall, Kerensa Nagle, Leanna Moron, and Sara Shaw



This report is made possible with funding from Minnesota Department of Human Services from the federal Child Care and Development Block Grant.

Suggested citation:

Hilty, R., Paschall, K., Nagle, K., Moron, L., & Shaw, S. (2018). *Evaluation of R.E.E.T.A.I.N., Minnesota's Child Care Workforce Retention Program – Technical Appendix*. Minneapolis, MN: Child Trends for the Minnesota Department of Human Services. DHS-7809A 1-19.



For accessible formats of this information or assistance with additional equal access to human services, write to dhs.info@state.mn.us, call 651-431-3809, or use your preferred relay service. ADA1 (2-18)

Contents

Introduction	4
Cost	6
Advisory Group	6
Review of Similar Retention Programs	7
Applicant Interview Protocol	22
Recruitment	22
Applicant Survey	22
Recruitment	22
Sample Characteristics.....	23
Analysis Plan.....	24
Tables of Survey Findings	25
Who took our survey?	25
How did applicants hear about R.E.E.T.A.I.N.?.....	32
How helpful did recipients find the bonus personally and professionally?	34
How specifically did the bonus help those recipients who found it to be helpful professionally?	42
T.E.A.C.H.....	49
Bonus Recipients' Perceptions of R.E.E.T.A.I.N.....	49
What challenges did applicants face when applying for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus?	57
Do past applicants plan on applying for another grant in the future?	66
What are the characteristics of past applicants who have since left the field?	68
References.....	73

Introduction

Child care programs struggle to retain qualified employees in Minnesota and nationwide.^{1,2} Frequent changes in program staff are associated with negative outcomes not only for programs,³ but also for remaining staff and the children they serve.^{4,5} Past research has found that high teacher turnover is associated with lower program quality, which can also negatively impact children's development and well-being.⁶ In addition to improving outcomes for children and working conditions for staff, stabilizing the child care workforce is a critical issue for the Minnesota economy, since child care shortages can hinder economic development.⁷

Reflecting growing attention to the importance of staff retention, Minnesota and several other states have invested in public initiatives to enhance wages for child care professionals. In 2003, the Minnesota Child Care Resource and Referral Network raised funds to launch the Retaining Early Educators through Attaining Incentives Now (R.E.E.T.A.I.N.) bonus program to encourage well-trained child care professionals to remain in the field. In 2004, the Minnesota Department of Humans Services (DHS) began funding the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. program. R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonuses offer a small financial incentive to providers with degrees who stay in the field and continually participate in professional development. In return, bonus recipients agree to remain in their current positions for at least one year after receiving the incentive. Bonuses typically range from \$500 to \$3,500 (depending on available funds) and are awarded to the most qualified candidates based on their scores on factors such as length of service in current position, wages, and professional development activities.

To date, little research has examined the effectiveness of retention programs such as the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus. Given this lack of information, it is crucial for state officials in Minnesota to understand how the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. program is functioning as a workforce retention initiative, and the extent to which child care professionals can equitably access the bonus.

To answer these and other questions, DHS contracted with Child Trends in 2018 to study the impact of R.E.E.T.A.I.N. on bonus recipient retention. The research team at Child Trends completed the following components of the study:

- Analyzed administrative data on those who applied for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus since 2013
- Convened two advisory groups, one of key state-level stakeholders and one of past applicants to R.E.E.T.A.I.N., to weigh in on the proposed study methods and findings
- Conducted an online survey of past R.E.E.T.A.I.N. applicants, including both those who received a bonus (recipients) and those who did not (non-recipients)
- Collected information on current R.E.E.T.A.I.N. policies, procedures, and implementation
- Reviewed existing literature on other relevant early childhood workforce retention programs
- Conducted individual interviews with a subset of bonus applicants and recipients

Drawn from this wide range of data sources, findings from this research provide actionable information for policymakers and programs in Minnesota. Given the lack of research on retention initiatives overall, this study can also serve as resource for other states interested in or implementing child care workforce retention initiatives. The study focuses on research questions in four key areas:

Retention

- Is receiving one or more R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonuses associated with providers' decisions to remain in the child care workforce?
- Are R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus recipients more likely to remain in the workforce than non-recipients?

Educational Attainment

- Do R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus recipients achieve higher levels of education or professional development compared to applicants who did not receive the bonus?

Supports

- Do R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus recipients report that the grant was useful? How do R.E.E.T.A.I.N. recipients report using the bonus? How do R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus recipients perceive the value of applying to R.E.E.T.A.I.N.?
- What role do other professional supports play in R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus recipients' decisions to stay in the field?
- What best practices have been identified in research on similar workforce retention programs? How can Minnesota use these practices to improve the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus program?

Barriers

- How difficult was it to apply for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus?
- Did applicants rely on any outside support (e.g., help from supervisors) to apply for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus?

This analysis also compares findings across key subgroups of R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus applicants. Specifically, it examines differences across provider type (e.g., center-based or family child care providers), number of times the provider received the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus, geographic location, Career Lattice Step, and provider race/ethnicity.

The main report (available from [Child Trends](#) and the Minnesota Department of Human Services) provides key findings and recommendations from the study with limited description of the research method and analyses. The main report includes the following:

- Background information on the topic of workforce retention and the aims of R.E.E.T.A.I.N.
- A brief description of the study research questions and research method
- Findings from the analysis of R.E.E.T.A.I.N. administrative data from 2013- 2018
- Maps of the locations of applicants
- Findings from the scan of similar workforce retention programs and the review of R.E.E.T.A.I.N. program documentation
- Findings from the analysis of a survey of R.E.E.T.A.I.N. applicants, including both recipients and non-recipients of the bonus
- Findings from the interviews with R.E.E.T.A.I.N. applicants
- A synthesis of key findings and recommendations

This technical appendix accompanies the main report and provides more information about the methods and findings. It includes the processes for convening the two advisory groups to solicit feedback on the study methods and findings, for reviewing the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. program implementation, and for scanning for similar retention initiatives. For the applicant survey and the accompanying qualitative interviews with applicants, the technical appendix describes our recruitment strategies, measures used, and patterns of missing data; all findings are broken down by key demographic and professional factors.

Cost

The project was split into four phases. The cost for each phase is displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. Project cost by phase

Project phase	Cost
Phase 1: Planning and development	\$18,047
Phase 2: Analysis and evaluation	\$39,290
Phase 3: Final report and recommendations	\$19,071
Phase 4: Ongoing project management	\$23,118
Total	\$99,526

Source: Child Trends contract with MN DHS (2018)

Advisory Group

Before conducting research activities, Child Trends convened two advisory groups to provide feedback on the proposed methods for the study. To incorporate the insights of both state-level officials and child care professionals who have applied for the bonus in the past, the research team decided to convene two separate advisory groups. The first group, referred to as the administrative advisory group, was composed of child care and early education stakeholders from state agencies, contractors (e.g., Child Care Aware), and non-profit organizations. The second group, referred to as the applicant advisory group, was composed of early educators who had previously applied for the bonus. The two advisory groups were convened separately to accommodate scheduling needs, remove any conflicts of interest, and ensure that participants in each group felt comfortable sharing feedback with the study team. Each advisory group was convened twice: once at the beginning of the study to share feedback on the proposed study methods, and once at the end of the project to discuss the study findings and the draft of the final report.

DHS provided the research team with a list of 18 state-level stakeholders to invite to the administrative advisory group. Ten were able to attend the first meeting, and nine were able to attend the second meeting. The administrative group met in-person at the Child Trends office, but participants also had the option to join online via WebEx. Members of the applicant advisory group were randomly selected from the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. applicant database, accounting for equal representation based on provider care type and number of bonuses received. Child Trends invited 14 past applicants from around Minnesota to participate. Three were able to attend the first meeting, and two were able to attend the second meeting. The applicant advisory group was held via WebEx in the evening to accommodate providers' daytime work schedules. A list of the advisory group invitees is presented in Table 2. To protect the privacy of the providers who took part in the past applicant advisory group, we share only the provider type of each invitee.

Table 2. Advisory group invitees

Administrative advisory group	
Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lyn Rhodes • Hareg Tsegaye • Nick Henderson
Children's Defense Fund, Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May Losloso • Jessica Anderson
Child Care Aware of Minnesota (including local agencies)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erin Young • Ann McCully • Val Peterson
Dakota County Technical College	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharon Bergen
Minnesota Child Care Provider Information Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Angelique Bruggeman
Minnesota Department of Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debbie Hewitt
Minnesota Initiative Foundations (MIFs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nancy Jost
Minnesota Association of Child Care Professionals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracy Stengel
Minnesota Tribal Resource for Early Childhood Care (MNTRECC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tamie Finn
New Horizon Academy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kat Butler • Chad Dunkley • Clare Sanford
Think Small	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cisa Keller
Voices and Choices for Children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bharti Wahi
Past applicant advisory group	
Family child care providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 providers
Center-based care providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 providers

Review of Similar Retention Programs

To better understand how R.E.E.T.A.I.N. program characteristics and implementation compare to other workforce retention programs, Child Trends conducted a review of early childhood workforce retention programs implemented in the United States. DHS provided Child Trends with a preliminary list of other early childhood workforce programs and potential resources for researching additional programs. Child

Trends examined these sources and reviewed the citation lists of the reports DHS provided to identify additional programs or resources that could be included in the review.¹

To tailor the process, the research team used the Early Childhood Workforce Index⁸ to focus the search on states identified as having wage supplement programs. For the identified states, the team conducted internet searches using the state names coupled with “early childhood” and “wage supplement.” In total, searches were conducted for 13 states, and 16 programs were identified in 11 states. Following the search, the characteristics of other states’ programs were compared to the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. program.

The final step was an online search conducted to identify outcome studies of the programs identified in this review. Search terms included the state name, program name, and “report,” “research,” and “evaluation.” For states whose annual reports were the most useful documents available, the most relevant report was selected. A summary of the programs reviewed is provided in Table 3. More detailed information about each program reviewed can be found in Table 4.

Table 3. Similar retention programs reviewed

State	Program name	Program type
Arizona	Professional REWARD\$ Program	Salary supplement
	Professional Career Pathways	Tuition restricted
	First Things First College Scholarship	Tuition restricted
California	AB212 Stipend Program	Salary supplement
Florida (Broward County & Miami-Dade County)	WAGE\$	Salary supplement
Illinois	Great START (Strategy to Attract and Retain Teachers)	Salary supplement
	Gateways Scholarship Program	Tuition restricted
Iowa	WAGE\$	Salary supplement
Louisiana	School Readiness Tax Credit for Staff and Directors	Salary supplement
Maryland	The Family Child Care Provider Grant Program	Reimbursement program
	Child Care Credential Program training vouchers and reimbursement	Tuition restricted
	Child Care Credential Program Achievement Bonus	Salary supplement
New Mexico	INCENTIVE\$ (inactive as of Fall 2018)	Salary supplement

¹ Prior to the main search, the research team conducted an initial search for programs used in early discussions of retention programs with DHS. For this search, the search terms were “early childhood,” “early care and education,” “retention programs,” and “wage supplement.”

State	Program name	Program type
North Carolina	WAGE\$	Salary supplement
Wisconsin	REWARD	Salary supplement

Source: Child Trends review of workforce retention programs similar to the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus program (2018)

Table 4. Similar retention programs reviewed (detailed)

Eligibility Requirements	Continuing Eligibility Requirements	Application Process	Amount of Stipend	Stipend Restrictions
Program Name: WAGE\$ Delaware Location: Delaware Funder: Delaware Office of Early Learning Program Goals: Child Care WAGE\$® DELAWARE is an education-based salary supplement program for early child care professionals. It is designed to increase stability and improve the quality of child care. The program also aims to increase retention, education, and compensation for the educators working directly in the classroom.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work directly with children under 5 at least 10 hours/week (administrators are only eligible for time worked in the classroom) • Earn a wage of \$17.00/hour or less • Have at least 6 credits of ECE, earned from regionally accredited school • Work for a licensed program participating in Delaware Stars (level 2 or above) • Have transcripts sent through Delaware First • Work at least 6 months in the same program before receiving payment • Be employed at same child care program during employment verification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must remain at same child care program for 6-month commitment period • Levels 1-5 of WAGE\$ scale are temporary levels. Teachers at these levels must move up to a higher level within two years to retain eligibility. (Deadlines are reestablished every time teacher moves up a temporary level.) • If provider moves to a new program, they will lose their WAGE\$ grant and must reapply to WAGE\$ after 6 months at the new site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide employment verification • Submit required documentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Income verification ○ Official transcripts ○ Completed direct deposit form ○ Voided check or bank note ○ Completed W9 tax form 	Annual supplement based on education level: Level 1: \$200 Level 2: \$700 Level 3: \$1,200 Level 4: \$1,700 Level 5: \$2,000 Level 6: \$2,300 Level 7: \$2,500 Level 8: \$5,000	Salary supplement, no restrictions
Program Name: WAGE\$ Florida Location: Florida, Broward County & Miami-Dade County Funder: Local contributors such as early learning coalitions and children services councils Program Goals: The Child Care WAGE\$® Florida Program is designed to increase stability and improve child care quality by reducing turnover and encouraging continued education of child care practitioners.				

