



FIRST THINGS FIRST

*Ready for School. Set for Life.*

# NEEDS AND ASSETS REPORT 2010



## SOUTHWEST MARICOPA

Regional Partnership Council



# SOUTHWEST MARICOPA


## Regional Partnership Council

---

### Council

Colleen Day, Chair  
Dr. Carlian W. Dawson, Vice Chair  
Patricia Avery-Schuster  
Mary Lou Chavez  
Susan D. Laurita  
Kelli Cordova Wright  
Kimberly R. Flack  
Debra Fonville-Williams  
Carol T Humble  
Marithe D. Sandoval  
David Schwake

18001 North 79th Avenue, Suite A-6  
Glendale, Arizona 85308  
Phone: 602.771.4960  
Fax: 623.486.0557  
[www.azftf.gov](http://www.azftf.gov)



# Contents

<b>Message from the Chair</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Introductory Summary and Acknowledgments</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>First Things First Southwest Maricopa Regional Partnership Council</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>7</b>
1.1 Overview of the Southwest Phoenix Region .....	7
1.2 Preliminary Analyses .....	7
1.3 Methodology .....	8
<b>2.0 THE FAMILIES AND CHILDREN LIVING IN THE SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b> .....	<b>11</b>
2.1 General Population Trends .....	11
2.2 Additional Population Characteristics .....	14
2.3 Economic Circumstances .....	19
2.4 Educational Indicators .....	23
<b>3.0 THE EARLY CHILDHOOD SYSTEM IN THE SOUTH PHOENIX REGION</b> .....	<b>24</b>
3.1 Early Care and Education .....	24
3.2 Supporting Families .....	31
3.3 Health .....	36
3.4 Public Awareness and Collaboration .....	44
3.5 Stakeholder Priority for Services .....	46
<b>4.0 SUMMARY AND FUTURE DIRECTION</b> .....	<b>48</b>
<b>APPENDIX A</b> .....	<b>51</b>
<b>APPENDIX B</b> .....	<b>123</b>
<b>APPENDIX C</b> .....	<b>129</b>

# Message from the Chair

---

August 17, 2010

Message from the Chair:

The past two years have been rewarding for the First Things First Southwest 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 by providing services and support for all children and families, i.e. expanding/enhancing family resource centers, offering comprehensive services including parenting education, early literacy development, implementing quality child care strategies and providing oral health and prevention information for parents and caregivers. The Regional Council will also continue to provide opportunities for a continued focus on improving the strength of family, friend and neighbor child care since it appears much child care in the region is informal.

Our strategic direction has been guided by the Needs and Assets reports specifically created for the Southwest 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 Southwest 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 Southwest Maricopa region. The new report will help guide our decisions as we move forward for young children and their families within the Southwest Maricopa region.

Going forward, the First Things First Southwest 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 within our region and throughout the entire State.

Thank you for your continued support.

Sincerely,



Colleen Day, Chair

Southwest Maricopa Regional Partnership Council

# Introductory Summary and Acknowledgments

## First Things First Southwest 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 Southwest Maricopa Region including the cities of Tolleson, Avondale, Litchfield Park, Goodyear, Buckeye, Gila Bend and Tonopah 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 in the Southwest Maricopa Region include access to free or low cost health services, support and resources for families, parent coaching and education, improved awareness among parents about early education needs and available services, the need for more social services and for services that meet basic needs, such as food and nutrition .

The First Things First Southwest 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 Regional Council's decisions and funding allocations,; while building a true comprehensive statewide early childhood system.

### **Acknowledgments:**

The First Things First Southwest 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 Southwest 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.

# 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 the Southwest Maricopa Region. 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 Reports is described in this section.

The focus of the report is the collection and meaningful analysis 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

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 and the 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 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. 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 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.

## **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.

## **Report Overview**

---

The Southwest Maricopa Region is largely a rural region with a number of small communities. The demographics of families with young children are mixed throughout the region.

In most of the region, median incomes are lower than in Maricopa County. Two-parent families living in Maricopa County have a median income of \$78,381. In the region, the median ranges from a low of \$65,539 in the Buckeye Elementary School District to a high of \$104,567 in the Liberty School District. Median incomes for families headed by a single mother are half or less of the median for two-parent families.

The region has many economic challenges. The unemployment rate in cities in the region more than doubled between 2005 and 2010, as it did for Maricopa County. In March 2010, the unemployment rates in Buckeye and Gila Bend were significantly higher than the countywide rate; the rest of the region had rates slightly below the countywide rate of 8.7 percent.

In January 2010, there were 1,043 children (five and younger) living in families receiving Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (welfare). This was a 33 percent increase from 2007 – a growth rate more than twice the countywide rate. The number of young children living in transitional or emergency shelters grew from 10 in 2007 to 27 in 2009 – a greater growth than observed in other Maricopa County First Things First regions.

The need for access to high quality, affordable childcare is strong throughout the region. In Maricopa County and the Pendergast School District, more than two-thirds of the households with children younger than 18 had all parents in the labor force – indicating a large need for childcare. Preschool enrollment is mixed in the region: particularly low in Buckeye, but higher than the countywide rate in the Litchfield and Pendergast School Districts and the cities of Avondale and Goodyear. The number of childcare providers accredited or recognized by a national organization rose from two in 2008 to seven in 2010; however, only 8 percent of licensed/certified providers in the region have national recognition for meeting specified quality standards.

State budget cuts are weakening the early childhood infrastructure in the region. In 2010, 280 four year old students were enrolled in preschool in the region through the state-funded Early Childhood Block Grant program. Due to budget cuts, that funding is no longer available. The number of children receiving subsidies for childcare dropped by 44 percent between 2009 and 2010, reflecting the state budget cuts that closed the door to any qualified, low-income working families who applied.

The input from the community through the online survey, stakeholder meetings, and telephone interviews all point to a great demand for quality improvements in childcare and financial assistance for parents needing childcare. More than half of the respondents to the online survey said that childcare services are not meeting the needs of families in the community, and 76 percent identified cost as the single most important barrier to childcare. Forty-five percent of respondents said that high quality childcare is a service that is missing in the region. The top recommendation in the survey for First Things First funding is to improve the quality of early childhood development and health programs.

There are notable challenges in the education system. Only 20 percent of schools in the region were Excelling or Highly Performing on the Arizona Learns profile, compared to 34 percent statewide; about 16 percent of the schools in the region were labeled as Underperforming, compared to fewer than 2 percent statewide.

Access to healthcare in the region has strengths and weaknesses. The region has rates of children without health insurance similar to the countywide rate of 16 percent. Over half of the respondents to the online survey said that access to free or low-cost health services is missing in the region. There were nine school-based clinics in the region in 2009 – a slight decrease since 2002, representing just over 10 percent of all school-based clinics in the state. The areas of Avondale, Tolleson, and Buckeye are considered to be medically underserved based on insufficient access to health providers.

There is racial and ethnic diversity in the region. The majority of young children in the region are Hispanic, with lower rates in the Liberty and Litchfield School Districts and the city of Goodyear. Parts of the region have higher rates of African American, young children than Maricopa County (Litchfield and Pendergast School Districts and the city of Avondale).

Fewer than 3 percent of young children in Maricopa County and in the region were born in other

countries. However, 37 percent of Maricopa County children younger than six have at least one foreign born parent. The percentages are lower in much of the Southwest Maricopa Region, with the exception of families living in Pendergast and Avondale Elementary School Districts (49% and 39%, respectively).

In Maricopa County, 9 percent of children younger than six live in a household headed by their grandparents. The rates are lower in Littleton and Litchfield School Districts, but just above 10 percent in the Avondale and Pendergast School Districts. About four in 10 of the respondents identified support for grandparents raising grandchildren, resources that support families, and parent coaching and education as services that are currently missing.

Community members value many assets in the region, including the Kith and Kin program, public libraries, the home-based nurse visitation program, Quality First, WIC, family literacy programs, the Women's Health Coalition, and emergency childcare scholarships. The Care 1st Resource Center in Avondale was specifically pointed out as a model for collaboration and for the convenient and comfortable delivery of multiple services.

Community members emphasized a need to improve awareness among parents about early education needs and available services. Currently, there is not enough information or communication about available services.

Community input also identified the need for more social services and for services that meet basic needs, such as food and nutrition. Four out of 10 survey respondents stated that social services are not meeting the needs of young children and their families in the region, and half said there are not enough social services.

# 1.0 Introduction

## 1.1 Overview of the Southwest Phoenix Region

---

The First Things First Southwest Maricopa Region is predominately a rural area of 4,325 square miles. This region is geographically the largest area in Maricopa County, extending across the Sonoran Desert to Yuma, Pima, and Pinal counties. Almost half of Maricopa County's land area is located in the Southwest region. The majority of residents reside in a string of suburban communities: Tolleson, Avondale, Litchfield Park, Liberty, Goodyear, and Buckeye, which are adjacent to west Phoenix. Additionally, the remote communities of Gila Bend, Palo Verde, and Tonopah are in this region.

## 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 Early Childcare and Education

The presence of a significant number of Head Start centers and home visiting programs demonstrates the community's interest in its low-income families, especially for those who might not have transportation to a childcare center. Community forums reported that the public schools in the region work well together, as well as with Head Start, to provide a complete education to children in the region. At the forums, citizens also stressed that the region's education is one of the top priorities of the community, and that quality education and childcare are crucial to having successful growth and development in their rapidly expanding cities.

### 1.2.2 Family Support

Even though the cities of the Southwest Maricopa Region are relatively young communities, people report having a strong sense of community and possess a great deal of concern for improving services. The strength of the communities is demonstrated by their desire to continue to build on what they have and to continue to make their community better.

### 1.2.3 Additional Needs

The number of social and educational services accessible to different areas of the region is variable. Like many regions of Maricopa County, access and the quantity of social services are the main issues in the Southwest Maricopa Region. The region continues to grow, yet the amount of social services, schools, and community centers have not kept pace. Even when new programs or services are created, there is difficulty in publicizing information to residents regarding the new services. Members of the community continue to stress the need for an available "clearinghouse"

of information, where people in need of a service can visit one website or one agency location to receive information and referrals for childcare, healthcare, and educational services. This type of system would also help the region see what programs are lacking most and where improvements are most necessary. Overall, community members want their communities to be safer with lower crime rates and to provide more complete support services, including emergency assistance programs and domestic violence centers for families in need.

## 1.3 Methodology

---

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

The focus of the report is the collection and meaningful analysis 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.

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 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 more than 4,000 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.

FTF provided MGT with 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 that they served, and many indicated that they serve communities across multiple regions.

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. Seventy respondents provided survey input about the Southwest 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 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 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 insufficient (too small) to allow for reliable estimation; therefore, localities depicted for respective analyses will vary from exhibit to exhibit.

In addition to national, state, and county-level data, geographies available through the ACS at the sub-FTE regional level include cities, towns, Unified School Districts, Elementary School Districts, and High School Districts. Note that the demographic statistics associated with school districts do not apply specifically to enrollment in these systems, but cover all residents living within the geographic boundaries.

## 2.0 THE FAMILIES AND CHILDREN LIVING IN THE SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION

This chapter presents data and analysis regarding families and children living in the region.

### 2.1 General Population Trends

**Exhibit 2-1** presents an analysis of the population of children age five and under. As shown:

- The percentage of the population that is under the age of five within localities in this region is higher than the percentage of children in the county, state, and nation.

#### EXHIBIT 2-1

##### PERCENTAGE, NUMBER, AND CHANGE IN POPULATION (UNDER 5)

AREA	POPULATION 0 TO 4 YEARS		
	MOST RECENT DATA	PERCENT OF TOTAL POPULATION (ALL AGES)	3-YEAR TREND
Avondale Elementary District	5,380	12.6%	*
Buckeye Elementary District	3,568	11.5%	*
Liberty Elementary District	2,169	8.7%	*
Litchfield Elementary District	5,461	8.7%	*
Littleton Elementary District	3,630	11.5%	*
Pendergast Elementary District	6,869	9.8%	*
Avondale City	7,368	10.5%	6.3%
Buckeye Town	4,414	11.9%	*
Goodyear City	6,050	9.9%	*
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.

\* Indicates sample size was too small to estimate specific demographic component.

**Exhibit 2-2** presents data relevant to the diversity of the population of children under five.

- The Litchfield Elementary and Pendergast Elementary School Districts and the city of Avondale have higher proportions of young African Americans than in Maricopa County or the state.
- More than six out of 10 children under five in the Avondale, Littleton, and Pendergast Elementary Districts are Hispanic or Latino, compared to fewer than five out of 10 countywide.

## EXHIBIT 2-2

## RACE AND ETHNICITY OF CHILDREN (UNDER 5)

AREA	PERCENT AGE 0 TO 4 YEARS (MOST RECENT DATA)					PERCENT CHANGE			
	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)
Cartwright Elementary District	71.2%	3.3%	*	25.5%	88.1%	57.7%	*	*	1.7%
Fowler Elementary District	83.0%	*	*	17.0%	88.1%	*	*	*	*
Isaac Elementary District	78.1%	*	*	21.9%	95.2%	*	*	*	*
Laveen Elementary District	64.3%	15.8%	*	19.9%	51.6%	*	*	*	*
Pendergast Elementary District	70.7%	9.4%	*	20.0%	67.5%	*	*	*	*
Roosevelt Elementary District	64.6%	10.5%	*	24.8%	75.2%	-12.1%	34.3%	*	-16.9%
Phoenix City	70.4%	6.2%	2.2%	21.2%	61.7%	28.0%	103.7%	-28.1%	13.6%
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 sample size was too small to estimate specific demographic component.

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

- The percentage of children under six who were born outside the U.S. in the Pendergast Elementary District and the city of Avondale was lower than Maricopa County (2.8%).

## EXHIBIT 2-3

### CHILDREN UNDER SIX WHO ARE FOREIGN BORN

AREA	PERCENT OF CHILDREN UNDER AGE 6
	MOST RECENT DATA
Pendergast Elementary District	2.3%
Avondale City, Arizona	2.7%
Maricopa County, Arizona	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:

- The percentage of children under six with at least one foreign born parent in the Pendergast Elementary District (49.0%) was higher than those of Maricopa County (36.6%) and Arizona (31.7%).
- The rates of children with at least one foreign born parent which are also below the county wide rate include the Buckeye and Litchfield Elementary Districts and in the cities of Avondale and Buckeye.

