Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit,
Canadian Child Care Federation, Child Care Now.
June 30, 2020.

CANADIAN CHILD CARE: PRELIMINARY RESULTS FROM A NATIONAL SURVEY DURING THE COVID19 PANDEMIC

Martha Friendly, Barry Forer, Rachel Vickerson and Sophia Mohamed

CHILDCARE RESOURCE AND RESEARCH UNIT

Child Care Now
Un Enfant Une Place

Canadian Child Care Federation
Fédération canadienne des services de garde à l'enfance

Canadian child care:
Preliminary results from a national survey during the COVID19 pandemic

Martha Friendly, Barry Forer, Rachel Vickerson, Sophia Mohamed
Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Child Care Now and the Canadian Child Care Federation
June 2020, pg. 270

Childcare Resource and Research Unit,
225 Brunswick Avenue Toronto ON Canada M5S 2M6
Telephone 416 926 9264
Email: contactus@childcarecanada.org
Website: childcarecanada.org

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication: Canadian child care: Preliminary results from a national survey during the COVID19 pandemic

Citation: Friendly, M., Forer, B., Vickerson, R. and Mohamed, S. (June 2020). Canadian child care: Preliminary results from a national survey during the COVID19 pandemic. Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit; Ottawa, Child Care Now; Ottawa. Canadian Child Care Federation

Table of Contents

Context: Child care and the coronavirus pandemic in Canada

At the end of 2019, a “novel” virus of a variety not previously known was identified as the cause of an outbreak of severe respiratory illness in Wuhan, China. The virus, a coronavirus labelled COVID-19, quickly spread to other countries and was classified as a pandemic by the World Health Organization on March 11, 2020. COVID-19 first came to Canada in January 2020 and provinces/territories began closing their licensed child care centres[1] for regular use and public schools in March. (For the status of child care services across Canada during the pandemic, see the ISSUE file: Child care and COVID-19 in Canada).

As non-essential workplaces were also closed by provincial/territorial orders, many families with young children (including children who were normally in school) were required to work from home, caring for and “home schooling” their children at the same time. It quickly became apparent that not only medical personnel but also other workers deemed to be essential such as transit and grocery store workers needed the support of reliable child care to enable parents in these jobs to work outside the home. Almost all provincial/territorial governments responded by designating and supporting to varying extents some child care centres and regulated family child care homes, usually under enhanced safety guidelines, to care for the children aged 0-12 years of these essential workers.

The pandemic, which immediately became a daily reality, created turmoil in the child care sector, chaos and distress for families, and dilemmas for policy makers at all levels. The regular revenue streams for child care services — parent fees[2] together with the normal public funding that varies significantly based on the province/territory—became uncertain or disappeared. As a result, maintaining child care staff jobs that depend on these private and public funds became unsustainable for many service providers.

Shuttered services in some provinces such as New Brunswick, Ontario and others tried to keep their operations financially viable by continuing to charge parents fees for services not used (usually offering to hold the space for the parent post-pandemic). Other provinces/territories continued to flow regular funding and several, such as Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and Quebec, added the parent fee portion to funding for services. In some jurisdictions, Ontario, for example, child care for essential workers

1 Note that regulated family child care was not closed by provincial/territorial governments in a number of jurisdictions.
2 Parent user fees make up the bulk of funds Canadian child care services rely on to operate in most provinces/territories.

was free, with no parent fees; in others, such as Alberta, parents paid full fees or eligible parents used fee subsidies to cover full fees. As the federal government rolled out an array of benefit programs aimed at keeping businesses and services afloat, rents and mortgages paid, and food on families' tables, some provinces such as Ontario urged or required their child care service providers to rely on these in lieu of provincial funding.

A full description of early learning and child care policy and initiatives across Canada during the COVID-19 pandemic is beyond the scope of this survey report. However, there has been little information available to answer many public or policy questions about child care during the pandemic and beyond –even the most basic questions such as "how many child care centres and regulated child care homes closed during the pandemic?" Thus this survey was undertaken specifically to provide some basic information about the impact of the pandemic on regulated child care services across Canada.

One impact of the pandemic has been that early learning and child care has been cast in a new light: as a necessity, not a luxury, in a well-functioning 21st century society. At the same time, the very nature of Canada's provision of this necessity has been demonstrated as deficient in a new way—or more precisely—for new audiences[3]. As the fragility of Canadian child care services has become more obvious, paradoxically, there has also been widespread public and political recognition that accessible, reliable ELCC services need to be an essential part of Canada`s post-pandemic recovery and reconstruction of the economy.

The purpose of this report is to make the descriptive data collected for this survey publicly available to those concerned with recovering the pre-COVID-19 capacity of regulated child care services and using this as a basis for beginning to construct a more solid, sustained, evidence-based early learning and child care system for all Canadians.

3 See, for example, There is no economic recovery without adequate child care or Experts say child care needs consideration in reopening plans

Survey description and methodology

Purpose and topics

The purpose of the survey, as the covering information inviting participation in the survey stated, was "to collect information about the impact of the COVID-19 crisis on the ELCC sector…the data will contribute to informed decisions about how the child care situation can be improved, to supporting the child care sector, and to public information." All the communications in promoting the survey made it clear that only the person most responsible for the operation of a single early learning and child care centre or a single regulated family child care home licensed or approved by a Canadian province or territory should fill out the survey. The survey questions were tied to a reference week of April 27th to May 1st to ensure a consistent snapshot of the impact of COVID-19 across Canada at one time point before services began to re-open.

Development of the survey

The survey questions in English were developed in April 2020, and then programmed into the online SurveyMonkey platform. This survey was designed strictly as an online survey; there was no hard copy version that could be completed. Once programmed, the survey was pretested from April 27th to May 1st, and finalized by May 4th. During the pretesting phase, the survey was translated into French, and a separate French version on SurveyMonkey was created. Each of these surveys had a distinct hyperlink and QR code. At the top of each survey, there was also a link to the survey in the other language, to accommodate those who preferred to do the survey in a different language than the one they had "clicked" on. The survey could be accessed through several methods: by clicking on either the English or French hyperlink in the email they received, or by scanning the associated QR codes. The survey could be completed using any device (computer, tablet, phone).

Distribution of the survey

The survey was distributed using multiple methods. A covering letter including links and QR codes for the survey was sent directly to lists of regulated child care services with email addresses available in six jurisdictions. Three provincial/territorial governments volunteered to email the covering letter and survey link to all the regulated child care services in their jurisdictions. In Ontario, the Ontario Municipal Social Services Association (OMSSA) sent the survey on to their members—children's services managers in the 47 administrative units across Ontario—suggesting that they send it to their regulated service providers. The Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care and the Association for Early Childhood Educators, Ontario, which have extensive workforce, service provider, parent and union networks distributed it widely. The Canadian Child Care Federation (CCCF) asked its Canada-wide member organizations to distribute it and sent it to the CCCF's 9,500 child care sector members. Child Care Now asked its partner organizations to promote the survey, as did the Childcare Resource and Research Unit through its website and weekly newsletter. Finally, social media were used to invite participation, specifically Twitter and Facebook.

Survey returns and data cleaning

The survey was open for completion from May 6th to May 19th, 2020. A week before the deadline, reminder emails were sent out through most of the original communication routes. By the May 19th deadline, there were 8,437 people who entered the survey and began responding to the questions. The first two questions were used to screen out those who were not in our desired demographic – the person most responsible for the day-to-day operation of either a licensed child care centre, or a regulated family child care home. There were 632 would-be respondents who answered "no" to the first question, which asked if they were the person most responsible at their child care service; the survey program terminated their participation at this point. There were a further 539 people who answered "yes" to the first question, but when asked next about their regular roles and responsibilities, did not indicate that they were an owner, manager, director, administrator, or supervisor or a regulated family child care provider; these were also diverted from further participation.

After the two screening questions, there were 7,266 remaining respondents, who were then free to complete the rest of the survey. When looking at the data from these respondents, it was clear (from the IP addresses) that some people completed the survey more than once for the same centre or family child care home. It is unclear about the reasons for these duplicates – sometimes there were two different respondents for the same centre, and given the fast-moving situation in child care, perhaps some people wanted to update their responses from a week earlier. Still, it was necessary to clean the data so that all duplicates were removed.

The following procedures were used when determining which duplicate records were to be removed: 1) all else being equal, the most complete response was retained; 2) if the same (apparent) respondent completed the survey more than once, the earlier version was retained; 3) if (apparently) different people responded for the same centre (based on their reported roles), the person with the most "senior" position's responses were retained. After all duplicates were removed, the resulting final number of valid responses was 6,564.

One last data cleaning step was to account for the fact that a small number of respondents completed one survey to represent multiple centres or agency-based family child care homes despite the directions to use one survey for each centre or home. Some examples of this were respondents from multi-site providers and large centres at post-secondary institutions. All the responses (particularly items about enrolment numbers, and comments) were examined carefully to identify responses that represented more than one centre or family child care home. Using these facilities' websites or provincial website information (where program information is often provided), the number of centres or agency-based family child care homes for most of these multi-site organizations was determined. In the end, 3% of the responses represented more than one centre or family child care provider. Each multi-site response was given a weight to account for the number of facilities represented by each response, and these weights were used in all analyses of the data. By using these weights, the number of facilities in the database increased from 6,564 to 8,300.

This online publicly available survey is not a representative sample of the larger pool of Canadian child care centres and regulated child care homes. Like other surveys of its kind, there may be biases in responses. For example, services that had already decided not to reopen may not have been interested in responding; those in which staff including administrators and directors had been laid off may not have received the email. There is, however, substantial representation of child care services in all parts of Canada in most provinces and territories (with the exception of Nunuvut and the Northwest Territories, which have very small populations), English and French respondents, and centres and family child care well represented.