Eligibility Requirements	Continuing Eligibility Requirements	Application Process	Amount of Stipend	Stipend Restrictions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work in a county that funds the Child Care WAGE\$® FLORIDA Project Work in a licensed or licensed-exempt ECE program Earn less than \$17.50/hour as a child care practitioner (teacher or assistant) Have a minimum of 6 credit hours in ECE from a regionally accredited college and a Florida Staff Credential Work at least 6 months in the same eligible ECE program Be employed at this same program at the time of employment confirmation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must remain at same child care program for 6-month commitment period Levels 1-5 of WAGE\$ scale are temporary levels. Teachers at these levels must move up to a higher level within two years to retain eligibility. (Deadlines are reestablished every time teacher moves up a temporary level.) If provider moves to a new program, they will lose their WAGE\$ grant and must reapply to WAGE\$ after 6 months at the new site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide employment verification Submit required documentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ownership form Education Documentation Income worksheet (family child care and small facility owners only) Income Verification Tax documentation (Center owners only) 	Annual supplement based on education level Level 1: \$200 Level 2: \$450 Level 3: \$600 Level 4: \$750 Level 5: \$1,125 Level 6: \$1,500 Level 7: \$2,250 Level 8: \$3,000	Salary supplement, no restrictions
<p>Program Name: WAGE\$ Iowa</p> <p>Location: Iowa</p> <p>Funder: Multiple funding sources from public and private sources</p> <p>Program Goals: Child Care WAGE\$® IOWA provides education-based salary supplements to low-paid early care and education providers working with children ages birth to 5 in regulated settings in Iowa. The project is designed to increase retention, education, and compensation.</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work in an eligible ECE program in a funded county Earn below the income cap (varies by county, standard cap is \$15/hour) Have minimum of 12 ECE credits from a regionally accredited school Work at least 6 months in the same child care program Be employed at same child care program for final confirmation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Levels 3-7 are temporary levels. Teachers at these levels must move to a higher level within 2 years to retain eligibility Must remain at same child care program for a 6-month commitment period If provider moves to a new program, they will lose their WAGE\$ grant and must reapply to WAGE\$ after 6 months at the new site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide employment verification Submit required documentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copy of DHS license or registration Copy of QRS certificate (if applicable) Copy of NAEYC/NAFCC (if applicable) Child Care Assistance verification (if applicable) Income verification Official transcripts 	Annual supplement based on education level Level 1: N/A Level 2: N/A Level 3: \$500 Level 4: \$800 Level 5: \$1,100 Level 6: \$1,400 Level 7: \$1,800 Level 8: \$2,300 Level 9: \$2,900 Level 10: \$3,500	Salary supplement, no restrictions

Eligibility Requirements	Continuing Eligibility Requirements	Application Process	Amount of Stipend	Stipend Restrictions
<p>Program Name: WAGE\$ North Carolina Location: North Carolina Funder: Local Smart Start partnerships and the Division of Child Development and Early Education Program Goals: The Child Care WAGE\$® Program provides education-based salary supplements to low-paid teachers, directors and family child care providers working with children birth to 5. The program aims to provide preschool children stable relationships with well-educated teachers by rewarding teacher education and continuity of care.</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work in a participating/funding county • Earn at or below the hourly income cap (\$14, \$16, \$18) selected by your local Smart Start partnership • Work with children under 5 for at least 10 hours per week • Work in a licensed child care program • Have a level of education appearing on the Child Care WAGE\$ Supplement Scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levels 2-7 are temporary levels. Teachers at these levels must move to a higher level within 2 years to retain eligibility • Must remain at same child care program for a 6-month commitment period • If provider moves to a new program, they will lose their WAGE\$ grant and must reapply to WAGE\$ after 6 months at the new site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete application and send to WAGE\$ North Carolina by mail • Provide employment verification • Submit required documentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Official transcripts ○ Income verification 	<p>Annual stipend based on education level</p> <p>Level 1: N/A Level 2: \$450 Level 3: \$600 Level 4: \$750 Level 5: \$950 Level 6: \$1,125 Level 7: \$1,325 Level 8: \$1,500 Level 9: \$1,875 Level 10: \$2,250 Level 11-13: \$3,000</p>	Salary supplement, no restrictions
<p>Program Name: INCENTIVE\$* Location: New Mexico Funder: unknown Program Goals: The supplements encourage early childhood educators to take more college classes to gain expertise about young children and to commit to continue working with children ages birth to 5.</p> <p><i>*Note that this program was discontinued during the course of the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. Evaluation. INCENTIVE\$ is no longer active.</i></p>				

Eligibility Requirements	Continuing Eligibility Requirements	Application Process	Amount of Stipend	Stipend Restrictions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work for a licensed ECE center, a registered or licensed family child care, or an Early Head Start Program (Santa Fe only) Currently earn less than \$16 an hour Work 10+ hours/week with children under 5 OR be a director-employee (centers only) Must have taken at least 5 credit hours of ECE courses or 70 hours of well-rounded college coursework In a center, the program must serve at least 1 child on state child care subsidy In a family child care, candidate must work with 1 non-relative under 5 AND the home must be listed on NewMexicoKids CCR&R as open to serving children under 5, including those on subsidy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education levels 1-7 are temporary levels. Teachers at these levels must move to a higher level within 2 years to retain eligibility Must remain at same child care program for a 6-month commitment period If provider moves to a new program, they will lose their WAGE\$ grant and must reapply to WAGE\$ after 6 months at the new site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mail completed application to INCENTIVE\$ New Mexico Must have Director, owner, or other authorized individual provide employment verification Submit required documentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official transcripts Income verification Family child care form (required for FCC providers) 	Annual stipend based on education level Level 1: \$300 Level 2: \$600 Level 3: \$900 Level 4: \$1,200 Level 5: \$1,700 Level 6: \$2,100 Level 7: \$2,500 Level 8: \$3,400 Level 9: \$4,500 Level 10: \$5,00	Salary supplement, no restrictions
<p>Program Name: Professional REWARD\$ Program</p> <p>Location: Arizona</p> <p>Funder: First Things First Regional Partnership Councils (each region's council determines funding amount in their region)</p> <p>Program Goals: First Things First aims to build a skilled and prepared early childhood workforce. The Professional REWARD\$ Program was designed to increase workforce retention by recognizing providers for educational attainment and continuity of care.</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registry Career Lattice Level is "B" or above (Diploma/GED and at least 6 credits in ECE or related field) Lawful U.S. resident over age 18 Employed at a child care program or family home provider regulated by a federal, state, or tribal authority in a First Things First Region Working at least 30 hours a week (directly with children under 5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must reapply every year. Cannot receive REWARD\$ incentive and an FTF College Scholarship Bonus in the same year REWARD\$ is offered twice each fiscal year (fall and spring), but individuals who receive an award in the first enrollment period (fall) are not eligible in the second enrollment period (spring). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create a Registry account with azearlychildhood.org Send official transcripts to Registry to verify credits earned. (Process takes several weeks) Have employer verify employment information with Registry 	Level B: \$500 Level C: \$700 Level D: \$900 Level E: \$1,200 Level F: \$1,500 Level G: \$2,000 Based on education level	Salary supplement, no restrictions

Eligibility Requirements	Continuing Eligibility Requirements	Application Process	Amount of Stipend	Stipend Restrictions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employed at current place of work for 12 consecutive months Earn \$20 or less per hour Employer meets one of the following criteria: Enrolled in/on wait list for Quality First OR Accredited by a national organization which is recognized by the Department of Education or Department of Economic Security 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicants must move up career lattice levels within a specified amount of time when at levels B-F. This varies based on lattice level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit required documentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> W-9 Form Professional Development and Education Report Valid form of identification 		
<p>Program Name: Professional Career Pathways Project</p> <p>Location: Arizona</p> <p>Funder: AZ Department of Economic Security Child Care Administration through Federal Child Care Development Block Grant Funds (CCDBG)</p> <p>Program Goals: The Professional Career Pathways Project is a scholarship program aimed at helping early education providers achieve specific career goals including but not limited to obtaining the CDA credential, the Certificate of Completion and Associate of Applied Science degree in Early Childhood Education.</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must work in a preschool, childcare center, or as a family child care provider. Volunteers may be eligible. Must identify an educational goal (Pathway) and pursue Early Childhood Education coursework to accomplish goal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must complete all courses paid for by the PCPP with a grade of C or above to maintain eligibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contact the ECE Department at a collaborating community college (listed on the website) Meet with an ECE advisor and identify educational Pathway Complete PCPP Application Form online Enroll in approved courses and purchase textbooks (after receiving grant) PCPP Course Pathway form 	Tuition for approved ECE courses (18 credits per school year; ECE courses only) and textbook vouchers (\$20 per credit) at college bookstore.	Can only be used for tuition and textbooks

Eligibility Requirements	Continuing Eligibility Requirements	Application Process	Amount of Stipend	Stipend Restrictions
<p>Program Name: First Things First College Scholarships Location: Arizona Funder: unknown Program Goals: The First Things First College Scholarship provides the early childhood workforce working directly with or on behalf of young children birth through age 5 access to education and training to achieve degrees, credentials, and specialized skills to promote children's development.</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must be a member of the Arizona Early Childhood Workforce Registry Meet minimum age defined by the college acceptance policy If employed, earn \$20.00 or less per hour Lawfully present in the US <p>Info from: http://news.coconinokids.org/first-things-first-college-scholarship/</p>	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must be a member of the Arizona Early Childhood Workforce Registry Select the scholarship you are applying for (listed in notes section) Required documentation is outlined in Scholarship Request Confirmation, but not available in pre-application materials 	Tuition, course, and college fees, and books for coursework leading to an approved degree or credential	Can only be used for tuition, books, and assessment fees
<p>Program Name: Great START (Strategy to Attract and Retain Teachers) Location: Illinois Funder: Illinois Department of Human Services (IDHS) Bureau of Child Care and Development Program Goals: Great START (Strategy to Attract and Retain Teachers) is a wage supplement program that rewards child care providers for remaining at their current place of employment and for college coursework obtained.</p>				

Eligibility Requirements	Continuing Eligibility Requirements	Application Process	Amount of Stipend	Stipend Restrictions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must work at a full-day, full-year child care facility licensed by the IL Department of Children and Family Services (IDCFS) If family child care, must work as family child care provider, family child care assistant, group home provider, or group home assistant If center-based program, must work as director, assistant director, teacher, or assistant teacher Care for Illinois children Employed by current center/home for minimum of one year Earn \$15 per hour or less and \$31,200 per year or less Citizen of United States or legal resident 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renewals occur every 6 months following initial eligibility Recipients will receive courtesy email reminder prior to renewal month Confirm contact and employment information is up to date Online: Renew Application Paper: Complete the Great Start Application and Information Update Form Mail required documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gateways Registry member Complete Great Start application online or on paper Mail required documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registry Membership Form Signed W-9 Official transcripts Income verification (including tax forms) Verification of children currently being served and IDHS child care assistance billing certificates/ program verification OR Proof of Care Form (family child care only) Most recent Form 8829 OR updated parent handbook with hours/days of operation (family child care only) 	Level 1: \$150 Level 2: \$225 Level 3: \$375 Level 4: \$525 Level 5: \$625 Level 6: \$825 Level 7: \$975 Level 8: \$1200 Level 9: \$1,575 Level 10: \$1,950 Applicants working less than 30 hrs a week will receive wage supplement at a prorated amount	Salary supplement, no restrictions
<p>Program Name: Gateways Scholarship Program</p> <p>Location: Illinois</p> <p>Funder: Illinois Department of Human Services (IDHS) and the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE)</p> <p>Program Name: The Gateways Scholarship Program is an individual-based scholarship opportunity, for practitioners working in early care and education. The program provides financial assistance for early childhood education and child development (ECE/CD) coursework and degrees offered through participating colleges and universities, dependent on available funding.</p>				

Eligibility Requirements	Continuing Eligibility Requirements	Application Process	Amount of Stipend	Stipend Restrictions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Care for Illinois children in an IDCFS licensed program or ISBE funded Preschool for All program Have been employed at your current program for at least 1 year Work an average of 15 hours per week Meet wage requirements (maximum hourly wage: \$24) Citizen of US or a legal resident 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commit to future work in early care and education or school-age care for a period, based on scholarship type Submit grade reports at the end of every term. If you do not submit grade reports for two consecutive terms, you will not be allowed to register for next term. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gateways Registry member Complete the Gateways Scholarship Program application online or on paper Mail required documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registry Membership Form Signed W-9 Official transcripts Income verification (including tax forms) Verification of children currently being served and IDHS child care assistance billing certificates/ program verification OR Proof of Care Form (family child care only) Most recent Form 8829 OR updated parent handbook with hours/days of operation (family child care only) 	<p>Tuition supplement based on hourly wage</p> <p><\$12.50 : 100% tuition</p> <p>\$12.51-\$15.00 : 90%</p> <p>\$15.01-\$18.00 : 80%</p> <p>\$18.01-\$21.00 : 70%</p> <p>\$21.01-\$24.00 : 60%</p>	<p>Tuition supplement</p>
<p>Program Name: AB 212 Stipend Program</p> <p>Location: Calaveras County, California*</p> <p>Funder: unknown</p> <p>Program Goals: Improve the retention of qualified child development employees who work directly with children in California Department of Education (CDE) contracted Title 5 Child Care and Development programs, including State Preschools.</p> <p><i>*Note that this program is active in 55 counties in California. Calaveras County is outlined here as an example.</i></p>				