## EXHIBIT 2-4

### CHILDREN UNDER SIX WITH AT LEAST ONE FOREIGN BORN PARENT

AREA	PERCENT OF CHILDREN UNDER AGE 6
	MOST RECENT DATA
Avondale Elementary District	39.2%
Buckeye Elementary District	27.4%
Litchfield Elementary District	25.0%
Littleton Elementary District	34.5%
Pendergast Elementary District	49.0%
Avondale City	31.9%
Buckeye Town	27.2%
Goodyear City	27.7%
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 about 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 and Asian or Pacific Islander 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	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>62,232</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>7.3%</b>	<b>88.4%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>62,667</b>	<b>0.15%</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>7.3%</b>	<b>88.5%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
	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	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>95,798</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>7.9%</b>	<b>87.5%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>99,215</b>	<b>0.16%</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>7.9%</b>	<b>87.7%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
	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 relevant to the diversity of the population being served. As shown:

- The Pendergast Elementary District has a higher proportion of single parent households with young children than Maricopa County and the state.

**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)
Pendergast Elementary District	60.2%	17.9%	22.0%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
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 region has lower rates of children under the age of six who are living with their grandparents than the state. The Littleton and Litchfield Elementary Districts have lower rates, whereas the Avondale and Pendergast Elementary Districts report rates close to the 9 percent rate in Maricopa County.

## EXHIBIT 2-7

### CHILDREN UNDER THE AGE OF SIX LIVING WITH GRANDPARENTS

AREA	PERCENT OF CHILDREN UNDER AGE 6
	MOST RECENT DATA
Cartwright Elementary District	13.7%
Isaac Elementary District	16.9%
Laveen Elementary District	11.3%
Pendergast Elementary District	10.5%
Roosevelt Elementary District	22.2%
Phoenix City	10.1%
Maricopa County	9.0%
Arizona	11.2%
United States	9.6%

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

**Exhibit 2-8** shows data on educational levels of mothers who gave birth within the last 12 months. As shown:

- The region has a higher rate of babies born to mothers who have some college education compared to Maricopa County.
- More than half of the babies born in the region had mothers who attained a high school education or less, similar to the countywide rate.

## 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	
Liberty Elementary District	7.8%	*	34.1%	*	38.3%	*	*	*	*	*	*
Litchfield Elementary District	*	*	24.7%	*	39.2%	*	21.8%	*	*	*	*
Littleton Elementary District	23.3%	*	31.9%	*	24.5%	*	*	*	*	*	*
Pendergast Elementary District	26.1%	*	42.4%	*	17.1%	*	11.5%	*	*	*	*
Avondale City	28.2%	-23.8%	27.3%	82.1%	25.9%	*	*	*	*	*	*
Buckeye Town	13.9%	*	*	*	37.7%	*	16.3%	*	*	*	*
Goodyear City	*	*	15.8%	*	39.7%	*	*	*	*	*	*
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 all parents in the home are employed or seeking employment, indicating a likely need for childcare. As shown:

- More than two-thirds of the households with children in the Pendergast Elementary District, Maricopa County, and Arizona have all parents in the labor force.

## 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
Pendergast Elementary District	69.1%	*
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**:

- Almost three out of every four single mothers in the Littleton Elementary District and two out of every three in the Litchfield Elementary District and the city of Avondale were in the labor force.
- Rates in the rest of the region were similar to the countywide rate of 55 percent.

## EXHIBIT 2-10

### SINGLE MOTHERS IN THE WORKFORCE

AREA	PERCENT OF SINGLE MOTHERS IN THE WORKFORCE**
	MOST RECENT DATA
Avondale Elementary District	54.9%
Liberty Elementary District	56.5%
Litchfield Elementary District	65.9%
Littleton Elementary District	72.1%
Pendergast Elementary District	57.0%
Avondale City	65.9%
Goodyear City	59.7%
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, as shown in **Exhibit 2-11**.

- Slightly more than 4 percent of households in Buckeye were considered to be linguistically isolated.
- Trend data are not available for specific areas; however, there has been a decline throughout the county and state.

## EXHIBIT 2-11

### LINGUISTIC ISOLATION OF HOUSEHOLDS

AREA	PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS LINGUISTICALLY ISOLATED	
	MOST RECENT DATA	3-YEAR TREND
Buckeye Town	4.4%	*
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 2-12** and **2-13**:

- **Exhibit 2-12** shows that from January-June 2007 to January-June 2009, the number of unemployment insurance claimants in the Southwest Maricopa Region more than tripled, a greater increase than elsewhere in the county and substantially larger than across the state.

## EXHIBIT 2-13

### NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS CLAIMING UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

AREA	JANUARY-JUNE 2007	JANUARY-JUNE 2009	PERCENT CHANGE
Southwest Maricopa	2,753	9,535	246.3%
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** shows that unemployment rates in Maricopa County and the cities and towns in the Southwest Maricopa Region more than doubled between 2005 and 2010.

## EXHIBIT 2-13

### UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

AREA	TOTAL EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS MARCH 2010	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE MARCH 2005	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE MARCH 2010	UNEMPLOYMENT PERCENT CHANGE
Avondale	35,361	4.0%	8.4%	110.0%
Buckeye	11,489	5.3%	11.0%	107.5%
Gila Bend	936	7.1%	14.4%	102.8%
Goodyear	21,445	3.0%	6.3%	110.0%
Litchfield Park	2,089	3.8%	8.1%	113.2%
Tolleson	2,768	4.1%	8.6%	109.8%
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 five) who are homeless and living in transitional or emergency shelters in Maricopa County. The exhibit includes children whose last permanent address was in the Southwest Maricopa Region. As shown:

- The number of homeless children in the Southwest Maricopa Region increased dramatically between 2007 and 2009.

## EXHIBIT 2-14

### HOMELESS CHILDREN LIVING IN SHELTERS

AREA	HOMELESS CHILDREN AGE 0 TO 5		
	2007	2009	PERCENT CHANGE
Southwest Maricopa	10	27	170.0%
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 under 18. As shown:

- Four out of the six school districts in this region had lower median incomes for the married couples than the state, county, and national median incomes.
- Median incomes in the city of Avondale have been growing dramatically compared to Maricopa County.

**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
Avondale Elementary District	\$70,299	*	\$24,679	*	\$21,964	*
Buckeye Elementary District	\$65,539	*	\$39,848	*	\$20,375	*
Liberty Elementary District	\$104,576	*	\$22,309	*	\$62,054	*
Litchfield Elementary District	\$87,399	*	\$70,072	*	\$34,596	*
Littleton Elementary District	\$65,602	*	\$63,382	*	\$32,125	*
Pendergast Elementary District	\$66,750	*	\$37,120	*	\$45,344	*
Avondale City	\$73,690	23.5%	\$60,017	118.2%	\$38,254	69.9%
Buckeye Town	\$76,208	*	\$38,258	*	\$28,250	*
Goodyear City	\$94,047	*	\$24,783	*	\$26,500	*
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.  
 \* indicates sample size too small to estimate specific demographic component.

Federal Poverty Level (FPL) guidelines vary by the size of the 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 in 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** shows poverty rates for families with young children. As shown:

- All of the localities for which data were available in this region reported lower incidences of poverty than county or statewide benchmarks.

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
Avondale Elementary District	*	*	*	*	7.4%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Litchfield Elementary District	*	*	*	*	6.5%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Pendergast Elementary District	5.7%	*	*	*	6.2%	*	*	*	*	26.9%	26.1%	*
Avondale City	9.5%	*	*	14.0%	8.4%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Buckeye Town	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Goodyear City	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
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 sample size was too small to estimate specific demographic component.

## 2.4 Educational Indicators

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

- The proportion of schools rated as Excelling in the Southwest Maricopa Region was only about 9 percent, as compared to 22 percent statewide.
- The percentage of schools Underperforming in this region is almost eight times higher than the statewide average.

### EXHIBIT 2-18

#### 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
Southwest Maricopa	8.9%	11.1%	33.3%	31.1%	15.6%	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.

### Section Summary

The region has a large percentage of young children in its population. There is also strong diversity in the region, with high percentages of African American and Hispanic young children. This indicates the need for cultural competence in the strategies and grantees of the region. There is great variation within the region for other demographic characteristics, such as the percentage of young children with at least one foreign born parent and the percentage of young children being raised by their grandparents. Median incomes also vary within the region. The effect of the economic recession on families is demonstrated by the substantial increase in the number of adults claiming unemployment insurance.

## 3.0 THE EARLY CHILDHOOD SYSTEM IN THE SOUTH PHOENIX REGION

### 3.1 Early Care and Education

**Exhibit 3-1** shows data related to the Child Care Resource and Referral (CCR&R) Program. As shown:

- The number of centers, the total capacity of these centers, and the capacity per center all increased between 2008 and 2010.

#### EXHIBIT 3-1

##### CHILD CARE RESOURCE AND REFERRAL SUMMARY STATISTICS

SOUTHWEST MARICOPA	2008	2010	PERCENT CHANGE
Number of Providers	103	143	38.8%
<b>TOTAL CAPACITY</b>	<b>4,177</b>	<b>7,561</b>	<b>81.0%</b>
Capacity per Provider	40.5	52.8	30.3%

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. Licensed centers include only Department of Health Services (DHS) licensed programs that provide fee-paying childcare services. DHS group homes have a 10 child maximum. The Department of Economic Security (DES) certified family childcare homes are approved to provide care or participate in the childcare food program. This exhibit displays the number of childcare providers that are regulated by the State. DHS licenses and inspects childcare centers, and also certifies home-based childcare businesses with five to 10 children, called "childcare group homes." 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:

- There was a decrease of 53 DES certified homes in the region between 2008 and 2010 – a 69 percent decline.

#### EXHIBIT 3-2

##### NUMBER OF LICENSED/CERTIFIED CENTERS/HOMES

AREA	DHS LICENSED CENTERS	DES CERTIFIED HOMES	GROUP HOMES	TOTAL
Southwest Maricopa 2008	51	77	9	137
Southwest Maricopa 2010	51	24	15	90
2008-10 Change	0	-53	6	-47

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:**

- ECBG preschool enrollment doubled for the region during this period (from 140 students to 280).
- Four school districts in this region relied on ECBG funding for preschool classes in 2010.

### 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
Liberty Elementary District	N/A	N/A	40	44.4%	N/A
Litchfield Elementary District	60	100.0%	90	100.0%	50.0%
Littleton Elementary District	20	100.0%	0	N/A	-100.0%
Pendergast Elementary District	60	100.0%	60	24.0%	0.0%
Saddle Mountain Unified School District	0	0.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tolleson Elementary School District	N/A	N/A	90	100.0%	N/A
SUM, Regional Districts	140	77.8%	280	53.8%	100.0%

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 being enrolled in a nursery, preschool, or kindergarten program. As shown:

- Enrollment rates varied across the region.
- Litchfield Elementary District had the highest enrollment per 1,000 children in the region, higher than the county and state. The Buckeye Elementary District and the town of Buckeye had lower enrollment rates than the county.

#### 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
Avondale Elementary District	293
Buckeye Elementary District	195
Litchfield Elementary District	345
Littleton Elementary District	222
Pendergast Elementary District	316
Avondale City	322
Buckeye Town	161
Goodyear City	339
Maricopa County	308
Arizona	314

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 (FPL; see definition in **Section 2.3**).

- Seventeen percent of the children enrolled in preschool in Maricopa County live in poor families. The rate was similar through most of the Southwest Maricopa Region.

## 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
Avondale Elementary District	16.2%	*
Buckeye Elementary District	7.1%	*
Liberty Elementary District	3.0%	*
Litchfield Elementary District	13.3%	*
Littleton Elementary District	16.2%	*
Pendergast Elementary District	19.2%	*
Avondale City	18.1%	31.0%
Buckeye Town	6.9%	*
Goodyear City	8.4%	*
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 quality of childcare available in the region. As shown:

- In the Southwest Maricopa Region, the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), the Association Montessori Internationale (AMI), and the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) each accredited/ recognized two area providers.
- The number of recognized providers increased by five across the region.
- Even with this increase, the percentage of all regulated providers that had a national recognition was only 8 percent.

## 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	0	1	0	0	2	0.02
2010	2	0	2	1	2	0	0	7	0.08
2008-10 Change	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	5	0.07

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 survey completed by early care and development stakeholders in the Southwest Maricopa Region. The survey was designed to identify the extent to which community needs are being met, the effects of budget cuts on service provision, services that may be lacking, and barriers to services. Survey topics included childcare, education, literacy development, special needs, health services, and social services. **Appendix A** provides survey response rates for each survey item within each section of the survey, while a summary of key survey findings directly related to early care and education is presented in this section of the report. Group meetings and personal interviews were also conducted throughout the Southeast Maricopa Region, which provided supplemental data to further explore early childcare and development topics. Summaries of the group meetings and personal interviews can be found in **Appendix B**.

Respondents rated (on a scale from Excellent to Very Poor) the extent to which services met the needs of children (birth through age five) and their families within their community for four areas specifically related to early care and education. **Exhibit 3-7** shows the percentage of responses within the region indicating that needs were well met (provided a rating of Good to Excellent) and the percentage reporting that needs were not well met (provided a rating of Poor or Very Poor). Needs were least met in the areas of childcare. Similarly, affordable and quality childcare was cited by group meeting and interview participants as an important area of need. Participants also indicated that services for children with special needs and disabilities were lacking.

## EXHIBIT 3-7

### MEETING EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION NEEDS

SERVICE AREAS	GOOD TO EXCELLENT	POOR OR VERY POOR
Childcare	37.0%	51.8%
Educational Services	50.0%	20.3%
Child/Family Literacy Development	54.9%	13.5%
Special Needs	39.9%	32.3%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.  
Total number of responses ranged from 111 to 170 across areas.

### 3.1.1 Barriers

Survey respondents were also asked to select the single most important barrier to children and families receiving services. Cost of childcare services was by far the most cited barrier in any of the services. **Exhibit 3-8** shows the most frequent responses. Group meeting and interview participants also mentioned the cost of childcare as a barrier, as well as transportation, language and cultural barriers, lack of family awareness of services, lack of provider knowledge of services, and lack of trust by families.

## EXHIBIT 3-8

### SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION BARRIERS

SERVICE AREAS	SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT BARRIER
Childcare	Cost (75.9%)
Educational Services	Awareness (27.2%) and Cost (26.6%)
Child/Family Literacy Development	Awareness (46.8%)
Special Needs	Not Enough Services (39.8%)

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.  
Total number of responses ranged from 111 to 170 across areas.

### 3.1.2 Budget Cuts

Survey respondents were asked to rate the effect 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 areas surveyed. As shown in **Exhibit 3-9**, most respondents indicated that budget cuts had a high or very high impact on services. Almost unanimously, respondent felt that budget cuts had a high or very high impact on childcare services.