Overview of this report

This report provides further detail following a [Highlights report on preliminary results from this survey](). This report follows the format of the survey, presenting descriptive data for each question, with breakdowns by province/territory. In addition to questions about number of spaces, age groups served and governance, the survey included questions about whether the service was open or closed, and for whom; current financing and pre-COVID19 financing; whether they were charging fees, and to whom; staff employment circumstances; use of federal benefit programs, both for employees and employers, expectations and concerns for the future, including permanent closure of the service and expectations/concerns about specific aspects of their future financial situation.

The survey provided opportunities at the end to write in comments, and many respondents provided these, with comments written in by 1,845 respondents when asked for general comments and additional information. The extensive comments from these survey respondents are provided verbatim in the “Appendix: Open-ended responses by province/territory” on page 75, with any identifying information removed, organized by province/territory.

The first report, the Highlights, was released June 10, 2020. This second report presents preliminary descriptive results by province/territory. The intention is to provide further analysis of quantitative and qualitative results in a third report in the coming months.

The following section presents the survey data organized by survey question. As many of the questions were asked of a subset of respondents based on their response to a previous question, who the question was asked of is included, as is whether the instruction was to “check all (choices) that apply.” The survey results are organized into two sections: first, questions that apply to centre-based child care, and second, those applicable to family child care homes. The data for each question are provided in a table format with data for each province/territory and a short summary statement[4]. Following the data section is an appendix organized by province/territory of respondents’ open-ended comments.

4 Data used in the summary statements has been rounded.

Descriptive provincial/ territorial data

Child care centres

1 Are you the person most responsible for the day-to-day operation of a Canadian centre-based child care centre or a regulated family child care home?

This is a preliminary screening question. Respondents answering “No” were directed out of the survey, and remaining respondents were divided between questions designed for child care centres (beginning at #2), and those for family child care homes (beginning at #34). In all jurisdictions, except NL, over 60% of respondents were responsible for child care centres.

P/T	% Yes, a child care centre	% Yes, a family child care home	Total # centres
NL	30.7	69.3	88
PE	91.1	8.9	45
NS	73.5	26.5	325
NB	71	29	297
QC	78.6	21.4	899
ON	70.6	29.4	2935
MB	73.4	26.6	519
SK	66.9	33.1	311
AB	63.6	36.4	1056
BC	64	36	1782
NT	100	0	1
NU	80	20	5
YT	76	24	25
TOTAL	69	31	8288

2 What are your day-to-day roles at this centre? Check all that apply.

Asked of all centres

This question provided another opportunity for screening. Only those who included “Owner” or “Director/Manager/Supervisor” in their responses (they were able to select more than one) were able to continue the survey. The vast majority of respondents across all provinces were “Directors/Managers/Supervisors” while the percentage of “Owners” varied province to province, perhaps based on the prevalence of privately owned child care in the jurisdiction.

P/T	% Owner	% Director/ Manager/ Supervisor	% Working directly with children	% Cooking, bookkeeping, janitorial	% Other roles at center	Total # centres
NL	22.2	92.6	59.3	44.4	3.7	27
PE	26.8	97.6	48.8	46.3	7.3	41
NS	38.5	92.9	52.3	39.7	5	239
NB	53.1	89.1	49.8	50.2	7.1	211
QC	43	86.7	16.8	18.2	1.6	707
ON	16	93.4	13.6	11.6	1.8	2071
MB	1.8	99.5	39.4	34.4	4.5	381
SK	3.8	99.5	50	44.2	2.4	208
AB	36	89.4	36.2	28.7	4.9	672
BC	41.3	92.5	51.1	33.6	4.3	1141
NT	0	100	100	0	100	1
NU	0	100	75	100	25	4
YT	47.4	100	57.9	36.8	5.3	19
TOTAL	27.84	92.42	30.79	24.66	3.25	5722

3 Does this centre offer ________? Check all that apply.

Asked of all centres

Centres selected all the program options they provided. The vast majority provided some form of full-day child care. About half provided part-day school age care (49%), and a smaller percentage provided a part day nursery or preschool program (32%). Most provinces followed similar breakdowns, with the notable exception of QC, which provides school-age child care under the auspice of school authorities.

P/T	% Full-day child care	% Part-day preschool or nursery school	% Part-day school-age child care	% Other	Total # centres
NL	96.2	38.5	50	3.8	26
PE	90	32.5	47.5	12.5	40
NS	88.6	29.8	49.6	5.3	228
NB	87	47.3	70	10.6	207
QC	100	5.6	2.1	3.3	676
ON	88.5	39.5	64.1	10.3	2026
MB	89.8	28.5	51.6	8.3	372
SK	97.6	29.1	52.4	11.7	206
AB	75	21.9	49.6	13.3	653
BC	79.6	41.8	42.5	8.4	1117
NT	100	100	100	100	1
NU	75	50	0	0	4
YT	89.5	26.3	57.9	31.6	19
TOTAL	86.9	32.5	48.7	9.2	5575

4 Which age groups normally receive care in this centre? Check all that apply.

Asked of all centres

This question shows the percentage of centres that offer care for each age group; centres were able to select as many as applied. Preschool-age children were the most frequently chosen age group across all jurisdictions. In Quebec, very few (10%) centres reported care for kindergarten age children, and only 3% reported providing school-age care. The remaining jurisdictions showed a more even spread.

P/T	% Infants	% Toddlers	% Preschoolers	% Kindergarten	% School-age	Total # centres
NL	26.9	84.6	88.5	57.7	57.7	26
PE	62.5	80	95	40	45	40
NS	50.4	86.4	95.6	25.4	57.9	228
NB	54.6	77.3	87	68.1	85	207
QC	79.4	84.8	94.5	10	2.7	678
ON	55.7	83.5	91.1	76.9	71.6	2024
MB	62.9	65.9	89	79.3	73.9	372
SK	67.5	96.1	99	92.2	70.4	206
AB	54.1	66.2	78.3	77	61.3	653
BC	45.6	57.3	81.2	48.3	48.3	1117
NT	100	100	100	100	100	1
NU	75	75	100	75	0	4
YU	47.4	78.9	94.7	63.2	57.9	19
TOTAL	56.9	75.5	88.2	61	57	5575

5 Is this centre part of ...?

Asked of all centres

Twenty-seven percent of centres were associated with a multi-site child care organization offering both centre-based and family child care; this ranged from a low of 8% in NL and 12% in MB to a high of 40% in AB. Twenty-six percent of centres were associated with a multi-service agency that also provides other social/family services. QC was lowest at 4%, and ON highest at 42%.

5 A A multi-site child care organization offering both centre-based and family child care?

P/T	% Yes	% No	Total # centres
NL	7.7	92.3	26
PE	31.6	68.4	38
NS	27.5	72.5	222
NB	33.7	66.3	199
QC	28.5	71.5	657
ON	30.9	69.1	1925
MB	11.8	88.2	364
SK	29.6	70.4	196
AB	39.5	60.5	621
BC	14.9	85.1	1044
NT	100	0	1
NU	50	50	4
YT	21.1	78.9	19
TOTAL	27	73	5316

5 B A multi-service agency that also offers other social/family services?

P/T	% Yes	% No	Total # centres
NL	16.7	83.3	24
PE	22.2	77.8	36
NS	12.3	87.7	211
NB	18.8	81.3	192
QC	4	96	579
ON	42.2	57.8	1788
MB	12.2	87.8	352
SK	24.3	75.7	189
AB	24.3	75.7	588
BC	22.1	77.9	1043
NT	100	0	1
NU	0	100	3
YT	17.6	82.4	17
TOTAL	26.2	73.8	5023

6 How is this child care centre operated? Check one only.

Asked of all centres

Auspice type varied significantly by jurisdictions, as expected, given the distribution of ownership models across Canada. Three jurisdictions (MB, SK, NU) report entirely, or almost entirely, not-for-profit centres, while eight jurisdictions (NL, PE, NS, NB, QC, AB, BC, YT) show more than 45% of centres operating as private businesses. The distribution of responses by auspice is generally consistent with the data in ECEC in Canada 2016.

P/T	% As a not-for-profit	% Operated by a municipality, school board or provincial or federal agency	% Operated by a First Nation or other Indigenous community or organization	% As a private business	% Other	Total # centres
NL	26.9	7.7	0	65.4	0	26
PE	27.5	7.5	2.5	62.5	0	40
NS	41.4	0.4	0	58.1	0	227
NB	38.5	0.5	1.5	59.5	0	205
QC	45.5	0.9	0.4	53.2	0	671
ON	77.2	2.7	0.5	19.4	0.1	2021
MB	95.7	0.3	1.1	3	0	371
SK	95.1	0.5	0.5	3.4	0.5	206
AB	49.6	2	0.5	47.8	0.2	651
BC	43.5	5.6	3	47.8	0	1116
NT	100	0	0	0	0	1
NU	100	0	0	0	0	4
YT	36.8	0	10.5	52.6	0	19
TOTAL	61.7	2.6	1.1	34.5	0.1	5558

7 During the week of April 27th to May 1st, was this centre open or closed?

Asked of all centres

During the reference week, 72% of centres were closed. Centres were mostly or entirely closed in all jurisdictions except QC, SK, BC, and YT; the percent of centres closed ranged from 33% in SK, to 100% in NS and NU.