Eligibility Requirements	Continuing Eligibility Requirements	Application Process	Amount of Stipend	Stipend Restrictions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide ECE services for pay to children under 13 in the same state subsidized center for at least 9 months (before applying) • Work at least 15 hours per week (directly with children) • Demonstrate you have an Assistant level Child Development Permit or higher issued by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing • Earn less than \$60,000 annually in child care • Apply for an AB212 stipend from only one county in California 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit required documentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ W-9 ○ Child Development Permit (or pending permit) ○ Professional Growth Plan and Record ○ Professional Growth certificates ○ Unofficial transcript or printout from college 	\$200 per semester unit up to 12 units, maximum stipend amount per program year is \$2400 (from Riverside County because Calaveras County does not include this information)	Salary reimbursement for tuition credits
<p>Program Name: Louisiana's School Readiness Tax Credit for Staff and Directors</p> <p>Location: Louisiana</p> <p>Funder: State Tax Refund</p> <p>Program Goals: This program aims to encourage continuity of care for Louisiana children and reduce staff turnover. A secondary goal is to increase center-based providers' participation in QRIS.</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work for at least 6 months at a licensed, center-based type III ECE program that participates in Louisiana's QRIS program • Enrolled in Louisiana pathways • *Not dependent on whether the teacher or director owes taxes* 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All directors/staff members registered with Louisiana Pathways will receive a form in January to complete if they would like to be eligible (form is filed with taxes) • Certificate of SRTC training/education level 	Refundable Tax Credit (2017 amount) Director I/Child Care Teacher I: \$1,680 II: \$2,239 III: \$2,798 IV: \$3,358	No restrictions, refundable tax credit

Eligibility Requirements	Continuing Eligibility Requirements	Application Process	Amount of Stipend	Stipend Restrictions
<p>Program Names: The Family Child Care Provider Grant Program</p> <p>Location: Maryland</p> <p>Funder: State Board of Education</p> <p>Program Goals: The Family Child Care Provider Grant Program exists to help registered family child care providers offset some of the costs of opening their child care programs.</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot have received the Family Child Care Provider Grant before • Applicant's annual income must not exceed 60% of Maryland's current State Median Income for the applicant's family size 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must continue to provide child care services at this location for a minimum of one year • Must provide child care for at least one child from one of the priority groups (Special Needs, Purchase of Care, Infants, Toddlers) for at least one year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mail in application and documentation 	Up to \$500	Reimbursement for upkeep expenses
<p>Program Name: Child Care Credential Program Training Vouchers and Reimbursements</p> <p>Location: Maryland</p> <p>Funder: unknown</p> <p>Program Goals: The goals of the Child Care Credential Program are to produce a well-qualified workforce, to increase the quality of child care, and to improve the status and compensation of child care providers. Depending upon available funding, child care providers participating in the Credential Program at Level two or higher are eligible for training vouchers or reimbursement for approved training.</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate in the Child Care Credential Program and meet the requirements for level two or higher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete approved training annually, in accordance with training plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit Training Voucher and Reimbursement Application (online option available) • Upload required documents 	Up to \$400 annually	Reimbursement for conferences, pre-service and college coursework only

Eligibility Requirements	Continuing Eligibility Requirements	Application Process	Amount of Stipend	Stipend Restrictions
<p>Program Name: Child Care Credential Program Achievement Bonus</p> <p>Location: Maryland</p> <p>Funder: unknown</p> <p>Program Goals: The goals of the Child Care Credential Program are to produce a well-qualified workforce, to increase the quality of child care, and to improve the status and compensation of child care providers. The Achievement Bonus is designed to provide a bonus to child care providers who achieve higher levels within the Maryland Child Care Credential Program.</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participate in the Child Care Credential Program and meet the requirements for level two or higher Employed at a licensed child care program for at least one year continuously Complete continued training and professional development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One-time achievement bonus upon completion of staff levels two through four and administrator level one Annual award at staff levels four plus, five, and six Annual award at administrator levels two, three, and four 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit application for renewal Submit required documentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proof of continued training Proof of professional training Proof of employment 	<p>One-time bonus (Staff) Level 2: \$200 Level 3: \$300 Level 4: \$500 Yearly bonus (Staff) Level 4+: \$600 Level 5: \$750 Level 6: \$1,000 Administrative Level 1: \$600 (one time) Level 2: \$750 (yearly) Level 3: \$1,000 (yearly) Level 4: \$1,500 (yearly)</p>	Salary supplement, no restrictions
<p>Program Name: REWARD Wisconsin</p> <p>Location: Wisconsin</p> <p>Funder: The Wisconsin State Legislature determines how grant monies are allocated (every two years).</p> <p>Program Goals: The goals of REGARD Wisconsin are to increase compensation of early childhood professionals, reward and retain professionals who have attained education specific to the field, encourage continued education, reduce turnover, and improve the quality of care received by Wisconsin children.</p>				

Eligibility Requirements	Continuing Eligibility Requirements	Application Process	Amount of Stipend	Stipend Restrictions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employed by a certified or licensed family child care program, licensed child care center, or any Head Start program Work at least 20 hours per week Work at least 5% of time in an ECE classroom, either directly with children or in supervision and support Live and/or work in Wisconsin earning \$16.50 an hour or less Have worked at present employer for 3 current and continuous years OR have 6 years of experience in regulated child care programs as documented by the registry Registry level 7 or above on the Registry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants at Registry Level 7, 8, 9, and 10 must complete 3 ECE credits over the course of two 6-month agreements to continue participating in REWARD. Participants at level 11 or above do not need to meet this requirement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit application for your provider type (family child care or group/center child care) through email, mail, or fax Submit required documentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Income verification 1040 W2 for child care business Schedule C for child care business Schedule E and K-1 for child care business 	6 Month Stipend Amount Level 7: \$50 Level 8: \$75 Level 9: \$100 Level 10: \$125 Level 11: \$150 Level 12: \$250 Level 13: \$300 Level 14: \$400 Level 15,16,17: \$450	Salary supplement, no restrictions

Applicant Interview Protocol

Recruitment

Child Trends conducted six interviews with R.E.E.T.A.I.N. applicants to provide a qualitative supplement to the survey data. Interviews consisted of questions concerning how providers learned about the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus, their experiences with the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. application, and their experiences applying for and either receiving or not receiving the bonus. Questions concerning the relationship between the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus and educational attainment were also included.

Providers were randomly selected to participate in an interview from the pool of applicants who responded to the online survey. Respondents were sampled based on their responses to two survey questions: “Have you received a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus since 2013?” and “In what type of program do you work?” As a thank-you for participating in an interview, providers were offered a \$25 Target gift card.

To ensure interview representation from a full spectrum of providers and applicant types, Child Trends chose participants from each of the three applicant types by randomly selecting one center-based provider and one family child care provider who completed the online survey. These individuals were invited via email and phone to take part in the interviews; when providers did not respond, the research team selected another individual who fit the same provider and applicant type criteria. Thirty-four providers were invited to take part in the interviews. Interviews took approximately 30 minutes each. In total, the research team completed interviews with six applicants: one non-recipient, one one-time recipient, three repeat recipients, and one provider who received a partial grant due to a mid-year position change. Half the interviewees worked in center-based care, and half worked in family child care.

Two members of the Child Trends research team conducted the interviews over the phone. One member of the research team was responsible for reading the interview protocol and prompting the respondent as necessary, and the other took detailed notes. Interviews were recorded (with the consent of each respondent) to ensure accuracy. Once all the interviews were conducted, researchers organized responses based on which subcategories each respondent fell into (applicant type and provider care type). Key themes and some verbatim quotes were incorporated into the results section of the final report to further contextualize findings from the online applicant survey.

Applicant Survey

Recruitment

Child Trends used administrative data from the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. applicant database² to identify and recruit child care professionals to participate in the survey. Any provider who applied to the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. program from 2013 to 2018 was eligible to participate. A total of 1,361 applicants were invited to take part in the study. Applicants were primarily recruited via email outreach; however, applicants with missing or invalid email addresses (N = 80) were recruited using phone outreach. As a thank-you for completing the survey, Child Trends entered respondents in weekly drawings to win one of five \$50 Target gift cards (30 gift cards

² Data were collected by MN Child Care Aware, the agency that administers the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. program, and were provided to Child Trends by MN DHS in June 2018.

over six weeks) and a one-time drawing for one of four \$250 gift cards. The anonymous 46-question survey was administered via SurveyGizmo and was open from July 18 to September 4, 2018 (approximately six weeks). The survey was available in English.³

Child Trends used the following recruitment methods to reach R.E.E.T.A.I.N. applicants:

- **Email:** The majority of the recruitment for the survey was conducted via email. The research team contacted each unique applicant in the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. applicant database for whom a valid email address was available. All R.E.E.T.A.I.N. applicants received the invitation and their unique survey link through email. A total of 1,334 applicants were contacted through email.
- **Phone calls:** Applicants without a valid email address were contacted by phone, if a phone number was available. A total of 115 applicants were contacted by phone. Applicants who were successfully contacted by a member of the research team were asked to provide a valid email address and were then invited to take part in the survey via email.
- **Web searches:** Child Trends staff conducted web searches to obtain email addresses and phone numbers for applicants who had neither a phone number nor email address in the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. administrative data. A total of 77 web searches were conducted.

Sample Characteristics

A total of 670 individuals responded to the survey. Of the 670 responses, there were 548 complete responses, 23 partial responses, and 99 disqualified responses. The majority of disqualified respondents were those who indicated that they had not applied for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus since 2013 (96 percent); the rest did not consent to taking the survey (4 percent). An additional 5 respondents were excluded from the analyses because they reported working in legal non-licensed settings or other settings that could not be categorized. To ensure applicants took the survey only once, the research team used unique identifiers tied to the respondents' email address, and the survey was programmed to allow only one response per email address. Additional measures were taken after the survey was closed to ensure that no duplicate responses were included in the analysis.

The analyses presented in this report are based on the complete and partial survey responses of R.E.E.T.A.I.N. applicants working in center-based or licensed family child care settings, which provides a total sample size of 571 respondents, or 42 percent of all R.E.E.T.A.I.N. applicants in the 2013–2018 period. Survey participants had the option to skip any question on the survey; consequently, each question had a varying rate of missing responses. Additionally, some questions were only asked of a subset of respondents (e.g., only recipients of the bonus were asked about the usefulness of the funds). The tables and graphs presented in this report display percentages calculated based on the total number of respondents who answered each question. Because this varies, the total number of responses for each question (N) is listed in each table. Tables also identify questions for which respondents could select multiple response options, or responses to open-ended questions that were thematically coded into categories rather than reported out by individual response.

Table 5 displays the number of respondents from each applicant type by complete and partial responses. The three applicant types include those who never received a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus (non-recipients), those who received the bonus once (one-time recipients), and those who received multiple bonuses (repeat recipients).

³ The R.E.E.T.A.I.N. application is currently only available in English.

Table 5. Survey responses by award type

	Full sample	Non-recipients	One-time recipients	Repeat recipients
Complete responses	551	232	226	79
Partial responses	26	3	8	0
Total	577	235	234	79

Source: Child Trends R.E.E.T.A.I.N. applicant survey data, 2018

Analysis Plan

Child Trends cleaned the survey data prior to analysis by developing the variables needed for analysis, recoding responses into numeric variables, and identifying outliers. The quantitative methodologists on the project developed an analysis plan including descriptive analyses of responses to each question and comparisons of responses across the following subgroups:

- Applicant type (non-recipients, one-time recipients, repeat recipients)
- Provider care type (center-based providers versus family child care providers)
- Career Lattice Step
- Geographic location (by Child Care Aware district)

Subgroup comparisons were conducted using chi-square or analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests. Given the number of analyses and multiple comparisons, significant differences were determined by a threshold of $p < .05$. Although the research team intended to analyze the results of the survey by respondent race/ethnicity, small sample sizes among non-white respondents made significance tests impossible. Findings are presented by respondent race/ethnicity throughout this appendix, but no significance tests were run on these findings.

When possible, open-ended responses were thematically coded into categories based on common themes. Open-ended responses were not coded in only one of two situations: a response was unique in that it could not be easily collapsed into a category with other responses to that question, or the total number of open-ended responses to a question was fewer than 10. In both these scenarios, responses were simply left in the “other” category. Thematically coded response categories are labeled as such whenever they appear in the tables presented in this appendix. However, because qualitatively coded responses were not analyzed by subgroup, they are only included in tables of overall findings. In subsequent tables of these findings by subgroup, all open-ended responses are simply coded as “other.” When coding, the research team did not address potential misinterpretations of questions.

Full tables of findings from the survey, including open-ended responses where applicable, are presented in tables throughout the Tables of Findings section of the appendix. Values less than five are suppressed to protect the privacy of survey respondents.

Tables of Survey Findings

Who took our survey?

Professional characteristics

Program type

	Total sample	
	N	%
Family child care providers	199	39%
Center-based providers	315	61%
Total	514	100%

Position when first applied to R.E.E.T.A.I.N.