#### EXHIBIT 3-9

##### IMPACT OF BUDGET CUTS TO EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION AREAS

SERVICE AREAS	HIGH/VERY HIGH IMPACT
Childcare	90.5%
Educational Services	62.0%
Child/Family Literacy Development	58.5%
Special Needs	66.9%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.

Total number of responses ranged from 111 to 170 across areas.

### 3.1.3 Missing Services

Survey respondents indicated which early care and education services were missing from their community. **Exhibit 3-10** shows that the most frequently cited missing service was childcare subsidies, followed by high quality childcare.

#### EXHIBIT 3-10

##### MISSING EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION SERVICES

MISSING EDUCATIONAL SERVICE AREAS	PERCENT MISSING
Early childhood literacy programs	41.1%
High quality childcare	45.2%
High quality childcare that provides alternative hours of operation	41.1%
Childcare subsidies	47.9%
Pre-Kindergarten	35.6%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.

Total number of responses was 73.

Organizations providing leadership and services in the Southwest Maricopa Region serve as assets within the community. Survey participants identified assets in the form of key organizations that provide strong leadership within their community for the provision of early care and education services. These organizations are included in **Exhibit 3-11**.

## EXHIBIT 3-11

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

A Stepping Stone Foundation	Arizona State University
Arizona Department of Education	LIFE
Arizona Early Intervention Program	Maricopa County
Arizona Literacy and Learning Center	Maricopa County Libraries
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Public Libraries
AZA United	Public Schools
AZAAP	Quality First
Blake Foundation	Raising Special Kids
Buckeye Town Library	Reach Out and Read
Central AZ College	Reading in Fundamental
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	Rise
City of Avondale	SARRC
Department of Economic Security	School Districts
First Things First	SEEK
Guthrie Mainstream	Southwest Human Development
H.O.P.E. Group	Unlimited Potential in South Phoenix
Head Start	Valley of the Sun United Way
Healthy Steps	YMCA
Leaps and Bounds; Pre-kindergarten readiness program,	

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

### Section Summary

The quality of the early care education system shows progress, with more providers earning a national recognition for meeting specified quality standards. However, the percentage of providers with a national recognition remains very low and the number of home-based childcare businesses certified by the state Department of Economic Security dropped significantly between 2008 and 2010. The regional strategy to support Family, Friend, and Neighbor Care is well suited to promote greater strength in the informal childcare system. Preschool enrollment varies widely in the region. Rates are particularly low in Buckeye and the Littleton and Avondale Elementary School Districts. The cost of childcare emerged as a top barrier to quality early childhood services in the online survey. More than half the respondents said that childcare needs are not met in the region. This could support additional regional strategies to expand the availability and improve the affordability of quality childcare.

## 3.2 Supporting Families

**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 them. As shown:

- The Southwest Maricopa Region saw a large increase in the number of very poor young children receiving TANF welfare benefits. The increase was more than double 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
Southwest Maricopa	785	1,043	32.87%	634	798	25.87%
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 Child Care 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 needs. The value of the voucher, however, is still based on the actual costs of childcare in 2000, and parents and providers have to pay 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:

- There was a 44 percent decline in the number of children in the region receiving childcare subsidies, larger than the decrease statewide.

### 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
Southwest Maricopa	2,801	4,031	772	1,074	1,721	2,512	433	603
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, offers familiarity and less stress for the child, and gives the child the ability to visit with parents and siblings. This exhibit compares by ZIP code the number of children removed from their homes versus the availability of foster homes. Each ZIP code is labeled as having a shortage or balance of foster homes. As shown:

- Overall, there is a large shortage of available foster homes relative to the number of children removed from their homes in the region. However, this shortage is not as large as the shortage in many of the FTF regions in Maricopa County.
- The (85323) ZIP code in the city of Avondale, near Agua Fria High School, had the largest number of removals and also the most severe shortage of available foster homes for these removals.

#### EXHIBIT 3-14

#### AVAILABILITY OF FOSTER HOME PLACEMENTS AS RELATED TO CHILD REMOVALS IN THE SOUTH PHOENIX 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
85309	0	0	0	0	No children removed
85322	0	0	0	0	No children removed
85323	111	17	63	-46	Very large shortage of foster homes
85326	84	35	51	-16	Shortage of foster homes
85337	0	0	0	0	No children removed
85338	95	48	68	-20	Large shortage of foster homes
85340	31	18	25	-7	Shortage of foster homes
85343	0	0	0	0	No children removed
85353	81	29	40	-11	Shortage of foster homes
85354	8	4	7	-3	Shortage of foster homes
85392	37	27	24	3	Foster homes exceed children
85395	5	13	2	11	Foster homes exceed children
85396	19	12	14	-2	Balance of foster homes and children
<b>SOUTHWEST MARICOPA TOTAL</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>-91</b>	

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. As shown:

- There were insufficient data available for 2005. Therefore, it was not possible to see the growth or decline of WIC participation in this region; however, nearly 5,000 children participated in the program during 2009.

## EXHIBIT 3-15

### WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC) PARTICIPATION

AREA	2005		2009		PERCENT CHANGE 2005-09	
	WOMEN	CHILDREN	WOMEN	CHILDREN	WOMEN	CHILDREN
Southwest Maricopa	N/A	N/A	2,804	4,912	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 children (birth through age five) and their families for three related areas. Exhibit 3-16 shows the percentage of responses within the region indicating that needs were well met (provided a rating of Good to Excellent) and the percentage reporting that needs were not well met (provided a rating of Poor or Very Poor). Needs were least met in the area of social services. Group meeting participants also mentioned social services as a need area.

## EXHIBIT 3-16

### MEETING NEEDS FOR FAMILY SUPPORT

SERVICE AREAS	GOOD TO EXCELLENT	POOR OR VERY POOR
Parenting Support/Education	35.0%	28.0%
Child/Family Literacy Development	54.9%	13.5%
Social Services	35.8%	39.5%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.  
Total number of responses ranged from 129 to 150 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 having 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 (57.0%)
Child/Family Literacy Development	Awareness (46.8%)
Social Services	Not enough services (50.6%)

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.  
Total number of responses ranged from 129 to 150 across areas.

### 3.2.2 Budget Cuts

Survey respondents rated the effect 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. As 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	56.0%
Child/Family Literacy Development	58.5%
Social Services	77.8%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.

Total number of responses ranged from 129 to 150 across areas

### 3.2.3 Missing Services

Survey respondents indicated which family support services were missing from their community. Shown in **Exhibit 3-19**, 42 percent of the respondents felt that support for grandparents raising grandchildren was missing or unavailable within their community. Group meeting participants indicated that grandparenting programs and parent education and training programs were lacking in the community.

#### EXHIBIT 3-19

##### MISSING FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES

MISSING FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICE AREAS	PERCENT MISSING
Support for grandparents raising grandchildren	42.2%
Parent coaching/education	38.6%
Support and education programs for parent and parenting teens	26.5%
Accessibility to resources that support families with young children	39.8%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.

Total number of responses ranged from 129 to 150 across areas.

Organizations providing leadership and services within the Southwest Maricopa Region serve as assets within the community. Survey participants identified assets in the form of key organizations that provide strong leadership within their community for the provision of family support services. These organizations are included in **Exhibit 3-20**.

## EXHIBIT 3-210

## ORGANIZATIONS OFFERING STRONG LEADERSHIP IN THE AREA OF FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	NASW
AZIP	PAFCO
Catholic Charities- Head start	Parenting Arizona
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	Quality First
Child Crisis Center	Raising Special Kids
City of Avondale Care First Resource Center	SARRC
CPS	School District Parenting Support Education
First Things First	School Districts
GALA	Southwest Human Development
Head Start	Teen Outreach Pregnancy Services
Leaps and Bounds; Prekindergarten readiness program, Arizona State University	University of Arizona Cooperative Extension
Maricopa County	Valley of the Sun United Way
Maricopa County Department of Public Health	YMCA

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

### Section Summary

Family stresses in the region are evident through the large increase in very poor young children receiving TANF benefits. The family resource center strategies in the region can help to strengthen families. While parts of the region have high rates of young children being raised by their grandparents, four out of 10 respondents to the online survey stated that support for these families is a missing service in the region. To address this, the region could consider focusing some of the family resource strategies on families headed by grandparents.

## 3.3 Health

Additional information is available in **Appendix C** related to data captured during the 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 preventative and primary care.
- Are more likely to have well-child visits and 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 rate of uninsured children in the region is similar to the countywide rate of 16 percent.
- Nearly one in three children living in the Pendergast Elementary School District relies on public health coverage (such as KidsCare or AHCCCS). The rate is much lower in Avondale.

### 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
Pendergast Elementary District	55.6%	31.5%	15.4%
Avondale City	67.5%	18.2%	16.2%
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 the percentages of births paid for with public funds, either by AHCCCS or Indian Health Service. Births are covered by AHCCCS for women meeting certain income qualifications. As shown:

- Litchfield Park shows the largest increase (43%) in public payer births, which is substantially higher than the county or state average (2.0% and 1.1%, respectively).
- Despite a decrease in the percentage of births paid by public payers between 2006 and 2008, over 80 percent of the births in Gila Bend were paid by the public.

### EXHIBIT 3-22

#### PERCENTAGE OF BIRTHS PAID BY PUBLIC HEALTH INSURANCE

AREA	PERCENT OF PUBLIC PAYER BIRTHS**		
	2006	2008	PERCENT CHANGE
Avondale	50.2%	54.6%	8.8%
Buckeye	43.5%	45.7%	4.9%
Gila Bend	86.4%	80.3%	-7.1%
Goodyear	28.8%	31.6%	10.0%
Litchfield Park	24.1%	34.4%	43.0%
Tolleson	49.1%	53.5%	9.0%
Tonopah	68.9%	69.3%	0.6%
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 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.

### 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 who receive the 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 Southwest Maricopa Region are similar to countywide rates.
- Overall, immunization rates in the region dropped between 2005 and 2009. However, there was a significant increase in immunization rates for the pneumococcal conjugate vaccine that prevents 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
Southwest Maricopa	70%	66%	-6%
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
Southwest Maricopa	43%	36%	-16%
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
Southwest Maricopa	23%	32%	41%
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 six with disabilities and those with disabilities who live in families with incomes below the Federal Poverty Level (FPL; see definition in **Section 2.3**). As shown:

- Approximately 0.8 percent of Maricopa County children under six have disabilities, compared to 0.7 percent in the city of Phoenix.
- A large proportion of the young children with disabilities live in poor families.

### EXHIBIT 3-26

#### CHILDREN UNDER 5 WITH DISABILITIES TOTAL PERCENTAGE AND PERCENTAGE BELOW FEDERAL POVERTY LEVEL (FPL)

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 fare better than those children who receive a late or no diagnosis. As shown in **Exhibit 3-27**:

- From 2006-07 to 2008-09, the number of children served by the Arizona Early Intervention Program (AZEIP) in the Southwest Maricopa Region increased from 54 to 71, an increase of more than 31 percent. The number of children served by AZEIP also increased for Arizona from 3,450 to 5,078, an increase of 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
Southwest Maricopa	54	71	31.5%
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 can improve a child's health. As shown in **Exhibit 3-28**:

- A majority of children under five in this region have regular visits with the same dental provider.
- 67 percent of parents in the Southwest Maricopa Region drive 10 miles or less for their child's dental care.

### EXHIBIT 3-28

#### ORAL HEALTH CARE CHILDREN (0 - 5)

<b>MY CHILD/CHILDREN AGE 5 AND UNDER HAVE REGULAR VISITS WITH THE SAME DENTAL PROVIDER.</b>	<b>SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>STATEWIDE</b>	<b>DIFFERENCE</b>
Strongly agree	59.7%	62.5%	-4.4%
Somewhat agree	9.9%	9.1%	8.4%
Somewhat disagree	7.7%	5.6%	39.2%
Strongly disagree	14.1%	13.1%	7.6%
Not sure	8.6%	9.8%	-11.9%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>.0%</b>
<b>HOW MANY MILES DO YOU HAVE TO GO TO GET DENTAL CARE FOR YOUR CHILDREN AGE 5 AND UNDER?</b>	<b>SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>STATEWIDE</b>	<b>DIFFERENCE</b>
Less than 5 miles	39.5%	39.8%	<b>-0.8%</b>
5-10 miles	27.5%	23.6%	<b>16.5%</b>
10-20 miles	10.0%	13.5%	<b>-25.5%</b>
More than 20 miles	13.7%	12.8%	<b>7.2%</b>
None available	9.3%	10.3%	<b>-10.3%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>.0%</b>

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

**Exhibits 3-29** and **3-30** present data regarding services available for those families who have children that do not have health insurance. As shown:

- Arizona had a total of 659 Sliding Fee Clinics available, with 264 clinics residing in Maricopa County.
- The Southwest Maricopa Region reported a total of 31 clinics in 2010.
- In 2009, there were nine school-based clinics in the region while there were 82 statewide.

### EXHIBIT 3-29

#### NUMBER OF SLIDING FEE SCALE CLINICS

<b>AREA</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>PERCENT CHANGE</b>
Southwest Maricopa	N/A	31	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

## NUMBER OF SCHOOL-BASED CLINICS

AREA	2002	2009	PERCENT CHANGE
Southwest Maricopa	10	9	-10.0%
Arizona	97	82	-15.5%
Percent of State Total	10.3%	11.0%	6.8%

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 region. As shown:

- There are two hospitals located in the Southwest Maricopa Region, both of which are located in the city of Goodyear.

## EXHIBIT 3-31

## AREA HOSPITALS

HOSPITAL	CITY	ZIP CODE
West Valley Hospital	Goodyear	85395
Western Regional Medical Center	Goodyear	85338

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

**Exhibit 3-32** depicts the number of Medically Underserved Areas (MUAs) and Health Professional Shortage Areas (HPSAs) for the Southwest Maricopa Region. Note that the names associated with Primary Care Areas may not be instructive as to the precise geographies that are encompassed: in order 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:

- Three of the four primary care areas are designated as medically underserved areas and have health professional shortages.
- Two of the four primary care areas are listed by the federal government as medically underserved.

## 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 <sup>^</sup>
Avondale/Tolleson	26	Population Group Low Income (Avondale/Tolleson)	Population Group Low Income (Avondale/Tolleson)	MUP Low Income	59.6
Buckeye	38	Geographic (Buckeye)	Geographic (Buckeye)	No	
Gila Bend	24	Geographic (Gila Bend)	Geographic (Gila Bend)	MUA	57.1
Litchfield Park	6	No	No	No	

Source: Arizona Department of Health Services.