P/T	% Open	% Closed	Total # centres
NL	23.1	76.9	26
PE	12.5	87.5	40
NS	0	100	229
NB	16.9	83.1	207
QC	59.7	40.3	678
ON	4.7	95.3	2028
MB	34.3	65.7	373
SK	67	33	206
AB	15.2	84.8	653
BC	56.4	43.6	1119
NT	100	0	1
NU	0	100	4
YT	63.2	36.8	19
TOTAL	27.9	72.1	5583

8 During the week of April 27th to May 1st, were the centre's hours of operation the same as before COVID-19?

Asked of all open centres

Open centres were divided across the country with regard to whether they were maintaining the same hours as before COVID-19. In five provinces/territories a majority of centres maintained the same hours as before COVID-19 (NB, QC, SK, AB, BC) while in four provinces, centres reported different hours (PE, ON, MB, YT); NL's six open centres were evenly split.

P/T	% Yes	% No	Total # centres
NL	50	50	6
PE	20	80	5
NB	60	40	35
QC	88.1	11.9	402
ON	28.9	71.1	97
MB	23.6	76.4	127
SK	74.3	25.7	136
AB	77.8	22.2	99
BC	57.1	42.9	630
NT	0	100	1
YT	41.7	58.3	12
TOTAL	63.2	36.8	1550

9 How are the hours of operation different than before COVID-19?

Asked of open centres reporting their hours were different

Of the open centres reporting different hours, three-quarters reported shorter operating hours across the country. ON was an anomaly with 72% of centres offering longer hours of operation. This may be related to ON's commitment to provide extended hours child care in the designated emergency child care centres open in the province.

P/T	% Hours of operation are longer	% Hours of operation are shorter	% Other	Total # centres
NL	0	100	0	3
PE	25	50	25	4
NB	42.9	50	7.1	14
QC	2.1	75	22.9	48
ON	72.1	10.3	17.6	68
MB	2.1	96.9	1	97
SK	2.9	97.1	0	35
AB	19	76.2	4.8	21
BC	15.9	80.8	3.3	271
NT	100	0	0	1
YT	0	100	0	7
TOTAL	19	74.7	6.3	569

10 On an average day, how many children were attending this centre pre-COVID-19 and during the reference week during the pandemic?

Asked of all open centres

This question asks centres about enrolment, both pre-COVID and for the reference week during the pandemic. Across all jurisdictions, there were drastic decreases in attendance for open centres, with median enrolment nationally at only 11% of the pre-COVID enrolment.

P/T	Median enrolment (# of children) pre-COVID-19	Median enrolment (# of children) reference week: April 21-May 1	Total # centres
NL	47.5	2	6
PE	50	3	5
NB	50	9	33
QC	77	8	394
ON	50	4	88
MB	45	6	123
SK	45	8	133
AB	60	5	94
BC	30.5	5	612
NT	95	25	1
YT	30	8.5	12
TOTAL	50	5.5	1501

11 Is attendance currently restricted to children whose parents are essential workers?

Asked of all open centres

Overall, 74% of open centres were restricted to children of essential workers. For all but three jurisdictions, at least 80% of open centres reported this restriction. The exceptions were BC and MB where two-thirds of open centres were restricted to essential workers, and SK where this was true for only 35% of open centres.

P/T	% Yes	% No	Total # centres
NL	83.3	16.7	6
PE	100	0	5
NB	97.1	2.9	35
QC	94.5	5.5	399
ON	82.4	17.6	91
MB	67.5	32.5	126
SK	34.6	65.4	133
AB	93.7	6.3	95
BC	63.6	36.4	613
NT	100	0	1
YT	100	0	12
TOTAL	73.8	26.2	1516

12 Currently, which parents have to pay a fee for their child's attendance at this centre?

Asked of open centres not restricted to essential workers

This question — for centres open to both essential and non-essential worker parents — shows quite a spread of responses by province/territory. The majority of centres in four jurisdictions (MB, SK, AB, BC) required all parents to pay the same fee, while QC reported that the majority of centres required none of the parents to pay fees. Note that the high Ontario "Other" category is probably a product of a small sample size, and weighted centres (see Methodology section).

P/T	% None of the parents pay a fee	% Essential workers do not pay any fees	% All parents pay a fee but essential workers pay less	% All parents pay the same fee	% Other	Total # centres
NL	100	0	0	0	0	1
NB	100	0	0	0	0	1
QC	63.6	4.5	0	31.8	0	22
ON	7.1	0	0	14.3	78.6	14
MB	0	0	0	97.6	2.4	41
SK	1.2	0	0	97.7	1.2	86
AB	16.7	0	0	83.3	0	6
BC	8.6	0.9	5	81.8	3.6	220
TOTAL	9.7	0.8	2.8	81.3	5.4	391

13 Currently, what fees do these essential workers pay for their child's attendance at the centre?

Asked of open centres only open to essential workers

The divided responses to this question reflect the contrasting policy choices of provinces/territories, so the overall total percent across provinces doesn't explain the full story. Five jurisdictions (NL, PE, QC, ON, YT) had 100%, or very close to, of essential workers paying no fees at their centres, while three jurisdictions (NB, MB, SK) reported that almost all essential workers were paying the full fee. AB and BC were the sole jurisdictions reporting a diverse range of fee policies at centres for essential workers.

P/T	% They do not pay a fee	% They pay a reduced fee	% They pay the full fee	% Other	Total # centres
NL	100	0	0	0	5
PE	100	0	0	0	5
NB	0	0	91.2	8.8	34
QC	95.2	0.5	3.5	0.8	376
ON	100	0	0	0	74
MB	1.2	0	97.6	1.2	84
SK	0	4.3	89.1	6.5	46
AB	1.1	18.4	54	26.4	87
BC	9.7	23.1	60	7.2	390
NT	0	100	0	0	1
YT	100	0	0	0	12
TOTAL	44.3	10	40.2	5.5	1114

14 On an average day, how many children were attending this centre before COVID-19?

Asked of all closed centres

This question asked closed centres about average pre-COVID enrolment to contribute to a full understanding how many children were being served in the surveyed centres pre-COVID.

P/T	Median enrolment, pre-COVID	Total # centres
NL	42	20
PE	47	33
NS	48.1	219
NB	49	171
QC	55	258
ON	70	1893
MB	52	235
SK	28	67
AB	50	535
BC	31	471
NU	54	4
YT	25	7
TOTAL	55	3913

15 Was your centre closure mandated by the government?

Asked of all closed centres

The vast majority of centres closed the week of April 27- May 1, 2020 were reported to be mandated to close by their government. However, in BC, 87% of closed centres were not provincially mandated to close. SK was the only jurisdiction with a divided response – 52% were mandated to close and 48% were not.

P/T	% Yes	% No	Total # centres
NL	100	0	20
PE	100	0	34
NS	99.6	0.4	227
NB	100	0	171
QC	97.1	2.9	272
ON	97.6	2.4	1909
MB	82.8	17.2	238
SK	52.2	47.8	67
AB	98.4	1.6	547
BC	13.4	86.6	478
NU	100	0	4
YT	0	100	7
TOTAL	86	14	3974

16 Who made the decision to close?

Asked of closed centres not mandated to close by government

Although the majority of closed centres were mandated to close by government, 557 centres closed due to the decisions of individuals or governing bodies. The most common decision making bodies were the board of directors (48%); 90% of centres not mandated to close by government in MB reported their board of directors made this decision. Across Canada, centre owners were the second most frequent decision maker (25%) while other governing bodies, such as school boards, made the decision in a minority of situations (9%).

P/T	% Board of directors	% Centre owner	% I made the decision, and I am not the owner	% Other governing bodies	% Other	Total # centres
NS	0	0	0	0	100	1
QC	37.5	12.5	0	25	25	8
ON	40.9	6.8	18.2	9.1	25	44
MB	90.5	0	2.4	2.4	4.8	42
SK	68.8	6.3	0	12.5	12.5	32
AB	30	30	0	20	20	10
BC	44.1	30	6.8	8.2	10.9	413
YT	14.3	57.1	0	28.6	0	7
TOTAL	47.9	24.6	6.6	8.8	12	557

17 How likely is it that the centre will be closed permanently?

Asked of all closed centres

Most closed centres (64%) said they would definitely re-open but a substantial minority (36%) expressed degrees of uncertainty. PE centres were the most confident, reporting 81% of centres would definitely re-open, followed by SK (73%) and NS (72%). In NL and AB, only 55% and 56% respectively said they would definitely re-open, while in NU and YT (with only a small number of centres), only 25% and 14% said they would definitely re-open.

P/T	% Definitely remain closed	% Probably remain closed	% Probably re-open	% Definitely re-open	% Not sure	Total # centres
NL	0	0	30	55	15	20
PE	0	0	12.9	80.6	6.5	31
NS	0	1.3	19.9	72.1	6.6	226
NB	0.6	2.3	18.7	70.2	8.2	171
QC	0	6.3	31.9	40.7	21.1	270
ON	0.3	1.3	23.2	66.2	9	1916
MB	2.1	4.6	20.2	66.4	6.7	238
SK	1.5	1.5	19.4	73.1	4.5	67
AB	1.1	4.7	23.9	56	14.2	548
BC	0	2.1	20.8	70.6	6.5	480
NU	0	25	25	25	25	4
YT	0	0	28.6	14.3	57.1	7
TOTAL	0.5	2.4	23	64.2	10	3978

18 For which types of parents is the provincial or municipal government providing funds to your centre to make up for lost fees?

Asked of all centres

The responses to this question show how many providers reported receiving public funds from government for each type of parent. For parents with fee subsidies, half of all centres overall reported receiving public funds, while for parents paying full fees, 21% overall reported receiving public funds. However, there were substantial differences between jurisdictions' approaches to covering parent fees during COVID-19. In PE and NS, the majority of centres reported being funded both for parents with fee subsidies and parents paying full fees but in SK, only 4% of centres reported receiving funds for full-fee paying parents, and 18% for parents with fee subsidies. In MB, SK and AB, 35% to 45% of centres reported no public funds provided to cover fees while in YT, 47% of centres were receiving public funding for essential workers only.