	Total sample	
	N	%
Lead teacher/teacher	370	66%
Owner	154	27%
Director	11	2%
Assistant teacher/teacher aide	9	2%
Multiple positions	7	1%
Assistant director	6	1%
Other	3	1%
Substitute	1	0%
Total	561	100%

Position by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Lead teacher/teacher	282	90%	53	27%
Owner	4	1%	141	71%
Director	10	3%	1	1%
Assistant teacher/teacher aide	8	3%	1	1%
Multiple positions	4	1%	3	2%
Assistant director	5	2%	0	0%
Other	2	1%	0	0%
Substitute	0	0%	0	0%
Total	315	100%	199	100%

Ages of children served (center-based respondents)

	Total sample	
	N	%
Infants (0 to 16 months)	94	31%
Toddlers (16 to 33 months)	101	33%
Preschoolers (33 months to not yet in kindergarten)	180	60%
School-age children (kindergarten to 12 years)	48	16%
Total	302	100%

Ages of children served (family child care respondents)

	Total sample	
	N	%
Newborn (less than 6 weeks)	13	7%
Infant (6 weeks to 12 months)	172	86%
Toddler (12 to 24 months)	187	94%
Preschool (24 months to 5 years)	196	98%
School-age children (5 to 12 years)	171	86%
Total	199	100%

Race/ethnicity

	Total sample	
	N	%
Black/African American, non-Hispanic	29	6%
Hispanic	14	3%
Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic	19	4%
White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	464	88%
Total	526	100%

District

	Total sample	
	N	%
Metro	277	57%
Northeast	54	11%
Northwest	61	12%
South	34	7%
West/Central	63	13%
Total	489	100%

Career Lattice Step (detailed)

	Total sample	
	N	%
12	9	2%
11	52	10%
10	205	41%
9	131	26%

	Total sample	
	N	%
8	21	4%
7	27	5%
6	45	9%
5	7	1%
4	3	1%
3	2	0%
2	1	0%
1	1	0%
Total	504	100%

Career Lattice Step (grouped)

	Total sample	
	N	%
College credit (Steps 8-12)	418	83%
Noncredit credential and/or college credits (Steps 6-7)	72	14%
Noncredit training (Steps 1-5)	14	3%
Total	504	100%

Career Lattice Step by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
College credit (Steps 8-12)	156	80%	225	84%
Noncredit credential and/or college credits (Steps 6-7)	34	17%	35	13%
Noncredit training (Steps 1-5)	5	3%	9	3%
Total	195	100%	269	100%

Credentials

	Total sample	
	N	%
None of the above	328	60%
Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential	108	20%
Minnesota Child Care Credential	26	5%
<i>Early childhood degree (or coursework)</i>	18	3%
<i>Infant/Toddler Credential</i>	17	3%
Director's Credential	16	3%
<i>Other (un-codable)</i>	16	3%
<i>Teaching license</i>	7	1%
<i>Parent Aware star rating</i>	6	1%
<i>Montessori certificate (American Montessori Society or American Montessori International)</i>	6	1%
Total	548	100%

Note: Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category.

Credentials by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
None of the above	207*	66%	99	51%
Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential	58	19%	44	22%
Other	27	9%	34	17%
Minnesota Child Care Credential	10	3%	16*	8%
Director's Credential	10	3%	3	2%
Total	312	100%	196	100%

Note: * indicates a statistically significant difference at $p < .05$.

Credentials by applicant type

	Non-recipient		One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None of the above	129	56%	150	67%	44	59%
Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential	57	25%	34	15%	12	16%
Other	27	12%	23	10%	13	17%
Minnesota Child Care Credential	9	4%	11	5%	5	7%
Director's Credential	8	3%	7	3%	1	1%
Total	230	100%	225	100%	75	100%

Credentials by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None of the above	168	61%	19	36%	34	58%	22	65%	47	75%
Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential	56	20%	16	30%	12	20%	7	21%	8	13%
Other	33	12%	9	17%	7	12%	3	9%	4	6%
Minnesota Child Care Credential	12	4%	6	11%	5	8%	2	6%	1	2%
Director's Credential	6	2%	3	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3	5%
Total	275	100%	53	100%	59	100%	34	100%	63	100%

Credentials by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None of the above	12	41%	6	43%	9	47%	288	63%
Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential	13	45%	6	43%	5	26%	79	17%
Other	1	3%	1	7%	4	21%	56	12%
Minnesota Child Care Credential	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	24	5%
Director's Credential	1	3%	1	7%	1	5%	12	3%
Total	29	100%	14	100%	19	100%	459	100%

Credentials by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None of the above	5	36%	19	28%	265	66%
Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential	4	29%	39	57%	52	13%
<i>Other</i>	3	21%	5	7%	53	13%
Minnesota Child Care Credential	2	14%	5	7%	18	4%
Director's Credential	0	0%	0	0%	15	4%
Total	14	100%	68	100%	403	100%

Education

Highest level of education

	Total sample	
	N	%
Less than high school	1	0%
High school, GED, or equivalent	61	11%
Associate degree in early care and education or related field	139	26%
Associate degree in unrelated field	43	8%
Bachelor's degree in early care and education or related field	173	32%
Bachelor's degree in unrelated field	74	14%
Graduate degree in early care and education or related field	41	8%
Graduate degree in unrelated field	13	2%
Total	545	100%

Highest level of education by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Less than high school	1	0%	0	0%
High school, GED, or equivalent	29	9%	30	15%
Associate degree in early care and education or related field	95	30%	41	21%
Associate degree in unrelated field	14	4%	27	14%
Bachelor's degree in early care and education or related field	101	32%	57	29%
Bachelor's degree in unrelated field	42	13%	30	15%
Graduate degree in early care and education or related field	26	8%	9	5%
Graduate degree in unrelated field	4	1%	5	3%
Total	312	100%	199	100%

Highest level of education by applicant type

	Non-recipient		One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than high school	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%
High school, GED, or equivalent	27	12%	24	11%	7	9%
Associate degree in early care and education or related field	67	29%	57	25%	14	18%
Associate degree in unrelated field	21	9%	15	7%	5	6%
Bachelor's degree in early care and education or related field	65	28%	75	33%	31	40%
Bachelor's degree in unrelated field	35	15%	26	12%	9	12%
Graduate degree in early care and education or related field	13	6%	21	9%	7	9%
Graduate degree in unrelated field	2	1%	6	3%	4	5%
Total	231	100%	224	100%	77	100%

Highest level of education by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than high school	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
High school, GED, or equivalent	27	10%	11	20%	9	15%	7	21%	5	8%
Associate degree in early care and education or related field	68	25%	12	22%	14	23%	13	38%	17	27%
Associate degree in unrelated field	15	5%	10	19%	10	16%	2	6%	4	6%
Bachelor's degree in early care and education or related field	89	32%	15	28%	18	30%	6	18%	24	38%
Bachelor's degree in unrelated field	43	16%	4	7%	9	15%	3	9%	10	16%
Graduate degree in early care and education or related field	25	9%	0	0%	1	2%	3	9%	3	5%
Graduate degree in unrelated field	6	2%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	274	100%	54	100%	61	100%	34	100%	63	100%

Highest level of education by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than high school	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
High school, GED, or equivalent	3	10%	2	14%	4	21%	49	11%
Associate degree in early care and education or related field	6	21%	3	21%	6	32%	115	25%
Associate degree in unrelated field	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	39	8%

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bachelor's degree in early care and education or related field	6	21%	5	36%	2	11%	155	34%
Bachelor's degree in unrelated field	4	14%	1	7%	4	21%	62	13%
Graduate degree in early care and education or related field	4	14%	3	21%	2	11%	31	7%
Graduate degree in unrelated field	1	3%	0	0%	1	5%	11	2%
Total	29	100%	14	100%	19	100%	462	100%

Highest level of education by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than high school	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
High school, GED, or equivalent	5	38%	34	49%	15	4%
Associate degree in early care and education or related field	1	8%	26	37%	99	24%
Associate degree in unrelated field	2	15%	9	13%	29	7%
Bachelor's degree in early care and education or related field	3	23%	1	1%	155	38%
Bachelor's degree in unrelated field	1	8%	0	0%	58	14%
Graduate degree in early care and education or related field	1	8%	0	0%	36	9%
Graduate degree in unrelated field	0	0%	0	0%	13	3%
Total	13	100%	70	100%	405	100%

Receipt of a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus

Applicant type

	Total sample	
	N	%
Non-recipient	235	43%
One-time recipient	233	43%
Repeat recipient	77	14%
Total	545	100%

Applicant type by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Non-recipient	147	47%	76	39%
One-time recipient	133	43%	73	38%
Repeat recipient	30	10%	45	23%
Total	310	100%	194	100%

Applicant type by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Non-recipient	135	49%	19	38%	17	29%	13	38%	30	48%
One-time recipient	101	37%	24	48%	27	46%	16	47%	25	40%
Repeat recipient	37	14%	7	14%	15	25%	5	15%	8	13%
Total	273	100%	50	100%	59	100%	34	100%	63	100%

How did applicants hear about R.E.E.T.A.I.N.?

How applicants report hearing about R.E.E.T.A.I.N.

	Total sample	
	N	%
A supervisor or director	263	47%
Child Care Aware (including local CCR&R agencies)	195	35%
Another child care provider	75	13%
Parent Aware Coach	55	10%
An early childhood association ¹	33	6%
An online search	23	4%
DHS	12	2%
<i>Other</i>	8	1%
<i>A flyer, mailing, or other promotional materials</i>	7	1%
<i>Through college connections (e.g., a professor or advisor)</i>	7	1%
Total	557	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category. ¹ Response option appeared in the online survey with examples: MN Centers of Excellence, MNAFEE, MNAEYC, MCCPIN, MACCP.

How applicants report hearing about R.E.E.T.A.I.N. by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
A supervisor or director	233*	74%	12	6%
Child Care Aware (including local CCR&R agencies)	54	17%	117*	59%
Another child care provider	32	10%	39*	20%
Parent Aware Coach	10	3%	39	20%
An early childhood association	14	4%	13	7%
An online search	11	4%	11	6%
DHS	3	1%	7	4%
<i>Other</i>	11	4%	10	5%
Total	314	100%	199	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category. * indicates a significant difference at $p < .05$.

How applicants report hearing about R.E.E.T.A.I.N. by applicant type

	Non-recipient		One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
A supervisor or director	125 ^a	53%	115 ^b	49%	19 ^{ab}	25%
Child Care Aware (including local CCR&R agencies)	78 ^a	33%	72 ^b	31%	39 ^{ab}	51%
Another child care provider	30	13%	31	13%	14	18%
Parent Aware Coach	24	10%	22	9%	7	9%
An early childhood association	12	5%	13	6%	5	6%
An online search	8	3%	12	5%	2	3%
DHS	6	3%	5	2%	1	1%
<i>Other</i>	6	3%	11	5%	5	6%
Total	235	100%	233	100%	77	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in *italics* were coded based on open-ended responses to the “other” category. Matching superscripts denote a statistically significant difference between subgroups ($p < .05$).

How applicants report hearing about R.E.E.T.A.I.N. by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/ Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A supervisor or director	171 ^a	62%	9 ^{ab}	17%	13 ^{ab}	21%	20 ^b	59%	21 ^a	33%
Child Care Aware (including local CCR&R agencies)	56 ^c	20%	28 ^c	52%	38 ^c	62%	13	38%	25 ^c	40%
Another child care provider	39	14%	12	22%	8	13%	2	6%	9	14%
Parent Aware Coach	9	3%	6	11%	9	15%	2	6%	15	24%
An early childhood association	16	6%	3	6%	4	7%	3	9%	0	0%
An online search	9	3%	2	4%	5	8%	1	3%	2	3%
DHS	4	1%	4	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3	5%
<i>Other</i>	14	5%	1	2%	4	7%	1	3%	0	0%
Total	276	100%	54	100%	61	100%	34	100%	63	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in *italics* were coded based on open-ended responses to the “other” category. Matching superscripts denote a statistically significant difference between subgroups ($p < .05$).

How applicants report hearing about R.E.E.T.A.I.N. by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A supervisor or director	17	59%	10	71%	8	42%	212	46%
Child Care Aware (including local CCR&R agencies)	6	21%	1	7%	7	37%	169	37%
Another child care provider	2	7%	2	14%	2	11%	66	14%
Parent Aware Coach	0	0%	0	0%	2	11%	51	11%

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
An early childhood association	2	7%	1	7%	1	5%	26	6%
An online search	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	16	3%
DHS	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	10	2%
<i>Other</i>	3	10%	0	0%	1	5%	17	4%
Total	29	100%	14	100%	19	100%	463	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the “other” category.

How applicants report hearing about R.E.E.T.A.I.N. by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
A supervisor or director	9	64%	28	39%	186	45%
Child Care Aware (including local CCR&R agencies)	5	36%	29	40%	146	35%
Another child care provider	1	7%	10	14%	58	14%
Parent Aware Coach	0	0%	9	13%	44	11%
An early childhood association	0	0%	1	1%	27	7%
An online search	0	0%	3	4%	19	5%
DHS	0	0%	1	1%	10	2%
<i>Other</i>	0	0%	4	6%	18	4%
Total	14	100%	72	100%	414	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the “other” category.

How helpful did recipients find the bonus personally and professionally?