\*Higher Primary Care Scores indicate more severe 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>.

\*\*Higher MUA/P scores indicate greater levels of medical underservice (or less severe underservice). 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/muaguide.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 (birth through age five) and their families within their community. Thirty-nine percent of respondents reported that health needs were well met (provided a rating of Good to Excellent) and 40 percent reported that needs were not well met (provided a rating of Poor or Very Poor).

Survey respondents were also asked to select the single most important barrier to children and families receiving health related services. The single most important barrier cited was cost of health services (31%). Additionally, 81 percent of responses indicated that budget cuts had a high or very high impact on health services.

Survey respondents indicated which health services were missing from their community. **Exhibit 3-33** shows the most frequent responses. Group meeting and interview participants indicated that access to healthcare was limited and emphasized gaps in services as being mental health services, dental care, and prenatal care for pregnant teens.

## EXHIBIT 3-33

## MISSING HEALTH SERVICES

MISSING HEALTH SERVICE AREAS	PERCENT MISSING
Access to free or low cost health services	52.1%
Health promotion and disease prevention education	39.7%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.  
Total number of responses was 73.

Organizations that provide leadership and services in the Southwest Maricopa region serve as assets within the community. Survey participants identified assets in the form of key organizations that provide strong leadership within their community for the provision of health services. These organizations are included in **Exhibit 3-34**.

## EXHIBIT 3-34

### ORGANIZATIONS OFFERING STRONG LEADERSHIP IN THE AREA OF HEALTH SERVICES

Arizona Health Care System	Phoenix Children's Hospital
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Quality First
Children's Action Alliance	Southwest Human Development
First Things First	St. Josephs Hospital
Kids Care	State Health Services
Maricopa County	Valley of the Sun United Way
MIHS	

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

### Section Summary

The features of the early childhood health system in the Southwest Maricopa Region are similar to those countywide. Parts of the region rely less on public health coverage for births than the countywide rate. Federal and state data indicate there is a measurable lack of access to primary healthcare in much of the region as well as a shortage of health professionals. Families in the region could benefit from strategies to link them with existing health services.

## 3.4 Public Awareness and Collaboration

Survey respondents were asked to select the single most important barrier to children and families receiving coordinated services. The single most important barrier to families getting coordinated services within the community was awareness of services (86%). Family awareness of services was also cited by group meeting and interview participants as an area needing improvement. Survey respondents were asked to report on two barriers especially related to coordinated services: eligibility differences among service providers and lack of communication between service providers. The percentage of respondents indicating that these were, in fact, barriers in their community was 35.3 percent for "eligibility differences among service providers" and 57.9 percent for "lack of communication between service providers." Mixed views were reported by meeting and interview participants about the communication and collaboration among agencies within the community. Some participants felt that communication and collaboration needed improvement and others felt that agencies were working well together. In general, interviewees felt that the Care 1st Resource Center is a good starting point for guiding families to services and for coordination of services.

Survey respondents rated the effect of budget cuts for providing coordinated services from having no impact to having a very high impact. Approximately 91 percent of responses indicated that budget cuts had a high or very high impact on coordinated services.

Respondents also reported on the quality, accessibility, convenience, timeliness, comprehensiveness, and responsiveness of services across all service areas and the degree to which services met the needs of children and families. The percentage of respondents indicating that needs were well met and the percentage indicating needs were poorly or very poorly 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	32.6%	22.9%
Accessibility of Information	25.5%	34.9%
Convenience of Services	15.7%	27.4%
Quality of Services	48.0%	1.1%
Timeliness of Services	29.6%	28.5%
Cultural Responsiveness of Services	36.4%	14.6%
Comprehensiveness of Services	31.1%	19.8%
Early Identification of Problems	20.4%	27.3%
Family Centered Practice	27.4%	18.7%
Client Focus	33.7%	21.7%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.  
Total number of responses was 267.

Survey participants and interviews also identified assets in the form of key organizations that provide strong leadership within their community for coordination of services. These organizations are included in **Exhibit 3-36**.

## EXHIBIT 3-36

## ORGANIZATIONS OFFERING STRONG LEADERSHIP WITHIN THE COMMUNITY IN THE AREA OF COORDINATED SERVICES

AHCCCS	FitTots
Alhambra School District	Head Start
Arizona Autism Coalition	Intertribal Council of Arizona
Arizona Child Care Association	Litchfield Elementary School District
Arizona Department of Education	Local Pediatric Physician
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Maricopa County
AzAAP	Maricopa County Public Health
AZIP	New Directions Institute
BESD	Public Schools
BOSS	Quality First
Care 1st Avondale Resource and Housing Center - Avondale	Scholarships
Central Arizona College	South Phoenix Healthy Start
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	Southwest Human Development
Child Care Resource and Referral	Southwest Network (Don Erickson)
Child Crisis Center	T.E.A.C.H. AZ
Children's Action Alliance	United Cerebral Palsy of Central
Churches	Arizona (0-3)
City of Phoenix	Valley of the Sun United Way
Community Center -Gila Bend	WIC
First Things First	YMCA
Firstcare Avondale Family Resource Center	

Sources: Responses from stakeholder surveys, stakeholder interviews, 2010.

## 3.5 Stakeholder Priority for Services

Understanding which service areas are viewed by early care and development stakeholders as the most critical for focusing resources will guide FTF's decisions about how best to use their resources to help children and families in the Southwest 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. The most frequently cited priority areas included improving the quality of early childhood development and health programs, increasing the access to quality early childhood developmental and health programs, and offering parent and family support and education concerning early childhood development and literacy.

### EXHIBIT 3-37

#### PRIORITY FOR FOCUS OF FTF RESOURCES

AREA	NUMBER ONE PRIORITY
Improve the quality of early childhood development and health programs	27.4%
Increase the access to quality early childhood developmental and health programs	21.9%
Increase access to preventative health and health screenings for children through age 5	2.7%
Offer parent and family support and education concerning early childhood development and literacy	21.9%
Provide professional development and training for early childhood development and literacy	1.4%
Increase coordination of early childhood development and health programs	12.3%
Increase public awareness about the importance of early childhood development and health	12.3%

Source: Stakeholder survey responses, 2010.

Interview participants suggested that FTF focus funding efforts on the following areas and activities:

- Mental health services.
- Food and nutrition.
- Social services.
- Childcare services.
- More communication and collaboration.
- Early childhood education.
- Provision of mobile units.
- Expansion of the CRC in downtown Avondale and making other venues such as CRC available in other targeted communities.

## Section Summary

Community stakeholders noted many needs in the region. Responses to the online survey particularly emphasized improving the quality of early childhood and health programs as a preferred priority for First Things First. Lack of awareness of existing services also emerged in the survey as a frequent barrier to services, such as parent support, literacy development, and early childhood education. The region could explore strategies to help increase awareness among parents and providers.

## 4.0 SUMMARY AND FUTURE DIRECTION

In most of the region, median incomes are lower than in Maricopa County. Two-parent families living in Maricopa County have a median income of \$78,381, while, in the region, the median ranges from a low of \$65,539 in the Buckeye Elementary School District to a high of \$104,567 in the Liberty School District. Median incomes for families headed by a single mother are half or less than the median for two-parent families.

The region faces many economic challenges. The unemployment rate in cities in the region more than doubled between 2005 and 2010, as it did for Maricopa County. In March 2010, the unemployment rate in Buckeye and Gila Bend was significantly higher than the countywide rate, while the rest of the region had rates slightly below the countywide rate of 8.7 percent.

In January 2010, there were 1,043 children (ages five and younger) living in families receiving Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). This was a 33 percent increase over 2007 – a growth rate more than twice the countywide rate. The number of young children living in transitional or emergency shelters from the region grew from 10 in 2007 to 27 in 2009 – a much larger growth than in the Maricopa County First Things First regions.

The need for access to high quality, affordable childcare is strong throughout the region. In Maricopa County and the Pendergast School District, more than two-thirds of the households with children younger than 18 had all parents in the labor force – indicating a great need for childcare. Preschool enrollment is mixed in the region: particularly low in Buckeye, but higher than the countywide rate in the Litchfield and Pendergast School Districts and the cities of Avondale and Goodyear. The number of childcare providers accredited or recognized by a national organization rose from two in 2008 to seven in 2010; currently, only 8 percent of licensed/certified providers in the region have such national recognition for meeting specified quality standards.

State budget cuts are weakening the early childhood infrastructure in the region. In 2010, 280 four year old students were enrolled in preschool in the region through the state-funded Early Childhood Block Grant program. Due to budget cuts, that funding is no longer available. The number of children receiving subsidies for childcare dropped by 44 percent between 2009 and 2010, reflecting the state budget cuts that closed the door to any qualified, low-income working families who applied.

The input from the community through the online survey, stakeholder meetings, and telephone interviews all point to a great demand for quality improvements in childcare and financial assistance for parents needing childcare. More than half of the respondents to the online survey said that childcare services are not meeting the needs of families in the community, and 76 percent identified cost as the single most important barrier in childcare. Forty-five percent of respondents said that high quality childcare is a service that is missing in the region. The top recommendation in the survey for First Things First funding is to improve the quality of early childhood development and health programs.

There are notable challenges in the education system. Only 20 percent of schools in the region were Excelling or Highly Performing on the Arizona Learns profile, compared to 34 percent statewide, while 16 percent of the schools in the region were rated as Underperforming, compared to 2 percent statewide.

Access to healthcare in the region shows strengths and weaknesses. The region has rates of children without health insurance similar to the countywide rate of 16 percent. However, just over half of the respondents to the online survey said that access to free or low-cost health services is missing in the region. There were nine school-based clinics in the region in 2009 – a slight decrease since 2002, and roughly 11 percent of the total number of school-based clinics statewide. The areas

of Avondale, Tolleson, and Buckeye are considered to be medically underserved based on insufficient access to health providers.

There is racial and ethnic diversity in the region. The majority of young children in the region are Hispanic, with lower rates in the Liberty and Litchfield School Districts and the city of Goodyear. Parts of the region have higher rates of African American young children than Maricopa County (Litchfield and Pendergast School Districts and the city of Avondale).

Fewer than 3 percent of young children in Maricopa County and in the region were born in other countries. However, 37 percent of children in Maricopa County younger than six have at least one foreign born parent. The percentages are lower in much of this region with the exception of families living in Pendergast and Avondale Elementary School Districts, at 49 and 39 percent, respectively.

In Maricopa County, 9 percent of children younger than six live in a household headed by their grandparents. The rates are lower in Littleton and Litchfield School Districts and just above 10 percent in Avondale and Pendergast School Districts. About four in 10 of the respondents identified support for grandparents raising grandchildren, resources that support families, and parent coaching and education as services that are currently missing.

Community members value many assets in the region, including the Kith and Kin program, public libraries, the home-based nurse visitation program, Quality First, WIC, family literacy programs, the Women's Health Coalition, and emergency childcare scholarships. The Care 1st Resource Center in Avondale was specifically pointed out as a model for collaboration and convenient and comfortable delivery of multiple services.

Community members emphasized a need to improve awareness among parents about early education needs and available services. Currently, there is not enough information or communication about services.

Community input also identified the need for more social services and for services that meet basic needs, such as food and nutrition. Four out of 10 survey respondents said that social services are not meeting the needs of young children and their families in the region, and half said that there are not enough social 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 Quality First and T.E.A.C.H. AZ are valued and will help to meet key needs in the region.

There are opportunities for improved collaboration and more communication with parents about early childhood needs and available services. The region could build on the strength of the Care 1st Resource Center by making it a hub for early childhood information and referrals.

The lack of transportation and the distance to services were identified as barriers in this region. This could be addressed by funding mobile services or bringing services to locations where families tend to congregate.

Because the cost of childcare was identified as a significant barrier, families in the region could benefit from childcare scholarships or other strategies to help them afford quality childcare.

## **Conclusion**

A continued focus on improving the strength of family, friend, and neighbor childcare makes sense, since it appears much of the childcare in the region is informal. Investing in family resource center strategies helps to build on existing strength in the region and allows First Things First to address the varied needs in the region. Specific family resource center services could be focused on supporting grandparents raising their grandchildren as well as linking families with quality childcare and healthcare 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 Supports/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 ©MGIT 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
Avondale	5.7	5.7	39.6	15.1	20.8	11.3	1.9
Buckeye	6.1	4.1	36.7	18.4	22.4	12.2	0.0
Goodyear	4.3	6.4	36.2	21.3	21.3	10.6	0.0
Litchfield Park	4.7	2.3	39.5	18.6	20.9	14.0	0.0
Tolleson	4.5	2.3	36.4	22.7	20.5	13.6	0.0
Gila Bend	3.2	3.2	35.5	12.9	25.8	19.4	0.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>13.1</b>	<b>0.4</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>37.8</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>24.9</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>1.9</b>

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
Avondale	62.3	66.0	49.1	81.1	49.1	28.3	35.8	47.2	13.2	47.2	30.2	58.5	1.9
Buckeye	61.2	65.3	40.8	77.6	51.0	24.5	30.6	46.9	12.2	40.8	24.5	53.1	4.1
Goodyear	59.6	72.3	36.2	78.7	51.1	25.5	25.5	42.6	12.8	38.3	29.8	59.6	2.1
Litchfield Park	62.8	69.8	41.9	79.1	48.8	27.9	32.6	46.5	18.6	46.5	32.6	58.1	2.3
Tolleson	63.6	72.7	40.9	75.0	52.3	31.8	31.8	47.7	15.9	45.5	34.1	61.4	2.3
Gila Bend	64.5	67.7	45.2	77.4	54.8	32.3	32.3	48.4	22.6	51.6	41.9	71.0	3.2
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>62.2</b>	<b>68.9</b>	<b>42.3</b>	<b>78.3</b>	<b>50.9</b>	<b>28.1</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>46.4</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>44.6</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>59.6</b>	<b>2.6</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>63.6</b>	<b>68.6</b>	<b>44.1</b>	<b>82.9</b>	<b>50.8</b>	<b>29.8</b>	<b>31.8</b>	<b>48.3</b>	<b>15.3</b>	<b>45.2</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>59.1</b>	<b>4.0</b>

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	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
Avondale	1.9	15.1	1.9	47.2	15.1	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	3.8	0.0	3.8
Buckeye	2.0	12.2	2.0	51.0	16.3	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	8.2	2.0	0.0	2.0
Goodyear	2.1	19.1	0.0	48.9	14.9	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.4	2.1	0.0	4.3
Litchfield Park	2.3	14.0	0.0	53.5	16.3	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	2.3	0.0	2.3
Tolleson	2.3	20.5	2.3	47.7	15.9	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	2.3	0.0	2.3
Gila Bend	3.2	3.2	0.0	61.3	22.6	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	3.2
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>50.9</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>53.8</b>	<b>12.7</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>2.6</b>

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
Avondale	56.6	24.5	7.5	1.9	9.4
Buckeye	55.1	16.3	8.2	2.0	18.4
Goodyear	59.6	19.1	8.5	2.1	10.6
Litchfield Park	53.5	27.9	7.0	2.3	9.3
Tolleson	63.6	20.5	6.8	2.3	6.8
Gila Bend	58.1	22.6	3.2	3.2	12.9
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>57.7</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>11.2</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>56.5</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>11.0</b>

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.