P/T	% Parents with fee subsidies	% Parents who pay full fees	% Essential workers	% No funds being provided	% Don't know	% TEF/ [5]CCOF (BC)	% Other	Total # centres
NL	62.5	54.2	41.7	0	12.5	0	12.5	24
PE	86.5	94.6	35.1	0	5.4	0	8.1	37
NS	77.3	60.5	9.5	3.6	5.5	0	18.6	220
NB	75.2	13.9	14.9	11.9	7.4	0	16.3	202
QC	37.5	21.3	29.7	20.7	11.4	0	13.4	634
ON	59.1	13.7	6	19	17.1	0	24	1926
MB	52.8	5.6	3.1	34.6	8.1	0	7.9	356
SK	17.8	4.1	6.1	56.3	16.2	0	10.2	197
AB	29.7	16.7	8.9	45	21.7	0	6.9	627
BC	44.9	35.8	25.8	14.7	17.2	18.1	7.4	1056
NT	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	1

continued next page

P/T	% Parents with fee subsidies	% Parents who pay full fees	% Essential workers	% No funds being provided	% Don't know	% TEF/ [5]CCOF (BC)	% Other	Total # centres
NU	50	50	25	25	25	0	25	4
YT	15.8	15.8	47.4	21.1	5.3	0	26.3	19
TOTAL	49.65	21.18	13.94	22.72	15.37	3.6	15.12	5303

5 These represent BC's child care funding program established for centres during the pandemic. They did not earmark funding to replace parent fees but the funds were relatively generous so as to cover them.

19 What kind of public funding from government does this centre NORMALLY receive (i.e. pre-COVID-19)?

Asked of all centres

In pre-COVID times, a majority of centres reported receiving public funding in the form of operating funds or grants (74.5%), and wage enhancement grants(70.5%), as well as fee subsidies which replace full or partial fees on behalf of eligible parents. Public funding for children with special needs was received by about half of the centres. AB was the only jurisdiction where it was reported by a minority of centres (24.8%) that they normally receive operating funds or grants. Note that QC does not normally use parent fee subsidies.

P/T	% Operational funding/ grant	% Wage enhancement grant	% Funds for children with special needs	% Equipment/ transportation	% Parent fee subsidies	% Funds for Indigenous programs	% No gov't funding	% Other	Total # centres
NL	75	33.3	45.8	37.5	91.7	4.2	0	4.2	24
PE	52.8	63.9	66.7	0	63.9	2.8	0	16.7	36
NS	64.1	85.9	70.5	5	85	0	3.6	2.7	220
NB	74.1	85.1	38.8	0.5	82.1	5	4	3.5	201
QC	59.4	9.9	42.5	4.6	32.6	0.5	33.2	2.8	635
ON	82.6	95.5	58.5	30.2	87.6	18.8	1.6	2	1912
MB	97.2	12.8	71	2.5	78	1.7	2.8	12.3	359
SK	88.9	17.6	55.3	2.5	70.9	0	1	5.5	199
AB	24.8	80.4	38.3	1.1	82.1	3.7	5	6.7	626
BC	90	80.3	41.8	4.5	84.6	3.7	0.6	6.6	1071
NT	100	100	100	100	100	100	0	0	1
NU	100	25	75	50	50	100	0	0	4
YT	100	78.9	73.7	10.5	94.7	15.8	0	0	19
TOTAL	74.5	70.5	51.4	13.2	78	8.5	5.8	4.6	5307

20 How much of the normal (pre-COVID-19) government funding is this centre CURRENTLY receiving?

Asked of all centres

Most centres overall (54%) reported now receiving less government funding ("None" plus "A portion of normal government funding" than they did pre-COVID); 11% said they were now receiving more funding (they may have been receiving public funds to replace parent fees, for example, which would be "more" funding). AB was the only jurisdiction where a majority of centres (56.5%) were receiving none of their normal government funding, whereas in all other jurisdictions, this was reported much less often – between 1.4% of centres (NS) to 10.8% (QC). In all four Atlantic provinces, QC SK, and YT, more than half the centres reported receiving all or more of their normal government funding.

P/T	% No normal government funding	% Portion of normal government funding	% All of normal government funding	% More than normal government funding	% Other	Total # centres
NL	4.5	18.2	63.6	4.5	9.1	22
PE	5.7	11.4	51.4	20	11.4	35
NS	1.4	12.1	58	26.1	2.4	207
NB	9.7	14.6	58.9	9.2	7.6	185
QC	10.8	31.8	44.7	6	6.7	418
ON	8.7	61.1	22.1	1.5	6.7	1844
MB	3.5	40	47.2	0.6	8.7	345
SK	2	32.7	55.1	3.1	7.1	196
AB	56.5	16.8	13.5	2.1	11.1	577
BC	7.7	36.4	11.7	34.6	9.6	1032
NT	0	0	0	100	0	1
NU	25	50	25	0	0	4
YT	10.5	5.3	15.8	36.8	31.6	19
TOTAL	13.4	40.9	27.2	10.6	8	4885

21 Which of the following best describes staff layoffs at your centre because of COVID- 19?

Asked of all centres

Nationally, centres could be divided into four roughly equally-sized groups in terms of staff layoffs. About one-quarter had no staff layoffs, one-quarter reported layoffs for some but not all staff, one-quarter reported all staff laid off except for the owner/director/manager, and one-quarter had all staff laid off. Having no staff laid off was reported to be highest in NS (91% of centres), PE (79%) and NL (77% of centres), and lowest in AB (only 5% of centres reported no staff layoffs). Laying off some but not all staff was highest in SK (57%) and lowest in PE (0%). 55.5% of AB centres reported that all staff had been laid off. Overall, 71% of centres reported laying off some staff.

P/T	% No staff laid off	% Less than half front line staff laid off	% More than half front line staff laid off	% All front line staff laid off, except director/ supervisor/ manager	% All staff including director/ supervisor/ manager laid off	Total # centres
NL	77.3	13.6	0	4.5	4.5	22
PE	78.8	0	0	0	21.2	33
NS	90.7	3.2	0	0.5	5.6	216
NB	20.4	11.7	5.6	21.4	40.8	196
QC	56	9.9	1	5.6	27.6	627
ON	24.5	25.5	4.5	27	18.5	1915
MB	16.6	8.7	28.7	32.7	13.2	355
SK	13.1	21.2	35.4	19.2	11.1	198
AB	5	1.6	10	27.9	55.5	620
BC	27.2	16.9	19.7	17.4	18.9	1053
NT	100	0	0	0	0	1
NU	25	25	0	50	0	4
YT	21.1	31.6	21.1	5.3	21.1	19
TOTAL	28.7	16.2	10.4	21.1	23.6	5259

22 The federal government is providing a variety of benefits for workers during the pandemic. To your knowledge, have any of the laid off staff (including the director/supervisor) applied for the Canada Emergency Response Benefit (CERB), Temporary Top-up for Low Income Workers or Employment Insurance (EI)?

All centres that have laid off some staff

Since this question only applies to centres with some or all staff laid off, the results are only interpretable for jurisdictions with sufficient numbers. For those jurisdictions, respondents reported that somewhere between 82% and 100% of laid off staff had applied for the Canada Emergency Response Benefit (CERB). Overall, 64% of laid off staff were reported to have applied for Employment Insurance (EI). Very few laid off staff were reported to have applied for the Top-up for Low Income Workers, with SK highest at 9%.

P /T	% Laid off staff applied for CERB	% Laid off staff applied for EI	% Laid off staff applied for Top-up for Low Income Workers	% Don't know	Total # centres
NL	50	75	0	0	4
NS	25	25	0	62.5	8
NB	84.2	51.3	2.6	6.6	76
QC	83.5	22.3	1	12.6	103
ON	89.9	74.1	1.7	6	1089
MB	95.6	53.2	1.2	2.8	250
SK	85.9	53	8.7	9.4	149
AB	85.9	71.5	1.6	8	249
BC	81.7	56.6	4.9	13.2	569
NU	100	33.3	0	0	3
YT	81.8	81.8	0	9.1	11
TOTAL	87.3	63.6	2.7	8.2	2511

23 For staff that have not been laid off because of COVID-19, which of the following best describes their current working hours?

Asked of all centres that have some staff still working

Nationally, for centres with staff still working, 41% had reduced working hours and 37% had working hours that were unchanged from pre-COVID. Centres with reduced working hours were most common in QC (63%) and ON (53%), and least common in MB (18%) and NS (23%). Few centres reported increased working hours, with NB having the most at 11%.

P/T	% Working hours reduced	% Working hours not changed	% Working hours not increased	% Working online/ remotely	% Not working	% Other	Total # centres
NL	50	20	0	0	20	10	20
PE	28	16	0	8	36	12	25
NS	23.2	23.8	0	13.5	23.2	16.2	185
NB	36.1	31.9	11.1	2.8	11.1	6.9	72
QC	62.5	25.9	0	5.6	2.4	3.6	413
ON	52.9	27	1	8.2	5.7	5.3	1025
MB	17.9	59.5	2.6	4.7	6.8	8.4	190
SK	24.3	63.2	3.7	0.7	2.9	5.1	136
AB	25.5	50	5.1	2	5.1	12.2	98
BC	27	49.8	5	2.7	4.5	11	664
NT	0	0	0	0	0	100	1
NU	0	50	0	0	50	0	2
YT	0	92.3	0	0	0	7.7	13
TOTAL	40.7	37	2.3	5.8	6.5	7.7	2844

24 For the Director/Owner/Manager that has not been laid off because of COVID-19, which of the following best describes her/his current working hours?