Personal factors

Recipients’ perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them take personal time off

	Total sample	
	N	%
Did not help	165	58%
Somewhat helped	62	22%
Really helped	59	21%
Total	286	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them take personal time off by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Did not help	91	58%	62	58%
Somewhat helped	37	23%	21	20%
Really helped	30	19%	24	22%
Total	158	100%	107	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them take personal time off by applicant type

	One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%
Did not help	130	60%	35	50%
Somewhat helped	42	19%	20	29%
Really helped	44	20%	15	21%
Total	216	100%	70	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them take personal time off by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did not help	70	55%	19	66%	24	60%	9	47%	19	58%
Somewhat helped	36	28%	5	17%	8	20%	3	16%	5	15%
Really helped	22	17%	5	17%	8	20%	7	37%	9	27%
Total	128	100%	29	100%	40	100%	19	100%	33	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them take personal time off by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did not help	3	30%	0	0%	5	63%	149	59%
Somewhat helped	5	50%	0	0%	2	25%	50	20%
Really helped	2	20%	1	100%	1	13%	53	21%
Total	10	100%	1	100%	8	100%	252	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them take personal time off by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did not help	2	50%	21	60%	134	58%
Somewhat helped	1	25%	6	17%	49	21%
Really helped	1	25%	8	23%	47	20%
Total	4	100%	35	100%	230	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them purchase goods/resources they needed for themselves

	Total sample	
	N	%
Did not help	33	11%
Somewhat helped	95	32%
Really helped	165	56%
Total	293	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them purchase goods/resources they needed for themselves by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Did not help	8	5%	22*	20%
Somewhat helped	53	33%	31	28%
Really helped	101*	62%	56	51%
Total	162	100%	109	100%

Note: * indicates a significant difference at $p < .05$.

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them purchase goods/resources they needed for themselves by applicant type

	One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%
Did not help	26	12%	7	10%
Somewhat helped	73	33%	22	31%
Really helped	123	55%	42	59%
Total	222	100%	71	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them purchase goods/resources they needed for themselves by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did not help	9	7%	7	23%	8	20%	1	5%	5	15%
Somewhat helped	24	20%	10	33%	17	43%	10	50%	7	21%
Really helped	89 ^a	73%	13 ^a	43%	15 ^a	38%	9 ^a	45%	21 ^a	64%
Total	122	100%	30	100%	40	100%	20	100%	33	100%

Note: Matching superscripts denote a statistically significant difference between subgroups ($p < .05$).

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them purchase goods/resources they needed for themselves by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did not help	0	0%	0	0%	2	22%	29	11%
Somewhat helped	0	0%	0	0%	3	33%	86	33%

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Really helped	10	100%	1	100%	4	44%	143	55%
Total	10	100%	1	100%	9	100%	258	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them purchase goods/resources they needed for themselves by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did not help	3	75%	5	14%	23	10%
Somewhat helped	1	25%	14	39%	77	33%
Really helped	0	0%	17	47%	136	58%
Total	4	100%	36	100%	236	100%

Professional Factors

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them purchase goods/resources they needed for the classroom

	Total sample	
	N	%
Did not help	74	25%
Somewhat helped	97	33%
Really helped	122	42%
Total	293	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them purchase goods/resources they needed for the classroom by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Did not help	55*	35%	8	7%
Somewhat helped	68*	43%	23	20%
Really helped	36	23%	82*	73%
Total	159	100%	113	100%

Note: * indicates a significant difference at $p < .05$.

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them purchase goods/resources they needed for the classroom by applicant type

	One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%
Did not help	62	28%	12	16%
Somewhat helped	73	33%	24	32%
Really helped	84	38%	38	51%
Total	219	100%	74	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them purchase goods/resources they needed for the classroom by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did not help	39	30%	4	13%	5	12%	4	20%	6	19%
Somewhat helped	46	35%	6	20%	17	40%	7	35%	10	31%
Really helped	46	35%	20	67%	20	48%	9	45%	16	50%
Total	131	100%	30	100%	42	100%	20	100%	32	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them purchase goods/resources they needed for the classroom by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did not help	2	20%	0	0%	2	22%	66	26%
Somewhat helped	4	40%	0	0%	5	56%	80	31%
Really helped	4	40%	1	100%	2	22%	112	43%
Total	10	100%	1	100%	9	100%	258	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in helping them purchase goods/resources they needed for the classroom by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did not help	1	25%	5	13%	63	27%
Somewhat helped	2	50%	14	37%	77	33%
Really helped	1	25%	19	50%	94	40%
Total	4	100%	38	100%	234	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in supporting their education

	Total sample	
	N	%
Did not help	187	65%
Somewhat helped	56	20%
Really helped	44	15%
Total	287	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in supporting their education by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Did not help	110	70%	63	58%
Somewhat helped	24	15%	26	24%
Really helped	23	15%	20	18%
Total	157	100%	109	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in supporting their education by applicant type

	One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%
Did not help	147	69%	40	55%
Somewhat helped	36	17%	20	27%
Really helped	31	14%	13	18%
Total	214	100%	73	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in supporting their education by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did not help	81	63%	17	59%	26	65%	12	63%	24	73%
Somewhat helped	25	20%	7	24%	9	23%	3	16%	5	15%
Really helped	22	17%	5	17%	5	13%	4	21%	4	12%
Total	128	100%	29	100%	40	100%	19	100%	33	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in supporting their education by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did not help	4	40%	0	0%	7	78%	165	65%
Somewhat helped	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	50	20%
Really helped	3	30%	1	100%	2	22%	37	15%
Total	10	100%	1	100%	9	100%	252	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in supporting their education by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did not help	3	75%	23	66%	150	65%
Somewhat helped	1	25%	8	23%	43	19%
Really helped	0	0%	4	11%	38	16%
Total	4	100%	35	100%	231	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in supporting their professional development

	Total sample	
	N	%
Did not help	155	54%
Somewhat helped	81	28%
Really helped	51	18%
Total	287	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in supporting their professional development by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Did not help	105*	67%	41	38%
Somewhat helped	37	24%	34*	31%
Really helped	15	10%	34*	31%
Total	157	100%	109	100%

Note: * indicates a significant difference at $p < .05$.

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in supporting their professional development by applicant type

	One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%
Did not help	124	58%	31	43%
Somewhat helped	55	26%	26	36%
Really helped	36	17%	15	21%
Total	215	100%	72	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in supporting their professional development by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did not help	81 ^a	63%	12	41%	13 ^a	32%	13	68%	17	52%
Somewhat helped	31	24%	9	31%	15	37%	4	21%	8	24%
Really helped	16	13%	8	28%	13	32%	2	11%	8	24%
Total	128	100%	29	100%	41	100%	19	100%	33	100%

Note: Matching superscripts denote a statistically significant difference between subgroups ($p < .05$).

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in supporting their professional development by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did not help	8	80%	0	0%	7	78%	130	52%
Somewhat helped	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	75	30%
Really helped	0	0%	1	100%	2	22%	47	19%
Total	10	100%	1	100%	9	100%	252	100%

Recipients' perceptions of how helpful the grant was in supporting their professional development by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did not help	3	75%	19	53%	124	54%
Somewhat helped	1	25%	7	19%	69	30%
Really helped	0	0%	10	28%	37	16%
Total	4	100%	36	100%	230	100%

Other factors

Recipients' perceptions of whether the grant was helpful in another way (not listed)

	Total sample	
	N	%
No	200	67%
Yes	100	33%
Total	300	100%

Recipients' perceptions of whether the grant was helpful in another way (not listed) by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
No	103	63%	82	70%
Yes	60	37%	35	30%
Total	163	100%	117	100%

Recipients' perceptions of whether the grant was helpful in another way (not listed) by applicant type

	One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%
No	155	70%	45	58%
Yes	68	30%	32	42%
Total	223	100%	77	100%

Recipients' perceptions of whether the grant was helpful in another way (not listed) by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	84	61%	22	76%	32	76%	12	57%	26	79%
Yes	53	39%	7	24%	10	24%	9	43%	7	21%
Total	137	100%	29	100%	42	100%	21	100%	33	100%

Recipients' perceptions of whether the grant was helpful in another way (not listed) by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	6	60%	1	100%	7	78%	181	68%
Yes	4	40%	0	0%	2	22%	84	32%
Total	10	100%	1	100%	9	100%	265	100%

Recipients' perceptions of whether the grant was helpful in another way (not listed) by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	3	75%	30	81%	157	65%
Yes	1	25%	7	19%	85	35%
Total	4	100%	37	100%	242	100%

Recipients perceptions of other ways the grant was helpful (open-ended)

	Total sample	
	N	%
Personal expenses (e.g., savings, bills, vacation)	81	86%
Program improvements or classroom materials	12	13%
Stress reduction; helps providers feel valued	7	7%
Higher education or professional development	4	4%
Other (including unspecified income supplement)	10	11%
Total	94	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Response categories were coded based on open-ended responses to the question.

How specifically did the bonus help those recipients who found it to be helpful professionally?

Educational supports

Recipients' perceptions of how the grant supported their education

	Total sample	
	N	%
The grant helped offset the costs of a college course	36	38%
The grant helped offset the costs of a certificate or credential program	24	25%
The grant allowed me to take time off work and devote time to my education	20	21%
Cost of professional development courses or trainings	14	15%
Other expenses	7	7%

	Total sample	
	N	%
Total	95	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the “other” category.

Recipients’ perceptions of how the grant supported their education by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
The grant helped offset the costs of a college course	22*	49%	10	23%
The grant helped offset the costs of a certificate or credential program	9	20%	15	35%
The grant allowed me to take time off work and devote time to my education	11	24%	7	16%
<i>Other expenses</i>	7	16%	13	30%
Total	45	100%	43	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the “other” category. * Indicates a statistically significant difference at $p < .05$.

Recipients’ perceptions of how the grant supported their education by applicant type

	One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%
The grant helped offset the costs of a college course	28	44%	8	25%
The grant helped offset the costs of a certificate or credential program	13	21%	11	34%
The grant allowed me to take time off work and devote time to my education	14	22%	6	19%
<i>Other expenses</i>	13	21%	8	25%
Total	63	100%	32	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the “other” category.

Recipients’ perceptions of how the grant supported their education by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/ Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The grant helped offset the costs of a college course	15	33%	6	55%	4	33%	3	43%	5	56%
The grant helped offset the costs of a certificate or credential program	14	30%	6	55%	2	17%	0	0%	1	11%
The grant allowed me to take time off work and devote time to my education	10	22%	2	18%	2	17%	1	14%	4	44%
<i>Other expenses</i>	9	20%	0	0%	4	33%	3	43%	0	0%
Total	46	100%	11	100%	12	100%	7	100%	9	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the “other” category.

Recipients' perceptions of how the grant supported their education by race/ethnicity

	Black/ African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The grant helped offset the costs of a college course	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	34	41%
The grant helped offset the costs of a certificate or credential program	2	33%	1	100%	2	100%	17	21%
The grant allowed me to take time off work and devote time to my education	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	18	22%
<i>Other expenses</i>	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	19	23%
Total	6	100%	1	100%	2	100%	82	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category.

Recipients' perceptions of how the grant supported their education by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
The grant helped offset the costs of a college course	0	0%	2	18%	30	38%
The grant helped offset the costs of a certificate or credential program	0	0%	6	55%	18	23%
The grant allowed me to take time off work and devote time to my education	1	100%	3	27%	15	19%
<i>Other expenses</i>	0	0%	0	0%	21	27%
Total	1	100%	11	100%	78	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category.

Professional development supports

Recipients' perceptions of how the grant supported their professional development

	Total sample	
	N	%
The grant helped offset the costs of a professional development training	108	84%
The grant allowed me to take time off work to consult with a coach or mentor	17	13%
<i>Other</i>	8	6%
Total	128	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category.

Recipients' perceptions of how the grant supported their professional development by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
The grant helped offset the costs of a professional development training	39	75%	60*	92%
The grant allowed me to take time off work to consult with a coach or mentor	10	19%	5	8%
<i>Other</i>	4	8%	3	5%
Total	52	100%	65	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category. * Indicates a statistically significant difference at $p < .05$.

Recipients' perceptions of how the grant supported their professional development by applicant type

	One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%
The grant helped offset the costs of a professional development training	72	82%	36	90%
The grant allowed me to take time off work to consult with a coach or mentor	13	15%	4	10%
<i>Other</i>	6	7%	2	5%
Total	88	100%	40	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category.

Recipients' perceptions of how the grant supported their professional development by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The grant helped offset the costs of a professional development training	39	83%	14	88%	23	88%	3	50%	14	88%
The grant allowed me to take time off work to consult with a coach or mentor	7	15%	3	19%	2	8%	2	33%	2	13%
<i>Other</i>	1	2%	0	0%	2	8%	2	33%	1	6%
Total	47	100%	16	100%	26	100%	6	100%	16	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category.

Recipients' perceptions of how the grant supported their professional development by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The grant helped offset the costs of a professional development training	1	50%	1	100%	2	100%	101	86%

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The grant allowed me to take time off work to consult with a coach or mentor	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	15	13%
<i>Other</i>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	6%
Total	2	100%	1	100%	2	100%	118	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the “other” category.

Recipients’ perceptions of how the grant supported their professional development by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
The grant helped offset the costs of a professional development training	0	0%	15	94%	87	84%
The grant allowed me to take time off work to consult with a coach or mentor	1	100%	0	0%	13	13%
<i>Other</i>	0	0%	1	6%	7	7%
Total	1	100%	16	100%	103	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the “other” category.