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

#### Avondale

AHCCCS	FitTots
Arizona Child Care Association	Head Start
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Litchfield Elementary School District
AzAAP	Maricopa County
Care 1st Avondale Resource and Housing Center - Avondale	New Directions Institute
Central Arizona Colleges	Quality First
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	Scholarships
Child Care Resource and Referral	South Phoenix Healthy Start
Child Crisis Center	Southwest Human Development
Children's Action Alliance	Southwest Network (Don Erickson)
Churches	Teach
City of Phoenix	Valley of the Sun United Way
Community Center -Gila Bend	VSUW
First Things First	WIC
Firstcare Avondale Family Resource Center	YMCA

#### Buckeye

AHCCCS	FitTots
Arizona Autism Coalition	Head Start
Arizona Child Care Association	Litchfield Elementary School District
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Maricopa County
AzAAP	New Directions Institute
AZIP	Public Schools
BESD	Quality First
BOSS	Southwest Human Development
Central Arizona Colleges	Southwest Network (Don Erickson)
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	Teach
Child Care Resource and Referral	United Way of Arizona
Child Crisis Center	Valley of the Sun United Way
Children's Action Alliance	VSUW
City of Phoenix	WIC
First Things First	YMCA
Firstcare Avondale Family Resource Center	

## Goodyear

AHCCCS	Head Start
Arizona Child Care Association	Litchfield Elementary School District
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Maricopa County
AzAAP	New Directions Institute
Care 1st Avondale Resource and Housing Center - Avondale	Quality First
Central Arizona Colleges	Scholarships
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	Southwest Human Development
Child Care Resource and Referral	Southwest Network (Don Erickson)
Child Crisis Center	Teach
Children's Action Alliance	United Cerebral Palsy of Central Arizona (0-3)
City of Phoenix	United Way of Arizona
Community Center -Gila Bend	Valley of the Sun United Way
First Things First	VSUW
Firstcare Avondale Family Resource Center	WIC
FitTots	YMCA

## Litchfield Park

AHCCCS	FitTots
Alhambra School District	Head Start
Arizona Child Care Association	Litchfield Elementary School District
Arizona Department of Education	Maricopa County
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Maricopa County Public Health
AzAAP	New Directions Institute
Care 1st Avondale Resource and Housing Center - Avondale	Quality First
Central Arizona Colleges	South Phoenix Healthy Start
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	Southwest Human Development
Child Care Resource and Referral	Southwest Network (Don Erickson)
Child Crisis Center	Teach
Children's Action Alliance	United Way of Arizona
City of Phoenix	Valley of the Sun United Way
Community Center -Gila Bend	VSUW
First Things First	WIC
Firstcare Avondale Family Resource Center	YMCA

## Tolleson

AHCCCS	Firstcare Avondale Family Resource Center
Arizona Child Care Association	FitTots
Arizona Department of Education	Head Start
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Litchfield Elementary School District
AzAAP	Maricopa County
Care 1st Avondale Resource and Housing Center - Avondale	Quality First
Central Arizona College	Southwest Human Development
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	Southwest Network (Don Erickson)
Child Care Resource and Referral	Teach
Child Crisis Center	United Way of Arizona
Children's Action Alliance	Valley of the Sun United Way
City of Phoenix	VSUW
Community Center -Gila Bend	WIC
First Things First	YMCA

## Gila Bend

AHCCCS	FitTots
Arizona Child Care Association	Head Start
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Intertribal Council of Arizona
AzAAP	Litchfield Elementary School District
Care 1st Avondale Resource and Housing Center - Avondale	Local Pediatric Physician
Central Arizona Colleges	Maricopa County
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	Southwest Human Development
Child Crisis Center	Southwest Network (Don Erickson)
Children's Action Alliance	Valley of the Sun United Way
City of Phoenix	VSUW
Community Center -Gila Bend	WIC
First Things First	
Firstcare Avondale Family Resource Center	

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
Avondale	5.7	18.9	34.0	22.6	11.3	7.5
Buckeye	6.1	18.4	34.7	22.4	10.2	8.2
Goodyear	4.3	17.0	36.2	23.4	10.6	8.5
Litchfield Park	7.0	14.0	39.5	20.9	11.6	7.0
Tolleson	6.8	13.6	38.6	20.5	11.4	9.1
Gila Bend	9.7	16.1	35.5	19.4	9.7	9.7
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>36.3</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>8.2</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>34.1</b>	<b>27.1</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>10.2</b>

AREA	CONVENIENCE/ACCESSIBILITY OF SERVICES (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Avondale	5.7	22.6	49.1	13.2	3.8	5.7
Buckeye	6.1	20.4	49.0	12.2	6.1	6.1
Goodyear	4.3	17.0	57.4	12.8	4.3	4.3
Litchfield Park	7.0	20.9	53.5	9.3	4.7	4.7
Tolleson	6.8	22.7	52.3	11.4	2.3	4.5
Gila Bend	9.7	22.6	51.6	12.9	0.0	3.2
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>52.1</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.9</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>51.0</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>6.2</b>

AREA	CONVENIENCE/ACCESSIBILITY OF SERVICES (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Avondale	5.7	22.6	49.1	13.2	3.8	5.7
Buckeye	6.1	20.4	49.0	12.2	6.1	6.1
Goodyear	4.3	17.0	57.4	12.8	4.3	4.3
Litchfield Park	7.0	20.9	53.5	9.3	4.7	4.7
Tolleson	6.8	22.7	52.3	11.4	2.3	4.5
Gila Bend	9.7	22.6	51.6	12.9	0.0	3.2
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>52.1</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.9</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>51.0</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>6.2</b>

AREA	QUALITY OF SERVICES (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Avondale	0.0	3.8	39.6	24.5	22.6	9.4
Buckeye	0.0	0.0	42.9	28.6	18.4	10.2
Goodyear	0.0	0.0	40.4	27.7	23.4	8.5
Litchfield Park	0.0	0.0	41.9	30.2	18.6	9.3
Tolleson	0.0	2.3	43.2	25.0	20.5	9.1
Gila Bend	0.0	0.0	45.2	25.8	22.6	6.5
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>41.9</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>9.0</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>35.2</b>	<b>32.1</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>10.7</b>

AREA	TIMELINESS OF SERVICES (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Avondale	5.7	20.8	35.8	20.8	11.3	5.7
Buckeye	6.1	18.4	38.8	20.4	10.2	6.1
Goodyear	6.4	23.4	34.0	21.3	10.6	4.3
Litchfield Park	4.7	23.3	37.2	20.9	9.3	4.7
Tolleson	4.5	27.3	38.6	15.9	9.1	4.5
Gila Bend	9.7	22.6	38.7	19.4	6.5	3.2
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>37.1</b>	<b>19.9</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>4.9</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>36.2</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>7.6</b>

AREA	CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS OF SERVICES (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Avondale	0.0	15.1	35.8	24.5	15.1	9.4
Buckeye	0.0	14.3	36.7	24.5	14.3	10.2
Goodyear	0.0	12.8	40.4	23.4	14.9	8.5
Litchfield Park	0.0	14.0	44.2	18.6	14.0	9.3
Tolleson	0.0	15.9	40.9	18.2	15.9	9.1
Gila Bend	0.0	16.1	45.2	12.9	19.4	6.5
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>40.1</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>9.0</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>14.1</b>	<b>36.9</b>	<b>24.1</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>11.2</b>

AREA	CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS OF SERVICES (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Avondale	0.0	15.1	35.8	24.5	15.1	9.4
Buckeye	0.0	14.3	36.7	24.5	14.3	10.2
Goodyear	0.0	12.8	40.4	23.4	14.9	8.5
Litchfield Park	0.0	14.0	44.2	18.6	14.0	9.3
Tolleson	0.0	15.9	40.9	18.2	15.9	9.1
Gila Bend	0.0	16.1	45.2	12.9	19.4	6.5
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>40.1</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>9.0</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>14.1</b>	<b>36.9</b>	<b>24.1</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>11.2</b>

AREA	EARLY IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEMS (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Avondale	5.7	20.8	41.5	18.9	1.9	11.3
Buckeye	6.1	20.4	34.7	20.4	4.1	14.3
Goodyear	6.4	21.3	36.2	19.1	2.1	14.9
Litchfield Park	4.7	23.3	41.9	16.3	2.3	11.6
Tolleson	4.5	22.7	43.2	15.9	2.3	11.4
Gila Bend	9.7	19.4	45.2	16.1	3.2	6.5
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>40.1</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>12.0</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>21.4</b>	<b>37.9</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>11.3</b>

AREA	CLIENT FOCUS (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Avondale	3.8	18.9	30.2	24.5	7.5	15.1
Buckeye	4.1	14.3	30.6	24.5	10.2	16.3
Goodyear	4.3	17.0	27.7	25.5	8.5	17.0
Litchfield Park	4.7	18.6	27.9	25.6	9.3	14.0
Tolleson	4.5	18.2	25.0	25.0	6.8	20.5
Gila Bend	6.5	16.1	29.0	29.0	6.5	12.9
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>17.2</b>	<b>28.5</b>	<b>25.5</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>16.1</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>16.2</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>16.7</b>

AREA	CLIENT FOCUS (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)					
	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW
Avondale	3.8	18.9	30.2	24.5	7.5	15.1
Buckeye	4.1	14.3	30.6	24.5	10.2	16.3
Goodyear	4.3	17.0	27.7	25.5	8.5	17.0
Litchfield Park	4.7	18.6	27.9	25.6	9.3	14.0
Tolleson	4.5	18.2	25.0	25.0	6.8	20.5
Gila Bend	6.5	16.1	29.0	29.0	6.5	12.9
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>17.2</b>	<b>28.5</b>	<b>25.5</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>16.1</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>16.2</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>16.7</b>

## 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
Avondale	33.3	21.2	30.3	12.1	3.0	0.0	0.0
Buckeye	17.6	11.8	23.5	41.2	5.9	0.0	0.0
Goodyear	28.6	0.0	42.9	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0
Litchfield Park	14.3	14.3	71.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tolleson	28.6	0.0	42.9	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gila Bend	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>27.4</b>	<b>15.1</b>	<b>34.2</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>21.4</b>	<b>35.3</b>	<b>19.7</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

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
Avondale	30.3	24.2	3.0	18.2	3.0	6.1	15.2
Buckeye	17.6	29.4	0.0	11.8	0.0	35.3	5.9
Goodyear	28.6	14.3	0.0	28.6	0.0	14.3	14.3
Litchfield Park	28.6	14.3	0.0	42.9	0.0	0.0	14.3
Tolleson	28.6	14.3	14.3	28.6	0.0	0.0	14.3
Gila Bend	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>27.4</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>12.3</b>	<b>12.3</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>19.7</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>13.5</b>

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
Avondale	39.4	39.4	57.6	30.3	48.5	42.4	48.5	33.3	36.4	42.4	54.5	3.0
Buckeye	41.2	29.4	47.1	47.1	41.2	29.4	52.9	29.4	29.4	41.2	58.8	0.0
Goodyear	71.4	57.1	42.9	42.9	42.9	71.4	42.9	57.1	42.9	57.1	71.4	0.0
Litchfield Park	85.7	57.1	57.1	42.9	42.9	42.9	57.1	28.6	57.1	85.7	57.1	0.0
Tolleson	42.9	57.1	42.9	57.1	28.6	14.3	28.6	28.6	42.9	71.4	42.9	0.0
Gila Bend	100.0	50.0	50.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>49.3</b>	<b>42.5</b>	<b>52.1</b>	<b>41.1</b>	<b>45.2</b>	<b>41.1</b>	<b>47.9</b>	<b>35.6</b>	<b>39.7</b>	<b>52.1</b>	<b>57.5</b>	<b>1.4</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>51.7</b>	<b>45.2</b>	<b>49.3</b>	<b>35.6</b>	<b>41.6</b>	<b>39.9</b>	<b>50.2</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>36.5</b>	<b>50.5</b>	<b>3.4</b>

## 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
Avondale	6.3	12.5	28.1	28.1	15.6	3.1	6.3
Buckeye	8.0	12.0	16.0	32.0	24.0	4.0	4.0
Goodyear	8.0	12.0	20.0	32.0	20.0	4.0	4.0
Litchfield Park	4.2	12.5	25.0	29.2	20.8	4.2	4.2
Tolleson	4.0	12.0	20.0	36.0	20.0	4.0	4.0
Gila Bend	10.5	15.8	15.8	31.6	21.1	0.0	5.3
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>12.7</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>31.3</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>4.7</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>14.8</b>	<b>22.9</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>23.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>6.9</b>

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
Avondale	31.3	25.0	43.8
Buckeye	32.0	12.0	56.0
Goodyear	32.0	20.0	48.0
Litchfield Park	33.3	16.7	50.0
Tolleson	32.0	16.0	52.0
Gila Bend	31.6	15.8	52.6
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>32.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>50.0</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>28.0</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>52.8</b>

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	BARRIERS TO PROVIDING PARENTING SUPPORT/ EDUCATION SERVICES (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)														
	TRANSPORTATION	COST	LOCATION(S)	AWARENESS	NOT ENOUGH SERVICES	DIFFICULT TO ENROLL	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	SERVICES NOT WANTED	NO CHILD	IMMIGRATION STATUS	ELIGIBILITY DIFFERENCES AMONG SERVICE PROVIDERS	LACK OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SERVICE PROVIDERS	DIFFICULT TO TAKE TIME OFF FROM WORK/SCHOOL	OTHER
Avondale	65.6	50.0	40.6	68.8	37.5	18.8	28.1	46.9	18.8	43.8	37.5	0.0	0.0	40.6	6.3
Buckeye	68.0	64.0	40.0	64.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	44.0	32.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	4.0
Goodyear	68.0	60.0	40.0	64.0	36.0	20.0	24.0	48.0	20.0	44.0	36.0	0.0	0.0	36.0	8.0
Litchfield Park	70.8	62.5	41.7	75.0	45.8	20.8	29.2	50.0	20.8	45.8	37.5	0.0	0.0	41.7	4.2
Tolleson	72.0	60.0	40.0	72.0	48.0	20.0	24.0	44.0	20.0	48.0	32.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	4.0
Gila Bend	68.4	57.9	36.8	68.4	31.6	26.3	21.1	42.1	21.1	47.4	26.3	0.0	0.0	42.1	5.3
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>68.7</b>	<b>58.7</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>68.7</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>20.7</b>	<b>24.7</b>	<b>45.3</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>45.3</b>	<b>34.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>5.3</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>62.7</b>	<b>49.2</b>	<b>36.8</b>	<b>71.2</b>	<b>39.8</b>	<b>17.5</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>38.4</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>42.6</b>	<b>26.9</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>44.1</b>	<b>5.6</b>