Asked of centres that have not laid off the Director/Owner/Manager

Nationally, for centres where the owner/director/manager was still working, that person's working hours had not changed in 44% of centres, and had increased in 29% of centres. Working reduced hours due to COVID was reportedly less common but was as high as 57% in NL, 37% in NB and 34% in AB. Working increased hours was highest in QC (54%), followed by ON (34%).

P/T	% Working hours reduced	% Working hours not changed	% Working hours increased	% Working online/ remotely	% Not working	% Other	Total # centres
NL	57.1	33.3	0	0	0	9.5	21
PE	32	36	8	8	4	12	25
NS	28.9	35.3	14.7	5.3	3.7	12.1	190
NB	37.4	30.4	26.1	0.9	0	5.2	115
QC	14.1	29.3	53.9	0.9	0.4	1.3	447
ON	20.7	40.8	33.7	1.3	0.1	3.4	1534
MB	15.4	62.6	19.7	0.7	0	1.6	305
SK	20.7	51.1	22.4	2.3	0	3.4	174
AB	34.1	40.4	14.1	5.9	0.7	4.8	270
BC	19.2	52	24.2	0.8	0.1	3.6	842
NT	0	100	0	0	0	0	1
NU	25	50	0	25	0	0	4
YT	6.7	66.7	13.3	0	0	13.3	15
TOTAL	21.2	43.5	29.4	1.7	0.4	3.8	3943

25 Please rate the child care centre's current financial situation compared to before COVID-19.

Asked of all centres

Most centres (67%) reported that the centre's current financial situation was worse than before COVID – somewhat worse for 29% of centres, and much worse for 38%. The percentage of "Much worse" was highest in AB centres (63%) with YT next at 53%. NL and PE were the only jurisdictions where most centres' financial situation was reported to be about the same as before COVID (62% and 58%, respectively).

P/T	% Much better than before COVID-19	% Somewhat better than before COVID-19	% About the same as before COVID-19	% Somewhat worse than before COVID-19	% Much worse than before COVID-19	% Not sure	Total # centres
NL	4.8	4.8	61.9	23.8	0	4.8	21
PE	0	8.3	58.3	11.1	8.3	13.9	36
NS	0.5	1.9	39.7	36.4	14.4	7.2	209
NB	1	5.2	28.5	22.3	34.2	8.8	193
QC	2.1	1	38.3	22.7	28.2	7.8	618
ON	2.7	1	7.6	36.4	44.3	8.1	1878
MB	2.5	6.5	27.8	25.5	30.9	6.8	353
SK	3.5	5.1	13.1	31.8	40.9	5.6	198
AB	5.8	1	5.6	18.3	62.5	6.8	602
BC	2.5	7.2	26.1	28.4	28.7	7.2	1033
NT	0	0	0	0	100	0	1
NU	0	0	0	75	25	0	4
YT	0	10.5	15.8	15.8	52.6	5.3	19
TOTAL	2.8	3	19	29.3	38.3	7.5	5165

26 Which of the following are causing these financial difficulties your centre is currently experiencing? Check all that apply.

Asked of centres responding “worse” to describe current financial situation

For those respondents who reported that their centre’s financial situation was worse than before COVID, the next item asked about the reason(s) for these difficulties. Almost all centres (98%) attributed their difficulties to lost or reduced parent fees. Lost or reduced government funding was chosen for 43% of centres overall, with more than half of centres identifying this as a reason for their financial difficulties only in AB (68%) and ON (53%).

P/T	% Lost/ reduced parent fee revenues	% Lost/ reduced government funding	% Other	Total # centres
NL	80	40	20	5
PE	71.4	57.1	0	7
NS	94.1	12.7	6.9	102
NB	98.1	11.1	5.6	108
QC	90.3	14.5	11.3	310
ON	99.3	53	4.8	1497
MB	98.5	31.2	13.6	199
SK	100	22.2	6.9	144
AB	97.3	67.7	11.2	483
BC	98.2	31.8	6.6	606
NT	100	0	0	1
NU	75	50	25	4
YT	100	38.5	7.7	13
TOTAL	97.7	42.9	7.3	3479

27 Is your child care centre currently experiencing any of the following financial difficulties? Check all that apply.

Asked of centres responding “worse” to describe current financial situation

For those centres whose financial situation was worse than before COVID, respondents were next asked about various types of financial difficulties. Nationally, meeting wage costs was the reason most often checked (46% of centres), followed by meeting fixed costs (e.g., rent and utilities; 41% of centres) and then meeting the cost of benefits (34% of centres). Difficulties meeting wage costs was chosen for at least half of centres in five jurisdictions (ON, SK, AB, NU, YT), while difficulties meeting fixed costs was checked for a majority of centres in NB, QC and AB.

P/T	% Meeting fixed costs	% Meeting wage/ salary costs	% Meeting benefit costs	% None of the above	% Other financial difficulties	Total # centres
NL	40	40	20	60	0	5
PE	42.9	42.9	42.9	14.3	0	7
NS	37.1	21.6	14.4	39.2	11.3	97
NB	52.8	30.2	13.2	28.3	12.3	106
QC	59.7	36.7	19.8	29.2	8.4	308
ON	32.9	51.4	44	28.5	28.8	1467
MB	28.4	47.9	29.9	37.1	14.9	194
SK	26.2	51.8	26.2	33.3	17	141
AB	69.9	51.6	42.1	14.5	11.6	475
BC	35	37.2	20.5	42.1	8	572
NT	0	0	0	0	100	1
NU	0	50	0	25	50	4
YT	20	50	50	20	30	10
TOTAL	41	45.9	34.1	29.9	18.7	3387

28 Which of the following problems do you anticipate in the short term (the first month or two) after this child care centre is able to resume or re-open the pre-COVID operations? Check all that apply.

Asked of all centres open and closed

For Canada as a whole, the top three anticipated problems in the short-term after re-opening/resuming pre-COVID operations were additional health and safety-related costs (88%), lower enrolment (85%), and staffing difficulties (65%). Health and safety concerns and lower enrolment were the top two anticipated problems across all jurisdictions except QC, where staffing difficulties ranked second and lower enrolment third. Concerns about re-opening costs were relatively high in ON (80%) and AB (74%), compared to 30% in BC and 33% in SK.

P/T	% Staffing difficul-ties	% Re-opening costs	% COVID health/ safety costs	% Lower enrol-ment	% Return to pre-COVID gov't funding	% Lack of reserve funds	% Centre unlikely to re-open	% None of the above	% Other	Total # centres
NL	57.1	38.1	85.7	76.2	23.8	28.6	0	4.8	0	21
PE	25	36.1	75	77.8	22.2	19.4	0	11.1	11.1	36
NS	49.3	59.6	87.7	90.1	17.2	42.4	1.5	1	7.4	203
NB	42.7	55.2	87.5	84.9	26	32.8	2.6	2.1	7.8	192
QC	61.3	49.1	85.3	54.8	20.6	26.7	4.6	2.4	7.6	591
ON	74.6	80.1	96	92.6	31.8	44.6	1.5	0.7	6.3	1820
MB	63.7	47	88.5	84.4	56.2	41.2	0	1.7	4.3	347
SK	52.8	33.3	80.5	87.7	23.1	44.1	0.5	1	5.6	195
AB	67.3	73.6	90.5	92.3	40	49.5	3.9	0.9	5.4	588
BC	60.9	29.6	76.8	83.6	37.2	31.4	1.5	3.2	5.9	1013
NT	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	1
NU	75	50	100	100	25	75	0	0	0	4
YT	73.7	47.4	89.5	78.9	42.1	78.9	5.3	0	10.5	19
TOTAL	65.1	59	88.3	85	33	39.5	2	1.6	6.2	5030

29 Which of the following problems do you anticipate in the longer term (up to six months) after this child care centre is able to resume pre- COVID operations? Check all that apply.

Asked of all centres open and closed

The same top three problems were anticipated in the longer term after re-opening/resuming but with slightly lower percentages than for the short-term concerns: health and safety-related costs (82%), lower enrolment (73%), and staffing difficulties (62%). QC was still the only jurisdiction to have more concerns about staffing difficulties than about lower enrolment, whereas PE had considerably lower concerns about staffing difficulty (31%) than other jurisdictions.

P/T	% Staffing difficul-ties	% COVID health/ safety costs	% Lower enrol-ment	% Return to pre-COVID gov't funding	% Lack of reserve funds	% Centre unlikely to re-open	% None of the above	% Other	Total # centres
NL	52.4	76.2	71.4	33.3	19	0	14.3	0	21
PE	31.4	60	54.3	25.7	22.9	0	8.6	11.4	35
NS	49.3	76.4	71.4	23.2	42.4	1	3	3	203
NB	44.8	81.3	80.2	28.1	35.4	2.1	4.2	6.8	192
QC	62.5	80.2	47.5	22	29.8	4.6	5.1	5.6	590
ON	70.8	91.6	84.6	35	45.7	1.9	1.6	4	1817
MB	59.5	81.8	71.4	51.7	46.2	0.3	4.3	2	346
SK	50.8	68.9	73.6	24.4	46.6	0.5	4.7	4.1	193
AB	59.5	83.9	82.6	48.4	53.5	4.4	0.9	4.1	585
BC	58.4	69.8	62.2	38.6	32.3	1.3	8.2	4.6	1011
NT	0	100	100	0	100	0	0	0	1
NU	100	100	100	25	50	25	0	0	4
YT	68.4	78.9	68.4	42.1	68.4	5.3	0	15.8	19
Total	62.2	82.1	73.1	35.7	41.4	2.2	3.8	4.3	5017

30. The federal government is providing a number of financial benefits to help bridge employers' funding gaps created by the COVID-19 crisis. Have you applied or do you plan to apply for any of these federal government benefits?

