

Prenatal-to-3 State Policy Roadmap - Errata

We hold ourselves to strict standards of precision and accuracy, but admit that occasionally we will fall short. The inaugural 2020 Prenatal-to-3 State Policy Roadmap included national and state-specific data on 111 indicators, including all of our policy and strategy-specific variation measures, outcomes, and demographics. The data for 41 of these indicators were derived from state-specific sources versus single, national datasets or summary information provided by secondary sources. With this volume and variety of data, we recognize that we may have missed a detail or nuance in identifying the most recent information or interpreting state-specific materials (e.g., SNAP administrative manuals). We encourage rigorous engagement with our reported information and welcome any questions or corrections from states and sources.

As a part of the PN3 Policy Impact Center's commitment to rigorous, transparent, and evidence-based policy analysis, we have collected the errors found to date in the information reported in our Prenatal-to-3 State Policy Roadmap and associated materials (e.g., state-specific state roadmaps). Errors we have identified are listed by policy/strategy. We will use the corrected data in our reporting, calculations, and analyses going forward, including our tracking of state-level progress in next year's roadmap.

Prenatal-to-3 State Policy Roadmap Errors (as of February 1, 2021)

(see individual sections below for more details)

- *Reduced Administrative Burden for SNAP*
 - Incorrect values for 14 states for the median recertification interval for households with SNAP-eligible children under 18
 - Incorrect interpretation of the recertification interval specified in the SNAP manual for two states (Mississippi and New York)
- *State Minimum Wage*
 - Incorrect value for Rhode Island's current minimum wage
 - Incorrect value for Rhode Island's cost-of-living adjusted minimum wage
- *Comprehensive Screening and Referral Programs*
 - Incorrect programs identified in three states (Iowa, Hawaii, and Minnesota)
- *Child Care Subsidies*
 - Incorrect source year for the Market Rate Survey used to set base reimbursement rates reported for Indiana and Texas
 - Incorrect base reimbursement rates reported for North Carolina
 - Incorrect reimbursement rates IF at the 75th percentile reported for Texas

For additional information regarding calculation details, data quality, and source data please refer to [Methods and Sources section of pn3policy.org](https://pn3policy.org).

Reduced Administrative Burden for SNAP

An internal review of the calculated values of the median recertification interval for households with any SNAP-eligible children under 18 identified that in the final transfer of these data to the files used in our analysis and report, an error was made and the **mean** value was used instead of the **median**. This caused the incorrect values to be reported for 14 states (see table below).

SNAP Recertification interval for households with SNAP-eligible children under 18

State	Mean (Incorrect data reported in Roadmap)	Median (Correct Data)
Alabama	12	12
Alaska	7	6
Arizona	6	6
Arkansas	13	12
California	12	12
Colorado	6	6
Connecticut	13	12
Delaware	12	12
District of Columbia	12	12
Florida	6	6
Georgia	6	6
Hawaii	12	12
Idaho	6	6
Illinois	12	12
Indiana	12	12
Iowa	6	6
Kansas	13	12
Kentucky	12	12
Louisiana	13	12
Maine	12	12
Maryland	7	6
Massachusetts	13	12
Michigan	12	12
Minnesota	12	12
Mississippi	10	12
Missouri	13	12
Montana	12	12
Nebraska	6	6
Nevada	6	6
New Hampshire	6	6

State	Mean (Incorrect data reported in Roadmap)	Median (Correct Data)
New Jersey	12	12
New Mexico	12	12
New York	11	12
North Carolina	6	6
North Dakota	6	6
Ohio	12	12
Oklahoma	13	12
Oregon	12	12
Pennsylvania	13	12
Rhode Island	12	12
South Carolina	6	6
South Dakota	12	12
Tennessee	12	12
Texas	6	6
Utah	6	6
Vermont	12	12
Virginia	12	12
Washington	12	12
West Virginia	13	12
Wisconsin	12	12
Wyoming	5	4

Notes: States noted in bold have subsequent changes in their adoption status due to the change in reported value. The changes noted above impact data presented in the tables on pages 145-146 and 281-282 of the Roadmap report and in the state-specific information reported on page 6 in the individual State Roadmaps.

For 12 states, the median is lower than the reported mean. There is no additional impact of this reporting error for these 12 states.