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	NO CHILD	IMMIGRATION STATUS	ELIGIBILITY DIFFERENCES AMONG SERVICE PROVIDERS	LACK OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SERVICE PROVIDERS	DIFFICULT TO TAKE TIME OFF FROM WORK/SCHOOL	OTHER
Avondale	9.4	12.5	6.3	40.6	9.4	3.1	0.0	0.0	3.1	6.3	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1
Buckeye	8.0	16.0	8.0	36.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0
Goodyear	12.0	16.0	8.0	40.0	8.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0
Litchfield Park	12.5	16.7	8.3	41.7	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	4.2	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0
Tolleson	20.0	16.0	8.0	36.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0
Gila Bend	15.8	15.8	0.0	47.4	10.5	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>12.7</b>	<b>15.3</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>47.4</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>4.0</b>

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	IMPACT OF RECENT BUDGET CUTS ON PROVIDING PARENTING SUPPORT/ EDUCATION SERVICES (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)				
	VERY HIGH	HIGH	LITTLE	NONE	DON'T KNOW
Avondale	34.4	28.1	6.3	0.0	31.3
Buckeye	32.0	32.0	4.0	0.0	32.0
Goodyear	36.0	28.0	8.0	0.0	28.0
Litchfield Park	33.3	33.3	4.2	0.0	29.2
Tolleson	36.0	28.0	4.0	0.0	32.0
Gila Bend	36.8	31.6	5.3	0.0	26.3
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>34.7</b>	<b>30.0</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>30.0</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>25.8</b>	<b>30.6</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>36.4</b>

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

## Avondale

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Quality First
Catholic Charities- Head start	Raising Special Kids
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	SARRC
Child Crisis Center	School District Parenting Support Education
City of Avondale Care First Resource Center	Southwest Human Development
First Things First	SWHD
Leaps and Bounds ; Pre kindergarten readiness program	Teen Outreach Pregnancy Services
Maricopa County	United Way of Arizona
Maricopa County Department of Public Health	University of Arizona Cooperative Extension
Parenting Arizona	

## Buckeye

AZIP	Raising Special Kids
Catholic Charities- Head start	SARRC
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	School Districts
Child Crisis Center	Southwest Human Development
First Things First	SWHD
Head Start	Teen Outreach Pregnancy Services
Maricopa County	United Way of Arizona
Maricopa County Department of Public Health	University of Arizona Cooperative Extension
Quality First	

## Goodyear

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Quality First
Catholic Charities- Head start	Raising Special Kids
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	SARRC
Child Crisis Center	Southwest Human Development
City of Avondale Care First Resource Center	SWHD
First Things First	Teen Outreach Pregnancy Services
Leaps and Bounds ; Pre kindergarten readiness program	United Way of Arizona
Maricopa County	University of Arizona Cooperative Extension
Maricopa County Department of Public Health	

## Litchfield Park

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Quality First
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	Raising Special Kids
Child Crisis Center	SARRC
City of Avondale Care First Resource Center	Southwest Human Development
First Things First	SWHD
Maricopa County	United Way of Arizona
Maricopa County Department of Public Health	University of Arizona Cooperative Extension
Parenting Arizona	

## Tolleson

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Quality First
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	Raising Special Kids
Child Crisis Center	SARRC
City of Avondale Care First Resource Center	Southwest Human Development
First Things First	SWHD
Maricopa County	United Way of Arizona
Maricopa County Department of Public Health	University of Arizona Cooperative Extension

## Gila Bend

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Raising Special Kids
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	SARRC
Child Crisis Center	Southwest Human Development
City of Avondale Care First Resource Center	SWHD
First Things First	Teen Outreach Pregnancy Services
Maricopa County	United Way
Maricopa County Department of Public Health	University of Arizona Cooperative Extension

## 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
Avondale	5.9	8.8	32.4	8.8	32.4	11.8	0.0
Buckeye	0.0	14.8	18.5	11.1	40.7	14.8	0.0
Goodyear	0.0	13.3	23.3	10.0	36.7	16.7	0.0
Litchfield Park	0.0	17.2	24.1	10.3	34.5	13.8	0.0
Tolleson	0.0	10.0	23.3	13.3	36.7	16.7	0.0
Gila Bend	0.0	15.0	10.0	15.0	45.0	15.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>12.9</b>	<b>22.9</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>37.1</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>26.5</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>27.9</b>	<b>15.2</b>	<b>1.9</b>

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
Avondale	50.0	26.5	23.5
Buckeye	44.4	22.2	33.3
Goodyear	46.7	26.7	26.7
Litchfield Park	44.8	27.6	27.6
Tolleson	43.3	26.7	30.0
Gila Bend	50.0	15.0	35.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>46.5</b>	<b>24.7</b>	<b>28.8</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>46.8</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>29.9</b>

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
Avondale	41.2	94.1	35.3	41.2	20.6	5.9	17.6	20.6	44.1	29.4	11.8
Buckeye	40.7	88.9	40.7	37.0	22.2	3.7	18.5	18.5	48.1	25.9	14.8
Goodyear	36.7	93.3	33.3	40.0	20.0	3.3	16.7	16.7	46.7	26.7	13.3
Litchfield Park	41.4	93.1	34.5	37.9	17.2	6.9	17.2	17.2	48.3	27.6	13.8
Tolleson	43.3	93.3	33.3	30.0	20.0	3.3	13.3	16.7	46.7	23.3	13.3
Gila Bend	35.0	90.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	5.0	15.0	20.0	60.0	30.0	15.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>92.4</b>	<b>35.9</b>	<b>37.6</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>48.2</b>	<b>27.1</b>	<b>13.5</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>39.0</b>	<b>89.4</b>	<b>30.2</b>	<b>36.5</b>	<b>21.2</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>11.8</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>

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	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
Avondale	5.9	76.5	2.9	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	5.9	0.0	2.9
Buckeye	3.7	70.4	3.7	3.7	3.7	0.0	3.7	0.0	7.4	0.0	3.7
Goodyear	3.3	76.7	3.3	3.3	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	3.3
Litchfield Park	6.9	75.9	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	6.9	0.0	3.4
Tolleson	3.3	80.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	3.3
Gila Bend	5.0	75.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	5.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>75.9</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>76.8</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>3.5</b>

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 (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY)				
	VERY HIGH	HIGH	LITTLE	NONE	DON'T KNOW
Avondale	73.5	17.6	2.9	0.0	5.9
Buckeye	66.7	14.8	3.7	0.0	14.8
Goodyear	73.3	16.7	3.3	0.0	6.7
Litchfield Park	72.4	20.7	0.0	0.0	6.9
Tolleson	76.7	16.7	3.3	0.0	3.3
Gila Bend	75.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>72.9</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>7.1</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>65.8</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>8.1</b>

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	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SELECTING CHILD CARE CHANGES WITHIN EACH GEOGRAPHIC ENTITY							
	CLOSED CHILD CARE CENTERS	FEWER CHILD CARE CLASSROOMS	CHILDREN OF DIFFERENT AGES COMBINED IN SINGLE CLASSROOM	CHILD CARE TEACHERS LAID OFF	CHILDREN STAYING HOME ALONE	CHILDREN STAYING WITH FAMILY, FRIENDS, AND/OR NEIGHBORS	REDUCED QUALITY OR VARIETY OF CHILD CARE	OTHER
Avondale	70.6	44.1	35.3	67.6	67.6	73.5	55.9	2.9
Buckeye	70.4	44.4	29.6	63.0	59.3	81.5	66.7	7.4
Goodyear	73.3	50.0	33.3	73.3	70.0	83.3	66.7	3.3
Litchfield Park	75.9	48.3	31.0	69.0	65.5	79.3	65.5	3.4
Tolleson	66.7	43.3	36.7	60.0	70.0	80.0	66.7	3.3
Gila Bend	70.0	50.0	40.0	70.0	70.0	80.0	75.0	5.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>71.2</b>	<b>46.5</b>	<b>34.1</b>	<b>67.1</b>	<b>67.1</b>	<b>79.4</b>	<b>65.3</b>	<b>4.1</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>60.0</b>	<b>40.8</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>62.9</b>	<b>67.0</b>	<b>77.5</b>	<b>61.1</b>	<b>6.1</b>

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 box below.

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

### Avondale

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	

### Buckeye

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	

### Goodyear

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	

### Litchfield Park

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	

## Gila Bend

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)

Blake Foundation

CAZColleges

Central AZ College

First Things First

Maricopa County

Southwest Human Development

SWHD

United Way

VSUW

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	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
Avondale	0.0	16.7	33.3	20.0	20.0	0.0	10.0
Buckeye	3.6	17.9	32.1	25.0	17.9	0.0	3.6
Goodyear	0.0	17.9	32.1	21.4	17.9	3.6	7.1
Litchfield Park	0.0	15.4	38.5	23.1	19.2	0.0	3.8
Tolleson	0.0	14.8	29.6	29.6	18.5	3.7	3.7
Gila Bend	0.0	21.1	26.3	26.3	21.1	0.0	5.3
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>32.3</b>	<b>24.1</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>5.7</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>35.3</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>5.1</b>

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
Avondale	23.3	13.3	63.3
Buckeye	21.4	21.4	57.1
Goodyear	17.9	21.4	60.7
Litchfield Park	19.2	19.2	61.5
Tolleson	25.9	22.2	51.9
Gila Bend	26.3	10.5	63.2
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>63.2</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>23.9</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>58.1</b>

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
Avondale	46.7	60.0	30.0	60.0	40.0	13.3	16.7	23.3	33.3	33.3	16.7	6.7
Buckeye	53.6	53.6	32.1	50.0	46.4	10.7	10.7	17.9	35.7	25.0	14.3	10.7
Goodyear	46.4	57.1	28.6	53.6	39.3	7.1	10.7	17.9	35.7	28.6	14.3	7.1
Litchfield Park	50.0	65.4	26.9	61.5	38.5	11.5	19.2	26.9	46.2	30.8	15.4	3.8
Tolleson	48.1	63.0	29.6	55.6	40.7	7.4	14.8	22.2	40.7	25.9	11.1	3.7
Gila Bend	52.6	63.2	31.6	63.2	36.8	5.3	15.8	26.3	47.4	26.3	10.5	5.3
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>49.4</b>	<b>60.1</b>	<b>29.7</b>	<b>57.0</b>	<b>40.5</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>39.2</b>	<b>28.5</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>6.3</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>49.5</b>	<b>59.9</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>57.2</b>	<b>35.5</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>14.1</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>37.8</b>	<b>24.6</b>	<b>15.6</b>	<b>7.2</b>

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
Avondale	6.7	26.7	3.3	26.7	13.3	3.3	0.0	0.0	6.7	6.7	0.0	6.7
Buckeye	7.1	17.9	3.6	25.0	14.3	7.1	0.0	0.0	7.1	3.6	3.6	10.7
Goodyear	7.1	28.6	0.0	25.0	14.3	3.6	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.1	0.0	7.1
Litchfield Park	7.7	26.9	0.0	30.8	15.4	3.8	3.8	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	3.8
Tolleson	7.4	33.3	0.0	25.9	18.5	3.7	0.0	0.0	7.4	0.0	0.0	3.7
Gila Bend	10.5	26.3	0.0	31.6	15.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	0.0	0.0	5.3
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>26.6</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>27.2</b>	<b>15.2</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>6.3</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>30.1</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>29.7</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>4.5</b>

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
Avondale	40.0	23.3	3.3	0.0	33.3
Buckeye	35.7	17.9	0.0	3.6	42.9
Goodyear	46.4	14.3	3.6	0.0	35.7
Litchfield Park	42.3	23.1	3.8	0.0	30.8
Tolleson	51.9	14.8	7.4	0.0	25.9
Gila Bend	42.1	21.1	5.3	0.0	31.6
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>43.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>33.5</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>39.8</b>	<b>22.6</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>32.9</b>

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

### Avondale

AEA	Head Start
Arizona Child Care Association	SARRC reverse integrated toddler preschool and pre K. programs
Association for Supportive Child Care	School Districts
Catholic Charities Head Start	Southwestern Development
First Things First	Southwest Human Development
Child and Family Resources, Inc.	Southwest Human Services
Children' Action Alliance	United Ways of Arizona
Quality First	

### Buckeye

AEA	Head Start
Arizona Child Care Association	Local School Agencies
Association for Supportive Child Care	SARRC reverse integrated toddler preschool and pre K. programs
Catholic Charities Head Start	School Districts
First Things First	Southwest Human Development
Child and Family Resources, Inc.	Southwest Human Services
Children' Action Alliance	United Ways of Arizona
Quality First	

### Goodyear

AEA	Head Start
Arizona Child Care Association	SARRC reverse integrated toddler preschool and pre K. programs
Association for Supportive Child Care	School Districts
Catholic Charities Head Start	Southwest Human Development
Quality First	Southwest Human Services
Child and Family Resources, Inc.	United Ways of Arizona
Children' Action Alliance	
First Things First	

## Litchfield Park

AEA	Head Start
Arizona Child Care Association	SARRC reverse integrated toddler preschool and pre K. programs
Arizona Department of Education	School Districts
Association for Supportive Child Care	Southwest Human Development
Quality First	Southwest Human Services
Child and Family Resources, Inc.	United Ways of Arizona
Children' Action Alliance	
First Things First	

## Tolleson

AEA	Head Start
Arizona Child Care Association	SARRC reverse integrated toddler preschool and pre K. programs
Arizona Department of Education	School Districts
Association for Supportive Child Care	Southwest Human Development
Child and Family Resources, Inc.	Southwest Human Services
Children' Action Alliance	United Ways of Arizona
First Things First, Quality First	

## Gila Bend

AEA	Head Start
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.	
Children' Action Alliance	

