

MEMORANDUM

September 9, 2021

Subject: Eligibility Estimates at Each Income Limit Used in the Definition of *Eligible Child* in a Proposed “Birth Through Five Child Care and Early Learning Entitlement”

From: Karen E. Lynch, Specialist in Social Policy, klynch@crs.loc.gov, 7-6899
Conor F. Boyle, Analyst in Social Policy, cboyle@crs.loc.gov, 7-2896
Emma C. Nyhof, Research Assistant, enyhof@crs.loc.gov, 7-3215

This memorandum was prepared to enable distribution to more than one congressional office.

On September 8, 2021, the House Committee on Education and Labor released a draft amendment in the nature of a substitute to a draft committee print responding to reconciliation directives contained in the FY2022 budget resolution (S.Con.Res. 14). This memorandum presents eligibility estimates for the child care proposal included in this amendment in the nature of a substitute, as released on September 8th (i.e., it does not reflect any changes that may be adopted at markup).¹ The child care proposal contained in the draft amendment in the nature of a substitute would, if enacted, establish a new “Birth Through Five Child Care and Early Learning Entitlement.” In many cases, this proposal draws on rules and definitions used in the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) Act. However, the proposal would not amend the CCDBG Act. Rather, it would establish a new program targeted to young children (i.e., those ages 0-5, but not yet in kindergarten).

In sum, the estimates in this memo suggest that roughly 16.8 million children may have been eligible for child care benefits under the draft proposal had it been fully implemented in early 2019. (The estimates reflect early 2019 because they draw on survey data that generally cover this timeframe.) The Congressional Research Service (CRS) developed these estimates primarily using data from the 2019 Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey (CPS). The 2019 ASEC includes demographic and other information about individuals and families, including their income, work status, and use of paid child care.² Effectively, the estimates in this memo represent the number of children who might have been eligible if the proposed child care program had been fully implemented in early 2019. The estimates capture children with at least one parent who met the activity requirements (if applicable) in the early months of 2019 and whose families also met the income requirements based on annual income in the prior year. In addition, CRS used the October 2018 School

¹ The draft committee print and the draft amendment in the nature of a substitute were accessed by the Congressional Research Service on September 8, 2021, and can be found at <https://docs.house.gov/Committee/Calendar/ByEvent.aspx?EventID=114029>. The draft amendment in the nature of the substitute was used for the analysis in this memo. Any changes to this text made during committee markup are not reflected in this memo.

² Data from the 2020 ASEC are also available, but it is not yet clear how the onset of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) may have affected the collection of those data, given that the survey was fielded in March 2020. As such, the Congressional Research Service opted to use the 2019 ASEC instead.

Enrollment Supplement to the CPS to refine child eligibility based on kindergarten enrollment status for the 2018-2019 school year. The **Appendix** provides further detail on certain data and methods used for this memo, including limitations.

Please note that the estimates in this memo were prepared for illustrative purposes only. Should this proposal be approved by the committee, the Congressional Budget Office would be responsible for developing a cost estimate. If enacted, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) would be the agency responsible for working with states, territories, and tribes to implement the new program.

Definition of *Eligible Child*

The text box presents the definition of an eligible child used in the draft proposal. The definition includes factors related to the child's age, the child's kindergarten enrollment status, the family's income, the family's assets, and (with limited exceptions) whether the child resides with a parent participating in an eligible activity.

Definition of *Eligible Child*

ELIGIBLE CHILD.—The term “eligible child” means an individual (without regard to the immigration status of the individual or of any parent of the individual)—

- (A) who is less than 6 years of age;
- (B) who is not yet in kindergarten;
- (C) whose family income does not exceed—
 - (i) for fiscal year 2022, 100 percent of the State median income for a family of the same size;
 - (ii) for fiscal year 2023, 115 percent of such State median income;
 - (iii) for fiscal year 2024, 130 percent of such State median income; and
 - (iv) for each of fiscal years 2025 through 2027, 200 percent of such State median income
- (D) whose family assets do not exceed \$1,000,000 (as certified by a member of such family); and
- (E) who—
 - (i) resides with a parent participating in an eligible activity;
 - (ii) is included in a population of vulnerable children identified by the lead agency involved, which at a minimum shall include children experiencing homelessness, children in foster care, children in kinship care, and children who are receiving, or need to receive, child protective services; or
 - (iii) resides with a parent who is more than 65 years of age.