For 2 states, the median is higher than the reported mean. For these states (**New York** and **Mississippi**) the impact of this data change is that they now qualify as having adopted and fully implemented the reduced administrative burden for SNAP policy. Additionally, upon further review of their SNAP manuals, it was discovered that the information contained had been incorrectly coded by our researchers. These two errors together impact the status of this policy for New York and Mississippi (see table below). This change is notable for Mississippi as with the incorrect information, Mississippi was identified as not fully implementing any of the effective policies. With the change in its status for Reduced Administrative Burden for SNAP, Mississippi has adopted and implemented one of the effective policies. For New York, the change in adoption status places New York in the category of states that have adopted and implemented all five effective policies.

State status of adoption and implementation of the Reduced Administrative Burden for SNAP policy

State	Incorrect data reported in Roadmap	Correct Data
Mississippi	0 - No, and the SNAP manual does not allow for a recertification interval of at least 12 months.	7 - Yes, but the SNAP manual provides little specific recertification interval guidance.
New York	0 - No, and the SNAP manual does not allow for a recertification interval of at least 12 months.	8 - Yes, but the SNAP manual allows for recertification intervals that are less than 12 months.

The changes to adoption status and progress noted above impact the information depicted in summary tables and graphics in multiple locations in the Roadmap and related products, such as the individual State Roadmaps:

- The policy counts in the policy summary graphic on pages 7 and 228 of the Roadmap and on page 4 of the individual state roadmaps:
 - Mississippi moves from 0 out of 5 to 1 out of 5.
 - New York moves from 4 out of 5 to 5 out of 5.
- The count of states (34 instead of 32) and adoption status map for Reduced Administrative Burden for SNAP on pages 8, 50, 67, 147, and 229 of the Roadmap.
- The summary counts of states’ adoption progress for Reduced Administrative Burden for SNAP in the table on pages 12 and 233 of the Roadmap (10 states instead of 12 coded as “0”, 2 states instead of 1 coded as “7”, and 11 states instead of 10 coded as “8”) and in the similar chart on page 6 of the individual State Roadmaps.
- The adoption progress table and associated choropleth map graphic for Reduced Administrative Burden for SNAP on page 144 of the Roadmap (with Mississippi’s progress value changing from 0 to 7 and New York’s progress value changing from 0 to 8).
- The progress to adoption value and description reported on page 6 of the Mississippi and New York State Roadmaps.

State Minimum Wage

In the Prenatal-to-3 Roadmap and associated materials, the minimum wage for Rhode Island as of October 1, 2020 was mistakenly reported as \$10.50. In 2020, a bill was enacted to schedule an increase in the minimum wage to \$11.50 effective October 1, 2020 [S. 2147 Substitute A, 2020 Leg., Reg. Sess., (R.I. 2020). <http://webserver.rilin.state.ri.us/BillText/BillText20/SenateText20/S2147A.pdf>]. The minimum wage data presented in the Roadmap and related products are meant to reflect the minimum wage as of October 1, 2020. The minimum wage for Rhode Island presented in the maps and tables on pages 162 and 284 of the Roadmap and page 7 of Rhode Island’s State Policy Roadmap should be \$11.50 and not \$10.50. Additionally, the cost-of-living adjusted hourly minimum wage should be \$11.58 instead of \$10.57 (pages 163 and 284 of the Roadmap and page 7 of Rhode Island’s State Policy Roadmap). This change to Rhode Island’s minimum wage does not impact Rhode Island’s adoption status as the reported minimum wage of \$10.50 was already above \$10; in all Roadmap text and tables Rhode Island was already credited with adopting and implementing a state minimum wage of at least \$10.

State Minimum Wage and Cost-of-Living Adjusted Minimum Wage – Rhode Island

	Incorrect data reported in Roadmap	Correct Data
Current Minimum Wage	\$10.50	\$11.50
Cost-of-Living Adjusted Minimum Wage	\$10.57	\$11.58

Comprehensive Screening and Referral Programs

In two states, existing Family Connects sites were not reported in the Roadmap: **Iowa** and **Minnesota**. In a third state, existing Healthy Steps sites were not reported in the Roadmap: **Hawaii**.

State has Evidence-based Comprehensive Screening and Referral Programs

	Incorrect data reported in Roadmap	Correct Data
Hawaii	Neither	HS
Iowa	Neither	FC
Minnesota	HS	Both FC and HS

Notes: The changes noted in the table impact the narrative summary of state screening and referral programs on pages 28 and 177 of the Roadmap and the screening and referral program data reported on page 178 of the Roadmap and page 8 of the Hawaii, Iowa, and Minnesota State Roadmaps.

