



FIRST THINGS FIRST

Ready for School. Set for Life.

NEEDS AND ASSETS REPORT 2010



CENTRAL MARICOPA

Regional Partnership Council




CENTRAL MARICOPA

Regional Partnership Council

Council

Andrea Colby, Chair
Maureen Duane, Vice Chair
Genoveva Acosta-Bueno
Hope Dillon
Trinity Donovan
Karen Emery
Jacqueline Garner
Kathy Halter
Zita Johnson
Frank Narducci
Glenn Waterkotte

1921 South Alma School Road, Suite 111
Mesa, Arizona 85210
Phone: 602-771-4984
www.azftf.gov



Contents

Message from the Chair	1
Introductory Summary and Acknowledgments	2
Executive Summary	3
1.0 INTRODUCTION	7
1.1 Overview of the Central Maricopa Region	7
1.2 Preliminary Analyses	7
1.3 Methodology	8
2.0 THE FAMILIES AND CHILDREN LIVING IN THE CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	11
2.1 General Population Trends	11
2.2 Additional Population Characteristics	14
2.3 Economic Circumstances	19
2.4 Educational Indicators	24
3.0 THE EARLY CHILDHOOD SYSTEM IN THE CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	25
3.1 Early Care and Education	25
3.2 Supporting Families	32
3.3 Health	38
3.4 Public Awareness and Collaboration	47
3.5 Stakeholder Priority for Services	49
4.0 SUMMARY AND FUTURE DIRECTION	50
Future Direction	51
Conclusion	52
APPENDIX A	53
APPENDIX B	120
APPENDIX C	127

Message from the Chair

August 11, 2010

Message from the Chair:

The past two years have been rewarding for the First Things First Central Maricopa Regional Partnership Council, as we delivered on our mission to build better futures for young children and their families. During the past year, we have touched many lives of young children and their families.

The First Things First Central Maricopa Regional Partnership Council will continue to advocate and provide opportunities as indicated throughout this report.

Our strategic direction has been guided by the Needs and Assets reports, specifically created for the Central Maricopa Region in 2008 and the new 2010 report. The Needs and Assets reports are vital to our continued work in building a true integrated early childhood system for our young children and our overall future. The Central Maricopa Regional Council would like to thank our Needs and Assets Vendor MGT of America, Inc. and Children's Action Alliance for their knowledge, expertise and analysis of the Central Maricopa region. The new report will help guide our decisions as we move forward for young children and their families within the Central Maricopa region.

Going forward, the First Things First Central Maricopa Regional Partnership Council is committed to meeting the needs of young children by providing essential services and advocating for social change.

Thanks to our dedicated staff, volunteers and community partners, First Things First is making a real difference in the lives of our youngest citizens and throughout the entire State.

Thank you for your continued support.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Andrea L. Colby".

Andrea Colby, Chair

Central Maricopa Regional Partnership Council

Introductory Summary and Acknowledgments

First Things First Central Maricopa Regional Partnership Council

The way in which children develop from infancy to well functioning members of society will always be a critical subject matter. Understanding the processes of early childhood development is crucial to our ability to foster each child's optimal development and thus, in turn, is fundamental to all aspects of wellbeing of our communities, society and the State of Arizona.

This Needs and Assets Report for the Central Maricopa Geographic Region provides a clear statistical analysis and helps us in understanding the needs, gaps and assets for young children and points to ways in which children and families can be supported. The needs young children and families face are outlined in the executive summary and documented in further detail in the full report.

The First Things First Central Maricopa Regional Partnership Council recognizes the importance of investing in young children and empowering parents, grandparents, and caregivers to advocate for services and programs within the region. This report provides basic data points that will aid the Council's decisions and funding allocations; while building a true comprehensive statewide early childhood system.

Acknowledgments:

The First Things First Central Maricopa Regional Partnership Council owes special gratitude to the agencies and key stakeholders who participated in numerous work sessions and community forums throughout the past two years. The success of First Things First was due, in large measure, to the contributions of numerous individuals who gave their time, skill, support, knowledge and expertise.

To the current and past members of the Central Maricopa Regional Partnership Council, your dedication, commitment and extreme passion has guided the work of making a difference in the lives of young children and families within the region. Our continued work will only aid in the direction of building a true comprehensive early childhood system for the betterment of young children within the region and the entire State.

We also want to thank the Arizona Department of Economic Security and the Arizona Child Care Resource and Referral, the Arizona Department of Health Services and the Arizona State Immunization Information System, the Arizona Department of Education and School Districts across the State of Arizona, the Arizona Head Start Association, the Office of Head Start, and Head Start and Early Head Start Programs across the State of Arizona, and the Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System for their contribution of data for this report.

- Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System.
- Arizona Department of Economic Security.
- Arizona Department of Health Services.
- Arizona Department of Education.
- American Community Survey.
- Arizona Head Start Association and National Head Start.

Executive Summary

In January 2010, MGT of America, Inc. (MGT), was awarded a contract by the Arizona Early Childhood Development and Health Board, also known as First Things First (FTF), to provide a Regional Needs and Assets Report for Central Maricopa. MGT teamed with Children's Action Alliance for this important engagement. The report synthesizes relevant community data to help inform the FTF Regional Council in decision-making.

Methodology

The methodology used to prepare the Regional Needs and Assets Report is described in this section.

The focus of the report is a collection and meaningful analyses of informative data indicators. The Needs and Assets Report includes an increased emphasis on the Council's existing "assets," that is the institutions or organizations within the region that can be strengthened, expanded, and/or partnered with to support early childhood activities.

Primary Data Collection and Analysis

Local regional data have been of the utmost importance to the success of this project. The team collected qualitative primary data to reflect the personal views of regional participants and the unique features of the region.

The team used three methods of primary data collection as described below:

1. Web-based stakeholder surveys.
2. Telephone interviews.
3. Stakeholder meetings.

Web-based Stakeholder Surveys

The team worked closely with FTF staff, including Regional Coordinators and Managers, to collect contact information from compiled lists of early care and development stakeholders in the region. The team supplemented these stakeholders with information obtained from key organizations, such as medical centers, school principals, food banks, libraries, and WIC centers.

FTF provided MGT with 2,360 email addresses for early care and development stakeholders in Maricopa County. Emails were sent to each contact seeking participation in the survey portion of this study. Respondents were asked to indicate the communities that they serve, and many respondents indicated that they serve communities across multiple regions.

The survey was initiated in April 2010 following revisions based on input from Regional Council Members. The surveys focused on qualitative data from stakeholders about early childhood needs and assets in their local community. Survey respondents were asked to provide information and/or data sources that will contribute further to the reports. Results of the survey are located in Appendix A of this report.

Telephone Interviews

The team conducted individual telephone interviews with stakeholders in the region to obtain

additional information and perspectives on early childhood needs and assets. In addition to early childhood professionals, the team interviewed parents and neighborhood leaders. Some interviewees provided input in written form if requested.

A summary of the responses is located in **Appendix B** of this report.

Stakeholder Group Interviews

Group meetings were held with community stakeholders. These group interviews involved organizations providing relevant services in the region and other select community members.

These group meetings provided additional relevant information, perceptions, and opinions of services considered assets as well as potential barriers or unmet needs of the community.

A summary of the responses is located in **Appendix B** of this report.

Secondary Data Collection and Analysis

The team worked with FTF and other Arizona and national data sources for indicators in the Regional Needs and Assets Report template provided in the FTF solicitation. The team worked closely with Regional Coordinators and Managers to identify local sources of documented information. Examples of national and regional sources included in this report are as follows:

- Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System.
- Arizona Department of Economic Security.
- Arizona Department of Health Services.
- Arizona Department of Education.
- American Community Survey

Report Overview

The Central Maricopa Region has a combination of strengths and challenges. Families in the city of Tempe have diversity and economic characteristics similar to Maricopa County. The city of Chandler, with a larger and faster-growing young child population, is less diverse and has more economic strength.

The region has notable strengths. Sixty percent of the schools in the region were excelling or highly performing compared to 36 percent of schools statewide. Preschool enrollment in the city of Tempe is similar to the rate in Maricopa County; enrollment in the rest of the region is significantly higher. Median incomes for families with children in Tempe are similar to or above the median in Maricopa County; median incomes in the rest of the region are significantly higher. The median incomes of families headed by a single mother are less than half the median of two-parent families.

The region has suffered during the economic downturn, but has retained many of its economic strengths. The unemployment rate in the region more than doubled between 2005 and 2010, as it did for Maricopa County. The cities of Chandler and Tempe both had lower unemployment rates than the county rate of 8.7 percent in March 2010. The unemployment rate at that time in the town of Guadalupe was much higher, at 15.3 percent. The number of children birth to age five living in

transitional or emergency shelters who previously had lived in the Central Maricopa Region rose from 54 in 2007 to 101 in 2009. This was larger growth than the number of homeless children in the First Things First regions in Maricopa County.

More than one out of ten White two-parent households in the city of Tempe had incomes below the federal poverty level, rising just above the countywide rate. Family poverty rates in Chandler were less than half that rate. The number of very poor young children in the region living in families receiving Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (welfare) grew by 34 percent between 2007 and 2010 – more than twice the growth rate statewide

The percentage of children without health coverage is lower in the region than the 15.5 percent countywide – ranging from 6 percent in the Kyrene School District to 13 percent in the city of Tempe. Despite high rates of public and private health coverage for children, the immunization rates in the region are lower than the statewide rates and have declined for children aged 12 to 24 months. The town of Guadalupe is considered a medically underserved area in Arizona, based on low access to health providers. Nearly half of the respondents to our online survey identified access to free or low cost health services as a missing service in the region.

The online survey included a question about what types of employer-based benefits are most important to families with young children. Eighty-two percent of survey respondents identified affordable health insurance for family members, 68 percent identified a flexible work schedule, and 64 percent identified paid time off for illness and vacation.

The region has lower percentages of young children who are Hispanic than Maricopa County; 33 percent in the city of Chandler and 39 percent in the city of Tempe, compared to 47 percent countywide. Thirty-seven percent of young children in Maricopa County had at least one parent who was foreign born; the rates are similar in Tempe and much lower in Chandler. Fewer than 5 percent of young children were born in another country throughout the region. Almost 7 percent of the households in Tempe have no one over the age of 14 who speaks English well; the rates are lower for the rest of the region.

Nine percent of children younger than six in Maricopa County are being raised by their grandparents; the rate is 8 percent in Tempe and 4 percent in Chandler. Forty-three percent of respondents to the online survey identified support for grandparents raising grandchildren as a service that is missing the region.

The need for access to high quality, affordable childcare is strong throughout the region. More than two out of three families with children in the city of Chandler have all parents in the workforce, indicating a high need for childcare. The rate is similar countywide. The number of licensed childcare centers and DES Certified homes both declined significantly in the region between 2008 and 2010. There are 27 childcare providers with a national recognition or accreditation, up from 25 in 2008. This is only 12 percent of all licensed and certified providers in the region. In 2010, 120 four year old students were enrolled in preschool in the Chandler School District through the state-funded Early Childhood Block Grant Program. Due to budget cuts, that funding is no longer available.

Community members greatly value the services in the region such as Head Start and other public preschool programs, area hospitals, parent information and education, family resource centers, support groups, teen outreach (for early childhood careers), libraries, and childcare subsidies (when available).

The input from the community through the online survey, the stakeholder meetings, and the telephone interviews all overwhelmingly point to a great demand for financial assistance for parents needing childcare. Thirty-three percent of the respondents to the online survey said that childcare services are not meeting the needs of families in the community and 73 percent identified cost as

the single most important barrier in childcare. More than half said that childcare subsidies are a service that is missing in the region.

Community input also emphasized a need to improve awareness among parents about early education needs and available services. There was a strong consensus that families of all income levels need more support and information. Lack of transportation was mentioned frequently as a barrier to families getting services.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Overview of the Central Maricopa Region

The Central Maricopa Region of Chandler, Guadalupe, Tempe and Ahwatukee embody both dense, urban, ethnically-diverse neighborhoods and new and growing suburban communities. Demographic differences exist among the population centers, with pockets of high poverty (such as in North Tempe and Guadalupe) and more affluent sections of the region (such as portions of Chandler and Ahwatukee). The region is an area of great diversity, with urban and suburban areas that differ from each other in many of the child and family indicators reflected in the Needs and Assets Report as well as identified by community stakeholders. The population of children (age 0 – 4) is growing rapidly in the region, putting pressure on the health, education, and early care systems that serve young children and their families.

1.2 Preliminary Analyses

As part of the Needs and Assets data collection, Children’s Action Alliance reviewed multiple reports, databases, and environmental scans related to children and families in Maricopa County and in the region. This section presents highlights of relevant information from these reports that are not covered elsewhere.

1.2.1 Assets

The region is home to many early education professional development programs, supported in large part by the region’s proximity to Arizona State University. The cities of this region are overall well-established and offer strong support for early education. In the city of Chandler, for example, the public school districts are supplemented by a large number of extra-curricular programs provided by ICAN, Boys and Girls Club, and the YMCA. Chandler Community Action Program (CAN) offers emergency utility assistance, and provides shelter for victims of domestic violence and the homeless.

1.2.2 Needs

The Central Maricopa Region focuses many resources towards early education and services. However, the low-income families in the region often have difficulty accessing education services, due to location, transportation difficulties, and wait-lists. The high quality youth programming and fee-for-service childcare offered in the communities are too expensive and consequently out of reach for many families. Low- to moderate-income families who live above the poverty level but who are still stressed financially, encounter issues with wait-lists or ineligibility for publicly funded programs. Therefore, affordable childcare and healthcare remain an issue in the region.

Many discrepancies in services exist between neighborhoods; the poorer neighborhoods and communities are lacking in human services, whereas many of the more prosperous areas have

City of Chandler Human Services: A Look to the Future. A Needs Assessment at the Request of the City of Chandler Community Development Division and the Housing and Human Service Commission. Conducted and compiled by The Williams Institute, December 2007.

The National Citizen Survey, Chandler, AZ: Summary of Findings.

Project LAUNCH: TAPESTRY, Arizona’s Local Environmental Scan, May 29, 2009.

Steps Toward Caring Communities, Valley of the Sun United Way, December 2007 Report.

underutilized services. Transportation to the service area is often difficult or impossible to manage. Although the Central Maricopa Region possesses many community resources, the need far outweighs the availability of services for domestic violence and homeless shelters, community food and clothing banks, emergency assistance programs, substance abuse treatment facilities and other social services. Even if there are available services, often there is a lack of available information about these services. The overall affluence of the region creates an “invisible population” of individuals and families that are struggling for sustainability and in need of community services.

1.3 Methodology

The methodology used to prepare Regional Needs and Assets Report is described in this section.

The focus of the report is a collection and meaningful analyses of informative data indicators. The Needs and Assets Report includes an emphasis on the Council’s existing “assets,” that is the institutions or organizations within the region that can be strengthened, expanded, and/or partnered with to support early childhood activities.

1.3.1 Primary Data Collection and Analysis

Local regional data have been of the utmost importance to the success of this project. The team collected qualitative primary data to reflect the personal views of regional participants and the unique features of the region.

Three methods were used for primary data collection:

1. Web-based stakeholder surveys.
2. Telephone interviews.
3. Stakeholder meetings.

Web-based Stakeholder Surveys

The team worked closely with FTF staff and the Regional Coordinators and Managers to collect contact information from currently compiled lists of early care and development stakeholders in the region. The team supplemented these stakeholders with information obtained from key organizations such as medical centers, school principals, food banks, libraries, and WIC centers.

FTF provided MGT 2,360 e-mail addresses for early care and development stakeholders in Maricopa County. E-mails were sent to each contact seeking participation in the survey portion of this study. Respondents were asked to indicate the communities which they served, and many indicated that they serve communities across multiple regions.

The survey was initiated in April 2010 following revisions based on input from Regional Council Members. The surveys focused on qualitative data from stakeholders about early childhood needs and assets in their local community. Survey respondents were asked to provide information and/or data sources that will contribute further to the reports.

The team coordinated with First Things First staff and Regional Coordinators and Managers to develop the survey instruments and to collect survey respondent contact information. A master list of potential respondents was created that consisted of early care and development stakeholders in each region. A draft survey was presented to two focus groups on March 25 and 26, 2010 during meetings that were accessible through teleconferencing and “Live Meeting” format. Input was synthesized and incorporated into the survey design and the final version was converted into a

web-based application in late March and early April.

Pilot testing began in early April and the online survey was provided to all respondents on April 22, 2010. Some key features of the survey include the ability for respondents to: provide information about multiple communities, edit responses as needed up until the final closing deadline, and review their survey completion status using a “completion matrix.” The survey period was extended for an additional week following a request for extension. The survey period ended on May 25, 2010. Eighty-one respondents provided survey input about the Central Maricopa Region. Survey responses can be found in **Appendix A**.

Telephone Interviews

The team conducted individual telephone interviews with stakeholders in the region to obtain additional information and perspectives on early childhood needs and assets. In addition to early childhood professionals, the team interviewed parents and neighborhood locals. Some interviewees provided input in written form if requested.

A summary of the responses is located in **Appendix B** of this report.

Stakeholder Group Interviews

Group meetings were held with community stakeholders. These group interviews involved organizations providing relevant services in the region and other select community members.

These meetings provided additional relevant information, perceptions, and opinions of services considered assets as well as potential barriers or unmet needs of the community.

A summary of the responses is located in **Appendix B** of this report.

1.3.2 Secondary Data Collection and Analysis

The team worked with FTF and other Arizona and national data sources for indicators in the Regional Needs and Assets Report template provided in the FTF solicitation. The team worked closely with Regional Coordinators and Managers to identify local sources of documented information. Examples of national and regional sources included in this report are as follows:

- Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System.
- Arizona Department of Economic Security.
- Arizona Department of Health Services.
- Arizona Department of Education.
- American Community Survey.
- Arizona Head Start Association and National Head Start.

Many of the analyses included in the successive chapters of this report rely on American Community Survey (ACS) data published by the U.S. Census Bureau. The information presented for each topic area reflects the most current and geographically comprehensive data available through this source. More specifically, three particular databases were used to generate the tables: 1) three-year average estimates covering the 2006-08 period; 2) single-year estimates for the year 2008; and, 3) single year estimates for the year 2005 (used as a historic reference point to calculate change). Items noted as “Most Recent Estimates” reflect either the three-year average estimate for the demographic statistic over the 2006-08 period or, if unavailable, the single-year estimate for the year 2008. Alternately,

items denoted as “3-Year Trend” indicate the percentage change in the demographic component between the single-year estimates for the years 2005 and 2008.

As noted, data from ACS are presented for the most specific geographies available for each data element. ACS will not publish results when population totals are too small to allow for reliable estimation; therefore, localities shown will vary from exhibit to exhibit.

In addition to national-, state-, and county-level data, geographies available through the ACS at the sub-FTF regional level include cities and towns and school districts. Note that the data shown for school districts do not refer to the students enrolled in school there; they cover all residents living within the geographic boundaries of the school districts. Because the boundaries of the cities and school districts do not match the First Things First regional boundaries, the exhibits include several geographies to best reflect the characteristics of the region. Some of these geographies overlap and some include residents outside the region.

2.0 THE FAMILIES AND CHILDREN LIVING IN THE CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION

This chapter presents data and analyses regarding families and children in the Central Maricopa Region.

2.1 General Population Trends

Exhibit 2-1 presents an analysis of the population of children (age four and under) being served.

- With the exception of the city of Tempe, all of the areas in the region show a three-year trend with significantly higher growth in children age four and younger than the state and Maricopa County.
- The Kyrene District has seen the largest increase with 52 percent growth.

EXHIBIT 2-1

PERCENTAGE, NUMBER, AND CHANGE IN POPULATION AGE 0 TO 5 YEARS

AREA	POPULATION AGE 5 AND UNDER		
	MOST RECENT DATA	PERCENT OF TOTAL POPULATION (ALL AGES)	3-YEAR TREND
Chandler Unified District	21,761	9.6%	19.7%
Tempe Union High School District	18,434	6.1%	21.3%
Kyrene Elementary District	9,764	6.4%	52.0%
Chandler City	22,820	9.2%	28.2%
Tempe City	8,451	5.2%	4.6%
Maricopa County	324,159	8.4%	11.3%
Arizona	500,031	7.9%	12.1%
United States	20,672,826	6.9%	3.2%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

Exhibit 2-2 presents data relevant to the diversity of the population for children under five. As shown:

- The percentages of young Hispanic children in this region are much lower than in Maricopa County and the state.
- Significant growth occurred among Hispanic/Latino young child populations in the region between 2005 and 2008, two to four times the county and statewide growth.