The income limits applied by this definition would increase incrementally over a period of four years, until settling at 200% of state median income in FY2025. Estimates in this memo consider eligibility at 100% of SMI and each successive income limit, concluding with the maximum limit of 200% of SMI. The draft proposal does not define the term *family income*, so there is some question as to whose income (and what types of income) might count for eligibility purposes. The estimates in this memo use income from all members of the family unit.³ If states are given the flexibility in such determinations (as they are under the CCDBG), there may be greater variation in countable income than is reflected in this memo.

In most cases, to be considered eligible, a child must reside with “a parent” who is participating in an eligible activity. The proposal would defer to the CCDBG Act definition of *parent*, which includes a legal guardian, foster parent, or other person standing in loco parentis.⁴ The CCDBG Act typically applies

³ The family unit is based on the Supplemental Poverty Measure (SPM) unit. For further discussion of income and family units, see the **Appendix**. Note that, due to limitations in the data, estimates in this memo assume families that were income-eligible were also asset-eligible. Income used to determine eligibility consists of total cash income, which includes earnings, other market income, and certain cash benefits (e.g., from social insurance, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and Supplemental Security Income (SSI)) before tax. Non-cash benefits, such as Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits, health benefits, subsidized housing, and energy assistance, are not included in this measure of income.

⁴ See §658P(10) of the CCDBG Act.

parental activity requirements to a child’s “parent or parents,” which has traditionally been interpreted as meaning both parents in a two-parent household.⁵ By contrast, the draft proposal would apply the activity requirement to “a parent,” suggesting that only one parent in a two-parent household must meet the activity standard. As such, the estimates of eligible children in this memo include those in two-parent households where only one parent meets the activity requirement.

Under the draft proposal, eligible activities are to include (at a minimum) the following:

- full-time or part-time employment, including self-employment;
- job search;
- job training;
- secondary, post-secondary, or adult education (e.g., a “program of high school classes, a course of study at an institution of higher education, classes toward an equivalent of a high school diploma recognized by State law, or English as a Second Language classes”);
- health treatment (including mental health or substance use treatment) for a condition that prevents participation in other eligible activities;
- activities to prevent child abuse or neglect, or for family violence prevention/intervention;
- employment and training under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP);
- employment and training activities under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA);
- work activities under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant; and
- leave taken under the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) or federal employee-equivalent, or state, local, or employer-provided paid or unpaid family, medical, or disability leave.

The proposal generally does not provide great detail about these eligible activities. For instance, the proposal does not specify what activities count as job search, nor does it specify a minimum number of hours needed to qualify participation as an eligible activity. As a result, states might exercise some flexibility in implementing the proposed eligible activity requirements, though this flexibility might be affected by HHS guidance or regulations. For purposes of the estimates in this memo, CRS assumed that any participation in an eligible activity would be sufficient.⁶

The draft proposal would effectively exempt certain children from the parental activity requirement, including children with at least one parent over the age of 65 and *vulnerable children* as defined by a lead agency receiving funds. The proposal specifies that vulnerable children are to include, at a minimum, children experiencing homelessness, children in foster care, children in kinship care, and children who are receiving, or who need to receive, child protective services. Due to lack of available data and uncertainty regarding how broadly this phrase might be interpreted, CRS did not attempt to estimate the number of all vulnerable children, meaning that eligible vulnerable children may be undercounted in these estimates. However, CRS did exempt from parental activity requirements those children with a parent over the age of 65, those children reported on the ASEC as being foster children, and those children reported on the ASEC as residing in certain living quarters that may qualify as homeless.

⁵ In practice, states and territories sometimes make exceptions under the CCDBG for two-parent families in which one parent has a disability or is otherwise incapable of providing care. For more information, see Kelly Dwyer, Sarah Minton, Danielle Kwon, and Kennedy Weisner, *The CCDF Policies Database Book of Tables: Key Cross-State Variation in CCDF Policies as of October 1, 2019*, HHS ACF Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, OPRE Report #2021-07, December 2020, pp. 13-62.