As a result of these changes, there are impacts on the overall progress of these states. Both **Iowa** and **Hawaii** move from having “little to no progress” to “some progress” in their categorical assessment of progress. **Minnesota** moves from “some progress” to “substantial progress.”

State status of progress toward implementation of the Child Care Subsidies strategy

	Incorrect data reported in Roadmap	Correct Data
Hawaii	1 - State does not have Family Connects sites, Healthy Steps sites, or an alternative comprehensive screening program.	5 - State has either Family Connects or Healthy Steps sites.
Iowa	3 - State has neither Family Connects or Healthy Steps sites, but does have an alternative comprehensive screening program.	6 - State has Family Connects or Healthy Steps sites (but not both) and an alternative comprehensive screening program.
Minnesota	5 - State has either Family Connects or Healthy Steps sites.	7 – State has both Family Connects and Healthy Steps sites.

Notes: The change in implementation status noted above impacts the progress data presented in the table and choropleth map on page 178 of the Roadmap and on page 8 of the Hawaii, Iowa, and Minnesota State Roadmaps. Additionally, these changes impact the total counts of states falling into the progress categories reported on pages 12 and 233 of the National Roadmap and page 8 of the State Roadmaps – 20 states instead of 21 in category “1”, 4 states instead of 5 in category “3”, 4 states instead of 3 in category “6”, and 8 states instead of 7 in category “7”.

The changes to implementation status and progress noted above impact the information depicted in summary tables and graphics in multiple locations in the Roadmap and related products, such as the individual State Roadmaps:

- In the strategy counts in the summary graphic on pages 7 and 228 of the Roadmap and on page 4 of the individual state roadmaps, Minnesota moves from a 2 out of 6 to a 3 out of 6.
- The count of states (9 instead of 8) and adoption status map for Comprehensive Screening and Referral Programs on pages 10, 51, 125, 173, and 231 of the Roadmap.
- The summary counts of states' adoption progress for Comprehensive Screening and Referral Programs in the table on pages 12 and 233 of the Roadmap (20 states instead of 21 in category "1", 4 states instead of 5 in category "3", 4 states instead of 3 in category "6", and 8 states instead of 7 in category "7") and in the similar chart on page 8 of the individual State Roadmaps.
- The adoption progress table and associated choropleth map graphic for Comprehensive Screening and Referral Programs on page 178 of the Roadmap (with Hawaii's progress value changing from 1 to 5, Iowa's progress value changing from 3 to 6, and Minnesota's progress value changing from 5 to 7).
- The progress to adoption value and description reported on page 8 of the Hawaii, Iowa, and Minnesota State Roadmaps.

Child Care Subsidies

Market Rate Surveys

In two states, a more recent market rate survey was used to set the base reimbursement rates than was reported in the Roadmap: **Indiana** and **Texas**.

Year of Market Rate Survey used to set current base reimbursement rates as of July 1, 2020

	Incorrect data reported in Roadmap	Correct Data
Indiana	2017	2018
Texas	2017	2019

Notes: The changes noted in the table impact the data reported in the tables on pages 185-186 of the Roadmap and page 8 of the Indiana and Texas State Roadmaps.

As a result of these changes, there are small impacts on the overall progress of two states, **Indiana** and **Texas**. Their categorical progress rating, little to no progress, does not change, however the value associated with their progress to implementation increases from 1 to 3.

State status of progress toward implementation of the Child Care Subsidies strategy

	Incorrect data reported in Roadmap	Correct Data
Indiana	1 - State base reimbursement rates do not meet the federally recommended 75th percentile and the state relies on an older (>2 years) market rate survey to set rates.	3 - State base reimbursement rates do not meet the federally recommended 75th percentile but the state relies on a recent market rate survey to set rates.
Texas	1 - State base reimbursement rates do not meet the federally recommended 75th percentile and the state relies on an older (>2 years) market rate survey to set rates.	3 - State base reimbursement rates do not meet the federally recommended 75th percentile but the state relies on a recent market rate survey to set rates.

Notes: The change in implementation status noted above impacts the progress data presented in the table and choropleth map on page 184 of the Roadmap and on page 8 of the Indiana and Texas State Roadmaps, with both Indiana and Texas moving from a value of 1 to a value of 3. Additionally, these changes impact the total counts of states falling into the progress categories reported on pages 12 and 233 of the National Roadmap and page 8 of the State Roadmaps – 19 states, instead of 21 in category “1” and 22 states instead of 20 in category “3”.