EXHIBIT 2-2

RACE AND ETHNICITY OF CHILDREN AGE FIVE AND UNDER

AREA	PERCENT AGE FIVE AND UNDER (MOST RECENT DATA)					PERCENT CHANGE (3-YEAR TREND)			
	RACE				ETHNICITY	RACE			ETHNICITY
	WHITE	AFRICAN AMERICAN	NATIVE AMERICAN	OTHER -OR- UNABLE TO ESTIMATE	HISPANIC OR LATINO (ANY RACE)	WHITE	AFRICAN AMERICAN	NATIVE AMERICAN	HISPANIC OR LATINO (ANY RACE)
Chandler Unified District	79.8%	2.7%	*	17.6%	31.8%	30.7%	*	*	73.6%
Tempe Union High School District	74.5%	5.3%	3.4%	16.8%	34.2%	35.8%	-1.5%	*	33.2%
Kyrene Elementary District	72.1%	6.2%	*	21.6%	18.8%	63.7%	*	*	37.9%
Chandler City	77.5%	3.5%	*	18.9%	33.3%	51.1%	*	*	82.9%
Tempe City	76.9%	4.4%	3.1%	15.7%	38.8%	18.1%	*	*	40.8%
Maricopa County	73.4%	4.9%	2.4%	19.3%	47.2%	20.9%	61.3%	-12.4%	19.4%
Arizona	69.3%	4.2%	5.5%	21.1%	45.7%	20.8%	59.8%	-13.6%	19.4%
United States	66.9%	13.6%	0.9%	18.6%	24.6%	4.9%	-3.8%	6.5%	16.1%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

*indicates that the sample size was too small to estimate specific demographic components.

Exhibit 2-3 presents data relevant to children with potential cultural and linguistic challenges. As shown:

- Several localities in the region had a higher percentage of children under six who are foreign born than do either Maricopa County (2.8%) or Arizona (2.2%). In Tempe, nearly 5 percent of the children under six were born outside the U.S.

EXHIBIT 2-3

CHILDREN UNDER SIX WHO ARE FOREIGN BORN

AREA	PERCENT OF CHILDREN UNDER AGE 6
	MOST RECENT DATA
Chandler Unified District	1.3%
Tempe Union High School District	3.9%
Kyrene Elementary District	3.8%
Chandler City	1.9%
Tempe City	4.8%
Maricopa County	2.8%
Arizona	2.2%
United States	1.6%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

Exhibit 2-4 also presents data relevant to children with potential cultural and linguistic challenges. As shown:

- Several localities within the region, Chandler Unified District, Kyrene Elementary District, and the city of Chandler, had lower percentages of children under six with at least one foreign born parent than either Maricopa County (36.6%) or Arizona as a whole (31.7%). The remaining localities more closely mirror the county and state rates.
- In every part of the region, more than one in five young children had at least one parent who was born in another country.

EXHIBIT 2-4

CHILDREN UNDER SIX WITH AT LEAST ONE FOREIGN BORN PARENT

AREA	PERCENT OF CHILDREN UNDER AGE 6
	MOST RECENT DATA
Chandler Unified District	23.1%
Tempe Union High School District	34.1%
Kyrene Elementary District	23.8%
Chandler City	24.3%
Tempe City	39.2%
Maricopa County	36.6%
Arizona	31.7%
United States	24.8%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

2.2 Additional Population Characteristics

Exhibit 2-5 presents data on the age and ethnicity of mothers giving birth in Maricopa County and Arizona. As shown:

- The proportion of births in Maricopa County to teen mothers stayed the same between 2005 and 2008 (11.6%).
- The proportion of births to teens was much higher for non-White mothers than for White non-Hispanic mothers.

EXHIBIT 2-5

BIRTHS BY AGE AND ETHNICITY

AREA		2005						2008					
		TOTAL	MOTHER'S AGE GROUP					TOTAL	MOTHER'S AGE GROUP				
			<15	15-17	18-19	20+	UNKNOWN		<15	15-17	18-19	20+	UNKNOWN
Maricopa County	TOTAL	62,232	0.2%	4.1%	7.3%	88.4%	0.0%	62,667	0.15%	4.1%	7.3%	88.5%	0.0%
	White Non-Hispanic	26,130	0.0%	1.5%	4.2%	94.2%	0.0%	26,201	0.02%	1.6%	4.5%	93.8%	0.0%
	Hispanic or Latino	28,318	0.4%	6.5%	9.9%	83.2%	0.0%	28,319	0.26%	6.5%	9.8%	83.4%	0.0%
	Black or African American	2,697	0.1%	5.9%	10.1%	83.8%	0.0%	3,272	0.28%	4.8%	10.1%	84.8%	0.0%
	American Indian or Alaska Native	1,817	0.4%	6.3%	11.8%	81.5%	0.0%	1,940	0.21%	5.4%	10.2%	84.3%	0.0%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	2,133	0.0%	1.0%	1.9%	97.0%	0.0%	2,605	0.04%	0.5%	2.2%	97.2%	0.0%
	Other/Unknown	1,137	0.0%	3.0%	7.1%	89.9%	0.0%	330	0.00%	3.9%	4.2%	91.2%	0.6%
Arizona	TOTAL	95,798	0.2%	4.4%	7.9%	87.5%	0.0%	99,215	0.16%	4.2%	7.9%	87.7%	0.0%
	White Non-Hispanic	39,657	0.0%	1.8%	5.1%	93.1%	0.0%	41,925	0.04%	1.8%	5.3%	92.9%	0.0%
	Hispanic or Latino	42,156	0.3%	6.5%	10.3%	82.9%	0.0%	42,639	0.26%	6.4%	10.2%	83.2%	0.0%
	Black or African American	3,450	0.2%	5.8%	10.5%	83.5%	0.0%	4,301	0.28%	4.7%	10.3%	84.7%	0.0%
	American Indian or Alaska Native	6,293	0.3%	7.6%	11.2%	80.9%	0.0%	6,362	0.35%	6.4%	11.9%	81.4%	0.0%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	2,805	0.0%	1.0%	2.4%	96.6%	0.0%	3,425	0.03%	0.8%	2.5%	96.7%	0.0%
	Other/Unknown	1,437	0.1%	2.9%	6.2%	90.8%	0.0%	563	0.00%	3.7%	4.4%	91.5%	0.4%

Source: Arizona Department of Health Services.

Exhibit 2-6 presents data about single and two-parent families by race and ethnicity. As shown:

- The rates of young children living in two-parent families vary in the region.
- In the Tempe Union School District, more than four in ten young Hispanic children live in single-parent families – a higher rate than young, non-Hispanic children.

EXHIBIT 2-6

TYPES OF FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN UNDER FIVE BY RACE AND ETHNICITY

AREA	PERCENT OF FAMILIES W/ CHILDREN UNDER 5 (MOST RECENT DATA)						PERCENT CHANGE IN TYPES OF FAMILIES (3-YEAR TREND)					
	ALL RACES & ETHNICITIES			HISPANIC OR LATINO (ANY RACE)			ALL RACES & ETHNICITIES			HISPANIC OR LATINO (ANY RACE)		
	TWO-PARENT	SINGLE PARENT (MALE)	SINGLE PARENT (FEMALE)	TWO-PARENT	SINGLE PARENT (MALE)	SINGLE PARENT (FEMALE)	TWO-PARENT	SINGLE PARENT (MALE)	SINGLE PARENT (FEMALE)	TWO-PARENT	SINGLE PARENT (MALE)	SINGLE PARENT (FEMALE)
Chandler Unified District	*	*	*	*	*	*	-21.3%	*	98.0%	*	*	*
Tempe Union High School District	69.9%	11.1%	19.0%	58.3%	16.9%	24.9%	27.6%	72.4%	-35.3%	*	*	*
Kyrene Elementary District	77.6%	9.0%	13.4%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chandler City	*	*	*	*	*	*	-11.0%	*	79.7%	*	*	*
Tempe City	67.9%	14.3%	17.8%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Maricopa County	71.3%	8.5%	20.3%	66.5%	10.8%	22.7%	-10.0%	4.6%	-2.6%	-9.2%	-6.3%	17.2%
Arizona	68.4%	9.0%	22.6%	63.9%	10.4%	25.7%	-8.4%	2.8%	2.0%	-12.1%	-4.5%	17.2%
United States	69.6%	7.5%	22.9%	65.3%	11.1%	23.7%	-0.8%	4.1%	2.7%	3.7%	4.1%	6.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

* indicates that the sample size was too small to estimate specific demographic components.

Exhibit 2-7 presents data relevant to children being raised by their grandparents. These families often have challenges due to the health and financial needs of grandparents and the circumstances that led to the children living with them. As shown:

- The percentage of children under six living with grandparents in the region is lower than those of Maricopa County (9%) and Arizona (11.2%).

EXHIBIT 2-7

CHILDREN UNDER THE AGE OF SIX LIVING WITH GRANDPARENTS

AREA	PERCENT OF CHILDREN UNDER AGE 6
	MOST RECENT DATA
Dysart Unified District	8.5%
Peoria Unified School District	13.3%
Glendale Elementary District	9.7%
Pendergast Elementary District	10.5%
El Mirage City	11.7%
Glendale City	9.4%
Peoria City	14.0%
Surprise City	7.9%
Maricopa County	9.0%
Arizona	11.2%
United States	9.6%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

Exhibit 2-8 shows the educational level of mothers. As shown:

- Babies born in this region are more likely to have a mother who has attained a bachelor's degree than those born in Maricopa County.
- It is notable, however, that in both the cities of Tempe and Chandler, more than one in three babies born had mothers with only a high school education or less.
- The three-year trend shows huge growth in the percentage of babies born in Chandler to mothers who had less than a high school education.

EXHIBIT 2-8

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF WOMEN WHO GAVE BIRTH IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS

AREA	EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT RATES OF WOMEN WHO GAVE BIRTH IN LAST 12 MONTHS									
	LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL		HIGH SCHOOL OR EQUIVALENT		SOME COLLEGE OR AA DEGREE		BACHELOR'S DEGREE		GRADUATE/ PROFESSIONAL DEGREE	
	MOST RECENT DATA	3-YEAR TREND	MOST RECENT DATA	3-YEAR TREND	MOST RECENT DATA	3-YEAR TREND	MOST RECENT DATA	3-YEAR TREND	MOST RECENT DATA	3-YEAR TREND
Kyrene Elementary District	3.6%	*	11.9%	*	26.2%	-51.3%	39.1%	*	*	*
Chandler City	14.8%	138.1%	21.0%	-19.5%	23.4%	-18.0%	28.3%	-11.5%	*	*
Tempe City	24.5%	*	18.4%	*	33.5%	23.2%	16.2%	*	*	*
Maricopa County	27.5%	13.3%	24.2%	-23.8%	26.7%	1.4%	14.7%	17.2%	6.8%	11.6%
Arizona	25.3%	-1.6%	26.1%	-20.9%	30.0%	13.8%	12.4%	15.1%	6.3%	15.4%
United States	17.8%	-7.6%	25.9%	-8.3%	29.2%	11.5%	18.2%	-2.1%	9.0%	9.8%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

* indicates sample size too small to estimate specific demographic component.

Exhibit 2-9 presents the percentage of households in which both parents are either employed or seeking employment. As shown:

- More than two out of three families with children in the city of Chandler and the Chandler School District have all parents in the workforce, indicating a high need for childcare. The rate is similar countywide.

EXHIBIT 2-9

PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN IN WHICH ALL PARENTS ARE IN THE LABOR FORCE

2006-08

AREA	PERCENT OF FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN UNDER 18**	
	MOST RECENT DATA	3-YEAR TREND
Chandler Unified District	66.8%	*
Chandler City	69.2%	6.1%
Maricopa County	66.9%	3.5%
Arizona	67.2%	5.1%
United States	71.0%	4.1%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

* indicates sample size too small to estimate specific demographic component.

** Represents all households with all parents employed or seeking employment as a proportion of total households with children under the age of 18.

Single mothers who work or are seeking employment are more likely to need childcare services. As shown in **Exhibit 2-10**:

- In Maricopa County, 55 percent of single mothers were in the workforce; rates in the region are somewhat higher.

EXHIBIT 2-10

SINGLE MOTHERS IN THE WORKFORCE

AREA	PERCENT OF SINGLE MOTHERS IN THE WORKFORCE**
	MOST RECENT DATA
Chandler Unified District	56.2%
Tempe Union High School District	57.8%
Kyrene Elementary District	63.7%
Chandler City	58.8%
Tempe City	57.4%
Maricopa County	55.0%
Arizona	56.0%
United States	60.8%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

** Single mothers (age 20-64) of children under the age of six that are employed or seeking employment as a proportion of total single mothers (age 20-64) of children under the age of six.

As defined by the Census Bureau, a linguistically isolated household is one in which no member 14 years old and over (1) speaks only English or (2) speaks a non-English language and speaks English “very well.” In other words, all members 14 years old and over have at least some difficulty with English. **Exhibit 2-11** presents data about households where children might not be exposed to English.

- Almost 7 percent of the households in Tempe have no one over the age of 14 who speaks English well; the rates are lower for the rest of the region.

EXHIBIT 2-11

LINGUISTIC ISOLATION OF HOUSEHOLDS

AREA	PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS LINGUISTICALLY ISOLATED	
	MOST RECENT DATA	3-YEAR TREND
Chandler Unified District	4.8%	-0.1%
Kyrene Elementary District	2.4%	*
Chandler City	4.8%	-0.1%
Tempe City	6.8%	-1.6%
Maricopa County	7.5%	-0.4%
Arizona	6.7%	-0.2%
United States	4.8%	0.1%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

* indicates sample size too small to estimate specific demographic component.

Note: Data presented in this exhibit are based on available figures for total households, not only households with children.

2.3 Economic Circumstances

Children in families with unemployed parents may face additional stresses. As shown in **Exhibits 2-13 and 2-14**:

- Between 2007 and 2009, the number of unemployment insurance claimants in the region and Maricopa County more than tripled.
- The unemployment rate in the region more than doubled from 2005 to 2010, as it did for Maricopa County.
- The cities of Chandler and Tempe both had lower unemployment rates than the countywide rate of 8.7 percent in March, 2010.
- The unemployment rate in Guadalupe was more than double the rates in Tempe and Chandler.

EXHIBIT 2-12

NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS CLAIMING UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

AREA	JANUARY-JUNE 2007	JANUARY-JUNE 2009	PERCENT CHANGE
Central Maricopa	5,752	18,203	216.5%
Maricopa County	40,890	130,251	218.5%
Arizona	87,083	231,628	166.0%

Source: Arizona Department of Economic Security (2007, 2009). DES Multidata pulled on May 4, 2010 from Database (Unpublished Data).

EXHIBIT 2-13

UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

AREA	TOTAL EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS MARCH 2010	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE MARCH 2005	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE MARCH 2010	UNEMPLOYMENT PERCENT CHANGE
Chandler	118,628	3.2%	6.7%	109.4%
Guadalupe	2,461	7.6%	15.3%	101.3%
Tempe	113,655	3.6%	7.6%	111.1%
Maricopa County	1,822,752	4.1%	8.7%	112.2%

Source: Arizona Department of Economic Security.

Exhibit 2-14 presents data on the number of children (birth to age five) who are homeless and living in transitional or emergency shelters. The data include children whose last permanent address was in the Central Maricopa Region. As shown:

- The number of homeless children in the Central Maricopa Region increased by 87 percent between 2007 and 2009. During the same time period, the number of homeless children countywide increased 64.1 percent.

EXHIBIT 2-14

HOMELESS CHILDREN LIVING IN SHELTERS

AREA	HOMELESS CHILDREN AGE 0 TO 5		
	2007	2009	PERCENT CHANGE
Central Maricopa	54	101	87.0%
Sum of FTF Maricopa Regions**	724	1,188	64.1%

Source: Maricopa Homeless Management Information System.

**Includes all data reported for ZIP codes encompassed by Central Phoenix, South Phoenix, North Phoenix, Central Maricopa, Northeast Maricopa, Northwest Maricopa, Southeast Maricopa, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and Southwest Maricopa FTF regions.

Exhibit 2-15 indicates the median income of families with children. As shown:

- Median incomes for two-parent families with children in Tempe are just above the median in Maricopa County. Incomes in other parts of the region are higher.
- The median income of families headed by a single mother is less than half the median of two-parent families.

EXHIBIT 2-15

MEDIAN INCOME OF FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN UNDER 18 BY FAMILY TYPE

AREA	MEDIAN PERSONAL INCOME, FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN UNDER 18					
	MARRIED COUPLES		SINGLE PARENT, MALE		SINGLE PARENT, FEMALE	
	MOST RECENT DATA	3-YEAR TREND	MOST RECENT DATA	3-YEAR TREND	MOST RECENT DATA	3-YEAR TREND
Chandler Unified District	\$97,562	10.9%	\$59,959	-31.4%	\$41,518	3.5%
Tempe Union High School District	\$96,650	1.6%	\$41,680	7.0%	\$37,933	8.1%
Kyrene Elementary District	\$111,830	9.2%	\$55,000	64.2%	\$48,192	28.5%
Chandler City	\$94,767	15.0%	\$62,344	-33.9%	\$40,031	-4.3%
Tempe City	\$80,019	-8.4%	\$36,529	5.2%	\$34,399	4.9%
Maricopa County	\$78,381	12.4%	\$42,272	12.0%	\$31,333	25.2%
Arizona	\$73,039	13.3%	\$39,197	11.3%	\$27,091	11.2%
United States	\$78,924	13.6%	\$38,160	7.3%	\$24,786	13.4%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

Federal poverty guidelines vary by size of family and are adjusted each year for inflation. As issued by the Department of Health and Human Services for 2009, the threshold for a single person is \$10,830 per year, and increases by \$3,740 with each additional family member. Families are considered to be living in poverty if their income is below \$14,570 for a family of two; \$18,310 for a family of three; and \$22,050 for a family of four.

Exhibit 2-16 provides data related to children living below the poverty level, which creates numerous risks for child development. As shown:

- Single parent households in the region are far more likely to be poor than households headed by a married couple.
- Hispanic families with young children are much more likely to be poor than families overall.
- More than one out of ten White, two-parent households in Tempe were poor, just above the countywide rate. Family poverty rates in Chandler were less than half that rate.

EXHIBIT 2-16

POVERTY STATUS OF FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN UNDER FIVE AND UNDER

AREA	PERCENT OF TWO PARENT HOUSEHOLDS BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (MOST RECENT DATA)						PERCENT OF SINGLE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (MOST RECENT DATA)					
	RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER			ETHNICITY	ALL RACES/ ETHNICITIES		RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER			ETHNICITY	ALL RACES/ ETHNICITIES	
	WHITE	AFRICAN AMERICAN	NATIVE AMERICAN	HISPANIC OR LATINO (ANY RACE)	TOTAL, TWO PARENTS	PERCENT CHANGE 3-YEAR TREND	WHITE	AFRICAN AMERICAN	NATIVE AMERICAN	HISPANIC OR LATINO (ANY RACE)	TOTAL, ONE PARENT	PERCENT CHANGE 3-YEAR TREND
Chandler Unified District	4.6%	*	*	15.0%	4.5%	-18.3%	*	*	*	*	*	*
Tempe Union High School District	8.8%	*	*	10.3%	9.2%	34.6%	31.6%	*	*	44.5%	33.8%	8.8%
Kyrene Elementary District	4.3%	*	*	*	6.3%	*	*	*	*	*	22.7%	*
Chandler City	4.0%	*	*	14.7%	4.3%	-28.5%	*	*	*	*	*	*
Tempe City	11.1%	*	*	*	10.9%	*	*	*	*	*	37.3%	*
Maricopa County	10.3%	7.0%	16.5%	21.3%	10.9%	-0.9%	37.5%	45.6%	38.1%	43.4%	37.4%	-4.5%
Arizona	10.1%	6.0%	24.0%	20.7%	11.2%	-11.5%	40.4%	44.5%	48.6%	47.6%	41.6%	-2.4%
United States	7.4%	10.9%	18.8%	19.4%	8.7%	-3.4%	39.8%	50.6%	50.4%	45.7%	43.4%	-3.8%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

* indicates that the sample size was too small to estimate specific demographic components.