Bonus amount

Recipients’ perceptions of how they would have used the grant funds if the amount had been doubled

	Total sample	
	N	%
Materials for your classroom/home child care setting	163	54%
Paid time off to help you, personally	120	40%
Accessing educational opportunities	108	36%
Paid time off to help with family needs	102	34%
Accessing professional development supports (e.g., training, coaches, meetings)	83	27%
<i>Personal expenses (e.g., savings, bills, vacation)</i>	48	16%
<i>Other</i>	6	2%
<i>Education or other trainings</i>	3	1%
<i>Program improvements (e.g., upgrading space or purchasing supplies)</i>	3	1%
Total	302	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the “other” category.

Recipients' perceptions of how they would have used the grant funds if the amount had been doubled by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Materials for your classroom/home child care setting	64	40%	90*	77%
Paid time off to help you, personally	66	41%	50	43%
Accessing educational opportunities	48	30%	52*	44%
Paid time off to help with family needs	64	40%	35	30%
Accessing professional development supports (e.g., training, coaches, meetings)	32	20%	44*	38%
<i>Other</i>	41*	25%	13	11%
Total	162	100%	117	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in *italics* were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category. * Indicates a statistically significant difference at $p < .05$.

Recipients' perceptions of how they would have used the grant funds if the amount had been doubled by applicant type

	One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%
Materials for your classroom/home child care setting	119	53%	44	58%
Paid time off to help you, personally	91	40%	29	38%
Accessing educational opportunities	78	35%	30	39%
Paid time off to help with family needs	69	31%	33	43%
Accessing professional development supports (e.g., training, coaches, meetings)	59	26%	24	32%
<i>Other</i>	45	20%	15	20%
Total	225	100%	76	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in *italics* were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category.

Recipients' perceptions of how they would have used the grant funds if the amount had been doubled by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/ Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Materials for your classroom/home child care setting	55 ^a	40%	25 ^a	83%	26	63%	15	71%	22	67%
Paid time off to help you, personally	56	41%	7	23%	18	44%	10	48%	15	45%
Accessing educational opportunities	48	35%	15	50%	17	41%	7	33%	11	33%
Paid time off to help with family needs	60	43%	7	23%	15	37%	6	29%	8	24%
Accessing professional development supports	33	24%	13	43%	15	37%	4	19%	12	36%

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/ Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(e.g., training, coaches, meetings)										
<i>Other</i>	30	22%	2	7%	6	15%	4	19%	5	15%
Total	138	100%	30	100%	41	100%	21	100%	33	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the “other” category. Matching superscripts denote a statistically significant difference between subgroups ($p < .05$).

Recipients’ perceptions of how they would have used the grant funds if the amount had been doubled by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Materials for your classroom/home child care setting	3	30%	1	100%	5	56%	148	56%
Paid time off to help you, personally	3	30%	0	0%	4	44%	105	39%
Accessing educational opportunities	6	60%	0	0%	4	44%	97	36%
Paid time off to help with family needs	3	30%	0	0%	4	44%	87	33%
Accessing professional development supports (e.g., training, coaches, meetings)	4	40%	0	0%	2	22%	74	28%
<i>Other</i>	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	57	21%
Total	10	100%	1	100%	9	100%	266	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the “other” category.

Recipients’ perceptions of how they would have used the grant funds if the amount had been doubled by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Materials for your classroom/home child care setting	3	75%	26	70%	126	52%
Paid time off to help you, personally	1	25%	19	51%	94	39%
Accessing educational opportunities	1	25%	17	46%	86	35%
Paid time off to help with family needs	0	0%	14	38%	83	34%
Accessing professional development supports (e.g., training, coaches, meetings)	0	0%	14	38%	64	26%
<i>Other</i>	1	25%	1	3%	55	23%
Total	4	100%	37	100%	243	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the “other” category.

T.E.A.C.H.⁴

Respondents who reported receiving a T.E.A.C.H. grant since 2013

	Total sample	
	N	%
Yes	37	7%
No	514	93%
Total	551	100%

Respondents who reported receiving a T.E.A.C.H. grant since 2013 by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	15	5%	19	10%
No	298	95%	180	90%
Total	313	100%	199	100%

Respondents who reported receiving a T.E.A.C.H. grant since 2013 by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	19	7%	5	9%	4	7%	2	6%	3	5%
No	256	93%	49	91%	57	93%	32	94%	60	95%
Total	275	100%	54	100%	61	100%	34	100%	63	100%

Bonus Recipients' Perceptions of R.E.E.T.A.I.N.

Recipients' agreement with the statement "It was worth it to apply for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant"

	Total sample	
	N	%
Strongly disagree	20	7%
Somewhat disagree	5	2%
Neutral	13	4%
Somewhat agree	28	9%
Strongly agree	235	78%
Total	301	100%

⁴ T.E.A.C.H. is a scholarship program that provides financial support to child care professionals to take courses towards an associate or bachelor's degree in Child Development or Early Childhood Education.

Recipients' agreement with the statement "It was worth it to apply for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant" by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	10	6%	8	7%
Somewhat disagree	2	1%	2	2%
Neutral	6	4%	5	4%
Somewhat agree	13	8%	13	11%
Strongly agree	132	81%	88	76%
Total	163	100%	116	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "It was worth it to apply for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant" by applicant type

	One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	14	6%	6	8%
Somewhat disagree	5	2%	0	0%
Neutral	12	5%	1	1%
Somewhat agree	21	9%	7	9%
Strongly agree	173	77%	62	82%
Total	225	100%	76	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "It was worth it to apply for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant" by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	7	5%	3	10%	3	7%	1	5%	4	12%
Somewhat disagree	1	1%	1	3%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%
Neutral	5	4%	1	3%	3	7%	0	0%	1	3%
Somewhat agree	15	11%	2	7%	4	10%	1	5%	2	6%
Strongly agree	110	80%	23	77%	30	71%	18	90%	26	79%
Total	138	100%	30	100%	42	100%	20	100%	33	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "It was worth it to apply for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant" by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	19	7%
Somewhat disagree	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	4	2%
Neutral	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	10	4%
Somewhat agree	2	20%	0	0%	1	11%	24	9%
Strongly agree	8	80%	1	100%	6	67%	209	79%
Total	10	100%	1	100%	9	100%	266	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "It was worth it to apply for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant" by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	0	0%	2	5%	18	7%
Somewhat disagree	0	0%	0	0%	5	2%
Neutral	0	0%	5	13%	8	3%
Somewhat agree	1	25%	6	16%	20	8%
Strongly agree	3	75%	25	66%	191	79%
Total	4	100%	38	100%	242	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "Because I received a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant, I was able to reach a higher Career Lattice Step"

	Total sample	
	N	%
Strongly disagree	67	22%
Somewhat disagree	38	13%
Neutral	129	43%
Somewhat agree	44	15%
Strongly agree	21	7%
Total	299	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "Because I received a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant, I was able to reach a higher Career Lattice Step" by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	35	22%	25	22%
Somewhat disagree	25	16%	9	8%
Neutral	64	40%	61	53%
Somewhat agree	24	15%	14	12%
Strongly agree	13	8%	7	6%
Total	161	100%	116	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "Because I received a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant, I was able to reach a higher Career Lattice Step" by applicant type

	One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	54	24%	13	17%
Somewhat disagree	28	13%	10	13%
Neutral	91	41%	38	50%
Somewhat agree	35	16%	9	12%
Strongly agree	15	7%	6	8%
Total	223	100%	76	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "Because I received a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant, I was able to reach a higher Career Lattice Step" by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	27	20%	4	13%	12	29%	6	29%	8	25%
Somewhat disagree	16	12%	4	13%	5	12%	2	10%	5	16%
Neutral	61	45%	13	43%	20	48%	8	38%	12	38%
Somewhat agree	24	18%	6	20%	4	10%	2	10%	3	9%
Strongly agree	8	6%	3	10%	1	2%	3	14%	4	13%
Total	136	100%	30	100%	42	100%	21	100%	32	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "Because I received a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant, I was able to reach a higher Career Lattice Step" by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	0	0%	0	0%	3	33%	59	22%
Somewhat disagree	1	10%	0	0%	3	33%	32	12%
Neutral	5	50%	0	0%	3	33%	117	44%
Somewhat agree	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	39	15%
Strongly agree	2	20%	1	100%	0	0%	17	6%
Total	10	100%	1	100%	9	100%	264	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "Because I received a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant, I was able to reach a higher Career Lattice Step" by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	2	50%	7	18%	56	23%
Somewhat disagree	0	0%	4	11%	32	13%
Neutral	0	0%	22	58%	103	43%
Somewhat agree	2	50%	3	8%	31	13%
Strongly agree	0	0%	2	5%	18	8%
Total	4	100%	38	100%	240	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "The amount of the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant was enough to help me, even in a small way"

	Total sample	
	N	%
Strongly disagree	6	2%
Somewhat disagree	4	1%
Neutral	15	5%
Somewhat agree	74	25%
Strongly agree	202	67%

	Total sample	
	N	%
Total	301	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "The amount of the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant was enough to help me, even in a small way" by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	2	1%	4	3%
Somewhat disagree	2	1%	2	2%
Neutral	7	4%	7	6%
Somewhat agree	40	25%	30	26%
Strongly agree	112	69%	73	63%
Total	163	100%	116	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "The amount of the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant was enough to help me, even in a small way" by applicant type

	One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	2	1%	4	5%
Somewhat disagree	2	1%	2	3%
Neutral	14	6%	1	1%
Somewhat agree	60	27%	14	18%
Strongly agree	147	65%	55	72%
Total	225	100%	76	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "The amount of the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant was enough to help me, even in a small way" by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	2	1%	1	3%	1	2%	0	0%	2	6%
Somewhat disagree	1	1%	0	0%	1	2%	1	5%	1	3%
Neutral	5	4%	0	0%	4	10%	3	14%	1	3%
Somewhat agree	38	28%	6	20%	11	26%	3	14%	8	24%
Strongly agree	91	66%	23	77%	25	60%	14	67%	21	64%
Total	137	100%	30	100%	42	100%	21	100%	33	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "The amount of the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant was enough to help me, even in a small way" by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	2%
Somewhat disagree	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	2%

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Neutral	1	10%	0	0%	1	11%	13	5%
Somewhat agree	3	30%	1	100%	4	44%	62	23%
Strongly agree	6	60%	0	0%	4	44%	181	68%
Total	10	100%	1	100%	9	100%	266	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "The amount of the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant was enough to help me, even in a small way" by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	0	0%	1	3%	5	2%
Somewhat disagree	0	0%	2	5%	2	1%
Neutral	0	0%	5	13%	9	4%
Somewhat agree	1	25%	12	32%	59	24%
Strongly agree	3	75%	18	47%	167	69%
Total	4	100%	38	100%	242	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "I would recommend applying for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant to other child care providers"

	Total sample	
	N	%
Strongly disagree	9	3%
Somewhat disagree	0	0%
Neutral	12	4%
Somewhat agree	45	15%
Strongly agree	235	78%
Total	301	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "I would recommend applying for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant to other child care providers" by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	2	1%	6	5%
Somewhat disagree	0	0%	0	0%
Neutral	5	3%	6	5%
Somewhat agree	21	13%	20	17%
Strongly agree	135	83%	84	72%
Total	163	100%	116	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "I would recommend applying for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant to other child care providers" by applicant type

	One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	6	3%	3	4%
Somewhat disagree	0	0%	0	0%
Neutral	10	4%	2	3%
Somewhat agree	40	18%	5	6%
Strongly agree	168	75%	67	87%
Total	224	100%	77	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "I would recommend applying for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant to other child care providers" by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	2	1%	1	3%	3	7%	0	0%	2	6%
Somewhat disagree	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Neutral	3	2%	1	3%	5	12%	0	0%	0	0%
Somewhat agree	25	18%	3	10%	5	12%	3	14%	5	15%
Strongly agree	108	78%	25	83%	29	69%	18	86%	26	79%
Total	138	100%	30	100%	42	100%	21	100%	33	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "I would recommend applying for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant to other child care providers" by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	3%
Somewhat disagree	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Neutral	0	0%	1	100%	1	11%	10	4%
Somewhat agree	2	20%	0	0%	2	22%	38	14%
Strongly agree	8	80%	0	0%	6	67%	210	79%
Total	10	100%	1	100%	9	100%	266	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "I would recommend applying for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant to other child care providers" by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	0	0%	2	5%	7	3%
Somewhat disagree	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Neutral	0	0%	4	11%	7	3%
Somewhat agree	0	0%	8	21%	36	15%
Strongly agree	4	100%	24	63%	192	79%

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total	4	100%	38	100%	242	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "Receiving the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant influenced my decision to stay in the child care workforce"

	Total sample	
	N	%
Strongly disagree	35	12%
Somewhat disagree	17	6%
Neutral	84	28%
Somewhat agree	83	28%
Strongly agree	81	27%
Total	300	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "Receiving the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant influenced my decision to stay in the child care workforce" by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	16	10%	15	13%
Somewhat disagree	8	5%	8	7%
Neutral	39	24%	35	30%
Somewhat agree	52	32%	27	23%
Strongly agree	47	29%	32	27%
Total	162	100%	117	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "Receiving the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant influenced my decision to stay in the child care workforce" by applicant type

	One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	28	13%	7	9%
Somewhat disagree	15	7%	2	3%
Neutral	64	29%	20	26%
Somewhat agree	58	26%	25	32%
Strongly agree	58	26%	23	30%
Total	223	100%	77	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "Receiving the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant influenced my decision to stay in the child care workforce" by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	12	9%	5	17%	6	14%	1	5%	5	15%
Somewhat disagree	10	7%	1	3%	2	5%	0	0%	1	3%
Neutral	35	26%	6	20%	11	26%	5	24%	12	36%

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Somewhat agree	40	29%	7	23%	10	24%	10	48%	8	24%
Strongly agree	39	29%	11	37%	13	31%	5	24%	7	21%
Total	136	100%	30	100%	42	100%	21	100%	33	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "Receiving the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant influenced my decision to stay in the child care workforce" by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	0	0%	1	100%	1	11%	32	12%
Somewhat disagree	2	20%	0	0%	2	22%	12	5%
Neutral	1	10%	0	0%	4	44%	74	28%
Somewhat agree	4	40%	0	0%	1	11%	76	29%
Strongly agree	3	30%	0	0%	1	11%	71	27%
Total	10	100%	1	100%	9	100%	265	100%

Recipients' agreement with the statement "Receiving the R.E.E.T.A.I.N. grant influenced my decision to stay in the child care workforce" by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	1	33%	5	13%	27	11%
Somewhat disagree	0	0%	1	3%	16	7%
Neutral	1	33%	11	29%	67	28%
Somewhat agree	0	0%	11	29%	65	27%
Strongly agree	1	33%	10	26%	67	28%
Total	3	100%	38	100%	242	100%

What challenges did applicants face when applying for a R.E.E.T.A.I.N. bonus?