Asked of all centres

30 A Temporary 10% Wage Subsidy

Respondents were asked about the current status of applications for four federal financial benefits for employers. Only 12% had applied for Temporary 10% Wage Subsidy by the time of the survey, with a further 7% having applied for and received this benefit. Centres in MB and SK were the most likely jurisdictions to have applied and/or received this benefit.

P/T	% Have not applied	% Plan to apply	% Have applied	% Have received	% Not sure	Total # centres
NL	70	0	0	0	30	20
PE	64.7	8.8	8.8	0	17.6	34
NS	66.7	4.7	6.3	4.7	17.7	192
NB	51.3	7	13.3	6.3	22.2	158
QC	73.8	10.6	4.8	1.3	9.5	526
ON	54.2	6.7	13.2	5	20.9	1512
MB	49.2	9.6	18.3	15.9	7	301
SK	35.8	13.3	15.8	17.6	17.6	165
AB	45.2	10.8	11.8	5.9	26.2	507
BC	53.7	8.6	12.1	10.5	15.1	929
NT	100	0	0	0	0	1
NU	33.3	0	0	66.7	0	3
YT	82.4	5.9	0	5.9	5.9	17
TOTAL	55.1	8.4	11.8	7.1	17.7	4365

30 B Canada Emergency 75% Wage Subsidy (CEWS)

29% of centres had applied for the Canada Emergency 75% Wage Subsidy (CEWS), with a further 7% having applied for and received the benefit. ON (45% applied, 11% received) and MB (46% applied, 9% received) were the most likely jurisdictions to at least have started the application process. YT, QC and NS were most likely to have not applied for this benefit (83%, 77% and 67%, respectively had not applied).

P/T	% Have not applied	% Plan to apply	% Have applied	% Have received	% Not sure	Total # centres
NL	65	5	0	0	30	20
PE	56.7	30	3.3	0	10	30
NS	77	1.1	1.6	2.7	17.6	187
NB	46.9	17.1	15.4	6.9	13.7	175
QC	67.3	20.2	4.8	0.9	6.7	539
ON	20.9	13.4	45.4	11.2	9.1	1767
MB	14.2	26.1	45.5	8.7	5.5	345
SK	25.1	38	20.7	5	11.2	179
AB	27.5	21.8	30.4	5.7	14.6	560
BC	55.2	12.8	15.1	3.8	13.1	946
NT	0	0	100	0	0	1
NU	50	25	25	0	0	4
YT	83.3	11.1	0	0	5.6	18
TOTAL	37.2	16.6	28.7	6.9	10.7	4771

30 C Canada Emergency Business Account (CEBA)

Only 11% of centres had applied for the Canada Emergency Business Account (CEBA) with a further 14% having received the benefit. The highest percentages for receiving the CEBA were in NB, AB and QC, all at 20% of centres or higher. At the other end of the scale, the highest percentages not applying for the CEBA were in YT (83% of centres), and NS, NL and PE, at 68% to 69% of centres.

P/T	% Have not applied	% Plan to apply	% Have applied	% Have received	% Not sure	Total # centres
NL	68.4	0	0	0	31.6	19
PE	67.6	2.9	11.8	2.9	14.7	34
NS	69.1	2.1	6.3	6.3	16.2	191
NB	40	2.4	9.7	25.5	22.4	165
QC	57.6	4.4	11	19.9	7.1	547
ON	31.4	2.8	11.9	13.7	40.2	1578
MB	55.4	8.1	5.3	6	25.3	285
SK	49.1	11.3	8.2	9.4	22	159
AB	29.6	4.5	16.1	22.5	27.2	533
BC	56.7	4.7	7.8	11.2	19.6	910
NT	100	0	0	0	0	1
NU	100	0	0	0	0	2
YT	83.3	0	5.6	5.6	5.6	18
TOTAL	44.4	4.2	10.5	14.3	26.6	4442

30 D Emergency Fund for Community Support (EFCS)

The results seem to indicate a lack of awareness of this federal benefit, the Emergency Fund for Community Support (EFCS), as less than 1% of centres nationally had applied, with only a handful reporting receipt of this benefit.

P/T	% Have not applied	% Plan to apply	% Have applied	% Have received	% Not sure	Total # centres
NL	68.4	0	0	0	31.6	19
PE	82.4	2.9	0	0	14.7	34
NS	79	0	0.5	0.5	19.9	186
NB	71.2	0	1.3	0.7	26.8	153
QC	84.5	2.2	0	0.2	13.1	503
ON	44.6	4.4	1.6	0.1	49.3	1477
MB	77.9	3.3	0.4	0	18.4	272
SK	66	2	1.4	0	30.6	147
AB	58.5	2	1	0.4	38.1	491
BC	69.8	2.6	0.6	0.1	27	894
NT	100	0	0	0	0	1
NU	100	0	0	0	0	2
YT	94.1	0	0	0	5.9	17
TOTAL	62.4	2.9	1	0.2	33.5	4196

30 E Canada Emergency Commercial Rent Assistance (CECRA)

There was a similarly small take-up of the Canada Emergency Commercial Rent Assistance (CECRA), with only 2% of centres nationally having applied, and very few actually reporting that this benefit had been received.

P/T	% Have not applied	% Plan to apply	% Have applied	% Have received	% Not sure	Total # centres
NL	73.7	0	0	0	26.3	19
PE	85.7	2.9	0	0	11.4	35
NS	80.6	1.1	0	0.5	17.7	186
NB	73.5	11.3	0.7	0	14.6	151
QC	71.8	12.2	4.2	0.6	11.3	524
ON	39.5	33.6	3	0.1	23.8	1518
MB	81.8	2.5	1.1	0	14.5	275
SK	71.8	6.0	0.7	0.7	20.8	149
AB	48.8	15.4	3.7	0.6	31.4	512
BC	73.8	6.4	0.6	0.2	19	893
NT	100	0	0	0	0	1
NU	50	50	0	0	0	2
YT	94.1	0	0	0	5.9	17
TOTAL	59.3	17.4	2.3	0.3	20.7	4282

31 Have you not applied for any federal government benefits because your provincial/territorial government is providing adequate child care funding?

Asked of centres that did not apply for any federal benefit

For the relatively few centres that had not applied for or received any of the federal benefits for employers, respondents were asked if the reason for this was because their province or territory was providing adequate child care funding. While 60% of centres overall agreed that this was true, there was great jurisdictional variation, from lows of 21% choosing “Yes” in ON and 25% in AB, to highs of 90% or more in NL, PE and NS.

P/T	% Yes	% No	Total # centres
NL	90	10	10
PE	92.9	7.1	14
NS	91.3	8.7	103
NB	54.3	45.7	35
QC	79.7	20.3	256
ON	20.8	79.2	159
MB	43.2	56.8	37
SK	42.3	57.7	26
AB	24.5	75.5	49
BC	61.4	38.6	233
NU	0	100	1
YT	54.5	45.5	11
TOTAL	60	40	934

32 What concerns, if any, do you have about each of these benefits? Check one concern for each benefit.

Asked of all centres

32 A Canada Emergency 75% Wage Subsidy (CEWS)

Respondents were asked about their concerns, if any, regarding COVID-related federal benefits. For the Canada Emergency 75% wage Subsidy (CEWS), 39% overall had no concerns. Concerns about how long it takes to receive the benefit were highest in NB, ON, AB and NU, while concerns about eligibility were highest in NL, QC, BC and YT.

P/T	% No concerns	% Have not heard of this benefit	% Funding amount not adequate	% Takes too long to receive money	% Centre ineligible for this fund	% Don't know	% Other	Total # centres
NL	52.9	11.8	11.8	11.8	29.4	35.3	0	17
PE	50	3.6	3.6	3.6	17.9	28.6	0	28
NS	46.1	10.5	1.3	1.3	23.7	25.7	5.3	152
NB	34.7	5.6	11.8	18.8	20.1	25.7	6.9	144
QC	41.4	14.3	7.7	10.6	26.7	17.2	5	483
ON	35	1.4	12.4	18.6	8.8	31.4	7.3	1594
MB	43.2	1.3	5.4	19.7	6	22.2	14	315
SK	45.7	1.7	4	13.9	12.1	23.1	13.9	173
AB	42.9	6.8	16.2	22.5	13.1	20.4	8.8	457
BC	38.4	7.5	4.6	7.8	25.8	21.3	9.8	861
NT	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
NU	50	0	50	75	25	0	0	4
YT	26.7	6.7	0	6.7	40	6.7	20	15
TOTAL	38.9	5.2	9.4	15.1	15.9	25	8.3	4244

32 B Canada Emergency Business Account (CEBA)

For the Canada Emergency Business Account (CEBA), 45% overall had no concerns. Concerns about how long it takes to receive the benefit were low overall, but 12% in NL. Concerns about eligibility were highest in NL, QC, BC and YT, same as for the CEWS.

P/T	% No concerns	% Have not heard of this benefit	% Funding amount-not adequate	% Takes too long to receive money	% Centre ineligible for this fund	% Don't know	% Other	Total # centres
NL	47.1	5.9	5.9	11.8	23.5	41.2	0	17
PE	34.6	19.2	0	0	15.4	34.6	0	26
NS	45.5	10.5	0.7	0.7	19.6	26.6	3.5	143
NB	44.9	14.5	3.6	2.2	11.6	29	6.5	138
QC	47.6	18.2	5	2.6	22.4	16.2	2.6	456
ON	50.6	9.3	7.3	3.3	14.3	18.6	4.1	1405
MB	34.3	19.1	4	1.1	7.9	34.7	7.2	277
SK	39.6	17.6	1.3	3.1	11.9	28.3	8.2	159
AB	45.2	13.1	12.8	2.1	15.6	23.2	6	436
BC	38.6	17.8	3	2.1	18.9	26.2	5.8	808
NT	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	1
NU	50	25	25	0	25	50	0	4
YT	21.4	21.4	0	0	42.9	14.3	7.1	14
TOTAL	44.9	13.9	5.8	2.5	16.1	22.9	4.9	3884

32 C Emergency Fund for Community Support (EFCS)

For the Emergency Fund for Community Support (EFCS), 27% of centres had not heard about this benefit, and 35% did not know if they had any concerns. As for particular concerns, eligibility concerns were checked for 15% of centres, with NL, QC and YT having the highest level of concern.