Section Summary

There is variation within the Central Maricopa Region in the demographic characteristics of young children and their families.

The region shows great economic strength. Despite this strength and high median incomes, there are clear signs of families at risk. The unemployment rate in Guadalupe is far higher than the rest of the region or Maricopa County, and the number of young homeless children in the region grew faster than in the Maricopa County First Things First regions overall. The 3-year trend shows growing stresses on families living in Chandler. There has been large growth in the percentage of young children living with single mothers in the Chandler Unified School District, and a large growth in the percentage of babies born in Chandler to mothers who have less than a high school education.

The number of young Hispanic children in the region has been growing significantly and many of them face high risks. Hispanic children living in the Tempe Union School District are more likely to live in single parent families, and Hispanic families with young children are much more likely to be poor than families overall. The region can address these needs with strategies and grantees that are culturally competent and targeted to families most in need. It is appropriate for regional strategies such as Healthy Families and Parents as Teachers to focus on supporting parents who are struggling, including single parents and parents with low incomes and little education.

2.4 Educational Indicators

Exhibit 2-17 shows the academic achievement among schools in the region. As shown:

- For 2008-09, 44.6 percent of the schools in the Central Maricopa Region were rated as “Excelling” – double the statewide rate.

EXHIBIT 2-17

AZ LEARNS PROFILE

AREA	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL SCHOOLS BY AIMS RATING 2008-09					
	EXCELLING	HIGHLY PERFORMING	PERFORMING PLUS	PERFORMING	UNDERPERFORMING	FAILING TO MEET ACADEMIC STANDARDS
Central Maricopa	44.6%	15.4%	16.9%	20.0%	3.1%	0.0%
Arizona	22.0%	14.2%	37.9%	22.8%	1.9%	1.2%

Source: Arizona Department of Education, 2010. AZ's Instrument to Measure Standard (AIMS) Results. Retrieved March 31, 2010, from Arizona Department of Education. <http://www.ade.state.az.us/researchpolicy/AIMSResults/>.

Charter schools are not included in the analysis.

AZ LEARNS is the Arizona Department of Education's school accountability system. Each school is labeled based on students AIMS test scores, state baseline goals, and yearly progress.

3.0 THE EARLY CHILDHOOD SYSTEM IN THE CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION

3.1 Early Care and Education

Exhibit 3-1 shows the childcare providers in the Child Care Resource and Referral Program (CCR&R). As shown;

- The number of providers and their capacity grew slightly from 2008 to 2010.

EXHIBIT 3-1

CHILD CARE RESOURCE AND REFERRAL SUMMARY STATISTICS

CENTRAL MARICOPA	2008	2010	PERCENT CHANGE
Number of Providers	306	333	8.82%
Total Capacity	20,857	22,862	9.61%
Capacity per Provider	68.16	68.65	0.73%

Source: Arizona Department of Economic Security, 2007, 2009. DES Multidata pulled on May 4, 2010, from Database (Unpublished Data).

Exhibit 3-2 presents the availability of regulated childcare in the region. This exhibit displays the number of childcare providers that are regulated by the state. DHS licenses and inspects childcare centers. DHS also certifies home-based childcare businesses with five to ten children, called "child-care group homes." The Department of Economic Security (DES) certifies and monitors home-based childcare businesses with four or fewer children that participate in the childcare subsidy program. There are many home-based childcare providers that are not certified by DES or DHS and are not included here. As shown:

- The number of licensed childcare centers and DES certified homes both declined significantly in the region between 2008 and 2010.

EXHIBIT 3-2

NUMBER OF LICENSED/CERTIFIED CENTERS/HOMES

AREA	DHS LICENSED CENTERS	DES CERTIFIED HOMES	GROUP HOMES	TOTAL
Central Maricopa 2008	211	107	26	344
Central Maricopa 2010	183	21	27	231
2008-10 Change	-28	-86	1	-113

Source: Child Care Resource and Referral, May 2010.

Many schools participate in the Early Childhood Block Grant (ECBG) Program to assist families in need. State funding for the ECBG preschool was eliminated in January 2010. Therefore, no more preschool students can enroll through this funding source. As shown in **Exhibit 3-3**:

- In 2010, there were 120 students enrolled in preschool in the Chandler Elementary District through ECBG.

EXHIBIT 3-3

EARLY CHILDHOOD BLOCK GRANT PUBLIC SCHOOL PRESCHOOL ENROLLMENTS

AREA	ECBG ENROLLMENT LEVELS				PERCENT CHANGE
	2005		2010		
	NUMBER ENROLLED IN PRESCHOOL	PERCENT OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT	NUMBER ENROLLED IN PRESCHOOL	PERCENT OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT	2005-10
Chandler Unified District	122	45.2%	120	100.0%	-1.6%
SUM, Regional Districts	122	45.2%	120	100.0%	-1.6%

Source: Arizona Department of Education: Student Services, 2008, 2010. Early Childhood Block Grant Reports: ECBG Enrollment Report data pulled on April 2, 2010 (Unpublished Report). N/A indicates that the data were not available.

Exhibit 3-4 presents data related to the number of children enrolled in nursery school, preschool, or kindergarten. As shown:

- Enrollment in the city of Tempe is similar to the rate in Maricopa County; enrollment in the rest of the region is significantly higher.

EXHIBIT 3-4

NUMBER OF CHILDREN (AGES THREE TO SIX) AND OVER ENROLLED IN NURSERY/PRESCHOOL OR KINDERGARTEN PER 1,000 CHILDREN

AREA	ENROLLMENTS PER 1,000 CHILDREN**
	MOST RECENT DATA
Chandler Unified District	342
Tempe Union High School District	356
Kyrene Elementary District	414
Chandler City	342
Tempe City	307
Maricopa County	308
Arizona	314
United States	383

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

** Total enrollments by children age three to six in nursery, preschool, or kindergarten per 1,000 children.

Exhibit 3-5 presents data related to the percentage of children enrolled in preschool or Kindergarten who live in families with incomes below the federal poverty level. As shown:

- Compared to Maricopa County, few of the children enrolled in preschool in Chandler or the Kyrene School District are poor. The percentage is higher in Tempe.

EXHIBIT 3-5

PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN (AGES THREE AND OVER) ENROLLED IN PRESCHOOL/NURSERY SCHOOL OR KINDERGARTEN WHO FALL BELOW THE FEDERAL POVERTY LEVEL (FPL)

AREA	PERCENT ENROLLED BELOW FPL	PERCENT CHANGE
	MOST RECENT DATA	3-YEAR TREND
Chandler Unified District	7.8%	90.8%
Tempe Union High School District	18.4%	293.0%
Kyrene Elementary District	11.7%	*
Chandler City	8.8%	114.0%
Tempe City	19.1%	*
Maricopa County	16.9%	14.6%
Arizona	19.1%	-0.5%
United States	17.6%	-2.2%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

* Indicates that the sample size was too small to estimate specific demographic components.

Exhibit 3-6 presents data related to the number of accredited/recognized area providers in Central Maricopa. As shown:

- In Central Maricopa, the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) had the largest share of accredited/recognized area providers. The number of providers with this accreditation decreased between 2008 and 2010.

EXHIBIT 3-6

RECOGNIZED AREA PROVIDERS

ACCREDITATION/ RECOGNITION	NUMBER OF ACCREDITED/RECOGNIZED AREA PROVIDERS								ACCREDITED PROVIDERS PER APPROVED PROVIDER**
	AMI	AMS	ACSI	NAC	NAEYC	NECPA	NAFCC	TOTAL	
2008	1	0	0	1	22	1	0	25	0.07
2010	2	0	9	2	13	1	0	27	0.12
2008-10 Change	1	0	9	1	-9	0	0	2	0.05

Source: Association Montessori Internationale (AMI), American Montessori Society (AMS), Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI), National Association of Child Care Professionals (NAC), National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), National Early Childhood Program Accreditation (NECPA) National Association for Family Child Care (NAFCC), 2010.

** Number of licensed centers per Exhibit 3-2.

In spring 2010, MGT administered a web-based stakeholder survey completed by early care and development stakeholders in Central Maricopa. The survey was designed to identify the extent to which community needs are being met, the impact of budget cuts on service provision, services that may be lacking, and barriers to services. Survey topics areas included childcare, education, literacy development, special needs, health services, and social services. **Appendix A** provides survey response rates for each survey item. MGT also conducted group meetings and personal interviews throughout the Central Maricopa Region, which provided supplemental data to further explore the topic areas. Summaries of the group meetings and personal interviews along with the meeting and interview questionnaires can be found in **Appendix B**. A summary of key survey findings, along with group meetings and interview findings, directly related to early care and education are presented in this section of the report.

Respondents rated (on a scale from Excellent to Very Poor) the extent to which services met the needs of their children (birth through age five) and their families in four areas specifically related to early care and education.

Exhibit 3-7 shows the percentage of responses within the region in which respondents' needs were well met (a rating of Good to Excellent) and the percent who reported that their needs were not well met (a rating of Poor or Very Poor). According to the group meeting participants, the quality and affordability of these services need to be improved greatly.

EXHIBIT 3-7

MEETING EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION NEEDS

SERVICE AREAS	GOOD TO EXCELLENT	POOR OR VERY POOR
Childcare	43.0%	33.3%
Educational Services	57.6%	17.9%
Child/Family Literacy Development	59.5%	27.5%
Special Needs	47.8%	26.0%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.
Total number of responses ranged from 109 to 157.

3.1.1 Barriers

Additionally, survey respondents were asked to select the single most important barrier to children and families receiving services. The single most important barriers reported related to educational services included awareness of services, cost of services, and not having enough services. The responses received from the group meetings and personal interviews conducted in this region support the survey's findings. Other barriers mentioned by the participants included: language barriers, transportation, complexity of eligibility process, lack of proper documentation for immigrant families, and lack of communication and coordination among agencies and families. **Exhibit 3-8** shows the most frequent responses.

EXHIBIT 3-8

SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION BARRIERS

SERVICE AREAS	SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT BARRIER
Childcare	Cost (72.7%)
Educational Services	Awareness (56.4%)
Child/Family Literacy Development	Awareness (53.1%)
Special Needs	Not Enough Services (34.8%)

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.
Total number of responses ranged from 109 to 157.

3.1.2 Budget Cuts

Survey respondents rated the impact of budget cuts on early care and education services from having no impact to having a very high impact. Budget cuts were a significant factor within each educational service area surveyed. Depicted in **Exhibit 3-9**, budget cuts were reported to have the most substantial impact on childcare. According to personal interview respondents, budget cuts resulted in a major loss and disconnect of services.

EXHIBIT 3-9

IMPACT OF BUDGET CUTS TO EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION AREAS

SERVICE AREAS	HIGH/VERY HIGH IMPACT
Childcare	86.9%
Educational Services	61.9%
Child/Family Literacy Development	48.5%
Special Needs	48.5%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.
Total number of responses was 85.

3.1.3 Missing Services

Survey respondents indicated which early care and education services were missing from their community. Shown in **Exhibit 3-10**, the most frequently cited missing service was childcare subsidies. Group meeting participants expressed that along with the need to access quality childcare, families also need assistance with payments through subsidies and scholarships.

EXHIBIT 3-10

MISSING EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SERVICES

MISSING EDUCATIONAL SERVICE AREAS	PERCENT MISSING
Early childhood literacy programs	34.0%
High quality childcare	34.0%
High quality childcare that provides alternative hours of operation	36.2%
Childcare subsidies	55.3%
Pre-Kindergarten	21.3%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.
Total number of responses was 85.

Organizations providing leadership and services in Central Maricopa serve as assets within the community. Survey participants identified assets in the form of key organizations providing strong leadership within their community for the provision of early care and education services. Information on key organizations was also collected during the group meetings and personal interviews. These organizations include those listed in **Exhibit 3-11**.

EXHIBIT 3-11

ORGANIZATIONS OFFERING STRONG LEADERSHIP IN THE AREA OF EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SERVICES

A Stepping Stone Foundation	H.O.P.E. Group
ARC of Tempe	LIFE
Arizona Child Care Association	Maricopa County
Arizona Literacy and Learning Center	Phoenix Children's Hospital
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Public Libraries
Autism organizations	Raising Special Kids
AZ EIP	Reach Out and Read
AZA United	Rise
AZAAP	SARRC
Blake Foundation	School Districts
Cardon Children's hospital	SEEK
Centers for Habilitation	Sholom Preschool
Central AZ College	Southwest Center for Human Development
Chandler City Council	Southwest Human Development
Child and Family Resources, Inc.	State Family Literacy at ADE
Child and Family Services	Summa Associates
Community Action Program (CAP)	Teen Outreach and Pregnancy Services
Department of Economic Security	Towne of Guadalupe
Early Reading First.	Triple R
East Valley Regional Partnership	Unlimited Potential in South Phoenix
First Things First	Valley of the Sun United Way
God's Garden	WIC
Guthrie Mainstream	YMCA

Sources: Stakeholder survey responses, stakeholder interview responses, 2010.

3.1.4 Section Summary

There are strengths in the early childhood infrastructure in the region, including very high enrollment in preschool and kindergarten. But the economic recession and budget cuts are clearly taking a toll. The number of licensed childcare centers and childcare homes certified by DES both declined and the closed door on childcare subsidies and the Early Childhood Block Grant preschool mean diminished access. The online survey identified cost as a huge barrier to families getting childcare and more than half the respondents said childcare subsidies are missing in the region. The region has put a focus on funding strategies to improve the quality of childcare with the Quality First improvement project and several grants to support professional development for childcare teachers. Continued scholarships and other strategies to help families afford childcare can address additional needs.

3.2 Supporting Families

This section of the report displays information about children and families receiving a variety of support services.

Exhibit 3-12 shows the number of children and families receiving Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, known as TANF. This benefit is monthly cash assistance (welfare) for parents and children who have extremely low incomes. The benefits are time-limited and parents must meet specific requirements to obtain the benefits:

- Between 2007 and 2010, Central Maricopa had a much greater increase in Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) cases involving children (age 0-5) than the statewide increase.

EXHIBIT 3-12

TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF)

AREA	TANF CHILDREN (AGE 0 - 5)			TANF FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN (AGE 0 - 5)		
	JANUARY 2007	JANUARY 2010	PERCENT CHANGE	JANUARY 2007	JANUARY 2010	PERCENT CHANGE
Central Maricopa	1,011	1,350	33.53%	779	1,021	31.07%
Arizona	20,867	23,866	14.37%	16,511	18,129	9.80%

Source: Arizona Department of Economic Security (2007, 2009). DES Multidata pulled on May 4, 2010 from Database (Unpublished Data).

Exhibit 3-13 shows the number of children and families who qualify for and receive childcare assistance. The assistance, which functions like a voucher, is available to parents with children 12 and younger who need childcare and meet certain income and other requirements. Parents can use the voucher to pay for childcare they choose. Parents have to pay an amount in addition to the voucher that depends on their income and their childcare. The value of the voucher, however, is still based on the actual costs of childcare in 2000, parents and providers have to pay to make up the difference. Since February 2009, no qualified, low-income, working parents have been able to sign up for the subsidy because of a freeze due to budget cuts. This led to a 38 percent decrease in the number of children receiving assistance statewide between 2007 and 2010. As shown:

- From 2009 to 2010, the number of families in Central Maricopa who received childcare assistance decreased by 34 percent.

EXHIBIT 3-13

CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE

AREA	JANUARY 2009				JANUARY 2010			
	NUMBER OF FAMILIES ELIGIBLE	NUMBER OF CHILDREN ELIGIBLE	NUMBER OF FAMILIES WHO RECEIVED ASSISTANCE	NUMBER OF CHILDREN WHO RECEIVED ASSISTANCE	NUMBER OF FAMILIES ELIGIBLE	NUMBER OF CHILDREN ELIGIBLE	NUMBER OF FAMILIES WHO RECEIVED ASSISTANCE	NUMBER OF CHILDREN WHO RECEIVED ASSISTANCE
Central Maricopa	1,588	2,277	1,271	1,696	989	1,440	818	1,112
Arizona	26,257	38,126	21,377	29,089	15,833	23,244	13,014	17,891

Source: Arizona Department of Economic Security.

Exhibit 3-14 depicts the number of children removed from their homes by Child Protective Services (CPS) due to abuse and neglect. This shows the concentration of CPS cases in certain areas. When children are removed from their own homes, the goal is to place them with relatives or with foster families who live in the same or nearby neighborhoods. This helps to promote stability in school, more familiarity and less stress for the child, and the ability to visit with parents and siblings. This exhibit compares by ZIP code the number of children removed from their homes and the availability of foster homes. Each ZIP code is labeled as having a shortage or balance of foster homes:

- In 2009, there was a shortage of available foster homes for children who had been removed from their families in the region.
- The ZIP code with the most number of children removed from their homes—as well as the largest number of foster homes—is 85225 near downtown Chandler.

EXHIBIT 3-14

AVAILABILITY OF FOSTER HOME PLACEMENTS AS RELATED TO CHILD REMOVALS IN THE NORTHWEST MARICOPA REGION, 2009

ZIP CODE	NUMBER OF REMOVALS	NUMBER OF FOSTER HOMES	NUMBER OF REMOVALS (EXCLUDING CHILDREN PLACED WITH RELATIVES)	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FOSTER HOMES AND REMOVALS (EXCLUDING CHILDREN PLACED WITH RELATIVES)	DESCRIPTION
85042	77	33	39	-6	Shortage of foster homes
85044	7	12	4	8	Foster homes exceed children
85045	4	4	4	0	Balance of foster homes and children
85048	10	13	6	7	Foster homes exceed children
85224	32	13	24	-11	Shortage of foster homes
85225	100	27	53	-26	Large shortage of foster homes
85226	18	13	12	1	Balance of foster homes and children
85248	11	4	9	-5	Shortage of foster homes
85249	5	23	3	20	Foster homes exceed children
85281	57	7	32	-25	Large shortage of foster homes
85282	30	13	18	-5	Shortage of foster homes
85283	44	9	32	-23	Large shortage of foster homes
85284	3	3	3	0	Balance of foster homes and children
85286	14	20	12	8	Foster homes exceed children
85287	0	0	0	0	No children removed
CENTRAL MARICOPA TOTAL	412	194	251	-57	

Source: Arizona Department of Economic Security (2007, 2009). DES Multidata pulled on May 4, 2010 from Database (Unpublished Data).

Exhibit 3-15 shows the number of mothers, babies, and children participating in the Women, Infants, and Children nutrition program, known as WIC. This federally funded service is available to pregnant women and mothers with their children from birth through age four who meet specific income guidelines:

- There was insufficient data available for 2005. Therefore, it was not possible to see the growth or decline of WIC participation in this region. It is noted that over 6,300 children received benefits in 2009, along with 3,700 women.

EXHIBIT 3-15

WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC) PARTICIPATION

AREA	2005		2009		PERCENT CHANGE 2005-09	
	WOMEN	CHILDREN	WOMEN	CHILDREN	WOMEN	CHILDREN
Central Maricopa	N/A	N/A	3,708	6,316	N/A	N/A

Source: Arizona Department of Health Services (2005, 2007, 2009). Arizona Women, Infants & Children data pulled April 22, 2010 Database (Unpublished Data). N/A indicates that the data were not available.

A summary of key survey findings related to family support services is presented in this section of the report. Survey respondents rated (on a scale from Excellent to Very Poor) the extent to which family support services met the needs of their children (birth through age five) and families for three related areas. **Exhibit 3-16** shows the percentage of responses that indicated that needs were well met (a rating of Good to Excellent) and the percent that reported that needs were not well met (a rating of Poor or Very Poor). Needs were least met in the area of social services.

EXHIBIT 3-16

MEETING NEEDS FOR FAMILY SUPPORT

SERVICE AREAS	GOOD TO EXCELLENT	POOR OR VERY POOR
Parenting Support/Education	50.0%	17.5%
Child/Family Literacy Development	59.5%	27.5%
Social Services	39.4%	33.4%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.

Total number of responses ranged from 75 to 85 across areas.

3.2.1 Barriers

Survey respondents were also asked to select the single most important barrier to families receiving support services. The single most important barriers reported across service areas related to family support service areas included awareness of services and not enough services. **Exhibit 3-17** shows the most frequent responses.