⁶ This decision and other assumptions and data limitations related to eligibility pathways are discussed in the Appendix.

Estimates of Eligible Children

Overall, 2019 ASEC data suggest there were approximately 23.7 million children ages 0-5 in early 2019. Of this total, somewhere between 10.6 million (45%) and 16.8 million (71%) were estimated to be eligible for child care benefits, depending on the income limit in place. Each income limit shown in **Table 1** corresponds to a limit specified in the proposal’s definition of *eligible child*, which incrementally increases the income limit from 100% of SMI in FY2022 up to 200% of SMI in FY2025.⁷ The estimates in this table were derived in two steps. First, CRS used the 2019 ASEC to identify children ages 0-5 whose family met parental activity requirements (unless identified as exempt) and whose family met each specified income limit. From there, CRS adjusted the estimates for kindergarten enrollment using data from the CPS School Enrollment Supplement from October of the 2018-2019 school year.⁸

Table 1. Eligibility Status of Children Ages 0-5 at Different Income Limits
Number of Children in Millions

Eligibility Status	100% of SMI		115% of SMI		130% of SMI		200% of SMI	
	Number of Children	% of Children	Number of Children	% of Children	Number of Children	% of Children	Number of Children	% of Children
Ineligible	13.2	55%	11.7	49%	10.6	44%	6.9	29%
Eligible	10.6	45%	12.0	51%	13.2	56%	16.8	71%
Total	23.7	100%	23.7	100%	23.7	100%	23.7	100%

Source: Estimated by the Congressional Research Service, based on data from the March 2019 Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey (CPS). Estimates were further adjusted based on data contained in the October 2018 CPS School Enrollment Supplement. The estimates capture children ages 0-5 who were not yet enrolled in kindergarten, who had a parent who met activity requirements in the early months of 2019 (or who was exempted from these requirements), and whose families met the applicable income eligibility requirements based on annual income in the prior year (2018). See **Appendix** for a discussion of the data, methods, and limitations.

Notes: SMI = State Median Income. Totals may not sum due to rounding.

Table 2 provides a breakdown of the reasons children were not estimated to be eligible. These estimates are presented for each of the incrementally increasing income limits specified in the definition of *eligible child* in the draft proposal.⁹ Having a family income in excess of the applicable income limit was the single-largest reason children were estimated to be ineligible, though the share of such children declined as the income limit increased. Kindergarten enrollment was the second-largest hindrance to eligibility, followed by cases in which a parent was not participating in an eligible activity.

⁷ Note that all data in **Table 1** are estimates of the relevant population aged 0-5 in 2019; that is, they do not project what that population would be in FY2022 through FY2027, though such projections would be expected to be only minimally different.

⁸ The ASEC does not include information on kindergarten enrollment, which is why the October 2018 CPS School Enrollment Supplement was consulted. The 2018 CPSSchool Enrollment Supplement found that roughly 73% of five-year-olds were enrolled in kindergarten (68%) or elementary school (5%) in October of the 2018-2019 school year (see Table 2 at <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2018/demo/school-enrollment/2018-cps.html>). However, kindergarten and elementary school enrollment estimates vary by data source. For instance, the National Center for Education Statistics reports that roughly 86% of five-year-olds were enrolled in school in 2018 and 2019 (see Table 202.20 at https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d20/tables/dt20_202.20.asp). Because of this variation, and because CRS assumed that enrollment rates for five-year-olds would be the same among income- and activity-eligible and income- and activity-ineligible children and families, the adjustment for kindergarten (or elementary school) enrollment used in this memo should be considered illustrative only.

⁹ The data in **Table 2** are estimates of the relevant population aged 0-5 in 2019; that is, they do not project what that population would be in FY2022 through FY2027, though such projections would be expected to be only minimally different.