P/T	% No concerns	% Have not heard of this benefit	% Funding not adequate	% Takes too long to receive money	% Centre ineligible for this fund	% Don't know	% Other	Total # centres
NL	50	22.2	5.6	11.1	27.8	33.3	0	18
PE	24	20	0	0	20	44	0	25
NS	40.5	18.9	0.7	0.7	19.6	27	2.7	148
NB	17.9	44.3	2.9	0.7	13.6	35.7	2.9	140
QC	29.7	36.2	3.7	2.2	27.8	18	2.6	461
ON	10.9	33.2	3.4	3.1	11.1	46.5	1.8	1339
MB	17.1	45.7	2.5	1.1	7.9	33.6	1.4	280
SK	22.5	40	0.6	0.6	10	33.8	3.8	160
AB	22.2	45.1	6.7	1.6	17.5	29.4	3.6	446
BC	23.7	39.2	1.3	1.7	16.6	29.7	3.8	826
NT	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	1
NU	25	50	25	0	0	75	0	4
YT	20	26.7	0	0	40	6.7	6.7	15
TOTAL	19.8	37.1	3.1	2.1	15.4	34.7	2.6	3863

32 D Canada Emergency Commercial Rent Assistance (CECRA)

For the Canada Emergency Commercial Rent Assistance (CECRA), 33% didn't know if they had concerns, and 25% had no concerns. Again, eligibility was the concern most often expressed (26% of centres), with similar levels of concern about eligibility across the jurisdictions.

P/T	% No concerns	% Have not heard of this benefit	% Takes too long to receive money	% Funding not adequate	% Centre ineligible for this fund	% Don't know	% Other	Total # centres
NL	47.1	11.8	11.8	5.9	35.3	35.3	0	17
PE	23.1	23.1	0	0	30.8	30.8	0	26
NS	42.6	11.5	0.7	2	25.7	25	5.4	148
NB	23.3	24.8	3	4.5	24.8	35.3	2.3	133
QC	37.3	18.1	5.8	4.5	28.3	18.1	6.5	448
ON	16.2	10.6	4.5	5.4	21.3	44.1	9.6	1363
MB	19.1	24.8	1.1	2.8	24.1	31.6	7.1	282
SK	24.8	18	1.2	3.1	26.1	29.8	7.5	161
AB	29.1	13.2	9.7	9.5	28.4	25.9	10.6	433
BC	29	14.7	2.5	2.4	30.4	26.4	8.8	796
NT	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	1
NU	25	25	0	25	0	75	0	4
YT	21.4	21.4	0	0	42.9	7.1	7.1	14
TOTAL	24.9	14.7	4.2	4.6	25.7	32.5	8.4	3826

33 To what extent do you believe all benefits (federal, provincial, municipal) taken together will meet your current financial needs?

Asked of all centres

Centres were asked to rate, on a five-point scale, the extent to which all the benefits (federal, provincial, and municipal) in total were meeting their financial needs. The results overall show a bell curve-shaped distribution, with 22% responding “Not at all” or “A little”, 34% responding “Somewhat”, and 25% responding “Mostly” or “Completely”. Respondents from QC centres had the most negative responses, with 37% in the two lowest categories, while PE had most positive responses, with 47% in the two highest categories. There was a considerable number of “Don’t know” responses.

P/T	% Not at all	% A little	% Somewhat	% Mostly	% Completely	% Don’t know	Total # centres
NL	0	10	30	5	15	40	20
PE	0	11.8	20.6	35.3	11.8	20.6	34
NS	5.7	3.1	18.1	22.3	15	35.8	193
NB	8.3	11.8	18.3	27.8	6.5	27.2	169
QC	23.4	13.7	16.2	14.4	6.1	26.2	561
ON	5.6	13.9	47.2	17.4	1.5	14.3	1777
MB	5	14.6	32.7	30.6	4.1	13.1	343
SK	8.2	13.9	34	23.2	2.1	18.6	194
AB	8.8	27.6	36.4	12.3	2.2	12.8	555
BC	5.6	9.1	25.7	28.8	7	23.8	942
NT	0	100	0	0	0	0	1
NU	25	0	50	0	0	25	4
YT	15.8	10.5	15.8	26.3	0	31.6	19
TOTAL	8.2	14	34	20.5	4.2	19	4812

Family child care homes

34 Which age groups normally receive care in this family child care home?

Asked of all family child care homes

More than 90% of our sample of family child care homes provide care for children for toddlers and preschool-age children. Care for infants is a bit less common, though at 70% or above for all jurisdictions except for NS and NB. Home-based care for kindergarten and school-age children was quite variable by jurisdiction, from near-zero in QC (which has a substantial supply of child care for these age groups in schools) to over 80% in SK.

P/T	% Infants	% Toddlers	% Preschoolers	% Kindergarten	% School-age	Total # homes
NL	86.4	89.8	72.9	18.6	13.6	59
PE	100	100	75	50	50	4
NS	57.6	81.2	78.8	35.3	58.8	85
NB	66.3	72.1	79.1	32.6	64	86
QC	82.2	85.3	79.6	0.5	0.5	191
ON	89.2	96.4	92.6	80.3	76.1	837
MB	80.3	83.9	94.2	60.6	72.3	137
SK	88.9	96	98	87.9	80.8	99
AB	78.9	96	92.8	67.7	60.8	375
BC	71.2	96.5	92.6	42.7	34.8	632
NU	0	100	100	0	0	1
YT	33.3	83.3	100	16.7	50	6
TOTAL	80.1	93.3	90.5	57.3	55.1	2512

35 Is this family child care home individually licensed, or part of a family child care agency?

Asked of all family child care homes

Nationally, there was an even split between family child care homes that are individually licensed vs. those that are part of a family child care agency. Agency-based family child care was the predominant model reported in NL, NS, QC, ON and AB. This is consistent with provincial policy; NL uses both models.

P/T	% FCC individually licensed by the P/T	% Part of family child care agency	Total # homes
NL	12.1	87.9	58
PE	75	25	4
NS	3.6	96.4	84
NB	97.6	2.4	85
QC	25.9	74.1	185
ON	17.9	82.1	804
MB	97.1	2.9	136
SK	93.9	6.1	99
AB	2.7	97.3	372
BC	97.1	2.9	627
NU	100	0	1
YT	100	0	6
TOTAL	46.3	53.7	2461

36 Is this family child care home part of _______?

Asked of family child care homes that are agency-based

For family child care homes that are agency-based, 38% were associated with a multi-site child care organization offering both centre-based and family child care, and 36% were associated with a multi-service agency that also provides other social/family services. These percentages did not vary much by province.

36 A A multi-site child care organization offering both centre-based and family child care?

P/T	% Yes	% No	Total # homes
NL	9.8	90.2	51
PE	0	100	1
NS	35.6	64.4	73
NB	100	0	1
QC	66.9	33.1	133
ON	41.5	58.5	631
MB	0	100	4
SK	42.9	57.1	7
AB	24.3	75.7	341
BC	40	60	20
TOTAL	37.8	62.2	1262

36 B A multi-service agency that also offers other social/family services?

P/T	% Yes	% No	Total # homes
NL	18	82	50
PE	0	100	1
NS	35.2	64.8	71
NB	100	0	1
QC	6.3	93.8	112
ON	43	57	635
MB	66.7	33.3	3
SK	14.3	85.7	7
AB	35.5	64.5	335
BC	23.8	76.2	21
TOTAL	35.8	64.2	1236

37 During the week of April 27th to May 1st, was this family child care home open or closed?

Asked of all family child care homes

Nationally, 39% of licensed family child care homes were reported closed during the reference week of April 27th to May 1st. In NS and NL, essentially all child care homes were closed. In five provinces (ON, MB, SK, AB, BC), a minority of homes were closed.

P/T	% Open	% Closed	Total # homes
NL	1.7	98.3	58
PE	25	75	4
NS	1.2	98.8	81
NB	11.8	88.2	85
QC	27.3	72.7	183
ON	62.2	37.8	826
MB	77.9	22.1	136
SK	79.2	20.8	101
AB	84.9	15.1	371
BC	67.1	32.9	633
NU	0	100	1
YT	100	0	6
TOTAL	60.7	39.3	2485

38 During the week of April 27th to May 1st, were your hours of operation the same as before COVID-19?

Asked of all open family child care homes

In all jurisdictions, a large majority of open family child care homes were maintaining the same hours of operation as before COVID-19. There were only three provinces (NB, SK, AB) where this percentage fell below 80% of homes. Of the relative few with changed hours of operation, shorter hours were much more likely than longer hours, again across jurisdictions.