EXHIBIT 3-17

SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT BARRIER TO FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES

SERVICE AREAS	SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT BARRIER
Parenting Support/Education	Awareness (50.0%)
Child/Family Literacy Development	Awareness (53.1%)
Social Services	Not enough services (36.4%)

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.

Total number of responses ranged from 75 to 85 across areas.

3.2.2 Budget Cuts

Survey respondents rated the impact of budget cuts on family support services from having no impact to having a very high impact. Budget cuts were a significant factor within each family support area surveyed. Shown in **Exhibit 3-18**, budget cuts were reported to have the most substantial impact on social services.

EXHIBIT 3-18

IMPACT OF BUDGET CUTS ON FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES

SERVICE AREAS	HIGH/VERY HIGH IMPACT
Parenting Support/Education	53.9%
Child/Family Literacy Development	48.5%
Social Services	65.7%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.

Total number of responses ranged from 75 to 85 across areas.

3.2.3 Missing Services

Survey respondents indicated which family support services were missing from their community. **Exhibit 3-19** shows family support services that were reported missing. Interview and meeting participants indicated a need for more parent education and support and services to improve parent literacy and assist families with applying for services.

EXHIBIT 3-19

MISSING FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES

MISSING FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICE AREAS	PERCENT MISSING
Support for grandparents raising grandchildren	62.5%
Parent coaching/education	54.2%
Support and education programs for parent and parenting teens	33.3%
Accessibility to resources that support families with young children	58.3%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.
Total number of responses was 85.

Organizations providing leadership and services in Central Maricopa serve as assets within the community. Survey participants identified assets in the form of key organizations providing strong leadership within their community for the provision of family support services. These organizations include those listed in **Exhibit 3-20**.

EXHIBIT 3-20

ORGANIZATIONS OFFERING STRONG LEADERSHIP IN THE AREA OF FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES

Arizona State PIRG	NASW
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	PAFCO
AzPAC	Parent University (Mesa Public Schools)
Black Child and Family Services	Raising Special Kids
Child and Family Resources, Inc.	Salvation Army
Child Crisis Center	SARRC
Children's Action Alliance	Southwest Behavioral Services
Communities in Schools of Tempe and Kyrene	Southwest Human Development
DES	Summa Associates
Family Resource Center	Teen Outreach Pregnancy Services
First Things First	Tempe Community Action Agency
GALA	Tempe Community Council
Healthy Families	Tempe School District
Maricopa County	University of Arizona Cooperative Extension
Maricopa County Department of Public Health	Valley of the Sun United Way
Maricopa County Head Start	YMCA

Sources: Stakeholder survey responses, stakeholder interview responses, 2010.

3.2.4 Employer Support

Survey respondents were asked to indicate the most important employer-based services for supporting families with young children. The most frequently identified services were affordable health insurance for family members (81.9%), flexible work schedules (67.8%), and paid vacation/sick time off from work (63.8%).

Only 26 percent of survey respondents indicated that employers in their community were supportive or very supportive of family responsibilities. Fifty-two percent felt that employers were somewhat supportive, and 17 percent felt employers were not very supportive.

3.2.5 Section Summary

There is a notable lack of support services and social services in the region. Despite the economic strength in the region, the number of very poor young children receiving TANF welfare benefits grew more than twice as fast as the number statewide in the past three years. The online survey results emphasized the shortage of social services. More than half of the respondents said that education and support for parents and grandparents are missing in the region. Regional family support strategies of Healthy Families and Parents as Teachers can begin to address this need.

3.3 Health

Additional information is available in **Appendix C** related to data captured during a 2008 Arizona Health Survey. This survey was completed by St. Luke's Health Initiatives and is an additional informative tool for decision-makers.

Exhibit 3-21 presents the percentage of children under 18 with and without health insurance coverage. Research has shown that children with health insurance:

- Have greater access to health care, particularly preventive and primary care.
- Are more likely to have well-child visits and childhood vaccinations than uninsured children.
- Are less likely to receive their care in the emergency room.
- Do better in school.

As shown in this exhibit:

- The percentage of children without health coverage and the percentage relying on public health coverage are both lower in the region than the countywide rate.
- The city of Tempe has the highest percentage of children not insured and the highest percentage covered by public insurance in the region.

EXHIBIT 3-21

HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR CHILDREN UNDER 18

AREA	PERCENT OF CHILDREN UNDER 18 BY INSURANCE COVERAGE/TYPE (MOST RECENT DATA)		
	INSURED-PRIVATE	INSURED-PUBLIC	NOT INSURED
Chandler Unified District	75.5%	16.2%	9.1%
Tempe Union High School District	70.4%	18.2%	12.4%
Kyrene Elementary District	88.0%	6.8%	5.8%
Chandler City	76.1%	16.1%	8.6%
Tempe City	63.6%	24.9%	13.2%
Maricopa County	59.6%	26.3%	15.5%
Arizona	56.5%	29.1%	16.2%
United States	64.1%	28.3%	9.9%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

Note: Total in excess of 100percent due to overlap between public/private insurance segments.

Exhibit 3-22 shows percentages of births paid with public funds, either AHCCCS or Indian Health Services. Births are covered by AHCCCS for women meeting certain income qualifications. As shown:

- Just over half of the births in Maricopa County are paid by public health coverage; the rate is similar in Tempe, much larger in Guadalupe, and much smaller in Chandler.

EXHIBIT 3-22

PUBLIC PAYER BIRTHS

AREA	PERCENT OF PUBLIC PAYER BIRTHS**		
	2006	2008	PERCENT CHANGE
Chandler	26.9%	31.5%	16.7%
Guadalupe	82.2%	76.4%	-7.0%
Tempe	51.0%	49.3%	-3.5%
Maricopa County	52.0%	53.0%	2.0%
Arizona	53.8%	54.4%	1.1%

Source: Arizona Department of Health Services. Arizona Primary Care Area Program Data Sets. <http://www.azdhs.gov/hsd/profiles/datasets.html>.** Percent of total births paid for by Arizona Health Care Costs Containment System (AHCCCS) or Indian Health Service (IHS).

Adequate prenatal care promotes healthy births. As shown in **Exhibit 3-23**:

- The vast majority of pregnant women in Maricopa County receive five or more prenatal visits, and the percentage increased slightly between 2005 and 2008.

EXHIBIT 3-23

NUMBER OF PRENATAL VISITS

AREA	TOTAL BIRTHS			NO VISITS			1-4 VISITS			5+ VISITS		
	2005	2008	PERCENT CHANGE	2005 PERCENT OF TOTAL	2008 PERCENT OF TOTAL	PERCENT CHANGE	2005 PERCENT OF TOTAL	2008 PERCENT OF TOTAL	PERCENT CHANGE	2005 PERCENT OF TOTAL	2008 PERCENT OF TOTAL	PERCENT CHANGE
Maricopa County	62,232	62,667	0.7%	1.9%	1.5%	-21.5%	3.5%	2.7%	-20.4%	94.5%	95.6%	1.2%
Arizona	95,798	99,215	3.6%	2.3%	1.8%	-24.6%	4.2%	3.6%	-14.5%	93.3%	94.5%	1.3%

Source: Arizona Department of Health Services, Arizona Primary Care Area Program Data Sets. <http://www.azdhs.gov/hsd/profiles/datasets.html>.

Children who have health problems early in life are more likely to face additional challenges. As shown in **Exhibit 3-24**:

- From 2005 to 2008, the total number of newborns admitted to newborn intensive care units in the state of Arizona increased from 5,479 to 5,931, an increase of 8.2 percent. There was also an increase in the number of newborns admitted in Maricopa County.

EXHIBIT 3-24

NUMBER RECEIVING NEONATAL INTENSIVE SERVICES

AREA	2005			2008			PERCENT CHANGE		
	TOTAL	GESTATIONAL AGE		TOTAL	GESTATIONAL AGE		TOTAL	GESTATIONAL AGE	
		PRETERM, <37 WEEKS PERCENT OF TOTAL	37 WEEKS OR MORE PERCENT OF TOTAL		PRETERM, <37 WEEKS PERCENT OF TOTAL	37 WEEKS OR MORE PERCENT OF TOTAL		PRETERM, <37 WEEKS PERCENT OF TOTAL	37 WEEKS OR MORE PERCENT OF TOTAL
Maricopa County	3,525	60.4%	39.6%	3,768	58.1%	41.9%	6.9%	-3.7%	5.6%
Arizona	5,479	60.5%	39.5%	5,931	59.1%	40.9%	8.2%	-2.2%	3.4%

Source: Arizona Department of Health Services, Arizona Primary Care Area Program Data Sets. <http://www.azdhs.gov/hsd/profiles/datasets.html>.

Children receiving proper immunizations are more likely to be in better health than those children that do not receive the required immunizations. As shown in **Exhibit 3-25**:

- Immunization rates in the region are lower than the countywide rates.
- The immunization rate for children 12 to 24 months fell slightly in the region between 2005 and 2009.
- Between 2005 and 2009, there was a significant increase in the immunization rates with the pneumococcal conjugate vaccine to prevent blood infections, meningitis, and ear infections in young children.

EXHIBIT 3-25

IMMUNIZATION RECORDS

AREA	VACCINATIONS 12-24 MONTHS (3:2:2:2)		
	2005	2009	PERCENT CHANGE
Central Maricopa	66%	63%	-5%
Maricopa County	68%	65%	-4%
Arizona	70%	67%	-6%
United States	73%	68%	-7%

AREA	VACCINATIONS 19-35 MONTHS (4:3:1:3:3:1)		
	2005	2009	PERCENT CHANGE
Central Maricopa	37%	38%	2%
Maricopa County	43%	39%	-7%
Arizona	46%	42%	-8%
United States	75%	72%	-4%

AREA	VACCINATIONS 19-35 MONTHS (4:3:1:3:3:1:4)		
	2005	2009	PERCENT CHANGE
Central Maricopa	20%	34%	70%
Maricopa County	23%	35%	54%
Arizona	26%	38%	48%
United States	N/A	65%	N/A

Source: Arizona Department of Health Services (2005, 2007, 2009). Arizona State Immunization Information System Data Base (ASIS) data pulled on May 4, 2010 (Unpublished Data).

Notes: CDC data is from July 2005 to June 2006 and July 2008 to June 2009. CDC data covers all vaccinations 24 months and prior. The smallest rate of vaccinations was used as the U.S. rate.

3:2:2:2 is 3 DTaP, 2 Polio, 2 Hib, and 2 Hepatitis B vaccines.

4:3:1:3:3:1 includes 4 doses diphtheria and tetanus toxoids and acellular pertussis vaccines, 3 doses poliovirus vaccine, 1 dose measles, mumps, and rubella vaccine, 3 doses Haemophilus influenzae type B vaccine, 3 doses hepatitis B vaccine, 1 dose varicella.

4:3:1:3:3:1:4 is 4:3:1:3:3:1: plus ≥4 doses of pneumococcal conjugate vaccine.

N/A indicates that the data were not available.

Exhibit 3-26 presents the percentage of children under five with disabilities and those with disabilities who live in families with incomes below the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). As shown:

- Less than 1 percent of Maricopa County children under five have disabilities. Less than half of those with disabilities live in poor families.

EXHIBIT 3-26

CHILDREN UNDER FIVE WITH DISABILITIES, TOTAL PERCENT AND PERCENT LIVING IN POOR FAMILIES

AREA	PERCENT OF CHILDREN UNDER 5 WITH DISABILITIES	PERCENT OF CHILDREN UNDER 5 WITH DISABILITIES, BELOW FPL
	MOST RECENT DATA	MOST RECENT DATA
Maricopa County	0.8%	0.3%
Arizona	0.8%	0.2%
United States	0.7%	0.2%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

Children with disabilities who receive an early diagnosis tend to fare better than those children who receive a late or no diagnosis. As shown **Exhibit 3-27**:

- From 2006-07 to 2008-09, the number of children served by the Arizona Early Intervention Program (AZEIP) in Central Maricopa increased from 329 to 543, an increase of 65 percent. The number of children served by AZEIP increased statewide by 47.2 percent.

EXHIBIT 3-27

ARIZONA EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (AZEIP) DEVELOPMENT SCREENINGS AND SERVICES TO CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES/AT RISK FOR DISABILITIES

AREA	AZEIP COUNTS		PERCENT CHANGE
	2006-07	2008-09	2007-09
Central Maricopa	329	543	65.0%
Arizona	3,450	5,078	47.2%

Source: Arizona Department of Economic Security, 2007, 2009. DES Multidata pulled on May 4, 2010, from Database (Unpublished Data).

Dental care improves a child's overall health. As shown in **Exhibit 3-28**:

- The majority of children under five in Central Maricopa have regular visits with the same dental provider.
- Eighty-five percent (85%) of parents in this region drive 10 miles or less for their child's dental care.

EXHIBIT 3-28

ORAL HEALTH CARE CHILDREN (0 - 5)

MY CHILD/CHILDREN AGE 5 AND UNDER HAVE REGULAR VISITS WITH THE SAME DENTAL PROVIDER.	CENTRAL MARICOPA	STATEWIDE	DIFFERENCE
Strongly agree	73.7%	62.5%	17.9%
Somewhat agree	8.2%	9.1%	-10.1%
Somewhat disagree	4.2%	5.6%	-25.0%
Strongly disagree	7.7%	13.1%	-41.0%
Not sure	6.2%	9.8%	-36.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	.0%

HOW MANY MILES DO YOU HAVE TO GO TO GET DENTAL CARE FOR YOUR CHILDREN AGE 5 AND UNDER?	CENTRAL MARICOPA	STATEWIDE	DIFFERENCE
Less than 5 miles	53.5%	39.8%	34.5%
5-10 miles	31.8%	23.6%	34.9%
10-20 miles	7.3%	13.5%	-46.0%
More than 20 miles	1.4%	12.8%	-89.3%
None available	6.0%	10.3%	-41.6%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	.0%

Source: First Things First: Medical Questions (FY 2008). Community Survey in Data Base (Unpublished Data).

Exhibit 3-29 presents the number of services available for those families who have children that do not have health insurance. As shown:

- Arizona has a total of 659 Sliding Fee Clinics available, with 264 clinics residing in Maricopa County.
- Central Maricopa reported a total of 22 clinics in 2010.

EXHIBIT 3-29

NUMBER OF SLIDING FEE SCALE CLINICS

AREA	2008	2010	PERCENT CHANGE
Central Maricopa	N/A	22	N/A
Maricopa County	247	264	6.9%
Arizona	N/A	659	N/A
U.S.	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: Arizona Department of Health Services.

Note: N/A indicates data were unavailable.

Exhibit 3-30 presents the number of school-based clinics available for those families who have children that do not have health insurance. As shown:

- In 2009, there were three school-based clinics in Central Maricopa (a decrease of one from 2002) while there were 82 statewide.

EXHIBIT 3-30

NUMBER OF SCHOOL-BASED CLINICS

AREA	2002	2009	PERCENT CHANGE
Central Maricopa	4	3	-25.0%
Arizona	97	82	-15.5%
Percent of State Total Arizona	8.2%	17.1%	107.0%

Source: Arizona Department of Health Services, 2009, University of Arizona Rural Health Office, 2002.

Note: Caution should be exercised in comparing 2002 numbers with 2009 numbers, as they were assembled by two different entities, and the criteria for inclusion were not apparent.

Exhibit 3-31 depicts the number of hospitals located in the Central Maricopa Region. As shown:

- There are two general hospitals and one specialty hospital located in Central Maricopa.

EXHIBIT 3-31

AREA HOSPITALS

HOSPITAL	CITY	ZIP CODE
Chandler Regional Hospital	Chandler	85224
Tempe St. Luke's Hospital	Tempe	85281
Arizona Orthopedic Surgical Hospital	Chandler	85224

Source: Arizona Department of Health Services, Licensed Hospitals as of April 2009.

Exhibit 3-32 presents medically underserved areas and health professional shortage areas. Note that the names associated with Primary Care Areas may not be instructive as to precise geographies encompassed. To determine the appropriate Primary Care Areas for inclusion, maps of FTF regions and Primary Care Areas were overlaid to determine all overlapping jurisdictions. As shown:

- Guadalupe is considered a medically underserved area in Arizona, based on low access to health providers.
- Guadalupe and parts of Chandler are considered medically underserved areas by federal designation.

EXHIBIT 3-32

MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED AREAS AND HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SHORTAGE AREAS

PRIMARY CARE AREA	PRIMARY CARE SCORE*	ARIZONA MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED AREA (AZMUA)	HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SHORTAGE AREA (HPSA)	FEDERAL MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED AREA/ POPULATION (MUA/P)	MUA/P SCORE**
Ahwatukee (Phoenix)	6	No	No	No	
Chandler	10	No	No	MUA	61.2
Guadalupe	68	Yes	No	MUA	49
Phoenix Central	34	Population Group Low Income (Phoenix Central)	Population Group Low Income (Phoenix Central)	MUP-Low Income, (South Central Phoenix)	59.3
Phoenix South Central	58	Population Group Low Income (Phoenix-South Central)	Population Group Low Income (Phoenix-South Central)	MUP-Low Income (South Central Phoenix)	59.3
Phoenix South Mountain	50	Geographic, (Phoenix-South Mountain)	Geographic, (Phoenix-South Mountain)	MUA (Phoenix-South Mountain)	59.6
Tempe	26	No	No	MUA (North Tempe)	52.4

Source: Arizona Department of Health Services.

*Higher scores indicate greater levels of medical underservice. The primary care score is the sum of the values for a given area in terms of the following components: population to provider ratio, travel time to the nearest primary care facility, percent of the population with income less than 200 percent of poverty level (and 100-200%), percent of uninsured births, ratio of hospital admissions with ambulatory sensitive condition's per 1000 population less than age 65, percentage of low birth rates, the sum of the percentage of births receiving no prenatal care or prenatal care in the second or third trimester, and the percentage of births reporting four or less prenatal care visits, premature mortality, infant mortality, percent minority, and the percent elderly, and unemployment rate above the statewide average. The values for the components of the primary care score can be found at: <http://www.azdhs.gov/hsd/profiles/pcuindex.pdf>.

**The MUA/P score is based on four variables: ratio of primary medical care physicians per 1,000 population, infant mortality rate, percentage of the population with incomes below the poverty level, and percentage of the population age 65 or over. For more on the MUA/P scores, see: <http://bhpr.hrsa.gov/shortage/mauguide.htm>

A summary of key survey findings related to health services is presented in this section of the report. Survey respondents rated (on a scale from Excellent to Very Poor) the extent to which services met the health needs of children and their families. Nearly 49 percent of respondents reported that health needs were well met (a rating of Good to Excellent). Twenty-one percent reported that their needs were not well met (a rating of Poor or Very Poor). Survey respondents were also asked to select the single most important barriers to children and families receiving health related services, which was reported to be the cost of services (37.9%). Additionally, 70 percent of responses indicated that budget cuts had a high or very high impact on health services. Personal interviewees stated that health care is denied to families without legal immigration status, and that there are not enough dentists available to serve children (five and under) and their families.

Survey respondents indicated which health services were missing from their community. According to the group meeting and personal interview participants, families lack sufficient access to a variety of health services including oral health and social/emotional health services. The participants also stated that there is a lack of screening and follow-up services, as well as a lack of nutrition information.

Exhibit 3-33 shows the most frequent responses for missing health services.

EXHIBIT 3-33

MISSING HEALTH SERVICES

MISSING HEALTH SERVICE AREAS	PERCENT MISSING
Access to free or low cost health services	48.9%
Health promotion and disease prevention education	34.0%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.
Total number of responses was 85.

Organizations providing leadership and services in Central Maricopa serve as assets within the community. Survey participants identified assets in the form of key organizations providing strong leadership within their community for provision of health services. These organizations include those listed in **Exhibit 3-34**.

EXHIBIT 3-34

ORGANIZATIONS OFFERING STRONG LEADERSHIP IN THE AREA OF HEALTH SERVICES

Arizona Chapter of American Academy of Pediatrics	Healthy Start
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Kiwanis
CAP	Maricopa County
Cardon Children's Hospital	Mesa Banner Desert NICU
Centro de Amistad	Mountain Park Health Center
Chandler Regional Hospital	Mountain Park Health Center – School for Naturopathic Medicine
Chandler School District CARE Center	Phoenix Children's Hospital
Children's Action Alliance	Preventive Dental Services
Catholic Healthcare West	Public Health Insurance Program
Early Head Start	Raising Special Kids
East Valley Pediatric Society	Scottsdale Healthcare
First Things First	St. Josephs Hospital
Golden Gate Community Center	Southwest Human Development
Head Start	

Sources: Stakeholder survey responses; stakeholder interview responses, 2010.