Table 2. Primary Reason a Child Is Not Estimated to Be Eligible

Number of Ineligible Children in Millions

Reason a Child Is Not Eligible	100% of SMI		115% of SMI		130% of SMI		200% of SMI	
	No. of Children	% of Children	No. of Children	% of Children	No. of Children	% of Children	No. of Children	% of Children
Income Exceeds Limit	10.6	81%	9.0	76%	7.6	72%	3.4	49%
Meets Income Limit, But Not Parent Activity Rules	1.0	8%	1.0	9%	1.1	10%	1.1	16%
<i>Single-Parent Family: Parent Not Active (non-add)</i>	0.9	6%	0.9	7%	0.9	8%	0.9	13%
<i>Two-Parent Family: <u>Neither</u> Parent Active (non-add)</i>	0.1	1%	0.1	1%	0.2	2%	0.2	3%
Meets Income and Activity Rules, But Child Enrolled in Kindergarten	1.5	12%	1.7	15%	1.9	18%	2.4	35%
Total	13.2	100%	11.7	100%	10.6	100%	6.9	100%

Source: Estimated by the Congressional Research Service, based on data from the March 2019 Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey (CPS). Estimates were further adjusted based on data contained in the October 2018 CPS School Enrollment Supplement. The estimates capture children ages 0-5 who were not yet enrolled in kindergarten, who had a parent who met activity requirements in the early months of 2019 (or who was exempted from these requirements), and whose families met the applicable income eligibility requirements based on annual income in the prior year (2018). See **Appendix** for a discussion of the data, methods, and limitations.

Notes: SMI = State Median Income. Totals may not sum due to rounding. Non-add lines sum to the total for children in income-eligible families who did not meet parent activity rules.

Appendix. Data Source, Methods, and Limitations

About the ASEC

The estimates in this memo were primarily derived using data from the 2019 Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey.¹⁰ Data from the 2020 ASEC are also available, but it is not yet clear how the onset of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic may have affected collection of those data, given that the survey was fielded in early 2020. Due to this uncertainty, data from the 2019 ASEC were used instead.

The ASEC is a household survey of the noninstitutionalized population conducted by the Census Bureau each year.¹¹ The ASEC includes questions related to household members' demographic characteristics, work experience, and income in the prior year. In addition, the ASEC includes questions about receipt of certain government benefits in the prior year. The ASEC does not include questions related to kindergarten enrollment.¹² Because the ASEC is a survey of a sample of households in the United States, estimates presented in this memorandum were weighted to make them representative of the population of U.S. households. U.S. territories are not included in the ASEC, so estimates of eligible children in the territories are excluded from this memo.

As the estimates in this memorandum come from a sample, they are subject to sampling error. Additionally, the information on the ASEC is based on respondents' answers to the survey questions. If respondents answered questions inaccurately, that might affect the estimates in this memorandum.

Family Unit

The draft proposal does not define the term “family income.” As such, there is some question as to whose income (and what income) might count for eligibility purposes. The family income estimates in this memo are based on the family unit used for the Supplemental Poverty Measure (SPM).¹³ The SPM unit includes individuals living together and related by birth, marriage, or adoption, as well as unmarried partners and their relatives, co-resident unrelated children, and foster children. The SPM unit was used because it seems to represent the economic unit in which individuals share resources to meet their needs. However, it is possible a different family unit might ultimately be used for purposes of determining eligibility under draft child care proposal. For instance, states and territories currently determine for themselves who to include in the child care assistance unit for the CCDBG.¹⁴ If this were to be the case

¹⁰ For more information on the ASEC, see <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/saie/guidance/model-input-data/cpsasec.html>.

¹¹ The noninstitutionalized population excludes those persons residing in institutional group quarters such as adult correctional facilities, juvenile facilities, skilled-nursing facilities, and other institutional facilities such as mental (psychiatric) hospitals and in-patient hospice facilities. The noninstitutionalized population includes members of the Armed Forces living in civilian housing units on a military base or in a household not on a military base.

¹² Adjustments based on school enrollment were made separately using the CPS School Enrollment Supplement. For more information, see <https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/current-population-survey-school-enrollment-supplement>. See also related discussion in footnote 8.

¹³ For more information, see CRS Report R45031, *The Supplemental Poverty Measure: Its Core Concepts, Development, and Use* (Table 1 may be of particular interest).