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
Avondale	8.3	12.5	37.5	20.8	4.2	8.3	8.3
Buckeye	5.6	11.1	38.9	22.2	11.1	5.6	5.6
Goodyear	5.0	10.0	40.0	20.0	5.0	10.0	10.0
Litchfield Park	0.0	11.8	41.2	29.4	5.9	5.9	5.9
Tolleson	0.0	11.1	38.9	27.8	11.1	5.6	5.6
Gila Bend	7.1	7.1	42.9	28.6	0.0	7.1	7.1
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>39.6</b>	<b>24.3</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>7.2</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>41.5</b>	<b>19.3</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>10.0</b>

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
Avondale	20.8	25.0	54.2
Buckeye	22.2	11.1	66.7
Goodyear	20.0	15.0	65.0
Litchfield Park	23.5	11.8	64.7
Tolleson	22.2	11.1	66.7
Gila Bend	21.4	14.3	64.3
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>21.6</b>	<b>15.3</b>	<b>63.1</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>21.2</b>	<b>14.1</b>	<b>64.7</b>

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
Avondale	37.5	20.8	25.0	70.8	33.3	0.0	25.0	50.0	12.5	12.5	25.0	20.8	0.0
Buckeye	27.8	27.8	33.3	66.7	33.3	0.0	27.8	61.1	16.7	11.1	16.7	22.2	5.6
Goodyear	30.0	30.0	25.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	15.0	10.0	20.0	15.0	0.0
Litchfield Park	41.2	29.4	29.4	70.6	29.4	0.0	29.4	64.7	23.5	11.8	23.5	23.5	0.0
Tolleson	38.9	27.8	22.2	66.7	38.9	0.0	33.3	61.1	22.2	16.7	22.2	16.7	0.0
Gila Bend	42.9	21.4	28.6	71.4	28.6	0.0	28.6	57.1	14.3	7.1	14.3	21.4	0.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>36.0</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>69.4</b>	<b>32.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>27.9</b>	<b>56.8</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>20.7</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>0.9</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>37.9</b>	<b>29.4</b>	<b>25.6</b>	<b>69.4</b>	<b>26.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>46.8</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>14.1</b>	<b>0.9</b>

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
Avondale	8.3	0.0	4.2	45.8	25.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	4.2	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0
Buckeye	5.6	0.0	5.6	50.0	22.2	0.0	0.0	11.1	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Goodyear	5.0	0.0	5.0	50.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
Litchfield Park	11.8	5.9	0.0	41.2	23.5	0.0	0.0	11.8	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tolleson	5.6	5.6	0.0	38.9	33.3	0.0	0.0	11.1	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gila Bend	7.1	0.0	0.0	57.1	21.4	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>46.8</b>	<b>24.3</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>52.8</b>	<b>15.1</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.6</b>

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
Avondale	25.0	29.2	4.2	4.2	37.5
Buckeye	16.7	33.3	5.6	0.0	44.4
Goodyear	20.0	35.0	5.0	0.0	40.0
Litchfield Park	23.5	41.2	0.0	0.0	35.3
Tolleson	33.3	38.9	0.0	0.0	27.8
Gila Bend	14.3	42.9	0.0	0.0	42.9
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>36.0</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>37.8</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>20.2</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>42.7</b>

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

### Avondale

Arizona Language and Literacy Center	Quality First
AZAAP	Reach Out and Read
City of Avondale	Reading is Fundamental
First Things First	Southwest Human Development
Maricopa County Libraries	SWHD- Reach Out and Read.
Public Libraries	Unlimited Potential in South Phoenix

### Buckeye

Arizona Language and Literacy Center	Public Libraries
AZAAP	Public Schools
AZIP	Quality First
Buckeye Town Library	Reach Out and Read
First Things First	Southwest Human Development
Head Start	Unlimited Potential in South Phoenix
Maricopa County Libraries	

### Goodyear

A Stepping Stone Foundation	Public Libraries
Arizona Language and Literacy Center	Quality First
Arizona Literacy and Learning Center	Reach Out and Read
AZAAP	Reading is Fundamental
City of Avondale	Southwest Human Development
First Things First	Unlimited Potential in South Phoenix
Maricopa County Libraries	Valley of the Sun United Way

## Litchfield Park

Arizona Department of Education	Public Libraries
Arizona Language and Literacy Center	Quality First
AZAAP	Reach Out and Read
City of Avondale	Reading is Fundamental
First Things First	Southwest Human Development
Maricopa County Libraries	Unlimited Potential in South Phoenix

## Tolleson

Arizona Department of Education	Public Libraries
Arizona Language and Literacy Center	Quality First
AZAAP	Reach Out and Read
City of Avondale	Reading is Fundamental
First Things First	Southwest Human Development
Maricopa County Libraries	Unlimited Potential in South Phoenix

## Gila Bend

Arizona Language and Literacy Center	Reach Out and Read
AZAAP	Reading is Fundamental
City of Avondale	Southwest Human Development
Public Libraries	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
Avondale	0.0	18.5	22.2	11.1	22.2	7.4	18.5
Buckeye	4.3	17.4	26.1	13.0	17.4	8.7	13.0
Goodyear	0.0	18.2	18.2	13.6	22.7	9.1	18.2
Litchfield Park	0.0	19.0	19.0	19.0	23.8	9.5	9.5
Tolleson	0.0	20.8	20.8	16.7	25.0	8.3	8.3
Gila Bend	0.0	18.8	12.5	12.5	31.3	12.5	12.5
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>13.5</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>25.5</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>13.0</b>

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
Avondale	48.1	7.4	44.4
Buckeye	47.8	8.7	43.5
Goodyear	54.5	0.0	45.5
Litchfield Park	57.1	4.8	38.1
Tolleson	54.2	12.5	33.3
Gila Bend	56.3	0.0	43.8
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>52.6</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>41.4</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>47.9</b>

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
Avondale	51.9	55.6	40.7	51.9	63.0	25.9	33.3	40.7	33.3	7.4	29.6	22.2	3.7
Buckeye	52.2	52.2	39.1	56.5	60.9	26.1	21.7	34.8	30.4	13.0	21.7	26.1	4.3
Goodyear	50.0	54.5	45.5	54.5	63.6	27.3	31.8	40.9	36.4	9.1	27.3	22.7	4.5
Litchfield Park	57.1	61.9	52.4	47.6	71.4	38.1	33.3	42.9	38.1	9.5	28.6	23.8	4.8
Tolleson	54.2	54.5	41.7	45.8	62.5	29.2	29.2	37.5	33.3	8.3	25.0	20.8	4.2
Gila Bend	62.5	62.5	56.3	50.0	68.8	25.0	37.5	43.8	37.5	12.5	31.3	31.3	0.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>54.1</b>	<b>56.4</b>	<b>45.1</b>	<b>51.1</b>	<b>64.7</b>	<b>28.6</b>	<b>30.8</b>	<b>39.8</b>	<b>34.6</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>27.1</b>	<b>24.1</b>	<b>3.8</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>54.6</b>	<b>54.6</b>	<b>49.9</b>	<b>58.8</b>	<b>62.8</b>	<b>29.1</b>	<b>26.8</b>	<b>36.3</b>	<b>31.1</b>	<b>14.1</b>	<b>26.8</b>	<b>25.4</b>	<b>1.7</b>

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
Avondale	3.7	11.1	3.7	22.2	37.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.7	3.7	3.7
Buckeye	4.3	8.7	4.3	26.1	34.8	4.3	0.0	0.0	4.3	8.7	0.0	0.0	4.3
Goodyear	4.5	9.1	4.5	22.7	40.9	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	4.5	0.0	4.5
Litchfield Park	4.8	19.0	4.8	14.3	42.9	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	4.8
Tolleson	8.3	12.5	4.2	20.8	41.7	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	4.2
Gila Bend	6.3	12.5	6.3	18.8	43.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	6.3
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>21.1</b>	<b>39.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>4.5</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>34.4</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>

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
Avondale	37.0	25.9	7.4	0.0	26.9
Buckeye	26.1	34.8	13.0	0.0	26.1
Goodyear	36.4	31.8	9.1	0.0	22.7
Litchfield Park	38.1	33.3	4.8	0.0	23.8
Tolleson	41.7	29.2	12.5	0.0	16.7
Gila Bend	31.3	37.5	6.3	0.0	25.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>35.3</b>	<b>31.6</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>24.1</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>26.4</b>	<b>31.4</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>29.9</b>

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

## Avondale

AArizona Early Intervention Program	LIFE
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Maricopa County
AZ EIP	Quality First
AZA United	Raising Special Kids
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	Rise
Department of Economic Security	SARRC
First Things First	SEEK
Guthrie Mainstream	Southwest Human Development
H.O.P.E. Group	Special Kids
Healthy Steps	SWHD
Leaps and Bounds ; Pre kindergarten readiness program	VSUW

## Buckeye

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

## Goodyear

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	LIFE
AZ EIP	Maricopa County
AZA United	Quality First
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	Raising Special Kids
Department of Economic Security	Rise
First Things First	SARRC
Guthrie Mainstream	SEEK
H.O.P.E. Group	Southwest Human Development
Healthy Steps	SWHD
Leaps and Bounds ; Pre kindergarten readiness program	VSUW

## Litchfield Park

Arizona Department of Education	Maricopa County
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Quality First
AZ EIP	Raising Special Kids
AZA United	Rise
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	SARRC
Department of Economic Security	SEEK
First Things First	Southwest Human Development
Guthrie Mainstream	Special Kids
H.O.P.E. Group	SWHD
Healthy Steps	VSUW
LIFE	

## Tolleson

Arizona Department of Education	LIFE
Arizona Early Intervention Program	Maricopa County
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Quality First
AZ EIP	Raising Special Kids
AZA United	Rise
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	SARRC
Department of Economic Security	SEEK
First Things First	Southwest Human Development
Guthrie Mainstream	SWHD
H.O.P.E. Group	SWHD
Healthy Steps	VSUW

## Gila Bend

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	LIFE
AZ EIP	Maricopa County
AZA United	Raising Special Kids
Child & Family Resources, Inc.	Rise
Department of Economic Security	SARRC
First Things First	SEEK
Guthrie Mainstream	SWHD
H.O.P.E. Group	VSUW
Healthy Steps	

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
Avondale	0.0	15.4	26.9	19.2	23.1	7.7	7.7
Buckeye	0.0	14.3	28.6	9.5	33.3	9.5	4.8
Goodyear	0.0	13.6	22.7	18.2	27.3	9.1	9.1
Litchfield Park	0.0	4.8	28.6	23.8	28.6	9.5	4.8
Tolleson	0.0	4.8	33.3	14.3	28.6	9.5	9.5
Gila Bend	0.0	16.7	22.2	16.7	33.3	5.6	5.6
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>27.1</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>28.7</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>7.0</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>27.9</b>	<b>21.6</b>	<b>24.1</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>7.3</b>

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
Avondale	34.6	19.2	46.2
Buckeye	34.6	19.2	46.2
Goodyear	40.9	13.6	45.5
Litchfield Park	42.9	19.0	38.1
Tolleson	42.9	14.3	42.9
Gila Bend	44.4	11.1	44.4
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>40.3</b>	<b>16.3</b>	<b>43.4</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>34.7</b>	<b>20.6</b>	<b>44.7</b>

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
Avondale	50.0	65.4	42.3	61.5	42.3	30.8	38.5	46.2	30.8	19.2	57.7	23.1	3.8
Buckeye	47.6	71.4	38.1	57.1	38.1	33.3	28.6	42.9	28.6	19.0	52.4	23.8	4.8
Goodyear	45.5	63.6	40.9	54.5	40.9	27.3	36.4	45.5	31.8	13.6	54.5	18.2	4.5
Litchfield Park	47.6	76.2	47.6	61.9	47.6	38.1	47.6	57.1	33.3	19.0	61.9	23.8	4.6
Tolleson	42.9	81.0	42.9	57.1	42.9	33.3	38.1	52.4	38.1	19.0	57.1	19.0	4.8
Gila Bend	44.4	66.7	38.9	50.0	38.9	22.2	33.3	50.0	27.8	16.7	50.0	22.2	5.6
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>46.5</b>	<b>70.5</b>	<b>41.9</b>	<b>57.4</b>	<b>41.9</b>	<b>31.0</b>	<b>37.2</b>	<b>48.8</b>	<b>31.8</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>55.8</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>55.5</b>	<b>69.2</b>	<b>39.4</b>	<b>56.9</b>	<b>40.6</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>34.3</b>	<b>43.8</b>	<b>23.9</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>52.3</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>4.8</b>

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
Avondale	7.7	26.9	7.7	23.1	7.7	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.5	0.0	7.7
Buckeye	4.8	28.6	4.8	19.0	14.3	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	4.8
Goodyear	9.1	27.3	9.1	18.2	9.1	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.6	0.0	9.1
Litchfield Park	4.8	38.1	4.8	14.3	9.5	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	9.5
Tolleson	4.8	33.3	0.0	19.0	9.5	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	9.5
Gila Bend	5.6	33.3	5.6	22.2	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	11.1
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>31.0</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>19.4</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>8.5</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>31.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>20.4</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>5.8</b>

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
Avondale	61.5	15.4	7.7	0.0	15.4
Buckeye	61.9	14.3	9.5	0.0	14.3
Goodyear	63.6	13.6	9.1	0.0	13.6
Litchfield Park	71.4	14.3	4.8	0.0	9.5
Tolleson	76.2	9.5	4.8	0.0	9.5
Gila Bend	66.7	16.7	5.6	0.0	11.1
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>12.4</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>52.7</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>18.7</b>

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

### Avondale

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Quality First
Children's Action Alliance	Southwest Human Development
First Things First	St. Josephs Hospital
Maricopa County	State Health Services
MIHS	SWHD
Phoenix Children's Hospital	VSUW

### Buckeye

Arizona Health Care System	Phoenix Children's Hospital
Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Quality First
Children's Action Alliance	Southwest Human Development
First Things First	St. Josephs Hospital
Kids Care	SWHD
Maricopa County	VSUW

### Goodyear

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

## Litchfield Park

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

## Tolleson

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Southwest Human Development
Children's Action Alliance	St. Josephs Hospital
First Things First	State Health Services
Maricopa County	SWHD
Phoenix Children's Hospital	VSUW
Quality First	