Section Summary

The region demonstrates both great strengths and great needs in the area of health for young children and their families. Children in the region are much more likely to have private health insurance than children countywide and less likely to be uninsured. In most of the region, less than half of births are paid for with public coverage. In Guadalupe, three out of four births are paid with public coverage. Immunization rates in the region are lower than the countywide rates – indicating barriers to health care. The results of the on-line survey affirm this barrier with just fewer than half the respondents saying that access to free or low cost health services are missing in the region. The region currently has a funding strategy with Catholic Health Care West Foundation to link families with oral healthcare. Additional strategies could be beneficial to connect families to immunizations and other health services.

3.4 Public Awareness and Collaboration

A summary of key survey findings directly related to provision of coordinated services is presented in this section of the report. Survey respondents rated (on a scale from Excellent to Very Poor) the extent to which coordinated services within their community met the needs of their children (birth through age five) and their families. Forty-six percent of respondents reported that their needs were well met (a rating of Good to Excellent) through coordinated services. Thirty-three percent reported that their needs were not well met (a rating of Poor or Very Poor). Some of the participants in the group meetings and personal interviews suggested that the coordination of services is lacking and needs improvement. The respondents did not feel that the agencies and programs available in their community coordinated their efforts and shared information adequately, especially where children with special needs are concerned. However, there were other participants that felt that WIC makes referrals to other services when needed, and that “word-of-mouth” was the best tool for communication and coordination.

Survey respondents were also asked to select the single most important barrier to children and families receiving coordinated services. The single most important barrier related to coordinated services was awareness of services. Meeting and interview respondents agreed. Participants stated that potential recipients are not aware of what services are available in the community and not aware of how to receive primary childcare, health care, or mental health services. Survey respondents were asked to report on two other barriers related to coordinated services: eligibility differences among service providers and the lack of communication between service providers. The percentage of respondents reporting these as barriers in their community was 34 percent for “eligibility differences among service providers” and 58 percent for “lack of communication between service providers.”

Respondents also reported on the quality, accessibility, convenience, timeliness, comprehensiveness, and responsiveness of services across all service areas in terms of the degree to which services met the needs of their children and families. The percentage of respondents indicating that their needs were well met and the percentage indicating services were not well met are shown in **Exhibit 3-35**.

EXHIBIT 3-35

QUALITY, ACCESSIBILITY, COMPREHENSIVENESS, AND RESPONSIVENESS IN MEETING EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION NEEDS

SERVICE TOPICS	GOOD TO EXCELLENT	POOR OR VERY POOR
Quality of Information	37.0%	18.2%
Accessibility of Information	23.0%	32.1%
Convenience of Services	23.0%	25.5%
Quality of Services	58.2%	1.8%
Timeliness of Services	30.3%	24.2%
Cultural Responsiveness of Services	43.0%	12.7%
Comprehensiveness of Services	33.4%	20.6%
Early Identification of Problems	23.6%	27.9%
Family Centered Practice	30.3%	17.0%
Client Focus	36.4%	20.0%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.
Total number of responses was 85.

Survey participants and interviewees also identified assets in the form of key organizations providing strong leadership within their community for coordination of services. These organizations include those listed in **Exhibit 3-36**.

EXHIBIT 3-36

ORGANIZATIONS OFFERING STRONG LEADERSHIP IN THE AREA OF COORDINATED SERVICES

AHCCCS	FitTots
Arizona Autism Coalition	Head Start
Arizona Child Care Association	Intertribal Council of Arizona
Arizona Partnership for Children	Le Petit Academy
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Local Pediatric Physician
Az Department of Health Services	Maricopa County
AzAAP	New Directions Institute
AzEIP	Parent Information Resource Center (PIRC)
CARE Partnership	Quality First
Central Arizona College	School Districts
Chandler Care Center	Scottsdale Healthcare
Chandler Regional Hospital	Scottsdale School District
Chandler Regional Medical Center	Southwest Center
Chandler Unified School District	Southwest Human Development
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	Southwest Network
Child Care Resource and Referral	Sunrise Preschools
Child Crisis Center	T.E.A.C.H.
Children's Action Alliance	Tempe Community Action Agency
City of Chandler	Tempe Elementary School District
City of Phoenix	United Cerebral Palsy of Central Arizona (0-3)
Communities in Schools of Tempe and Kyrene	Valley of the Sun United Way
East Valley Family Resource Center	WIC
First Things First	YMCA

Sources: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010; stakeholder interview responses, 2010.

3.5 Stakeholder Priority for Services

Understanding which service areas are viewed by early care and development stakeholders as most critical for focusing resources will guide FTF's decisions about how best to use their resources to help children and families within the Central Maricopa Region. To gather this important information, survey respondents were asked to indicate the number one priority area for FTF. **Exhibit 3-37** shows the percentage of survey respondents reporting that a given priority area was the number one priority for focusing FTF resources. The top two highest priority areas were increasing access to quality early childhood developmental and health programs and improving the quality of early childhood development and health programs.

EXHIBIT 3-37

PRIORITY FOR FOCUS OF FTF RESOURCES

AREA	NUMBER ONE PRIORITY
Improve the quality of early childhood development and health programs	19.1%
Increase the access to quality early childhood developmental and health programs	38.3%
Increase access to preventative health and health screenings for children through age 5	6.4%
Offer parent and family support and education concerning early childhood development and literacy	12.8%
Provide professional development and training for early childhood development and literacy	0.0%
Increase coordination of early childhood development and health programs	6.4%
Increase public awareness about the importance of early childhood development and health	17.0%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.

Section Summary

The top priority in the online survey for First Things First funding in the region is very clearly to increase access to quality early childhood programs. This priority was chosen by far more respondents than any other priority. Quality improvement has been a key focus of funding strategies in the region to date. Given the community input and the stresses of the economy and budget cuts, the region might consider putting more emphasis on strategies to help families reach and afford services.

4.0 SUMMARY AND FUTURE DIRECTION

The region has notable strengths. Sixty percent of schools in the region were excelling or highly performing compared to 36 percent of schools statewide. Preschool enrollment in the city of Tempe is similar to the rate in Maricopa County; enrollment in the rest of the region is significantly higher. Median incomes for families with children in Tempe are similar to or above the median in Maricopa County; median incomes in the rest of the region are significantly higher. The median incomes of families headed by a single mother are less than half the median of two-parent families.

The region has suffered during the economic downturn, but has retained many of its economic strengths. The unemployment rate in the region more than doubled between 2005 and 2010, as it did for Maricopa County. The cities of Chandler and Tempe both had lower unemployment rates than the county rate of 8.7 percent in March 2010. The unemployment rate at that time in the town of Guadalupe was much higher, at 15.3 percent. The number of children birth to age five living in transitional or emergency shelters who had previously lived in the Central Maricopa Region rose from 54 in 2007 to 101 in 2009. This was larger growth than the number of homeless children in the First Things First regions in Maricopa County.

More than one out of ten White, two-parent households in the city of Tempe had incomes below the federal poverty level, just above the countywide rate. Family poverty rates in Chandler were less than half that rate. The number of very poor young children in the region living in families receiving Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (welfare) grew by 34 percent between 2007 and 2010 – more than twice the growth rate statewide

The percentage of children without health coverage is lower in the region than the 15.5 percent countywide – ranging from 6 percent in the Kyrene School District to 13 percent in the city of Tempe. Despite high rates of public and private health coverage for children, immunization rates in the region are lower than statewide and have declined for children aged 12 to 24 months. The town of Guadalupe is considered a medically underserved area in Arizona, based on low access to health providers. Nearly half of the respondents to our online survey identified access to free or low cost health services as a missing service in the region.

The online survey included a question about what types of employer-based benefits are most important to families with young children. Eighty-two percent of survey respondents identified affordable health insurance for family members, 68 percent identified a flexible work schedule, and 64 percent identified paid time off for illness and vacation.

The region has lower percentages of young children who are Hispanic than Maricopa County; 33 percent in the city of Chandler and 39 percent in the city of Tempe, compared to 47 percent countywide. Thirty-seven percent of young children in Maricopa County had at least one parent who was foreign born; the rates are similar in Tempe and much lower in Chandler. Fewer than 5 percent of young children were born in another country throughout the region. Almost 7 percent of the households in Tempe have no one over the age of 14 who speaks English well; the rates are lower for the rest of the region.

Nine percent of children younger than six in Maricopa County are being raised by their grandparents; the rate is 8 percent in Tempe and 4 percent in Chandler. Forty-three percent of respondents to the online survey identified support for grandparents raising grandchildren as a service that is missing the region.

The need for access to high quality, affordable childcare is strong throughout the region. More than two out of three families with children in the city of Chandler have all parents in the workforce,

indicating a high need for childcare. The rate is similar countywide. The number of licensed childcare centers and DES Certified homes both declined significantly in the region between 2008 and 2010. There are 27 childcare providers with a national recognition or accreditation, up from 25 in 2008. This is only 12 percent of all licensed and certified providers in the region. In 2010, 120 four year old students were enrolled in preschool in the Chandler School District through the state-funded Early Childhood Block Grant Program. Due to budget cuts, that funding is no longer available.

Community members greatly value the services in the region such as Head Start and other public preschool programs, area hospitals, parent information and education, family resource centers, support groups, teen outreach (for early childhood careers), libraries, and childcare subsidies (when available).

The input from the community through the online survey, the stakeholder meetings, and the telephone interviews all overwhelmingly point to a great demand for financial assistance for parents needing childcare. Thirty-three percent of the respondents to the online survey said that childcare services are not meeting the needs of families in the community and 73 percent identified cost as the single most important barrier in childcare. More than half said that childcare subsidies are a service that is missing in the region.

Community input also emphasized a need to improve awareness among parents about early education needs and available services. There was a strong consensus that families of all income levels need more support and information. Lack of transportation was mentioned frequently as a barrier to families getting services.

Future Direction

The data and community input point to several potential priority areas for future First Things First funding in the region.

The current efforts to improve access to quality childcare through the Quality First project to coach and support childcare centers and T.E.A.C.H. AZ scholarships for the education of childcare teachers are valued and will help to meet key needs in the region. Because the cost of childcare was identified as a major barrier, these can be supplemented with continued childcare scholarships and other affordability strategies.

Because transportation was identified as a common barrier, strategies to provide more in-home services or mobile services can be explored.

There is an opportunity to develop an infrastructure and technology to connect providers with information, through websites, resource directories, or other software. Funding is needed to focus specifically on this function of sharing information to help families access services.

Many families in the region who do not qualify for many services because of their incomes still need support and information about parenting. There could be a focus on increasing awareness of existing services that are available to all families, like the Birth to 5 Helpline operated by Southwest Human Development, or promoting good parenting through community events.

There is interest in the region in focusing on parent education and support while there is a lack of social services. The trend data show growing stresses on families in the region and greater stresses on young children living in Hispanic families. Strategies could be designed to reach out to families most at risk, including children living with single parents, low-income families, and parents with a high school education or less.

Conclusion

The current regional strategies seem well designed to improve the quality of childcare. The data calls for additional emphasis on affordability strategies. The stakeholders in the region also see great potential benefit from strategies that enhance coordination and help link families with social services and health services.

APPENDIX A

**FIRST THINGS FIRST***NEEDS AND ASSETS SURVEY WEB SITE***DIRECTIONS:**

Everyone must complete SECTION ONE: Coordinating Services and SECTION TWO: Questions Specific to Your Community.

Complete SECTIONS 3 through 9 of the survey if you feel you have sufficient knowledge to share your opinions. For those sections of the survey that you **do not feel knowledgeable**, please mark the checkbox provided.

If you serve people in multiple communities, you MAY provide different answers for each community. The [Survey Completion Chart](#) indicates when you have completed a survey section for each of the communities you serve.

Listed below are the sections of the survey:

- [Edit Your Organization's Service Area](#)
- [Section 1: Coordinated Services in Your Community for Children Birth through Age 5 and Their Families](#)
- [Section 2: Questions Specific to Your Community](#)
- [Section 3: Parenting Support/Education Services](#)
- [Section 4: Child Care](#)
- [Section 5: Education](#)
- [Section 6: Literacy Development for Children and Parents](#)
- [Section 7: Services for Children with Special Needs](#)
- [Section 8: Health Services](#)
- [Section 9: Social Services](#)

Web Site ©MGT of America, Inc. E-Mail Technical Support

Section 1: Coordinated Services in Your Community for Children Birth Through Age 5 and Their Families

1. Thinking about the Coordinated Services in your Community for children birth through age 5 and their families, please rate how well the coordination currently meets families' needs.

AREA	HOW WELL THE COORDINATION OF SERVICES CURRENTLY MEETS FAMILIES' NEEDS (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)						
	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	NEUTRAL	POOR	VERY POOR	NOT SURE
Tempe	3.2	3.2	38.7	17.7	27.4	8.1	1.6
Chandler	1.5	6.2	38.5	21.5	20.0	9.2	3.1
Guadalupe	2.6	5.3	39.5	15.8	26.3	10.5	0.0
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	0.0	6.7	46.7	6.7	26.7	13.3	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	2.4	4.8	38.8	18.8	24.2	9.1	1.8
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	4.0	4.9	37.8	17.3	24.9	9.2	1.9

2. What are the barriers to families getting Coordinated Services in your Community for children birth through age 5? YOU MAY CHECK MORE THAN ONE.

AREA	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SELECTING BARRIER WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY												
	TRANSPORTATION	COST	LOCATION(S)	AWARENESS	NOT ENOUGH SERVICES	DIFFICULT TO ENROLL	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	QUALITY	NO CHILD CARE PROVIDED	IMMIGRATION STATUS	DIFFICULT TO TAKE TIME OFF FROM WORK/SCHOOL	OTHER
Tempe	58.1	64.5	40.3	85.5	48.4	24.2	30.6	43.5	11.3	41.9	33.9	54.8	4.8
Chandler	63.1	73.8	41.5	84.6	55.4	26.2	35.4	52.3	12.3	50.8	32.3	56.9	3.1
Guadalupe	65.8	71.1	44.7	84.2	55.3	31.6	36.8	52.6	15.8	52.6	36.8	63.2	5.3
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	66.7	73.3	40.0	80.0	46.7	40.0	40.0	53.3	13.3	46.7	46.7	60.0	6.7
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	61.8	69.7	41.8	84.8	52.7	26.7	33.9	49.1	12.7	47.9	33.9	57.6	4.2
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	63.6	68.6	44.1	82.9	50.8	29.8	31.8	48.3	15.3	45.2	35.0	59.1	4.0

3. From the selections you made above, what is the SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT barrier to families getting Coordinated Services in Your Community for children birth through age 5? CHECK ONLY ONE.

AREA	IMPACT OF RECENT BUDGET CUTS (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)				
	VERY HIGH	HIGH	LITTLE	NONE	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	54.8	30.6	4.8	0.0	9.7
Chandler	55.4	27.7	3.1	0.0	13.8
Guadalupe	60.5	26.3	5.3	0.0	7.9
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	46.7	33.3	6.7	0	13.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	56.4	28.5	4.2	0.0	10.9
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	56.5	26.0	6.1	0.5	11.0

4. Please rate the impact of recent budget cuts on Coordinated Services in Your Community for children birth through age 5 and their families.

AREA	IMPACT OF RECENT BUDGET CUTS (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)				
	VERY HIGH	HIGH	LITTLE	NONE	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	54.8	30.6	4.8	0.0	9.7
Chandler	55.4	27.7	3.1	0.0	13.8
Guadalupe	60.5	26.3	5.3	0.0	7.9
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	46.7	33.3	6.7	0	13.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	56.4	28.5	4.2	0.0	10.9
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	56.5	26.0	6.1	0.5	11.0

5. Please identify if there is a key organization(s) that is providing **STRONG LEADERSHIP** for Coordinated Services in the Community for children birth through age 5 and their families. List this organization(s) in the box below.

Tempe

AHCCCS	Head Start
AHCCCESS plans	Le Petit Academy
Arizona Autism Coalition	Litchfield Elementary School District
Arizona Child Care Association	Maricopa County
Arizona Partnership for Children	New Directions Institute
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Quality First
Az Department of Health Services	School Districts
AzAAP	Scottsdale Healthcare
AzEIP	Scottsdale School District
CARE Partnership	Southwest Center
Central Arizona Colleges	Southwest Human Development
Child Care Resource and Referral	Southwest Network (Don Erickson)
Child Crisis Center	Sunrise Preschools
Children's Action Alliance	Teach
City of Phoenix	Tempe Community Action Agency
Communities in Schools of Tempe and Kyrene	Tempe Elementary School District
East Valley Family Resource Center	United Way
First Things First	Valley of the Sun United Way
Firstcare Avondale Family Resource Center	VSUW
FitTots	WIC
Fountain Hills School District	YMCA

Chandler

AHCCCS	FitTots
AHCCCESS plans	Fountain Hills School District
Arizona Association of Childcare	Head Start
Arizona Autism Coalition	Intertribal Council of Arizona
Arizona Child Care Association	Le Petit Academy
Arizona Partnership for Children	Litchfield Elementary School District
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Local Pediatric Physician
Az Department of Health Services	Maricopa County
AzAAP	New Directions Institute
CARE Partnership	Parent Information Resource Center (PIRC)
Central Arizona Colleges	Quality First
Chandler Care Center	School Districts
Chandler Regional Hospital	Scottsdale Healthcare
Chandler Regional Medical Center	Scottsdale School District
Chandler Unified School District	Southwest Center
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	Southwest Human Development
Child Care Resource and Referral	Southwest Network (Don Erickson)
Child Crisis Center	Sunrise Preschools
Children's Action Alliance	Teach
City of Chandler	United Cerebral Palsy of Central Arizona (0-3)
City of Phoenix	Valley of the Sun United Way
Communities in Schools of Tempe and Kyrene	VSUW
East Valley Family Resource Center	WIC
First Things First	YMCA
Firstcare Avondale Family Resource Center	

Guadalupe

AHCCCS	Litchfield Elementary School District
Arizona Child Care Association	Maricopa County
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	New Directions Institute
AzAAP	Quality First
Central Arizona Colleges	Southwest Human Development
Children's Action Alliance	Southwest Network (Don Erickson)
City of Phoenix	Teach
Communities in Schools of Tempe and Kyrene	Tempe Community Action
East Valley Family Resource Center	Tempe Elementary School District
First Things First	Valley of the Sun United Way
Firstcare Avondale Family Resource Center	VSUW
FitTots	WIC
Head Start	YMCA

Pascua Yaqui Tribe

AHCCCS

Arizona Child Care Association

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)

AzAAP

First Things First

Firstcare Avondale Family Resource Center

FitTots

Litchfield Elementary School District

Southwest Human Development

Valley of the Sun United Way

WIC

Note: Some responses may indicate the same organization yet are referred to in the report per the individual responses.

6. Thinking about ALL SERVICES currently available for children birth through 5 and their families in YOUR COMMUNITY, please rate the degree to which services currently meet families' needs in the areas below.