Difficulty with the application

Applicants' perceptions of whether they experienced any challenges when applying for a grant

	Total sample	
	N	%
No	465	84%
Yes	87	16%
Total	552	100%

Applicants' perceptions of whether they experienced any challenges when applying for a grant by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
No	258	82%	167	85%
Yes	55	18%	29	15%
Total	313	100%	196	100%

Applicants' perceptions of whether they experienced any challenges when applying for a grant by applicant type

	Non-recipient		One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	180	77%	203	89%	71	92%
Yes	54	23%	25	11%	6	8%
Total	234	100%	228	100%	77	100%

Applicants' perceptions of whether they experienced any challenges when applying for a grant by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	220	80%	46	87%	54	92%	30	88%	53	85%
Yes	55	20%	7	13%	5	8%	4	12%	9	15%
Total	275	100%	53	100%	59	100%	34	100%	62	100%

Applicants' perceptions of whether they experienced any challenges when applying for a grant by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	20	71%	10	71%	14	74%	397	86%
Yes	8	29%	4	29%	5	26%	63	14%
Total	28	100%	14	100%	19	100%	460	100%

Applicants' perceptions of whether they experienced any challenges when applying for a grant by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	11	79%	66	93%	337	82%
Yes	3	21%	5	7%	73	18%
Total	14	100%	71	100%	410	100%

Applicants' reported challenges when applying for a grant

	Total sample	
	N	%
Difficulty mailing in or uploading required forms	35	41%
Questions on the application were difficult to answer or confusing	24	28%
Difficulty accessing my Learning Record	16	19%
Limited time/availability to complete the application	14	16%
Difficulty with registering for Develop	13	15%
Application was too long	7	8%
Difficulty with completing the application due to technology, such as limited access to a computer or internet	7	8%
<i>Other reason (un-codable)</i>	6	7%
<i>Lack of support completing application</i>	7	8%
<i>Technical difficulties that were out of my control</i>	7	8%
<i>Did not qualify for the grant</i>	6	7%
<i>Problems with lack of transparency and changes in scoring system</i>	3	4%
Difficulty obtaining my paystub or tax form	5	6%
Application was not in my preferred language	1	1%
Total	85	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category.

Applicants' reported challenges when applying for a grant by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Difficulty mailing in or uploading required forms	24	44%	9	31%
Questions on the application were difficult to answer or confusing	16	30%	7	24%
Difficulty accessing my Learning Record	12	22%	4	14%
Limited time/availability to complete the application	9	17%	5	17%
Difficulty with registering for Develop	8	15%	4	14%
Application was too long	4	7%	3	10%
Difficulty with completing the application due to technology, such as limited access to a computer or internet	6	11%	1	3%
<i>Other, please specify</i>	14	26%	13	45%
Difficulty obtaining my paystub or tax form	3	6%	2	7%
Application was not in my preferred language	1	2%	0	0%
Total	54	100%	29	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category.

Applicants' reported challenges when applying for a grant by applicant type

	Non-recipient		One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Difficulty mailing in or uploading required forms	25	47%	8	32%	1	17%
Questions on the application were difficult to answer or confusing	13	25%	7	28%	4	67%
Difficulty accessing my Learning Record	14	26%	1	4%	1	17%
Limited time/availability to complete the application	8	15%	4	16%	2	33%
Difficulty with registering for Develop	8	15%	4	16%	1	17%
Application was too long	6	11%	1	4%	0	0%
Difficulty with completing the application due to technology, such as limited access to a computer or internet	7	13%	0	0%	0	0%
<i>Other, please specify</i>	17	32%	10	40%	1	17%
Difficulty obtaining my paystub or tax form	5	9%	0	0%	0	0%
Application was not in my preferred language	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	53	100%	25	100%	6	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category.

Applicants' reported challenges when applying for a grant by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/ Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Difficulty mailing in or uploading required forms	20	37%	5	71%	2	40%	1	25%	3	33%
Questions on the application were difficult to answer or confusing	20	37%	0	0%	1	20%	1	25%	1	11%
Difficulty accessing my Learning Record	13	24%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%
Limited time/availability to complete the application	8	15%	2	29%	0	0%	2	50%	1	11%
Difficulty with registering for Develop	7	13%	1	14%	2	40%	1	25%	0	0%
Application was too long	5	9%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Difficulty with completing the application due to technology, such as limited access to a computer or internet	5	9%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
<i>Other, please specify</i>	14	26%	2	29%	3	60%	2	50%	5	56%
Difficulty obtaining my paystub or tax form	4	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%
Application was not in my preferred language	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	54	100%	7	100%	5	100%	4	100%	9	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category.

Applicants' reported challenges when applying for a grant by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Difficulty mailing in or uploading required forms	6	75%	2	50%	1	20%	23	38%
Questions on the application were difficult to answer or confusing	3	38%	2	50%	1	20%	15	25%
Difficulty accessing my Learning Record	3	38%	1	25%	1	20%	11	18%
Limited time/availability to complete the application	1	13%	1	25%	1	20%	10	16%
Difficulty with registering for Develop	2	25%	2	50%	3	60%	6	10%
Application was too long	0	0%	1	25%	1	20%	4	7%
Difficulty with completing the application due to technology, such as limited access to a computer or internet	1	13%	1	25%	0	0%	5	8%
<i>Other, please specify</i>	1	13%	0	0%	3	60%	22	36%
Difficulty obtaining my paystub or tax form	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	7%
Application was not in my preferred language	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	8	100%	4	100%	5	100%	61	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category.

Applicants' reported challenges when applying for a grant by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Difficulty mailing in or uploading required forms	2	67%	3	60%	26	37%
Questions on the application were difficult to answer or confusing	1	33%	1	20%	21	30%
Difficulty accessing my Learning Record	1	33%	1	20%	11	15%
Limited time/availability to complete the application	0	0%	2	40%	10	14%
Difficulty with registering for Develop	0	0%	1	20%	10	14%
Application was too long	0	0%	0	0%	7	10%
Difficulty with completing the application due to technology, such as limited access to a computer or internet	1	33%	0	0%	4	6%
<i>Other, please specify</i>	0	0%	2	40%	25	35%
Difficulty obtaining my paystub or tax form	0	0%	0	0%	5	7%
Application was not in my preferred language	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
Total	3	100%	5	100%	71	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Items in italics were coded based on open-ended responses to the "other" category.

Help with the application

Applicants' reports of whether they received help when applying for a grant

	N	%
No	481	88%
Yes	64	12%
Total	545	100%

Applicants' reports of whether they received help when applying for a grant by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
No	258	83%	184*	96%
Yes	53*	17%	7	4%
Total	311	100%	191	100%

Note: * indicates a statistically significant difference at $p < .05$.

Applicants' reports of whether they received help when applying for a grant by applicant type

	Non-recipient		One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	197	86%	208	91%	68	91%
Yes	32	14%	21	9%	7	9%
Total	229	100%	229	100%	75	100%

Applicants' reports of whether they received help when applying for a grant by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	229	85%	48	92%	57	97%	30	88%	56	89%
Yes	41	15%	4	8%	2	3%	4	12%	7	11%
Total	270	100%	52	100%	59	100%	34	100%	63	100%

Applicants' reports of whether they received help when applying for a grant by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	24	86%	12	86%	16	84%	405	90%
Yes	4	14%	2	14%	3	16%	47	10%
Total	28	100%	14	100%	19	100%	452	100%

Applicants' reports of whether they received help when applying for a grant by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	10	71%	62	93%	368	91%

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	4	29%	5	7%	38	9%
Total	14	100%	67	100%	406	100%

Applicants' reports of who helped them apply for a grant

	Total sample	
	N	%
A supervisor or director	47	75%
A colleague	10	16%
Someone from a Child Care Aware agency	6	10%
Other	4	6%
A coach	1	2%
Someone from a child care association	0	0%
Total	63	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N.

Applicants' reports of who helped them apply for a grant by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
A supervisor or director	42	81%	2	29%
A colleague	9	17%	0	0%
Someone from a Child Care Aware agency	2	4%	4	57%
Other	3	6%	1	14%
A coach	0	0%	1	14%
Someone from a child care association	0	0%	0	0%
Total	52	100%	7	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N.

Applicants' reports of who helped them apply for a grant by applicant type

	Non-recipient		One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
A supervisor or director	24	75%	17	81%	4	57%
A colleague	5	16%	3	14%	1	14%
Someone from a Child Care Aware agency	3	9%	0	0%	3	43%
Other	2	6%	2	10%	0	0%
A coach	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
Someone from a child care association	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	32	100%	21	100%	7	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N.

Applicants' reports of who helped them apply for a grant by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/ Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A supervisor or director	30	75%	1	25%	1	50%	4	100%	7	100%
A colleague	5	13%	1	25%	2	100%	0	0%	1	14%
Someone from a Child Care Aware agency	4	10%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
A coach	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Someone from a child care association	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	40	100%	4	100%	2	100%	4	100%	7	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N.

Applicants' reports of who helped them apply for a grant by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A supervisor or director	2	50%	2	100%	3	100%	34	74%
A colleague	1	25%	1	50%	0	0%	7	15%
Someone from a Child Care Aware agency	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	4	9%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	7%
A coach	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%
Someone from a child care association	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	4	100%	2	100%	3	100%	46	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N.

Applicants' reports of who helped them apply for a grant by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
A supervisor or director	3	75%	3	60%	26	70%
A colleague	1	25%	0	0%	7	19%
Someone from a Child Care Aware agency	0	0%	2	40%	4	11%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	3	8%
A coach	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
Someone from a child care association	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	4	100%	5	100%	37	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N.

Applicants' reports of what type of help they received when applying

	Total sample	
	N	%
Clarifying definitions of application materials	36	58%
Support in mailing in or uploading application materials	26	42%
Accessing the internet to complete the application	16	26%
Helping me understand the application in my preferred language	2	3%
Total	62	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N.

Applicants' reports of what type of help they received when applying by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Clarifying definitions of application materials	28	54%	4	67%
Support in mailing in or uploading application materials	31	60%	3	50%
Accessing the internet to complete the application	14	27%	2	33%
Helping me understand the application in my preferred language	2	4%	0	0%
Total	52	100%	6	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N.

Applicants' reports of what type of help they received when applying by applicant type

	Non-recipient		One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Clarifying definitions of application materials	16	52%	10	48%	7	100%
Support in mailing in or uploading application materials	21	68%	12	57%	3	43%
Accessing the internet to complete the application	10	32%	4	19%	2	29%
Helping me understand the application in my preferred language	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	31	100%	21	100%	7	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N.

Applicants' reports of what type of help they received when applying by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Clarifying definitions of application materials	20	50%	2	67%	2	100%	2	50%	5	71%
Support in mailing in or uploading application materials	25	63%	1	33%	0	0%	2	50%	5	71%
Accessing the internet to complete the application	11	28%	1	33%	0	0%	1	25%	2	29%

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/ Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Helping me understand the application in my preferred language	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%
Total	40	100%	3	100%	2	100%	4	100%	7	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N.

Applicants' reports of what type of help they received when applying by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Clarifying definitions of application materials	2	50%	1	50%	2	67%	25	56%
Support in mailing in or uploading application materials	2	50%	1	50%	1	33%	27	60%
Accessing the internet to complete the application	3	75%	1	50%	0	0%	8	18%
Helping me understand the application in my preferred language	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	2%
Total	4	100%	2	100%	3	100%	45	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N.