## Gila Bend

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

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
Avondale	0.0	14.8	25.9	25.9	14.8	18.5	0.0
Buckeye	0.0	8.7	17.4	34.8	17.4	21.7	0.0
Goodyear	0.0	9.5	23.8	23.8	19.0	23.8	0.0
Litchfield Park	0.0	9.5	28.6	23.8	14.3	23.8	0.0
Tolleson	0.0	9.5	19.0	28.6	19.0	23.8	0.0
Gila Bend	0.0	12.5	18.8	31.3	25.0	12.5	0.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>27.9</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>20.9</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>25.3</b>	<b>23.4</b>	<b>22.3</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>

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
Avondale	33.3	14.8	51.9
Buckeye	43.5	0.0	56.5
Goodyear	42.9	9.5	47.6
Litchfield Park	38.1	19.0	42.9
Tolleson	42.9	9.5	47.6
Gila Bend	43.8	6.3	50.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>40.3</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>49.6</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>38.0</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>52.2</b>

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
Avondale	37.0	40.7	40.7	77.8	48.1	25.9	18.5	25.9	29.6	14.8	37.0	11.1	3.7
Buckeye	39.1	52.2	43.5	73.9	69.6	17.4	21.7	34.8	34.8	17.4	39.1	13.0	4.3
Goodyear	42.9	52.4	42.9	76.2	61.9	19.0	23.8	33.3	33.3	14.3	42.9	9.5	4.8
Litchfield Park	52.4	57.1	38.1	81.0	57.1	19.0	28.6	38.1	33.3	19.0	52.4	9.5	4.8
Tolleson	42.9	57.1	42.9	71.4	61.9	28.6	23.8	33.3	33.3	14.3	42.9	9.5	4.8
Gila Bend	56.3	62.5	43.8	75.0	62.5	25.0	25.0	37.5	37.5	12.5	50.0	12.5	6.3
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>44.2</b>	<b>52.7</b>	<b>41.9</b>	<b>76.0</b>	<b>59.7</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>43.4</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>4.7</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>45.1</b>	<b>50.1</b>	<b>43.1</b>	<b>76.6</b>	<b>56.7</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>29.1</b>	<b>24.5</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>38.8</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>5.3</b>

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
Avondale	3.7	7.4	3.7	29.6	33.3	3.7	0.0	0.0	7.4	0.0	7.4	0.0	3.7
Buckeye	4.3	8.7	4.3	13.0	47.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	0.0	8.7	4.3	0.0
Goodyear	4.8	9.5	4.8	23.8	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	9.5	0.0	0.0
Litchfield Park	4.8	9.5	0.0	33.3	38.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	9.5	0.0	0.0
Tolleson	4.8	9.5	0.0	23.8	48.9	4.8	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	9.5	0.0	0.0
Gila Bend	6.3	6.3	0.0	25.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>24.8</b>	<b>41.9</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.8</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>24.8</b>	<b>40.5</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>2.8</b>

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
Avondale	44.4	25.9	7.4	0.0	22.2
Buckeye	43.5	26.1	4.3	0.0	26.1
Goodyear	52.4	23.8	4.8	0.0	19.0
Litchfield Park	52.4	28.6	4.8	0.0	14.3
Tolleson	57.1	19.0	4.8	0.0	19.0
Gila Bend	56.3	25.0	0.0	0.0	18.8
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION</b>	<b>50.4</b>	<b>24.8</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>20.2</b>
<b>TOTAL PERCENT WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY</b>	<b>46.0</b>	<b>24.4</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>22.4</b>

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

### Avondale

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Quality First
CPS	Southwest Human Development
First Things First	SWHD
GALA	Teen Outreach Pregnancy Services
Maricopa County	VSUW
NASW	YMCA
PAFCO	

### Buckeye

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	PAFCO
First Things First	Quality First
GALA	Southwest Human Development
Maricopa County	SWHD
NASW	VSUW

### Goodyear

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)	Quality First
First Things First	Southwest Human Development
GALA	SWHD
Maricopa County	Teen Outreach Pregnancy Services
NASW	VSUW
PAFCO	YMCA

## Litchfield Park

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)  
 CPS  
 First Things First  
 GALA  
 Maricopa County  
 NASW  
 PAFCO

Quality First  
 Southwest Human Development  
 SWHD  
 Teen Outreach Pregnancy Services  
 VSUW  
 YMCA

## Tolleson

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)  
 First Things First  
 GALA  
 Maricopa County  
 NASW  
 PAFCO

Quality First  
 Southwest Human Development  
 SWHD  
 Teen Outreach Pregnancy Services  
 VSUW

## Gila Bend

Association for Supportive Child Care (ASCC)  
 First Things First  
 GALA  
 Maricopa County  
 NASW

PAFCO  
 SWHD  
 Teen Outreach Pregnancy Services  
 VSUW

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

# APPENDIX B

## SOUTHWEST MARICOPA REGION

### STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

#### SECTION I. STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

---

##### **Introduction**

Meetings were held on June 14th at Avondale City Hall, and June 17th at the Care 1st Resource Center in Avondale, AZ. There were a total of six participants in attendance, including an elementary school district principal, a public health program manager, a vice chairman of the Southwest Regional Partnership Council, a library youth services manager, a Teen Outreach Pregnancy Services (TOPS) operations director, and a WIC supervisor.

##### **Assets**

A variety of programs and services were mentioned as assets in the Southwest Maricopa Region, including First Things First, the Head Start Program, the home-based Nursing and Visitation (through Family and Nurse Partnership program), St. Mary's Food Bank, Healthy Avondale, Healthy Families, parent support and training programs. However, some of the attendees also mentioned such agencies as the Maricopa Library System's Story Time, the Emergency Scholarship program, Quality First, the Grand-parenting program (Kids and Kin), the Teen Outreach Programs, Avondale's Care 1st Resource Center, the community center, the Litchfield feeding Program, and the CAPS Program (car seat installation).

In regards to key organizations that provide effective leadership in serving children five and under and their families in the Southwest Maricopa Region, participants mentioned agencies such as the Phoenix Children Hospital (Health Services and Play Services), Southwest Human Development, the West Valley Leadership Program, and the West Valley Black Arizona Program.

Participants thought it would be possible to build on these assets if there were more collaboration among agencies, more information given to parents on the services available, a centralized hub to search for the resources available, and getting children and their families more involved.

##### **Needs**

In regards to needs not being met in the community the majority of the participants agreed that childcare, mental health services, social services, and parent education and training were definite concerns. The participants also mentioned need areas not being met such as families not having food, shelter, transportation and clothing, healthcare services (dental), car seats or education about car seats, provider training so that the provider can educate the families, no prenatal care for pregnant teens, grand-parenting programs, early childhood development, and services for disabled and special needs children and their families. Participants also expressed the need for education on developmental disabilities.

In conjunction with the above mentioned areas of need, there were a number of barriers discussed that keep families from getting what they need to support the development, health, and education of their children that included: transportation, the failing economy (no money, jobs, or homes), linguistic and cultural barriers, families not knowing what services are available, lack of knowledge on the providers' behalf, and a lack of trust by the families.

Children and their families are being turned away from a variety of services due to the DES childcare waiting list, unaffordable child care, and not enough services being provided in their region. Most of the services needed are either located in other regions or overlapping, and not in the families' locations. If services are not offered, families are turned away instead of being redirected to alternative regions for needed services. Other reasons included the denial of AHCCCS due to immigration and legal status.

In order to address these areas of concern, families need transportation and/or mobile units to ensure that the families have access to the available services. Also, gaps in services can be addressed through programs paying the sliding scale fee for families, providing resource centers at schools for references and referral assistance, providing in-home services, expanding available resources to more regions (avoiding overlapping), and increasing parent education and their knowledge of services. In an effort to address mental health issues, participants suggested increasing the screening efforts.

## **Information and Coordination**

There was a consensus among the groups that families were not aware of the available services being provided in their communities and that the providers in their communities are not even aware of all the resources and how to access them. There is a lack of outreach between the providers and the families, therefore causing a gap in services available and provided. In the Southwest Maricopa Region, participants feel that if the needed information on services is not found at the Care 1st Resource Center, the families are not aware of what is out there or where to find it.

The communication and the collaboration among agencies and organizations in the community is lacking as well. The communication is only on an as-needed basis. One of the attendees made the comment that the communication is difficult due to people being territorial and wanting to protect their own. Participants feel that if there is more collaboration among the agencies, then the gap in services can be addressed, as well as the elimination of overlapping or duplicated services.

## **Suggestions and Ideas**

Childcare, early childhood development, parenting support and education, and healthcare services were all mentioned universally in both meetings in regards to the FTF funding priorities. Also mentioned as funding priorities were transportations services, health prevention and awareness services, literacy development, pregnant and parenting teens, grand-parenting, education on car seats, Head Start, policy development that protects children and their health, and resource centers at health clinics and schools.

It was suggested that to improve families' involvement and increase providers and families' knowledge of services available and where they are provided, First Things First should consider creating a centralized hub for information or a directory containing all available services, the providers of those services, and where the services are located.

## SECTION II. PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

### Introduction

During the month of June, personal telephone interviews were conducted within the Southwest Maricopa Region in an effort to encourage core neighborhood leaders to share their insights and opinions about services for children five and under and their families. The targeted population included neighborhood activists and leaders of community groups. The towns and cities from which interview participants were drawn included: Avondale, Buckeye, Goodyear, Litchfield Park, Tolleson, and Gila Bend. Some of the interviewees were located in other cities or towns but provided services in the FTF Southwest Maricopa Region. Several interviewees chose to provide their responses to the interview questions in written form. Written responses were reviewed and follow-up e-mails or calls were made to provide any needed clarifications. There was a broad range of interviewees from parents, childcare center owners, community advocates, resource coordinators, and community groups. After multiple attempts to contact the stakeholders provided by FTF (via e-mail and phone), 11 provided responses for this report

### Assets

When asked about services and community efforts that are working well in their communities, interviewees described a number of programs and organizations. Some examples given by interviewees included:

- AHCCCS program.
- Parenting education classes.
- Summer food programs.
- The Arizona Kids and Kin program (grand-parenting programs).
- The Library Story Time program.
- Parenting and Teens Outreach programs.
- Health Fairs (immunizations and car seats).
- The WIC program. There are three computers at the community WIC office for the children under five to play with while parents are in classes or while waiting to complete the WIC process.
- The Emergency Baby Boxes program (Giveaway of 50-60 boxes containing diapers, wipes, formula, and baby food).
- The Family Literacy Support and Education programs. The community has Literacy Symposiums for adults in the community. The next Symposium will be bilingual and will be for both the children and their families.
- Care 1st Resource Center (One-Stop Shopping). According to the interviewee, as one of several social services agencies, the Care 1st Resource Center in downtown Avondale is the type of venue that provides a plethora of services to the community in a convenient, safe, and comfortable environment, helps to alleviate major barriers to accessing services for families. The CRC is “kid friendly” and provides an environment where parents can take care

of their business while children are being entertained. The more services that are made available through this type of venue, the more families can be served.

Interviewees were also queried about key organizations providing leadership concerning early childhood services in their areas. The following organizations were mentioned:

- Rio Salado College. The college provides parenting classes, education, and training. They also offer behavioral counseling through Kids and Kin.
- United Way.
- City of Avondale.
- Care 1st Health Plan of AZ.
- Women's Health Coalition of Avondale.
- WIC.

## Needs

Interviewees were also asked to describe unmet needs within their communities for children five and under and their families. In this context, they discussed services from which this group may have been turned away or denied as well as the barriers to receiving needed services. The list of unmet needs provided in the interviews is as follows:

- Healthcare. Access to healthcare is very limited.
- Activities for young children. Children need a stimulating social environment to aid in early childhood development.
- Affordable and quality childcare that will allow the parents to get the education and services they need.
- Services for special needs children and their families, including children with autism.
- Parent education.
- Early childhood education.
- Food and nutrition.
- Emergency counseling.
- Domestic violence awareness in families with children five and under.
- Mental health services.

As mentioned, barriers were also discussed both in the context of families being denied services or effectively prevented from receiving them. Interviewees mentioned that families are not being turned away or denied services. However, because of such things as parents' lack of education and training, families are afraid, and due to the political climate, families are not seeking services. Many of the interviewees shared some of what they considered as barriers. At the top of the list were Immigration Laws and Transportation. Also mentioned as barriers were such as new state laws to require state employees to report people who may not be in the country legally, linguistic and

cultural barriers, childcare, no money or jobs, communication is lacking, and services are just not available in the area.

## Information and Coordination

Interviewees were asked how well they think organizations that serve families with young children are working together as well as how this can be improved.

A few interviewees stated that the collaboration among agencies is fair but needs to improve. Yet, other interviewees felt that organizations were working very well together and further stated that a lot of referrals between agencies occur due to First Things First. The interviewees felt that the Care 1st Resource Center (CRC) serves as the wave of the future for coordinating services. Interviewee expressed that with the economic situation, families need a place to go to access services or obtain information. The CRC is a good starting point to lead families to services. The collaboration between CRC and other agencies only leads to referrals among each other's services.

An example given by an interviewee of the type of collaboration among agencies included such things as when the CRC intake personnel identify a pregnant woman or one with small children, there is an automatic referral to WIC. The same goes with WIC identifying families without health insurance. WIC refers them to CRC's Women's Health Coalition (WHC). Also, during the WHC monthly meetings, other such providers such as social services and faith-based organizations from throughout the community are encouraged to attend so they can network and support each other.

Interviewees were asked to comment on how well families in their community are aware of or know how to find services or resources from which they could benefit. Although a few participants said that the families are not aware, others suggested that the families were aware, but improvement is needed. Interviewees mentioned that there is a great hub for referrals and bilingual communication in their communities. One interviewee felt that there is still much to be done to inform and educate communities about the benefits and services available to support families. However, a much bigger and wider ranged outreach plan should be developed and conducted in order for more families to know where to go.

## Suggestions and Ideas

Throughout the interviews, the participants were asked to suggest how to improve services for children five and under and their families and how to address these families' unmet needs in their community. Some of the interviewees made the following suggestions:

- Increase campaigning and advertising for First Things First.
- More educated and bilingual staff.
- Vouchers for childcare.
- Supply bus passes and transportation vouchers to families.
- Coordination of referral services.
- More areas or venues for families to access resources. Extend service area to include those hard to reach rural areas.
- More educational stimulating activities for families with young children.

- Provide more services.

Lastly, interview participants were asked to identify what they felt to be the top priority for FTF funding in their community. The responses are below:

- Mental health services.
- Food and nutrition.
- Social services.
- Childcare services.
- More communication and collaboration.
- Early childhood education.
- Provide mobile units to serve those hard to reach areas.
- FTF should expound upon the CRC in downtown Avondale and make other venues such as CRC available in other targeted communities.

# 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 mean that parents do not notice signs of developmental 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.