AREA	QUALITY OF INFORMATION (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	6.5	11.3	33.9	32.3	8.1	8.1
Chandler	6.2	12.3	35.4	24.6	7.7	13.8
Guadalupe	2.6	15.8	31.6	26.3	13.2	10.5
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	6.7	26.7	0.0	40.0	13.3	13.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	5.5	12.7	33.9	27.9	9.1	10.9
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	4.5	15.4	34.1	27.1	8.7	10.2

AREA	ACCESSIBILITY OF INFORMATION (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	14.5	17.7	38.7	17.7	4.8	6.5
Chandler	12.3	20.0	33.8	18.5	3.1	12.3
Guadalupe	10.5	21.1	31.6	21.1	5.3	10.5
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	13.3	26.7	13.3	26.7	6.7	13.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	12.7	19.4	35.2	18.8	4.2	9.7
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	11.9	21.9	34.4	18.8	4.5	8.9

AREA	CONVENIENCE/ACCESSIBILITY OF SERVICES (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	8.1	17.7	45.2	19.4	4.8	4.8
Chandler	7.7	18.5	46.2	15.4	3.1	9.2
Guadalupe	5.3	18.4	42.1	23.7	5.3	5.3
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	13.3	13.3	40.0	26.7	0.0	6.7
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	7.3	18.2	44.8	18.8	4.2	6.7
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	6.0	19.6	51.0	13.6	3.6	6.2

AREA	QUALITY OF SERVICES (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	0.0	1.6	29.0	40.3	19.4	9.7
Chandler	0.0	3.1	29.2	35.4	21.5	10.8
Guadalupe	0.0	0.0	34.2	34.2	23.7	7.9
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	0.0	0.0	26.7	33.3	20.0	20.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	0.0	1.8	30.3	37.0	21.2	9.7
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	0.1	2.4	35.2	32.1	19.6	10.7

AREA	TIMELINESS OF SERVICES (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	4.8	19.4	37.1	19.4	11.3	8.1
Chandler	4.6	20.0	35.4	20.0	9.2	10.8
Guadalupe	5.3	18.4	42.1	18.4	13.2	2.6
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	13.3	26.7	33.3	13.3	13.3	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	4.8	19.4	37.6	19.4	10.9	7.9
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	5.5	22.5	36.2	18.3	10.0	7.6

AREA	CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS OF SERVICES (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	0.0	12.9	33.9	29.0	14.5	9.7
Chandler	1.5	12.3	32.3	26.2	15.4	12.3
Guadalupe	0.0	10.5	36.8	31.6	13.2	7.9
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	0.0	13.3	40.0	20.0	13.3	13.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	0.6	12.1	33.9	28.5	14.5	10.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	0.4	14.1	36.9	24.1	13.3	11.2

AREA	COMPREHENSIVENESS OF SERVICES (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	4.8	17.7	35.5	25.8	6.5	9.7
Chandler	4.6	13.8	38.5	24.6	6.2	12.3
Guadalupe	2.6	18.4	31.6	34.2	5.3	7.9
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	6.7	0.0	53.3	26.7	0.0	13.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	4.2	16.4	35.8	27.3	6.1	10.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	2.8	17.9	37.8	24.6	6.5	10.4

AREA	EARLY IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEMS (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	9.7	19.4	37.1	17.7	3.2	12.9
Chandler	9.2	16.9	33.8	20.0	4.6	15.4
Guadalupe	5.3	23.7	36.8	23.7	2.6	7.9
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	6.7	13.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	13.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITH IN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	8.5	19.4	35.8	20.0	3.6	12.7
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	6.0	21.4	37.9	19.6	3.7	11.3

AREA	FAMILY CENTERED PRACTICE (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	1.6	17.7	37.1	21.0	9.7	12.9
Chandler	3.1	12.3	35.4	18.5	12.3	18.5
Guadalupe	0.0	15.8	42.1	23.7	7.9	10.5
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	6.7	0.0	40.0	26.7	6.7	20.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	1.8	15.2	37.6	20.6	10.3	14.5
CITIES WITHIN NORTHEAST MARICOPA	0.7	17.7	39.0	19.2	10.4	13.1

AREA	CLIENT FOCUS (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	6.5	17.7	27.4	24.2	8.1	16.1
Chandler	6.2	10.8	27.7	29.0	7.7	18.5
Guadalupe	5.3	13.2	28.9	31.6	10.5	10.5
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	6.7	0.0	40.0	26.7	6.7	20.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	6.1	13.9	27.9	27.9	8.5	15.8
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	4.8	16.2	28.8	26.1	7.4	16.7

Section 2: Questions Specific to Your Community

1. Please rate your level of knowledge of programs supported by First Things First in YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE OF PROGRAMS SUPPORTED BY FIRST THINGS FIRST (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)						
	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	NEUTRAL	POOR	VERY POOR	NOT SURE
Tempe	20.0	40.0	26.7	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Chandler	7.7	26.9	23.1	34.6	7.7	0.0	0.0
Guadalupe	16.7	50.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	12.8	34.0	23.4	23.4	6.4	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	18.0	21.4	35.3	19.7	5.5	0.0	0.0

2. What is the number one priority area for First Things First to focus resources to help children birth through age five and their families in YOUR COMMUNITY? CHECK ONLY ONE.

AREA	NUMBER ONE PRIORITY AREA FOR FTF TO FOCUS RESOURCES (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)						
	IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT AND HEALTH PROGRAMS	INCREASE THE ACCESS TO QUALITY EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENTAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS	INCREASE ACCESS TO PREVENTIVE HEALTH AND HEALTH SCREENINGS FOR CHILDREN THROUGH AGE 5	OFFER PARENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT AND EDUCATION CONCERNING EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT AND LITERACY	PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT AND LITERACY	INCREASE COORDINATION OF EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT AND HEALTH PROGRAMS	INCREASE PUBLIC AWARENESS ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT AND HEALTH
Tempe	26.7	46.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	20
Chandler	15.4	30.8	11.5	19.2	0.0	7.7	15.4
Guadalupe	16.7	50	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	19.1	38.3	6.4	12.8	0.0	6.4	17.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	24	26	4.1	19.7	2.9	9.9	13.5

3. What services are missing in YOUR COMMUNITY for families with children birth through age 5?
CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

AREA	SERVICES THAT ARE MISSING IN THE COMMUNITY (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)											
	SUPPORT FOR GRANDPARENTS RAISING GRANDCHILDREN	PARENT COACHING/EDUCATION	ACCESS TO FREE OR LOW COST HEALTH SERVICES	EARLY CHILDHOOD LITERACY PROGRAMS	HIGH QUALITY CHILD CARE	HIGH QUALITY CHILD CARE THAT PROVIDES ALTERNATIVE HOURS OF OPERATION	CHILD CARE SUBSIDIES	PRE-KINDERGARTEN	HEALTH PROMOTION AND DISEASE PREVENTION EDUCATION	SUPPORT AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR PREGNANT AND PARENTING TEENS	ACCESSIBILITY TO RESOURCES THAT SUPPORT FAMILIES WITH YOUNG CHILDREN	OTHER
Tempe	40	26.7	60	40	40	40	46.7	13.3	33.3	26.7	53.3	0.0
Chandler	38.5	42.3	42.3	34.6	19.2	26.9	57.7	26.9	30.8	26.9	53.8	3.8
Guadalupe	66.7	16.7	50	16.7	83.3	66.7	66.7	16.7	50	50	33.3	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	42.6	34	48.9	34	34	36.2	55.3	21.3	34	29.8	51.1	2.1
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	51.7	45.2	49.3	35.6	41.6	39.9	50.2	28.8	32.9	36.5	50.5	3.4

Section 2: Questions Specific to Central Maricopa

1. Please rank the top three employer-based services listed below concerning their importance in supporting families with children birth through age five in YOUR COMMUNITY. RANK THE TOP THREE SERVICES WITH "1" AS THE MOST IMPORTANT.

TEMPE	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES IN TEMPE			TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN TEMPE
	1. THE MOST IMPORTANT	2.	3.	
Flexible work schedules	12.1	25.9	29.3	67.2
Paid Family Leave	3.4	5.2	10.3	19.0
Paid time off from work (sick and/or vacation time)	8.6	22.4	29.3	60.3
Availability of affordable health insurance for family members	56.9	15.5	6.9	79.3
Financial Assistance for back up child care (when regular child care is not available)	20.7	17.2	10.3	48.3
Designated lactation or breastfeeding areas in workplace	6.9	1.7	0.0	8.6

CHANDLER	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES IN CHANDLER			TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CHANDLER
	1. THE MOST IMPORTANT	2.	3.	
Flexible work schedules	11.9	20.3	35.6	67.8
Paid Family Leave	3.4	6.8	8.5	18.6
Paid time off from work (sick and/or vacation time)	10.2	25.4	28.8	64.4
Availability of affordable health insurance for family members	59.3	18.6	5.1	83.1
Financial Assistance for back up child care (when regular child care is not available)	18.6	16.9	10.2	45.8
Designated lactation or breastfeeding areas in workplace	3.4	1.7	1.7	6.8

GUADALUPE	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES IN GUADALUPE			TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN GUADALUPE
	1. THE MOST IMPORTANT	2.	3.	
Flexible work schedules	9.4	34.4	25.0	68.8
Paid Family Leave	6.3	6.3	9.4	21.9
Paid time off from work (sick and/or vacation time)	12.5	15.6	40.6	68.8
Availability of affordable health insurance for family members	62.5	15.6	6.3	84.4
Financial Assistance for back up child care (when regular child care is not available)	18.8	15.6	6.3	40.6
Designated lactation or breastfeeding areas in workplace	3.1	3.1	0.0	6.3

2. Summary of the importance of the employer-based services listed below in supporting families with children birth through age five in Central Maricopa.

CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN TEMPE	TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CHANDLER	TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN GUADALUPE	TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION
Flexible work schedules	67.2	67.8	68.8	67.8
Paid Family Leave	19.0	18.6	21.9	19.4
Paid time off from work (sick and/or vacation time)	60.3	64.4	68.8	63.8
Availability of affordable health insurance for family members	79.3	83.1	84.4	81.9
Financial Assistance for back up child care (when regular child care is not available)	48.3	45.8	40.6	45.6
Designated lactation or breastfeeding areas in workplace	8.6	6.8	6.3	7.4

3. In your opinion, in general how supportive are employers in YOUR COMMUNITY about family responsibilities?

AREA	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY					
	VERY SUPPORTIVE	SUPPORTIVE	SOMEWHAT SUPPORTIVE	LITTLE SUPPORT	NO SUPPORT	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	3.4	22.4	51.7	19.0	0.0	3.4
Chandler	8.5	16.9	52.5	13.6	0.0	8.5
Guadalupe	9.4	15.6	53.1	18.8	0.0	3.1
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	6.7	18.8	52.3	16.8	0.0	5.4

Section 3: Parenting Support/Education Services for Families with Children Birth Through Age 5

1. Thinking about Parenting Support/Education Services for families with children birth through age 5, please rate how well these services currently meet families' needs throughout YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	HOW WELL PARENTING SUPPORT/EDUCATION SERVICES CURRENTLY MEET FAMILIES' NEEDS (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)						
	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	NEUTRAL	POOR	VERY POOR	NOT SURE
Tempe	0.0	8.8	29.4	23.5	29.4	2.9	5.9
Chandler	3.0	12.1	27.3	30.3	18.2	0.0	9.1
Guadalupe	0.0	11.1	22.2	27.8	27.8	0.0	11.1
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	0.0	28.6	14.3	28.6	28.6	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	1.2	10.6	27.1	27.1	24.7	1.2	8.2
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	4.0	14.8	22.9	26.1	23.7	1.7	6.9

2. Are there waiting lists or families being turned away due to a shortage of Parenting Support/ Education Services for families with children birth through age 5 in YOUR COMMUNITY?

If you answered YES, please provide a specific example(s) in YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	ARE THERE WAITING LISTS? (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)		
	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	32.4	17.6	50.0
Chandler	21.2	15.2	63.6
Guadalupe	27.8	27.8	44.4
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	28.6	14.3	57.1
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	27.1	18.8	54.1
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	28.0	19.2	52.8

3. What are the barriers to providing Parenting Support/Education Services for families with children birth through age 5 in YOUR COMMUNITY? YOU MAY CHECK MORE THAN ONE.

AREA	SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT BARRIER (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)														
	TRANSPORTATION	COST	LOCATION(S)	AWARENESS	NOT ENOUGH SERVICES	DIFFICULT TO ENROLL	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	SERVICES NOT WANTED	IMMIGRATION STATUS	NO CHILDCARE PROVIDED	ELIGIBILITY DIFFERENCES AMONG SERVICE PROVIDERS	LACK OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SERVICE PROVIDERS	DIFFICULT TO TAKE TIME OFF FROM WORK/SCHOOL	OTHER
Tempe	5.9	14.7	0.0	55.9	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.8
Chandler	9.1	6.1	0.0	51.5	9.1	3.0	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.1
Guadalupe	11.1	16.7	0.0	50.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	14.3	28.6	0.0	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	8.2	11.8	0.0	52.9	5.9	1.2	2.4	0.0	1.2	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.8
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	9.3	14.7	1.4	47.4	8.7	1.9	0.4	0.4	2.2	2.4	4.9	0.0	0.0	2.3	4.0

4. From the selections you made above, what is the SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT barrier to providing Parenting Support/Education Services for families with children birth through age 5 in YOUR COMMUNITY? CHECK ONLY ONE.

AREA	SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT BARRIER (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)														
	TRANSPORTATION	COST	LOCATION(S)	AWARENESS	NOT ENOUGH SERVICES	DIFFICULT TO ENROLL	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	SERVICES NOT WANTED	IMMIGRATION STATUS	NO CHILDCARE PROVIDED	ELIGIBILITY DIFFERENCES AMONG SERVICE PROVIDERS	LACK OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SERVICE PROVIDERS	DIFFICULT TO TAKE TIME OFF FROM WORK/SCHOOL	OTHER
Tempe	5.9	14.7	0.0	55.9	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.8
Chandler	9.1	6.1	0.0	51.5	9.1	3.0	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.1
Guadalupe	11.1	16.7	0.0	50.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	14.3	28.6	0.0	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	8.2	11.8	0.0	52.9	5.9	1.2	2.4	0.0	1.2	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.8
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	9.3	14.7	1.4	47.4	8.7	1.9	0.4	0.4	2.2	2.4	4.9	0.0	0.0	2.3	4.0

5. Please rate the impact of recent budget cuts on providing Parenting Support/ Education Services for families with children birth through 5 in YOUR COMMUNITY.

If you rated this question Very High or High, please provide specific examples in YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	HOW WELL CHILD CARE FOR CHILDREN BIRTH THROUGH AGE 5, CURRENTLY MEET FAMILIES' NEEDS (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)						
	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	NEUTRAL	POOR	VERY POOR	NOT SURE
Tempe	2.6	7.7	30.8	12.8	28.2	15.4	2.6
Chandler	2.6	13.2	34.2	10.5	23.7	15.8	0.0
Guadalupe	0.0	13.6	22.7	18.2	27.3	13.6	4.5
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	0.0	14.3	28.6	0.0	14.3	42.9	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	2.0	11.1	30.3	13.1	26.3	15.2	2.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	2.3	11.9	26.5	14.2	27.9	15.2	1.9

6. Please identify if there is a key organization(s) that is providing **STRONG LEADERSHIP** within **YOUR COMMUNITY** for Parenting Support/Education Services for families with children birth through 5.

List of key organization(s) that are providing strong leadership

Tempe

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Parent University (Mesa Public Schools)
AzPAC	Raising Special Kids
Black child and family services	SARRC
Child Crisis Center	Southwest Human Development
Communities in Schools of Tempe and Kyrene	SWHD
Family Resource Center	Tempe Community Action - Communities in Schools
First Things First	Tempe School District
Healthy Families	United Way
Maricopa County	University of Arizona Cooperative Extension
Maricopa County Department of Public Health	

Chandler

Arizona State PIRC	Maricopa County Head Start
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Parent University (Mesa Public Schools)
AzPAC	Raising Special Kids
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	SARRC
Child Crisis Center	Southwest Human Development
Communities in Schools of Tempe and Kyrene	Summa Associates
First Things First	SWHD
Healthy Families	Teen Outreach Pregnancy Services
Maricopa County	United Way
Maricopa County Department of Public Health	University of Arizona Cooperative Extension

Guadalupe

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Raising Special Kids
AzPAC	SARRC
Child Crisis Center	Southwest Human Development
Communities in Schools of Tempe and Kyrene	SWHD
First Things First	Tempe Community Action - Communities in Schools
Healthy Families	United Way
Maricopa County	University of Arizona Cooperative Extension
Maricopa County Department of Public Health	
Parent University (Mesa Public Schools)	

Pascua Yaqui Tribe

Raising Special Kids
SARRC

Southwest Human Development

Note: Some responses may indicate the same organization yet are referred to in the report per the individual responses.

Section 4: Child Care for Children Birth Through Age 5

1. Thinking about Child Care for children birth through age 5, please rate how well these services currently meet families' needs throughout YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	HOW WELL CHILD CARE FOR CHILDREN BIRTH THROUGH AGE 5, CURRENTLY MEET FAMILIES' NEEDS						
	(PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)						
	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	NEUTRAL	POOR	VERY POOR	NOT SURE
Tempe	2.6	7.7	30.8	12.8	28.2	15.4	2.6
Chandler	2.6	13.2	34.2	10.5	23.7	15.8	0.0
Guadalupe	0.0	13.6	22.7	18.2	27.3	13.6	4.5
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	0.0	14.3	28.6	0.0	14.3	42.9	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	2.0	11.1	30.3	13.1	26.3	15.2	2.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	2.3	11.9	26.5	14.2	27.9	15.2	1.9

2. Are there waiting lists or children birth through age 5 being turned away due to a shortage of Child Care their parents prefer in YOUR COMMUNITY?

If you answered YES, please provide a specific example(s) in YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	ARE THERE WAITING LISTS? (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)		
	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	53.8	20.5	25.6
Chandler	39.5	28.9	31.6
Guadalupe	50.0	22.7	27.3
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	57.1	28.6	14.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	47.5	24.2	28.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	46.8	23.3	29.9

3. What are the barriers for parents to get the Child Care they prefer for children birth through age 5 in YOUR COMMUNITY? YOU MAY CHECK MORE THAN ONE.

AREA	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SELECTING BARRIER WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY										
	TRANSPORTATION	COST	LOCATION(S)	AWARENESS	NOT ENOUGH SERVICES	DIFFICULT TO ENROLL	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	QUALITY	IMMIGRATION STATUS	OTHER
Tempe	2.6	74.4	5.1	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	2.6
Chandler	2.6	73.7	2.6	2.6	5.3	0.0	2.6	0.0	5.3	0.0	5.3
Guadalupe	4.5	68.2	4.5	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.6	0.0	4.5
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	14.3	57.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	3.0	72.7	4.0	5.1	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	8.1	0.0	4.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	4.8	76.8	1.9	3.1	1.7	0.0	.7	0.0	7.2	.2	3.5

4. From the selections you made above, what is the SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT barrier for parents to get the Child Care they prefer for children birth through age 5 in YOUR COMMUNITY? CHECK ONLY ONE.

AREA	IMPACT OF RECENT BUDGET CUTS TO STATE CHILD CARE SUBSIDIES FOR PARENTS TO GET THE CHILD CARE THEY PREFER FOR CHILDREN BIRTH THROUGH AGE 5 (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)				
	VERY HIGH	HIGH	LITTLE	NONE	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	71.8	20.5	5.1	0.0	2.6
Chandler	60.5	21.1	10.5	0.0	7.9
Guadalupe	63.6	22.7	4.5	0.0	9.1
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	42.9	42.9	0.0	0.0	14.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	65.7	21.2	7.1	0.0	6.1
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	65.8	23.0	3.0	.1	8.1

5. Please rate the impact of budget cuts to state child care subsidies for parents to get the Child Care they prefer for children birth through age 5 in YOUR COMMUNITY.

If you rated this question Very High or High, please provide specific examples in YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	IMPACT OF RECENT BUDGET CUTS TO STATE CHILD CARE SUBSIDIES FOR PARENTS TO GET THE CHILD CARE THEY PREFER FOR CHILDREN BIRTH THROUGH AGE 5 (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)				
	VERY HIGH	HIGH	LITTLE	NONE	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	71.8	20.5	5.1	0.0	2.6
Chandler	60.5	21.1	10.5	0.0	7.9
Guadalupe	63.6	22.7	4.5	0.0	9.1
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	42.9	42.9	0.0	0.0	14.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	65.7	21.2	7.1	0.0	6.1
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	65.8	23.0	3.0	.1	8.1

6. Please identify recent changes to Child Care for children birth through age 5 in YOUR COMMUNITY due to the economy and budget cuts. YOU MAY CHECK MORE THAN ONE.

AREA	HOW WELL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN BIRTH THROUGH AGE 5, CURRENTLY MEET FAMILIES' NEEDS (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)						
	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	NEUTRAL	POOR	VERY POOR	NOT SURE
Tempe	0.0	21.2	36.4	15.2	18.2	3.0	6.1
Chandler	0.0	18.8	37.5	21.9	12.5	6.3	3.1
Guadalupe	0.0	26.3	36.8	21.1	10.5	0.0	5.3
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	0.0	14.3	42.9	28.6	14.3	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	0.0	21.4	36.9	19.0	14.3	3.6	4.8
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	0.6	18.3	35.3	21.3	16.7	2.6	5.1

7. Please identify if there is a key organization(s) that is providing **STRONG LEADERSHIP** within **YOUR COMMUNITY** for Child Care for children birth through age 5. List these organization(s) in the boxes below.