Subsidy Rates – North Carolina

Incorrect rates were reported for **North Carolina** for the base and 75th percentile reimbursement rates. North Carolina only provides subsidies for children enrolled in center-based and family child care settings rated as 3-star or higher in the North Carolina Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS) (<https://ncchildcare.ncdhhs.gov/Provider/Providing-Child-Care/Subsidized-Child-Care/Care-for-Children-Receiving-Subsidy>). However, the rates originally reported in the Roadmap reflect reimbursement rates for QRIS 1-star rated settings. Infant rates were also used for all groups; the rates below are for infants/toddlers and 2-year-olds in center-based care and infants and 2-year-olds in family child care.

Base reimbursement rates and calculated rates IF set at the 75th percentile of the Market Rate Survey used to set reimbursement rates – North Carolina

	Incorrect data reported in Roadmap	Correct Data
<i>Center-based care</i>		
Infant base rate	\$536	\$963
Base reimbursement rate for infants IF set at 75 th percentile of the Market Rate Survey used to set reimbursement rates	\$1,170	\$1,257
Toddler base rate	\$536	\$937
Base reimbursement rate for toddlers IF set at 75 th percentile of the Market Rate Survey used to set reimbursement rates	\$1,170	\$1,213
<i>Family child care</i>		
Infant base rate	\$446	\$740
Base reimbursement rate for infants IF set at 75 th percentile of the Market Rate Survey used to set reimbursement rates	\$711	\$715
Toddler base rate	\$446	\$743
Base reimbursement rate for toddlers IF set at 75 th percentile of the Market Rate Survey used to set reimbursement rates	\$715	\$715

Notes: The data changes noted in the table impact the information presented in the tables on pages 189-190 and pages 287-288 of the Roadmap. Additionally, for family child care, North Carolina’s corrected base reimbursement rate is now at or above the 75th percentile moving them from the “No” to the “Yes” category reported in the table on page 186 of the Roadmap and on page 8 of the North Carolina State Roadmap.

Subsidy Rates – Texas

In the Roadmap, we mistakenly reported that the current reimbursement rates for **Texas** (released in August of 2018) were based on the 2017 Market Rate Survey; however the values we reported were based on the 2018 Market Rate Survey (<https://www.twc.state.tx.us/files/partners/board-maximum-reimbursement-rates-twc.pdf>). The reimbursement rates in place as of July 1, 2020 took effect October 1, 2019 (https://www.twc.texas.gov/files/policy_letters/attachments/wd-23-19att1-twc.pdf) and are based on the 2019 Market Rate Survey (https://www.twc.texas.gov/files/policy_letters/wd-23-19-twc.pdf). Reimbursement rates for the Gulf Coast Workforce Development Area (the geographic location used in reporting base reimbursement rates) did not change between 2018 and 2019.

Additionally, the 75th percentile reimbursement rates presented in the Roadmap for Texas were calculated using the older, incorrect market rate survey (2017). Corrected versions of the base reimbursement rates if set at the 75th percentile based on the 2019 Market Rate Survey are presented in the table below. This change does not impact the progress value for Texas as the base reimbursement rates are still below the rate at the 75th percentile.

Base reimbursement rates and calculated rates IF set at the 75th percentile of the Market Rate Survey used to set reimbursement rates – Texas

Texas	Incorrect data reported in Roadmap	Correct Data
<i>Center-based care</i>		
Infant base rate	\$702	\$702
Base reimbursement rate for infants IF set at 75 th percentile of the Market Rate Survey used to set reimbursement rates	\$787	\$871
Toddler base rate	\$604	\$604
Base reimbursement rate for toddlers IF set at 75 th percentile of the Market Rate Survey used to set reimbursement rates	\$731	\$801
<i>Family child care</i>		
Infant base rate	\$558	\$558
Base reimbursement rate for infants IF set at 75 th percentile of the Market Rate Survey used to set reimbursement rates	\$700	\$765
Toddler base rate	\$531	\$531
Base reimbursement rate for toddlers IF set at 75 th percentile of the Market Rate Survey used to set reimbursement rates	\$650	\$727

Notes: The data changes noted in the table impact the information presented in the tables on pages 189-190 and pages 287-288 of the Roadmap.