¹⁴ For more information on the variation in child care assistance units across states and territories, see Kelly Dwyer, Sarah Minton, Danielle Kwon, and Kennedy Weisner, *The CCDF Policies Database Book of Tables: Key Cross-State Variation in CCDF Policies as of October 1, 2019*, HHS ACF Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, OPRE Report #2021-07, December 2020, pp. 20-99.

under the draft child care proposal, there may be greater variation in family income units than is reflected in estimates presented in this memo.

State Median Income

In order to determine whether families had income meeting the incrementally increasing limits in the bill, CRS adjusted SMI estimates used by HHS to set FY2018 eligibility for the federal Low Income Home Energy Assistance (LIHEAP) program. The FY2018 LIHEAP estimates represented 60% of SMI, adjusted for family size. CRS scaled these estimates up to 100% of SMI, 115% of SMI, 130% of SMI, and 200% of SMI, adjusted for family size.

Table A-1 presents the dollar thresholds equal to 200% of SMI for a family of four in each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia. This was the maximum income limit used for the estimates in this memo. For comparison, **Table A-1** also presents the *maximum allowable* income for a family of four under the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG), based on the federal income threshold under current law (85% of SMI). (Note that while federal law sets the maximum allowable family income for CCDBG benefits at 85% of SMI, many states have chosen to set their maximum income level below this threshold.) To put SMI levels in context—and because the federal child care subsidies have historically been discussed in the context of low-income individuals—the table also displays amounts equal to 100% of the federal poverty guidelines for a family of four in 2018.

Table A-1. Estimated State Median Income (SMI) Thresholds and Federal Poverty Guidelines for a Family of Four

State	200% of SMI (FY2018)	85% of SMI (FY2018)	100% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines (2018)
Alabama	\$136,657	\$58,079	\$25,100
Alaska	\$191,567	\$81,416	\$31,380
Arizona	\$137,400	\$58,395	\$25,100
Arkansas	\$122,697	\$52,146	\$25,100
California	\$161,383	\$68,588	\$25,100
Colorado	\$178,960	\$76,058	\$25,100
Connecticut	\$220,297	\$93,626	\$25,100
Delaware	\$180,387	\$76,664	\$25,100
Dist. of Col.	\$193,217	\$82,117	\$25,100
Florida	\$136,563	\$58,039	\$25,100
Georgia	\$141,317	\$60,060	\$25,100
Hawaii	\$180,400	\$76,670	\$28,870
Idaho	\$129,960	\$55,233	\$25,100
Illinois	\$172,690	\$73,393	\$25,100
Indiana	\$148,517	\$63,120	\$25,100
Iowa	\$162,523	\$69,072	\$25,100
Kansas	\$157,910	\$67,112	\$25,100
Kentucky	\$141,893	\$60,305	\$25,100
Louisiana	\$147,153	\$62,540	\$25,100
Maine	\$158,473	\$67,351	\$25,100

State	200% of SMI (FY2018)	85% of SMI (FY2018)	100% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines (2018)
Maryland	\$220,077	\$93,533	\$25,100
Massachusetts	\$220,383	\$93,663	\$25,100
Michigan	\$158,153	\$67,215	\$25,100
Minnesota	\$192,307	\$81,730	\$25,100
Mississippi	\$120,163	\$51,069	\$25,100
Missouri	\$151,343	\$64,321	\$25,100
Montana	\$145,587	\$61,874	\$25,100
Nebraska	\$160,173	\$68,074	\$25,100
Nevada	\$138,723	\$58,957	\$25,100
New Hampshire	\$204,750	\$87,019	\$25,100
New Jersey	\$220,413	\$93,676	\$25,100
New Mexico	\$122,777	\$52,180	\$25,100
New York	\$178,273	\$75,766	\$25,100
North Carolina	\$140,637	\$59,771	\$25,100
North Dakota	\$181,497	\$77,136	\$25,100
Ohio	\$159,103	\$67,619	\$25,100
Oklahoma	\$133,633	\$56,794	\$25,100
Oregon	\$148,043	\$62,918	\$25,100
Pennsylvania	\$172,717	\$73,405	\$25,100
Rhode Island	\$186,407	\$79,223	\$25,100
South Carolina	\$134,727	\$57,259	\$25,100
South Dakota	\$155,093	\$65,915	\$25,100
Tennessee	\$135,663	\$57,657	\$25,100
Texas	\$145,037	\$61,641	\$25,100
Utah	\$148,873	\$63,271	\$25,100
Vermont	\$172,333	\$73,242	\$25,100
Virginia	\$189,753	\$80,645	\$25,100
Washington	\$176,100	\$74,843	\$25,100
West Virginia	\$139,213	\$59,166	\$25,100
Wisconsin	\$170,517	\$72,470	\$25,100
Wyoming	\$163,790	\$69,611	\$25,100