List of key organization(s) that are providing strong leadership

Tempe

Arizona Child Care Association	Maricopa County
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Southwest Human Development
Blake Foundation	SWHD
CAZColleges	United Way
Central AZ College	VSUW
Child and Family Services	YMCA
First Things First	

Chandler

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Southwest Human Development
Blake Foundation	Summa Associates
CAZColleges	SWHD
Central AZ College	Triple R
First Things First	United Way
God's Garden	VSUW
Maricopa County	YMCA
Sholom Preschool	

Guadalupe

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Southwest Human Development
Blake Foundation	SWHD
CAZColleges	United Way
Central AZ College	VSUW
First Things First	YMCA
Maricopa County	

Pascua Yaqui Tribe

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Southwest Human Development
Blake Foundation	United Way
Central AZ College	

Note: Some responses may indicate the same organization yet are referred to in the report per the individual responses.

Section 5: Education for Children Birth Through Age 5

1. Thinking about Educational Services for children birth through age 5, please rate how well these services currently meet families' needs throughout YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	ARE THERE WAITING LISTS? (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)		
	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	27.3	21.2	51.5
Chandler	21.9	21.9	56.3
Guadalupe	31.6	21.1	47.4
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	14.3	14.3	71.4
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	26.2	21.4	52.4
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	23.9	18.0	58.1

2. Are there waiting lists or families being turned away due to a shortage of Educational Services for children birth through age 5 in YOUR COMMUNITY?

If you answered YES, please provide a specific example(s) in YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	ARE THERE WAITING LISTS? (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)		
	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	27.3	21.2	51.5
Chandler	21.9	21.9	56.3
Guadalupe	31.6	21.1	47.4
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	14.3	14.3	71.4
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	26.2	21.4	52.4
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	23.9	18.0	58.1

3. What are the barriers to families getting Educational Services for children birth through age 5 in YOUR COMMUNITY? YOU MAY CHECK MORE THAN ONE.

AREA	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SELECTING BARRIER WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY											
	TRANSPORTATION	COST	LOCATION(S)	AWARENESS	NOT ENOUGH SERVICES	DIFFICULT TO ENROLL	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	QUALITY	IMMIGRATION STATUS	DIFFICULT TO TAKE TIME OFF FROM WORK/SCHOOL	OTHER
Tempe	6.1	33.3	3.0	27.3	9.1	6.1	3.0	0.0	6.1	0.0	0.0	6.1
Chandler	6.3	34.4	0.0	21.9	12.5	3.1	3.1	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	12.5
Guadalupe	10.5	26.3	0.0	42.1	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	0.0	0.0	5.3
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	28.6	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	7.1	32.1	1.2	28.6	9.5	3.6	2.4	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	8.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	8.2	30.1	0.5	29.7	11.2	3.6	1.7	0.4	7.3	1.9	0.9	4.5

4. From the selections you made above, what is the SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT barrier to families getting Educational Services for children birth through age 5 in YOUR COMMUNITY? CHECK ONLY ONE.

AREA	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SELECTING BARRIER WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY											
	TRANSPORTATION	COST	LOCATION(S)	AWARENESS	NOT ENOUGH SERVICES	DIFFICULT TO ENROLL	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	QUALITY	IMMIGRATION STATUS	DIFFICULT TO TAKE TIME OFF FROM WORK/SCHOOL	OTHER
Tempe	6.1	33.3	3.0	27.3	9.1	6.1	3.0	0.0	6.1	0.0	0.0	6.1
Chandler	6.3	34.4	0.0	21.9	12.5	3.1	3.1	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	12.5
Guadalupe	10.5	26.3	0.0	42.1	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	0.0	0.0	5.3
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	28.6	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	7.1	32.1	1.2	28.6	9.5	3.6	2.4	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	8.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	8.2	30.1	0.5	29.7	11.2	3.6	1.7	0.4	7.3	1.9	0.9	4.5

5. Please rate the impact of recent budget cuts on Educational Services for children birth through age 5 in YOUR COMMUNITY.

If you rated this question Very High or High, please provide specific examples in YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	IMPACT OF RECENT BUDGET CUTS ON EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN BIRTH THROUGH AGE 5 (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)				
	VERY HIGH	HIGH	LITTLE	NONE	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	39.4	24.2	3.0	0.0	33.3
Chandler	40.6	18.8	6.3	0.0	34.4
Guadalupe	42.1	21.1	0.0	0.0	36.8
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	28.6	42.9	0.0	0.0	28.6
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	40.5	21.4	3.6	0.0	34.5
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	39.8	22.6	4.1	0.5	32.9

6. List of key organization(s) that is providing STRONG LEADERSHIP within YOUR COMMUNITY for Educational Services for children birth through 5. List this organization(s) in the box below.

List of key organization(s) that are providing strong leadership

Tempe

AEA	Kyrene School District
Arizona Child Care Association	SARRC reverse integrated toddler preschool and pre K. programs
Association for Supportive Child Care	Southwest Human Development
Child and Family Resources, Inc.	Tempe Schools
Children' Action Alliance	United Way
Head Start	

Chandler

AEA	Children' Action Alliance
Arizona Child Care Association	Head Start
Association for Supportive Child Care	Kyrene School District
Chandler School District	SARRC reverse integrated toddler preschool and pre K. programs
Chandler Unified School District Early Childhood	Southwest Human Development
Child and Family Resources, Inc.	

Guadalupe

AEA	Kyrene Schools
Arizona Child Care Association	SARRC reverse integrated toddler preschool and pre K. programs
Association for Supportive Child Care	Southwest Human Development
Child and Family Resources, Inc.	Tempe Schools
Children' Action Alliance	
Head Start	

Pascua Yaqui Tribe

AEA	SARRC reverse integrated toddler preschool and pre K. programs
Head Start	

Note: Some responses may indicate the same organization yet are referred to in the report per the individual responses.

Section 6: Literacy Development Services for Children Birth Through Age 5 and Their Families

1. Thinking about Literacy Development Services for children birth through age 5 and their families, please rate how well these services currently meet families' needs throughout YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	HOW WELL LITERACY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FOR CHILDREN BIRTH THROUGH AGE 5 AND THEIR FAMILIES, CURRENTLY MEET FAMILIES' NEEDS (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)						
	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	NEUTRAL	POOR	VERY POOR	NOT SURE
Tempe	0.0	8.0	48.0	20.0	8.0	4.0	12.0
Chandler	4.0	4.0	56.0	20.0	0.0	8.0	8.0
Guadalupe	0.0	7.1	50.0	14.3	0.0	7.1	21.4
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	0.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	1.6	6.3	51.6	18.8	3.1	6.3	12.5
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	4.1	10.8	41.5	19.3	7.9	6.4	10.0

2. Are there families being turned away due to a shortage of Literacy Development Services for children birth through age 5 and their families in YOUR COMMUNITY?

If you answered YES, please provide a specific example(s) in YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	ARE THERE FAMILIES TURNED AWAY? (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)		
	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	24.0	12.0	64.0
Chandler	16.0	8.0	76.0
Guadalupe	28.6	0.0	71.4
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	20.0	0.0	80.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	21.9	7.8	70.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	21.2	14.1	64.7

3. What are the barriers to families getting Literacy Development Services for children birth through age 5 and their families in YOUR COMMUNITY? YOU MAY CHECK MORE THAN ONE.

AREA	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SELECTING BARRIER WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY												
	TRANSPORTATION	COST	LOCATION(S)	AWARENESS	NOT ENOUGH SERVICES	DIFFICULT TO ENROLL	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	QUALITY	NO CHILD CARE PROVIDED	IMMIGRATION STATUS	DIFFICULT TO TAKE TIME OFF FROM WORK/SCHOOL	OTHER
Tempe	36.0	28.0	28.0	68.0	24.0	0.0	24.0	52.0	4.0	8.0	12.0	16.0	0.0
Chandler	32.0	36.0	28.0	68.0	28.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	4.0	8.0	8.0	24.0	0.0
Guadalupe	42.9	21.4	35.7	78.6	21.4	0.0	21.4	50.0	0.0	7.1	14.3	14.3	0.0
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	40.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	35.9	29.7	29.7	70.3	25.0	0.0	21.9	46.9	3.1	7.8	10.9	18.8	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	37.9	29.4	25.6	69.4	26.3	1.4	21.9	46.8	8.8	9.5	14.6	14.1	0.9

4. From the selections you made above, what is the SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT barrier to families getting Literacy Development Services for children birth through age 5 and their families in YOUR COMMUNITY? CHECK ONLY ONE.

AREA	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SELECTING BARRIER WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY												
	TRANSPORTATION	COST	LOCATION(S)	AWARENESS	NOT ENOUGH SERVICES	DIFFICULT TO ENROLL	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	QUALITY	NO CHILD CARE PROVIDED	IMMIGRATION STATUS	DIFFICULT TO TAKE TIME OFF FROM WORK/SCHOOL	OTHER
Tempe	4.0	8.0	0.0	48.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
Chandler	8.0	4.0	0.0	48.0	12.0	0.0	4.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	8.0
Guadalupe	7.1	0.0	0.0	71.4	7.1	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	20.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	6.3	4.7	0.0	53.1	9.4	0.0	1.6	12.5	0.0	0.0	1.6	4.7	6.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	6.9	4.6	1.7	52.8	15.1	.3	.5	10.5	2.4	0.0	1.4	1.0	2.6

5. Please rate the impact of recent budget cuts on Literacy Development Services for children birth through age 5 in YOUR COMMUNITY.

If you rated this question Very High or High, please provide specific examples in YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	IMPACT OF RECENT BUDGET CUTS ON LITERACY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FOR CHILDREN BIRTH THROUGH AGE 5 (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)				
	VERY HIGH	HIGH	LITTLE	NONE	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	24.0	36.0	12.0	0.0	28.0
Chandler	8.0	28.0	12.0	0.0	52.0
Guadalupe	21.4	28.6	7.1	0.0	42.9
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	20.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	40.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	17.2	31.3	10.9	0.0	40.6
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	20.2	28.8	5.2	3.1	42.7

6. List of key organization(s) that is providing **STRONG LEADERSHIP** within **YOUR COMMUNITY** for services for children through age 5 with Special Needs and their families.

List of key organization(s) that are providing strong leadership

Tempe

AZAAP	Southwest Human Development
Early Reading First.	State Family Literacy at ADE
Public Libraries	United Way
Reach Out and Read	Unlimited Potential in South Phoenix

Chandler

A Stepping Stone Foundation	Reach Out and Read
Arizona Language and Literacy Center	Southwest Human Development
Arizona Literacy and Learning Center	Unlimited Potential in South Phoenix
AZAAP	Valley of the Sun United Way
Public Libraries	

Guadalupe

AZAAP	Southwest Human Development
Early Reading First.	State Family Literacy at ADE
Reach Out and Read	Unlimited Potential in South Phoenix

Note: Some responses may indicate the same organization yet are referred to in the report per the individual responses.

Section 7: Services for Children Birth Through Age 5 with Special Needs and Their Families

1. Thinking about services for children birth through age 5 with Special Needs and their families, please rate how well these services currently meet families' needs throughout YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	HOW WELL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN BIRTH THROUGH AGE 5 WITH SPECIAL NEEDS AND THEIR FAMILIES, CURRENTLY MEET FAMILIES' NEEDS (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)						
	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	NEUTRAL	POOR	VERY POOR	NOT SURE
Tempe	0.0	14.3	28.6	14.3	17.9	10.7	14.3
Chandler	0.0	19.2	30.8	11.5	11.5	7.7	19.2
Guadalupe	0.0	20.0	33.3	13.3	20.0	13.3	0.0
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	0.0	42.9	28.6	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	0.0	17.4	30.4	13.0	15.9	10.1	13.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	1.1	18.2	25.5	13.9	19.2	9.1	13.0

2. Are there waiting lists or families being turned away due to a shortage of services for children through age 5 with Special Needs and their families in YOUR COMMUNITY?

If you answered YES, please provide a specific example(s) in YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	ARE THERE WAITING LISTS OR FAMILIES TURNED AWAY? (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)		
	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	39.3	3.6	57.1
Chandler	38.5	3.8	57.7
Guadalupe	46.7	0.0	53.3
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	57.1	0.0	42.9
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	40.6	2.9	56.5
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	44.8	7.4	47.9

3. What are the barriers to families getting services for children through age 5 with Special Needs in YOUR COMMUNITY? YOU MAY CHECK MORE THAN ONE.

AREA	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SELECTING BARRIER WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY												
	TRANSPORTATION	COST	LOCATION(S)	AWARENESS	NOT ENOUGH SERVICES	DIFFICULT TO ENROLL	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	QUALITY	NO CHILD CARE PROVIDED	IMMIGRATION STATUS	DIFFICULT TO TAKE TIME OFF FROM WORK/SCHOOL	OTHER
Tempe	42.9	53.6	42.9	57.1	64.3	21.4	17.9	28.6	28.6	14.3	21.4	21.4	0.0
Chandler	42.3	46.2	42.3	61.5	61.5	23.1	19.2	30.8	30.8	11.5	19.2	19.2	0.0
Guadalupe	66.7	66.7	60.0	66.7	80.0	26.7	26.7	46.7	40.0	13.3	33.3	33.3	0.0
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	85.7	57.1	71.4	42.9	71.4	42.9	28.6	42.9	28.6	14.3	28.6	14.3	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	47.8	53.6	46.4	60.9	66.7	23.2	20.3	33.3	31.9	13.0	23.2	23.2	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	54.6	54.6	49.9	58.8	62.8	29.1	26.8	36.3	31.1	14.1	26.8	25.4	1.7

4. From the selections you made above, what is the SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT barrier to families getting services for children through age 5 with Special Needs in YOUR COMMUNITY? CHECK ONLY ONE.

AREA	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SELECTING BARRIER WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY												
	TRANSPORTATION	COST	LOCATION(S)	AWARENESS	NOT ENOUGH SERVICES	DIFFICULT TO ENROLL	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	QUALITY	NO CHILD CARE PROVIDED	IMMIGRATION STATUS	DIFFICULT TO TAKE TIME OFF FROM WORK/SCHOOL	OTHER
Tempe	3.6	17.9	7.1	21.4	35.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	7.1
Chandler	3.8	11.5	7.7	26.9	30.8	0.0	3.8	3.8	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	7.7
Guadalupe	6.7	13.3	6.7	26.7	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	14.3	0.0	14.3	28.6	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	4.3	14.5	7.2	24.6	34.8	0.0	1.4	1.4	0.0	5.8	0.0	0.0	5.8
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	5.2	13.3	5.6	26.1	34.4	2.3	0.5	0.2	0.3	5.3	1.6	1.1	4.1

5. Please rate the impact of recent budget cuts on services for children through age 5 with Special Needs and their families in YOUR COMMUNITY.

If you rated this question Very High or High, please provide specific examples in YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	IMPACT OF RECENT BUDGET CUTS ON SERVICES FOR CHILDREN BIRTH THROUGH AGE 5 WITH SPECIAL NEEDS AND THEIR FAMILIES IN YOUR COMMUNITY (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)				
	VERY HIGH	HIGH	LITTLE	NONE	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	18.5	29.6	14.8	3.7	33.3
Chandler	15.4	30.8	7.7	3.8	42.3
Guadalupe	20.0	33.3	13.3	0.0	33.3
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	14.3	57.1	14.3	0.0	14.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	17.6	30.9	11.8	2.9	36.8
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	26.4	31.4	11.0	1.3	29.9

6. List of key organization(s) that is providing **STRONG LEADERSHIP** within **YOUR COMMUNITY** for services for children through age 5 with Special Needs and their families.

List of key organization(s) that are providing strong leadership

Tempe

ARC of Tempe	Maricopa County
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Phoenix Children's Hospital
Autism organizations	Raising Special Kids
AZ EIP	SARRC
AZA United	School Districts
Cardon Children's hospital	SEEK
Centers for Habilitation	Southwest Center for Human Development
First Things First	SWHD
Guthrie Mainstream	United Way
H.O.P.E. Group	VSUW
LIFE	

Chandler

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Phoenix Children's Hospital
AZ EIP	Raising Special Kids
AZA United	Rise
Cardon Children's hospital	SARRC
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	School Districts
Department of Economic Security	SEEK
First Things First	Southwest Center for Human Development
Guthrie Mainstream	SWHD
H.O.P.E. Group	VSUW
LIFE	
Maricopa County	

Guadalupe

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Maricopa County
AZ EIP	Raising Special Kids
AZA United	SARRC
First Things First	SEEK
Guthrie Mainstream	SWHD
H.O.P.E. Group	VSUW
LIFE	

Pascua Yaqui Tribe

AZA United	Raising Special Kids
Guthrie Mainstream	SARRC
H.O.P.E. Group	SEEK
LIFE	

Note: Some responses may indicate the same organization yet are referred to in the report per the individual responses.

Section 8: Health Services for Children Birth Through Age 5

1. Thinking about Health Services for children birth through age 5, please rate how well these services currently meet families' needs throughout YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	HOW WELL HEALTH SERVICES FOR CHILDREN BIRTH THROUGH AGE 5 AND THEIR FAMILIES, CURRENTLY MEET FAMILIES' NEEDS (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)						
	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	NEUTRAL	POOR	VERY POOR	NOT SURE
Tempe	3.0	12.1	33.3	27.3	21.2	0.0	3.0
Chandler	3.1	18.8	31.3	21.9	15.6	3.1	6.3
Guadalupe	0.0	11.1	33.3	22.2	22.2	0.0	11.1
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	0.0	14.3	28.6	14.3	42.9	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	2.4	14.5	32.5	24.1	19.3	1.2	6.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	1.3	13.3	27.9	21.6	24.1	4.5	7.3

2. Are there waiting lists or children birth through age 5 turned away due to a shortage of Health Services in YOUR COMMUNITY?

If you answered YES, please provide a specific example(s) in YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	ARE THERE WAITING LISTS OR CHILDREN TURNED AWAY? (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)		
	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	27.3	30.3	42.4
Chandler	28.1	28.1	43.8
Guadalupe	27.8	27.8	44.4
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	42.9	14.3	42.9
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	27.7	28.9	43.4
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	34.7	20.6	44.7

3. What are the barriers to children birth through age 5 getting Health Services in YOUR COMMUNITY? YOU MAY CHECK MORE THAN ONE.

AREA	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SELECTING BARRIER WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY												
	TRANSPORTATION	COST	LOCATION(S)	AWARENESS	NOT ENOUGH SERVICES	DIFFICULT TO ENROLL	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	QUALITY	NO CHILD CARE PROVIDED	IMMIGRATION STATUS	DIFFICULT TO TAKE TIME OFF FROM WORK/SCHOOL	OTHER
Tempe	54.5	75.8	36.4	54.5	45.5	21.2	33.3	39.4	21.2	15.2	57.6	27.3	3.0
Chandler	53.1	62.5	34.4	56.3	40.6	21.9	34.4	37.5	15.6	12.5	53.1	25.0	3.1
Guadalupe	55.6	72.2	33.3	66.7	33.3	27.8	33.3	44.4	27.8	16.7	61.1	22.2	5.6
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	71.4	71.4	28.6	71.4	28.6	28.6	28.6	42.9	28.6	14.3	42.9	14.3	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	54.2	69.9	34.9	57.8	41.0	22.9	33.7	39.8	20.5	14.5	56.6	25.3	3.6
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	55.5	69.2	39.4	56.9	40.6	28.9	34.3	43.8	23.9	16.5	52.3	26.1	4.8

4. From the selections you made above, what is the SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT barrier to children birth through age 5 getting Health Services in YOUR COMMUNITY? CHECK ONLY ONE.