Applicants' reports of what type of help they received when applying by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Clarifying definitions of application materials	1	25%	2	50%	26	70%
Support in mailing in or uploading application materials	2	50%	2	50%	19	51%
Accessing the internet to complete the application	1	25%	2	50%	10	27%
Helping me understand the application in my preferred language	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%
Total	4	100%	4	100%	37	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N.

Do past applicants plan on applying for another grant in the future?

Applicants' reports of whether they plan to apply for another grant in the future

	N	%
No	37	7%
Yes	405	74%
Unsure	108	20%
Total	550	100%

Applicants' reports of whether they plan to apply for another grant in the future by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
No	18	6%	3	2%
Yes	245	78%	143	73%
Unsure	52	17%	50	26%
Total	315	100%	196	100%

Applicants' reports of whether they plan to apply for another grant in the future by applicant type

	Non-recipient		One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	19	8%	12	5%	4	5%
Yes	150	65%	181	78%	67	88%
Unsure	62	27%	38	16%	5	7%
Total	231	100%	231	100%	76	100%

Applicants' reports of why they do or do not plan to apply for another grant in the future by response to previous question

	Yes		No or Unsure	
	N	%	N	%
Benefits of grant money	129	45%	1	1%
Great incentive/program, appreciate recognition	73	25%	0	0%
Has not received but will reapply	44	15%	1	1%
Ease of application	42	15%	0	0%
Will reapply if eligible	27	9%	2	2%
Other reason (un-codable)	11	4%	10	8%
Application requirements and timeline are discouraging	9	3%	16	12%
It is worth trying/ "Why wouldn't I?"	9	3%	0	0%
Enjoy unrestricted use of grant funds	9	3%	0	0%
Does not qualify for grant	6	2%	31	24%
Discouragement from not receiving grant in past	6	2%	28	22%
Perceived lack of transparency or communication in system, seems unfair	5	2%	13	10%
Acceptance criteria are unreasonable or unfair	4	1%	10	8%
Dislike taxes on grant discourage application	2	1%	7	5%
Dislike changes to the program	2	1%	3	2%
Technical difficulties or problems completing the application	2	1%	3	2%
Career change/exit	0	0%	32	25%
Total	288	100%	130	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N. Response categories were coded based on open-ended responses to the question. Un-codable responses were varied, but the majority were not coded due to ambiguity or lack of clarity.

What are the characteristics of past applicants who have since left the field?

Who left the field

Applicants reports of whether they currently care for children ages 0 to 12 for pay

	N	%
Yes	521	96%
No, though I am still in the child care field	10	2%
No, I have left the child care field	14	3%
Total	545	100%

Applicants reports of whether they currently care for children ages 0 to 12 for pay by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	314	100%	199	100%
No, though I am still in the child care field	1	0%	0	0%
No, I have left the child care field	0	0%	0	0%
Total	315	100%	199	100%

Applicants reports of whether they currently care for children ages 0 to 12 for pay by applicant type

	Non-recipient		One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	224	97%	211	94%	76	99%
No, though I am still in the child care field	5	2%	5	2%	0	0%
No, I have left the child care field	3	1%	9	4%	1	1%
Total	232	100%	225	100%	77	100%

Applicants reports of whether they currently care for children ages 0 to 12 for pay by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	276	100%	54	100%	61	100%	34	100%	63	100%
No, though I am still in the child care field	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No, I have left the child care field	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	277	100%	54	100%	61	100%	34	100%	63	100%

Applicants reports of whether they currently care for children ages 0 to 12 for pay by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	26	93%	14	100%	19	100%	440	95%

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No, though I am still in the child care field	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	9	2%
No, I have left the child care field	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	13	3%
Total	28	100%	14	100%	19	100%	462	100%

Applicants reports of whether they currently care for children ages 0 to 12 for pay by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	14	100%	70	100%	386	96%
No, though I am still in the child care field	0	0%	0	0%	8	2%
No, I have left the child care field	0	0%	0	0%	10	2%
Total	14	100%	70	100%	404	100%

Applicants' reported work in the child care field (among those not currently caring for children ages children 0 to 12)

	N	%
I am an administrator at a child care program	3	30%
I work for a Child Care Resource and Referral Agency (CCR&R)	0	0%
I work for the state or local government	1	10%
I work for non-profit educational organization	2	20%
I work for for-profit educational organization	0	0%
I am a professional development trainer	1	10%
I work as a consultant in the field	0	0%
Other, please specify	3	30%
Total	10	100%

Applicants' reports of whether they currently work in the child care field

	Total sample	
	N	%
Yes	518	95%
No	28	5%
Total	546	100%

Applicants' reports of whether they currently work in the child care field by program type

	Center-based providers		Family child care providers	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	302	97%	196	100%
No	9	3%	0	0%
Total	311	100%	196	100%

Applicants' reports of whether they currently work in the child care field by applicant type

	Non-recipient		One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	220	96%	212	93%	75	97%
No	9	4%	16	7%	2	3%
Total	229	100%	228	100%	77	100%

Applicants' reports of whether they currently work in the child care field by district

	Metro		Northeast		Northwest		South		West/ Central	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	266	97%	52	98%	58	98%	34	100%	61	97%
No	7	3%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	2	3%
Total	273	100%	53	100%	59	100%	34	100%	63	100%

Applicants' reports of whether they currently work in the child care field by race/ethnicity

	Black/African American, non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Other/ multiracial, non-Hispanic		White/ Caucasian, non-Hispanic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	28	97%	13	100%	19	100%	433	95%
No	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	25	5%
Total	29	100%	13	100%	19	100%	458	100%

Applicants' reports of whether they currently work in the child care field by Career Lattice Step

	Non-credit training		Non-credit credential and/or college credits		College credit	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	12	92%	68	100%	389	95%
No	1	8%	0	0%	20	5%
Total	13	100%	68	100%	409	100%

Applicants' reported field of work since leaving the child care workforce

	Total sample	
	N	%
Working in another, unrelated field	8	31%
Working for a government agency or non-profit organization	3	12%
Working for a public or private school	12	46%
Working in coaching or licensing	3	12%
Taking a leave of absence to be with family or young children	3	12%
Total	26	100%

Reasons for leaving the field

Applicants' reported reasons for leaving the child care field

	Total sample	
	N	%
Compensation was too low	15	56%
Family/own children	11	41%
Lack of health insurance or other benefits	8	30%
Lack of paid time off	8	30%
Lack of respect for the child care field/profession from others	7	26%
Lack of growth opportunities	6	22%
Licensing regulations were burdensome	6	22%
Other, please specify	6	22%
I did not have the professional supports I needed	5	19%
My own medical issues	3	11%
I felt isolated	3	11%
I went back to school	2	7%
This was never my career path	1	4%
I retired	1	4%
I had difficulties running my small business	0	0%
Total	27	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N.

Applicants' reported reasons for leaving the child care field by applicant type

	Non-recipient		One-time recipient		Repeat recipient	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Compensation was too low	7	78%	7	47%	1	50%
Family/own children	5	56%	6	40%	0	0%
Lack of health insurance or other benefits	5	56%	2	13%	1	50%
Lack of paid time off	3	33%	3	20%	2	100%
Lack of respect for the child care field/profession from others	4	44%	3	20%	0	0%
Lack of growth opportunities	2	22%	3	20%	1	50%
Licensing regulations were burdensome	1	11%	4	27%	1	50%
Other	1	11%	4	27%	1	50%
I did not have the professional supports I needed	4	44%	1	7%	0	0%
My own medical issues	1	11%	1	7%	0	0%
I felt isolated	2	22%	1	7%	0	0%
I went back to school	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%
This was never my career path	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%
I retired	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
I had difficulties running my small business	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	9	100%	15	100%	2	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N.

Applicants' reports of what factors might have led them to stay in the field

	Total sample	
	N	%
Supports with seeking additional education opportunities	2	8%
Supports for running my family child care small business	0	0%
Paid time off (vacation days, sick days)	10	42%
Other	4	17%
More social support, reduced feeling of social isolation	5	21%
More respect for the child care profession	9	38%
More opportunity for leadership positions	7	29%
Less burdensome licensing regulations	6	25%
Higher salary/compensation	22	92%
Health insurance	7	29%
Coaching (starting with a new coach or adding more time with a current coach)	1	4%
Total	24	100%

Note: Respondents could select multiple response options, so percentages total more than 100 and responses total more than the N.

References

- ¹ Valorose, J. & Chase, R. (2012). *Child care workforce in Minnesota 2011 statewide study of demographics, training and professional development: Final report*. Minnesota Department of Human Services. Retrieved from <http://www.wilder.org/Wilder-Research/Publications/Studies/Child%20Care%20Workforce%20in%20Minnesota,%202011%20Study/2011%20Statewide%20Study%20of%20Demographics,%20Training%20and%20Professional%20Development.pdf>
- ² Totenhagen, C. J., Hawkins, S. A., Casper, D. M., Bosch, L. A., Hawkey, K. R., & Borden, L. M. (2016). Retaining early childhood education workers: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Research in Early Childhood Education*, 30(4), 585-599. DOI: 10.1080/02568543.2016.1214652.
- ³ Totenhagen, C. J., Hawkins, S. A., Casper, D. M., Bosch, L. A., Hawkey, K. R., & Borden, L. M. (2016). Retaining early childhood education workers: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Research in Early Childhood Education*, 30(4), 585-599. DOI: 10.1080/02568543.2016.1214652.
- ⁴ Bridges, M. & Carlat, J. (2003). Training and retaining early care and education staff. Bay area child-care retention incentive programs: Evaluation and year one progress report, 2001-2002 (PACE Policy Brief). Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED475497.pdf>
- ⁵ Holochwost, S. J., DeMott, K., Buell, M., Yannetta, K., & Amsden, D. (2009). Retention of staff in the early childhood education workforce. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, 38(5), 227-237.
- ⁶ Totenhagen, C. J., Hawkins, S. A., Casper, D. M., Bosch, L. A., Hawkey, K. R., & Borden, L. M. (2016). Retaining early childhood education workers: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Research in Early Childhood Education*, 30(4), 585-599. DOI: 10.1080/02568543.2016.1214652.
- ⁷ Werner, M. (2016). *A quiet crisis: Minnesota's child care shortage*. Center for Rural Policy and Development: Mankato, MN.
- ⁸ Whitebook, M., McLean, C., & Austin, L. J. E. (2016). *Early childhood workforce index – 2016*. Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California, Berkeley.

651-431-3861

Attention. If you need free help interpreting this document, call the above number.

ያስተውሉ፡ ካለምንም ክፍያ ይህንን ዶክመንት የሚተረጎም ለዘርፍ አስተርጓሚ ከፈለጉ ከላይ ወደተጻፈው የስልክ ቁጥር ይደውሉ።

ملاحظة: إذا أردت مساعدة مجانية لترجمة هذه الوثيقة، اتصل على الرقم أعلاه.

သတိ။ ဤစာရွက်စာတမ်းအားအခမဲ့ဘာသာပြန်ပေးခြင်း အကူအညီလိုအပ်ပါက၊ အထက်ပါဖုန်းနံပါတ်ကိုခေါ်ဆိုပါ။

កំណត់សំគាល់ ។ បើអ្នកត្រូវការជំនួយក្នុងការបកប្រែឯកសារនេះដោយឥតគិតថ្លៃ សូមហៅទូរស័ព្ទតាមលេខខាងលើ ។

請注意，如果您需要免費協助傳譯這份文件，請撥打上面的電話號碼。

Attention. Si vous avez besoin d'une aide gratuite pour interpréter le présent document, veuillez appeler au numéro ci-dessus.

Thov ua twb zoo nyeem. Yog hais tias koj xav tau kev pab txhais lus rau tsab ntaub ntawv no pub dawb, ces hu rau tus najnpawb xov tooj saum toj no.

ဟ်သုဉ်ဟ်သးဘဉ်တက့ၢ်. ဖဲနမ့ၢ်လိဉ်ဘဉ်တၢ်မၤစၢၤကလိလၢတၢ်ကကျိးထံဝဲဒဉ်လံာ် တိလံာ်မိတခါအံၤန့ဉ်, ကိးဘဉ်လိတဲစိနီၢ်ဂံၢ်လၢထးအံၤန့ဉ်တက့ၢ်.

알려드립니다. 이 문서에 대한 이해를 돕기 위해 무료로 제공되는 도움을 받으시려면 위의 전화번호로 연락하십시오.

ໂປຣດຊາບ. ຖ້າຫາກ ທ່ານຕ້ອງການການຊ່ວຍເຫຼືອໃນການແປເອກະສານນີ້ພຣີ, ຈົ່ງໂທໂປທີ່ໝາຍເລກຂ້າງເທິງນີ້.

Hubachiisa. Dokumentiin kun tola akka siif hiikamu gargaarsa hoo feete, lakkoobsa gubbatti kenname bilbili.

Внимание: если вам нужна бесплатная помощь в устном переводе данного документа, позвоните по указанному выше телефону.

Digniin. Haddii aad u baahantahay caawimaad lacag-la'aan ah ee tarjumaadda qoraalkan, lambarka kore wac.

Atención. Si desea recibir asistencia gratuita para interpretar este documento, llame al número indicado arriba.

Chú ý. Nếu quý vị cần được giúp đỡ dịch tài liệu này miễn phí, xin gọi số bên trên.