Source: Estimates for 200% and 85% of SMI were derived using the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Office of Community Services (OCS), “The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program Announces the State Median Income Estimates for Federal Fiscal Year 2018,” Transmittal No. LIHEAP-IM-2017-03, June 26, 2017, https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/ocs/im_17_03_liheap_smi_fy18.pdf. The 2018 Federal Poverty Guidelines are drawn from HHS, Office of the Secretary, “Annual Update of the HHS Poverty Guidelines,” 83 FR 2642, January 18, 2018, <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2018/01/18/2018-00814/annual-update-of-the-hhs-poverty-guidelines>. As noted in 83 FR 2642, the poverty guidelines are the same for the 48 contiguous states and DC; there are separate poverty guidelines for Alaska and for Hawaii due to Office of Economic Opportunity administrative practices beginning in the 1966-1970 period.

Eligibility Pathways

The bill would generally require a child’s “parent” to be engaged in an “eligible activity.” Parental activity estimates are subject to a number of limitations. For instance, the ASEC data on parental activities are generally static; that is, they are based on responses at the time of the survey, and therefore may not account for potential changes in parental activity over the course of the year. Because of this, certain judgments were made regarding a parent’s activity status. As an example, the estimates in this memo assume that parents identified on the ASEC as having a job would qualify on the basis of employment, even if the ASEC reported that the parent was not at work at the time of the survey. Similarly, some parents reported that they were unemployed, but expecting to be recalled to work shortly and/or were engaged in job search. All such parents were assumed to qualify on the basis that they likely had been employed at some point in the last 12 months and/or because they were engaged in job search. (For the purposes of this memo, all such parents were assigned to the job search pathway.)

A number of eligibility pathways may be undercounted in this memo due to lack of available data. For instance the ASEC does not ask if an individual is receiving a health treatment (including mental health and substance use treatment) for a condition that would effectively prevent that individual from participating in eligible activities. As a proxy for this eligibility pathway, the estimates in this memo include individuals who reported being absent from a job due to health issues, as well as those who reported work-limiting disabilities or health problems. Likewise, the ASEC has little information on parents who are taking leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) or other types of federal, state, or local programs supporting a paid or unpaid family, medical, or disability leave program, or a program of employer-provided leave. For this memo, the “leave” pathway only accounts for parents who reported being on maternity or paternity leave at the time of the survey. Estimates of parents engaged in school and job training may also be undercounted. For instance, job training estimates only count people who indicated that they were working, but were absent from work due to school or training.

It was not possible to estimate participation in several other eligibility pathways. This is because the ASEC does not collect information on certain activities. These activities include, for instance, family violence prevention or intervention activities, activities to prevent child abuse and neglect, work activities under a state’s Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, or employment and training activities under a state’s Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) or Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) program.

The draft proposal does not specify whether a parent must spend a minimum amount of time in an eligible activity to meet the eligible activity participation requirements. For purposes of these estimates, CRS assumed that any participation in an eligible activity would be sufficient. This decision was made for two reasons. The primary reason is that, while the ASEC does have some information on work hours, similar data are not available for all types of eligibility pathways. As a result, it is not possible to determine hours spent in all types of eligible activities. The secondary reason is that the definition of “eligible child” in the draft proposal does not specify a minimum number of hours. The definition indicates that “part-time” employment is sufficient, suggesting that a parent need not be engaged in an activity during a full work day or work year.