AREA	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SELECTING BARRIER WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY												
	TRANSPORTATION	COST	LOCATION(S)	AWARENESS	NOT ENOUGH SERVICES	DIFFICULT TO ENROLL	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	QUALITY	NO CHILD CARE PROVIDED	IMMIGRATION STATUS	DIFFICULT TO TAKE TIME OFF FROM WORK/SCHOOL	OTHER
Tempe	3.0	39.4	3.0	21.2	12.1	0.0	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.1	0.0	3.0
Chandler	3.1	34.4	9.4	21.9	12.5	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	3.1
Guadalupe	5.6	27.8	0.0	27.8	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	5.6
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	14.3	0.0	0.0	28.6	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	3.6	34.9	4.8	22.9	12.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.5	0.0	3.6
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	6.1	31.1	4.1	20.4	13.4	2.5	1.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	14.7	0.3	5.8

5. Please rate the impact of recent budget cuts on Health Services for children birth through age 5 in YOUR COMMUNITY.

If you rated this question Very High or High, please provide specific examples in YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	IMPACT OF RECENT BUDGET CUTS ON HEALTH SERVICES FOR CHILDREN BIRTH THROUGH AGE 5 IN YOUR COMMUNITY (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)				
	VERY HIGH	HIGH	LITTLE	NONE	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	45.5	21.2	12.1	0.0	21.2
Chandler	40.6	28.1	12.5	0.0	18.8
Guadalupe	55.6	22.2	11.1	0.0	11.1
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	42.9	28.6	14.3	0.0	14.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	45.8	24.1	12.0	0.0	18.1
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	52.7	18.2	9.9	0.4	18.7

6. Please identify if there is a key organization(s) that is providing **STRONG LEADERSHIP** within **YOUR COMMUNITY** for Health Services for children birth through age 5. List this organization(s) in the box below.

List of key organization(s) that are providing strong leadership

Tempe

Arizona Chapter of American Academy of Pediatrics.	Maricopa County
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Mountain Park Health Center
Cardon Children's Hospital	Mountain Park Health Center - School for Naturopathic Medicine
Children's Action Alliance	Phoenix Children's Hospital
Early Head Start	Scottsdale Healthcare
East Valley Pediatric Society	St. Josephs Hospital
First Things First	SWHD
Golden Gate Community Center	United Way
Head Start	VSUW
Kiwanis	

Chandler

Arizona Chapter of American Academy of Pediatrics.	Kiwanis
Arizona Chapter of American Academy of Pediatrics.	Maricopa County
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Mountain Park Health Center
Cardon Children's Hospital	Phoenix Children's Hospital
Chandler School District CARE Center	Scottsdale Healthcare
Children's Action Alliance	St. Josephs Hospital
CHW	SWHD
East Valley Pediatric Society	VSUW
First Things First	

Guadalupe

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Phoenix Children's Hospital
Children's Action Alliance	St. Josephs Hospital
First Things First	SWHD
Maricopa County	VSUW

Pascua Yaqui Tribe

Phoenix Children's Hospital

St. Josephs Hospital

Note: Some responses may indicate the same organization yet are referred to in the report per the individual responses.

Section 9: Social Services Support for Children Birth Through Age 5 and Their Families

1. Thinking about Social Services Support for children birth through age 5 and their families, please rate how well these services currently meet families' needs throughout YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	HOW WELL SOCIAL SERVICES SUPPORT FOR CHILDREN BIRTH THROUGH AGE 5 AND THEIR FAMILIES, CURRENTLY MEET FAMILIES' NEEDS (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)						
	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	NEUTRAL	POOR	VERY POOR	NOT SURE
Tempe	0.0	10.0	33.3	16.7	23.3	13.3	3.3
Chandler	0.0	3.6	28.6	21.4	21.4	10.7	14.3
Guadalupe	0.0	5.9	29.4	23.5	29.4	11.8	0.0
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	0.0	16.7	16.7	16.7	33.3	16.7	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	0.0	6.7	30.7	20.0	24.0	12.0	6.7
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	0.6	9.0	25.3	23.4	22.3	14.7	4.7

2. Are there waiting lists or children birth through age 5 turned away due to a shortage of Health Services in YOUR COMMUNITY?

If you answered YES, please provide a specific example(s) in YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	ARE THERE WAITING LISTS OR FAMILIES TURNED AWAY? (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)		
	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	46.7	10.0	43.3
Chandler	35.7	7.1	57.1
Guadalupe	47.1	5.9	47.1
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	16.7	0.0	83.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	42.7	8.0	49.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	38.0	9.8	52.2

3. What are the barriers to families getting Social Services Support for children birth through age 5 in YOUR COMMUNITY? YOU MAY CHECK MORE THAN ONE.

AREA	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SELECTING BARRIER WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY												
	TRANSPORTATION	COST	LOCATION(S)	AWARENESS	NOT ENOUGH SERVICES	DIFFICULT TO ENROLL	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	QUALITY	NO CHILD CARE PROVIDED	IMMIGRATION STATUS	DIFFICULT TO TAKE TIME OFF FROM WORK/SCHOOL	OTHER
Tempe	3.3	16.7	3.3	33.3	30.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0
Chandler	3.6	10.7	3.6	28.6	39.3	0.0	3.6	0.0	3.6	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0
Guadalupe	5.9	11.8	5.9	17.6	47.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	4.0	13.3	4.0	28.0	37.3	1.3	1.3	0.0	4.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	5.0	10.4	2.5	24.8	40.5	0.6	0.3	0.2	4.8	0.6	7.3	0.3	2.8

4. From the selections you made above, what is the SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT barrier to families getting Social Services Support for children birth through age 5 in YOUR COMMUNITY? CHECK ONLY ONE.

AREA	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SELECTING BARRIER WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY												
	TRANSPORTATION	COST	LOCATION(S)	AWARENESS	NOT ENOUGH SERVICES	DIFFICULT TO ENROLL	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	QUALITY	NO CHILD CARE PROVIDED	IMMIGRATION STATUS	DIFFICULT TO TAKE TIME OFF FROM WORK/SCHOOL	OTHER
Tempe	3.3	16.7	3.3	33.3	30.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0
Chandler	3.6	10.7	3.6	28.6	39.3	0.0	3.6	0.0	3.6	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0
Guadalupe	5.9	11.8	5.9	17.6	47.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	4.0	13.3	4.0	28.0	37.3	1.3	1.3	0.0	4.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	5.0	10.4	2.5	24.8	40.5	0.6	0.3	0.2	4.8	0.6	7.3	0.3	2.8

5. Please rate the impact of recent budget cuts on Social Services Support for children birth through age 5 and their families in YOUR COMMUNITY.

If you rated this question Very High or High, please provide specific examples in YOUR COMMUNITY.

AREA	IMPACT OF RECENT BUDGET CUTS ON SOCIAL SERVICES SUPPORT FOR CHILDREN BIRTH THROUGH AGE 5 AND THEIR FAMILIES IN YOUR COMMUNITY (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)				
	VERY HIGH	HIGH	LITTLE	NONE	DON'T KNOW
Tempe	46.7	26.7	13.3	0.0	13.3
Chandler	39.3	25.0	10.7	0.0	25.0
Guadalupe	58.8	23.5	11.8	0.0	5.9
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN CENTRAL MARICOPA REGION	46.7	25.3	12.0	0.0	16.0
TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY	46.0	24.4	7.0	0.3	22.4

6. Please identify if there is a key organization(s) that is providing **STRONG LEADERSHIP** within **YOUR COMMUNITY** for Social Services Support for children birth through age 5 and their families. List this organization(s) in the box below.

List of key organization(s) that are providing strong leadership

Tempe

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	PAFCO
AzPaC	Salvation Army
Children's Action Alliance	Southwest Human Development
DES	SWHD
Family Resource Center	Tempe Community Action Agency
First Things First	Tempe Community Council
GALA	United Way
Maricopa County	VSUW
NASW	YMCA

Chandler

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	PAFCO
AzPaC	Southwest Behavioral Services
Children's Action Alliance	Southwest Human Development
First Things First	SWHD
GALA	Tempe Community Council
Maricopa County	VSUW
NASW	YMCA

Guadalupe

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	NASW
AzPaC	PAFCO
Children's Action Alliance	SWHD
First Things First	Tempe Community Council
GALA	VSUW
Maricopa County	

Pascua Yaqui Tribe

GALA
PAFCO

Southwest Human Development

Note: Some responses may indicate the same organization yet are referred to in the report per the individual responses.

APPENDIX B

NORTHEAST MARICOPA REGION

STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

SECTION I. STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

Introduction

Meetings were held on June 1st at the Sunset Branch of the Chandler Public Library, and June 4th at the Association for Supportive Child Care. There were a total of 14 participants, including a school district community relations manager, childcare center owner/directors, members from Arizona State University, Channel 8 PBS, and social services providers.

Assets

A variety of programs and services were mentioned as assets, including parent information and education, family resource centers, support groups, health services, nutrition services, teen outreach (for early childhood careers), libraries, early care and education, and childcare subsidies (when available). One collaborative organization was mentioned as an asset—the East Valley Regional Partnership (although not all participants were familiar with this group).

Participants thought it would be possible to build on these assets if there were additional funding to serve more people, a good source of information on available resources, legislation that supports young children and their families, public awareness of the benefits of investing in early childhood, corporate support for early childhood programs, and leadership in the early childhood sector.

Needs

With respect to early care and education, families need access to quality childcare and assistance with payments (subsidies, scholarships).

Families need access to a variety of health-related services, including oral health and social/emotional health services, screening and follow-up services, and nutrition information.

In order to enhance their confidence and effectiveness as parents, families need parent education, support, empowerment, and access to enrichment experiences for their children. They need flexible work schedules, programs that will improve their own literacy, transportation, and help with applying for services.

Children and their families are being turned away from a variety of services, including childcare subsidies, quality childcare, special education, screening and early intervention services, and healthcare coverage and services.

Barriers that keep families from getting what they need to support the development, health, and education of their children include: language, awareness of resources, transportation to get to services, loss of services (cutbacks), disconnected services (lack of continuity), hours of operation of services, complexity of eligibility processes, and fear/lack of proper documentation for immigrant families.

Gaps in services can be addressed through additional funding, increased awareness of available resources, partnerships, policy changes, greater public awareness, parent education and support, more qualified providers, better provider wages, and follow-up.

Information and Coordination

There was agreement that families lack information about available resources and that even providers who are in a position to refer (e.g., childcare, healthcare) are not aware of all the resources and how to access them. Further, concern was expressed that families often do not know what to ask for (“they don’t know what they don’t know”). They need recommendations and support to help them get what they need for their children and families.

While there are examples of effective communication, coordination, and collaboration among early childhood partners, there is neither infrastructure nor technology to support this on a region-wide (or larger) scale. Concern was expressed about perceived competition among providers when there is so much need to be addressed.

Various agencies were listed as providing early childhood leadership, but the lists were different in the two focus groups. Those mentioned included the Valley of the Sun United Way, East Valley School Readiness Partnership, Emerging Leaders, the Early Childhood Network, the Family Child Care Network, First Things First, Arizona Department of Education, Association for Supportive Child Care, and the United Way.

Suggestions and Ideas

Support for a comprehensive, one-stop family information and resource site was expressed.

To improve communication and coordination, it was recommended that a technological infrastructure be developed to connect providers (e.g., resources, master calendar, blogs). Channel 8 described software that might be used to support such an effort.

Priorities for First Things First funding were:

- Quality care and education
- Parent education
- Healthcare
- Family resources/support
- Professional development

SECTION II. PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

Introduction

Summarized within this report are the personal interviews and e-mail correspondences for the First Things First Needs and Assets report for the Central Maricopa Region of Arizona conducted during the month of June 2010. After numerous attempts to contact the stakeholders provided by FTF (via e-mail and phone), 28 provided responses for this report. Over 50 members of the community were contacted, and the types of respondents that participated in the personal interviews for this region varied in professions from doctors and parents, to government service providers and community organizers. The participants were asked a series of ten questions after providing their contact information and describing their roles in working with or being affiliated with families with children ages five and under.

Some of the most notable organizations the participants were affiliated with included:

- First Things First (FTF)
- Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC)
- Community Action Program (CAP)
- Town of Guadalupe
- Chandler City Council

Assets

Central Maricopa respondents were forthcoming with examples of organizations that provided services that work well in their communities and that provide leadership with regard to community efforts involving children five and under and their families. Many respondents had positive things to say about the FTF program itself, including several community members that believe that FTF has been successful in its efforts to encourage and educate parents and motivate them to ensure the proper health and development of their children. One respondent also appreciates that FTF assists with funding of community food drives in the Central Maricopa Region.

Other programs in the Central Maricopa Region that respondents believe work well varied from libraries to state programs and private enterprises. Several respondents stated that the public libraries in their community provide informative and educational activities for families with young children. Many mentioned that the WIC program is a good program that provides nutritional education, refers families in need to other community services, and provides for transportation to its office to those who need it. Other organizations that were mentioned included the following:

- Tribal offices
- Mesa Banner Desert NICU (and the developmental specialists assigned from there)
- Public preschools and elementary schools
- Raising Special Kids
- CAP (emergency food boxes and assistance with applications for state services)
- Centro de Amistad

- Head Start
- Arizona Chapter of American Academy of Pediatrics
- Southwest Center for Human Development
- Children’s hospitals and family clinics
- Healthy Start
- Community Resource Centers
- Empowerment Systems, Inc., which:
 - Provides childcare and kindergarten programs
 - Has a boys and girls club
 - Runs a domestic violence program
- Public health insurance programs
- Preventative dental services
- Association for Support of Child Care
- Chandler Regional Hospital
- Libraries for the Future
- Chandler Christian Community Center
- Local high schools

Needs

The participants also were asked to comment on those areas where they saw needs were not being met for young children and families in their communities. The most frequently mentioned problem for respondents was that childcare is too expensive and that families need assistance or subsidies to be able to work. Many respondents also mentioned that public transportation or transportation assistance is lacking in their communities. Along with transportation, some respondents feel that other basic needs are not met, such as food and shelter assistance for low to moderate income families. Some more specific problems that individual respondents identified were as follows:

- The Head Start program needs improvement as some families, especially working mothers, do not qualify due to income.
- Middle-income families are left out of services.
- Community involvement activities are needed to promote healthy lifestyles like community gardens, support groups, social networks, and health and human services.
- Waiting lists for preschools made it so those that qualify still could not get their children enrolled.
- Education services are needed on discipline, nutrition, general health, medical help available, and dental care.

- Spanish-speaking assistance is not available.
- Program providers do not understand how to communicate with families about what is available to them.
- Postpartum home visits by health and social workers are needed or transportation for mothers and children to and from their postnatal visits.
- CAP needs more funding for its housing program.
- Healthcare is denied to undocumented residents.
- There are long waiting lists for special medical services.
- Employment opportunities are limited.
- Assistance to prevent eviction and utility service interruption needs more resources.
- Not enough dentists serve young children and dentists need better reimbursement by ACCCHS (Medicaid).

Information and Coordination

In general, most respondents did not feel that the agencies and programs available in their community coordinated their efforts and shared information adequately. However, the respondents provided some positive and negative feedback regarding the coordination of services. The positive feedback included the following:

- Behavioral Health Center communicates with the Town of Guadalupe.
- WIC makes referrals to other services when needed.
- Local media and outreach are effective.
- The best tool for coordination of efforts is through word-of-mouth referrals from the good services being provided.
- FTF and grants have helped, since services used to be more fragmented.

However, more often the respondents pointed out negative aspects of the communication and coordination of services for children five and under and their families in their communities. Specifically, the following list summarizes the negative feedback provided:

- Coordination between services for kids with special needs is poor.
- Coordination between CAP and Centro de Amistad services and other agencies could be improved.
- Potential recipients are not aware of what services are available in the community and not aware of how to receive primary health care, mental health services, and help from non-profit organizations.
- Collaboration between health centers providing maternal and infant health services and community centers/community health centers are not in place.
- Citizens do not have a one-stop community development corporation to improve coordination and communication.

- Competition over FTF funding has led to poor collaboration.

Suggestions and Ideas

Almost every respondent from the Central Maricopa Region suggested ideas related to educating families and providing community events and programs to promote healthy lifestyles. The specific suggestions regarding community outreach and education initiative were as follows:

- Educate families on developmental services available.
- Educate families on their critical role in child development and the need and importance of continuing medical care.
- Community centers should coordinate and promote services available.
- Provide a full-time community action agency.
- Relay information about maternal and infant health to families.
- Provide information about preventative dental care to families.
- Promote wellness information like fitness, nutrition, and safety.
- Provide classes on computer skills.

Since childcare was the most prominent problem that respondents identified in their communities, they suggested that financial assistance be provided for childcare, early education, and preschool programs. One respondent suggested that more FTF scholarships be granted in their community, and others stated that the quality of childcare could be improved through FTF programs. Still others suggested that preschool be provided to all families regardless of income.

About half of the respondents also suggested that health insurance and medical coverage be improved for families in their community. Although some said that free or modified medical insurance coverage should be provided for things like immunizations and asthma, others suggested that expanded availability of developmental therapy such as speech and occupational services are the most important health concerns. Two respondents stated that it would be a good idea to have post-partum home visits by health and social workers and transportation to postnatal visits. One respondent suggested the use of promotoras, or lay health workers, to provide basic medical education and services to families. Others suggested additional ACCCHS (Medicaid) funding. Finally, a dentist that participated thought that a raise in the amount of Medicaid reimbursement rates for preventative dental services was necessary.

Other individuals mentioned the following ideas for improving the lives of young children and families in the Central Maricopa Region:

- Programs need to be more accessible to the working poor.
- Change income requirements or fill funding gap for Head Start program.
- Agencies working more closely together to provide coordinated services, possibly through the use of parental liaisons and more coordination and collaboration about services available to families.
- Provide more transportation services, including to and from clinics and agencies.
- Provide more funding for CAP food donations and refrigeration.

- Provide more funding to grass roots organizations, instead of top-down government agencies to serve more people with available funding.
- Provide low-cost children's activities (like those provided by the YMCA that are costly) in multiple languages and with ways to include children with disabilities.
- Develop more volunteer-type services.
- Make clothing more affordable and accessible to parents.

APPENDIX C

ST. LUKE'S HEALTH INITIATIVES SURVEY RESULTS

In 2008, the Arizona Health Survey was completed by St. Luke's Health Initiatives. The survey included more than 4,000 households, which makes it one of the most extensive surveys ever undertaken in the state. The purpose of the survey was to help researchers, community leaders, and policy makers understand the health and well-being of Arizona citizens. The results can be used to create new opportunities for Arizona-specific policies, grants, planning, community engagement, and program development.


Our area of focus for this report is the child survey, which screened children between the ages of 0 and 12 years old. The adult member of the household with the most knowledge of the child's health was given the survey via telephone. Nearly 650 respondents answered this survey, primarily consisting of Maricopa County residents.

This section highlights a few of the survey questions and responses from these households with children.

Childcare Providers for a Child in a Typical Week


Respondents may choose more than one provider, so these numbers add to more than 100%.

Based on these survey results, the most common child care provider in a typical week was the child’s grandparent or other family member. Close behind is the number of children who received care from a pre-school.




Days Per Week You Read with Your Child

Studies have shown that reading to a child on a frequent basis is an important factor in their literary development. A majority of respondents reported reading to their child on a daily basis.




Time Since Last Medical Doctor Visit

Slightly disturbing is the relatively high percentage of children who have not visited a medical doctor within the last two years. A yearly check up is important in identifying health problems the child may have developed.




Reason Child Does Not Have Health Insurance

One of the most common reasons for a child not being covered by some type of health insurance was that it was too expensive. This is important because it highlights the need for affordable health insurance options, like KidsCare.




Reason Child is Not Enrolled in KidsCare

A relatively large percentage of children who were not enrolled in KidsCare had not been enrolled because their parent(s) didn't know the program existed. If the KidsCare program starts accepting applications again, this statistic verifies the importance of educating the public about this coverage.




Parents Concern About Their Child's Abilities Compared to Other Children Their Age

Most parents were not concerned at all about their child's abilities compared to other children their age. This does not necessarily mean all of those children are without problems; their parents may not recognize signs of developmental, behavioral or learning delays.



Time Since Last Dental Clinic Visit

The majority of respondents stated that their child had visited the dentist in the last six months. A good sign considering that good dental care is important for overall child health. However, one out of five respondents said their child has never been to the dentist, putting those children at risk for a range of health problems.



Reasons for Not Visiting the Dental Clinic

Of some concern is the rather large percentage of children who have not gone to the dentist because parents said their child was not old enough. The American Dental Association recommends that a child see the dentist for the first time within six months of the appearance of their first tooth or by their first birthday, whichever comes first.