P/T	% Yes	% No	Total # homes
NL	100	0	2
PE	100	0	1
NS	100	0	1
NB	60	40	10
QC	88	12	50
ON	82.9	17.1	510
MB	90.4	9.6	104
SK	78.5	21.5	79
AB	73	27	311
BC	85.5	14.5	422
YT	83.3	16.7	6
TOTAL	82	18	1496

39 How are the hours of operation different than before COVID-19?

Asked of all open family child care homes

P/T	% Longer hours of operation	% Shorter hours of operation	% Other	Total # homes
NB	25	0	75	4
QC	33.3	33.3	33.3	6
ON	4.6	33.3	62.1	87
MB	0	40	60	10
SK	0	41.2	58.8	17
AB	4.7	73.3	22.1	86
BC	11.3	79	9.7	62
YT	0	100	0	1
TOTAL	6.6	56.8	36.6	273

40 On an average day, how many children including your own were attending this family child care home?

Asked of all open family child care homes

This question asks the family child care provider about pre-COVID and during-COVID enrolment including her own, as specified in provincial/territorial regulations. What is most noteworthy is that in all jurisdictions, there were substantially fewer children enrolled in the reference week— usually one-third to one-half of previous enrolment. This was true across provinces/territories. Note that several jurisdictions had very few open family child care homes.

P/T	Median enrolment, pre-COVID	Median enrolment, reference week: April 27-May 1	Total # homes
NL	3	1	1
PE	8	5	1
NS	6	3	1
NB	6	4	9
QC	6	0	50
ON	6	2	502
MB	7	4	99
SK	10	3	74
AB	6	3.8	301
BC	7	3	405
YT	6.5	3	6
TOTAL	6	3	1449

41 Is attendance currently restricted to children whose parents are essential workers?

Asked of all open family child care homes

The total responses suggest that attendance in most regulated family child care was not restricted to children whose parents are essential workers; only 24.1% overall answered “Yes, it was restricted to essential workers.” However, provincial/territorial breakdowns show a different picture: it is more associated with the particular province/territory. Outside Atlantic Canada, with low response numbers on this question, QC has a very high number of child care homes restricted to essential worker parents (94%), while in all the other provinces/territories except BC and YT, most regulated family child care was not restricted to essential workers.

P/T	% Yes	% No	Total # homes
NL	100	0	1
PE	100	0	1
NS	0	100	1
NB	100	0	9
QC	94	6	50
ON	11.5	88.5	504
MB	11.1	88.9	99
SK	17.3	82.7	75
AB	12.4	87.6	307
BC	41.7	58.3	405
YT	83.3	16.7	6
TOTAL	24.1	75.9	1458

42 Currently, which parents have to pay a fee for their child's attendance at this family child care home?

Asked of open family child care homes not restricted to essential workers

This question – for family care homes open to both essential and non-essential worker-parents – shows the spread of responses by province/territory. Of the jurisdictions with many responses, four (MB, SK, AB, BC) show essential and non-essential worker-parents paid the same fees in most family child care home, whereas in ON, 73% said essential workers paid no fee.

P/T	% No parents pay a fee	% Essential workers pay no fee	% All parents pay fee; essential workers pay less	% All parents pay same fee	% Other	Total # homes
NS	100	0	0	0	0	1
QC	100	0	0	0	0	3
ON	5.4	72.6	0.7	19.6	1.8	445
MB	8	0	1.1	83.9	6.9	87
SK	1.6	0	1.6	87.1	9.7	62
AB	1.5	0	0.4	93.3	4.9	268
BC	11.6	1.7	2.2	79.3	5.2	232
YT	0	0	0	0	100	1
TOTAL	6.1	29.8	1	59	4.2	1099

43 Currently, what fees do these essential workers pay for their child's attendance at the family child care home?

Asked of open family child care homes restricted to essential workers

This question was for family child care homes restricted to essential workers; the previous question was for family child care not restricted to essential worker parents. Looking only at the jurisdictions with a substantial number of responses shows quite a range of difference among them. Family child care providers reported parents paid no fee in QC (98%), YT (80%) and ON (62%) whereas in five jurisdictions (NB, MB, SK, AB, BC), many more providers (range from 61% to 92%) reported essential worker-parents paid full fees.

P/T	% Do not pay a fee	% Pay a reduced fee	% Pay the full fee	% Other	Total # homes
NL	100	0	0	0	1
PE	0	0	100	0	1
NB	11.1	0	88.9	0	9
QC	97.8	0	0	2.2	46
ON	62.1	5.2	19	13.8	58
MB	0	0	91.7	8.3	12
SK	7.7	15.4	76.9	0	13
AB	0	21.1	71.1	7.9	38
BC	6	25.9	60.8	7.2	166
YT	80	0	0	20	5
TOTAL	28.1	16	48.4	7.4	349

44 On an average day, how many children were attending this family child care home before COVID-19?

Asked of all closed family child care homes.

This question asks closed centres about average pre-COVID enrolment, as specified in provincial/territorial regulations in order to understand the enrolment patterns fully.

P/T	Median enrolment, pre-COVID-19	Total # homes
NL	6	57
PE	4	3
NS	6	78
NB	6	75
QC	6	129
ON	6	300
MB	8	29
SK	8.5	20
AB	5	53
BC	6	205
NU	6	1
TOTAL	6	950

45 Was your family child care home closure mandated by the government?

Asked of all closed family child care homes

The responses to this question reflect several things: first, the closure of family child care homes was reported by 100% of providers as mandated by the government in four jurisdictions (NL, PE, NB, NU), 99% in NS and 84% in QC. Second, among the family child care homes whose closure was not mandated by the provincial/territorial government, a substantial number nevertheless closed – as many as 90% in SK, 89% in BC, 86% in MB and 81% in AB. Note that some providers in jurisdictions such as ON, MB, SK, and BC where their closure was not mandated by the government nevertheless reported that their closure was provincially mandated.

P/T	% Yes	% No	Total # homes
NL	100	0	57
PE	100	0	3
NS	98.7	1.3	77
NB	100	0	75
QC	84	16	125
ON	38	62	305
MB	13.8	86.2	29
SK	9.5	90.5	21
AB	18.5	81.5	54
BC	11	89	210
NU	100	0	1
TOTAL	49.3	50.7	957

46 Who made the decision to close?

Asked of all closed family child care homes not mandated to close by government

This question asked who made the decision to close if closure was not mandated by the provincial/territorial government. Note that four provinces (NS, QC, ON, AB) use an agency-based family child care system, whereas providers are individually licensed in five provinces (PE, NB, MB, SK, BC). NL uses both models (there was only one in NU and none in NT). Thus, in MB, SK, AB and BC, most providers said the decision to close was theirs, whereas in NL, NS and ON, they cited the agency. But in QC – using an agency model – about half claimed the decision themselves and half said it was an agency decision and in AB, which uses an agency model, 83% of providers said closing was their decision. It is noteworthy that agency closure was cited in some jurisdictions that do not use an agency model.

P/T	% I did	% Family child care agency did	Total # homes
NL	9.4	90.6	53
PE	0	100	3
NS	2.6	97.4	77
NB	45.2	54.8	73
QC	49.6	50.4	115
ON	34.5	65.5	287
MB	92.9	7.1	28
SK	85.7	14.3	21
AB	82.6	17.4	46
BC	99.5	0.5	201
NU	100	0	1
TOTAL	52.9	47.1	905

47 How likely is it that your family child care home will be closed permanently?

Asked of all closed family child care homes

Most family child care providers – 56% in NB to 70% in SK said they would definitely re-open. However, the remaining 30% to 40% chose less certain options including “Probably re-open”, “Probably remain closed” to “Not sure”. A very small number of regulated family child care providers in a few provinces whose child care was currently closed – NL, ON, AB and BC – said they definitely would remain closed.

P/T	% Definitely remain closed	% Probably remain closed	% Probably re-open	% Definitely re-open	% Not sure	Total # homes
NL	3.6	3.6	18.2	63.6	10.9	55
PE	0	0	0	66.7	33.3	3
NS	0	2.6	24.7	59.7	13	77
NB	0	2.7	26.7	56	14.7	75
QC	0.8	5	20	58.3	15.8	120
ON	3.8	3.8	15.7	64.5	12.3	293
MB	0	4	16	80	0	25
SK	0	0	20	70	10	20
AB	2	2	10	64	22	50
BC	2	3.4	26.1	59.1	9.4	203
NU	0	0	0	100	0	1
TOTAL	2.1	3.5	20.1	61.9	12.5	922

48 For which types of parents is the provincial or municipal government providing funds to your family child care home to make up for lost fees? Check all that apply.

Asked of all family child care homes

The responses to this question show how many providers reported receiving public funds from government for each type of parent. The most striking result is the spread of approaches reported among jurisdictions. A majority of family child care providers in three provinces – MB, SK, AB – reported that no public funds were being provided to cover parent fees while very few providers in four jurisdictions (NL, NS, QC, YT) reported that no parent fees were being covered.

P/T	% Parents with fee subsidies	% Parents who pay full fees	% Essential workers	% No funds being provided	% Don't know	% Other	Total # homes
NL	37	74.1	14.8	1.9	7.4	11.1	54
PE	25	50	0	25	25	0	4
NS	80.3	66.2	12.7	4.2	8.5	5.6	71
NB	53.7	31.7	11	13.4	8.5	25.6	82
QC	43.5	15.6	18.2	3.9	26	7.1	154
ON	43.7	30.6	44.6	29.6	11.2	2.4	778
MB	26.7	10.3	3.4	56.9	11.2	6.9	116
SK	14.3	9.9	0	61.5	15.4	16.5	91
AB	25.1	8.3	3.3	56.5	18	2.1	338
BC	37.2	26.5	12.6	19.1	17.3	24.8	565
NU	100	0	0	0	0	0	1
YT	33.3	33.3	50	0	0	50	6
TOTAL	38.5	25.6	21.7	29.8	14.6	10.4	2260

49 What kinds of public funding from government does your family child care home NORMALLY receive (i.e., pre-COVID-19)? Check all that apply.

Asked of all family child care homes

The responses to this question represent the percent of family child care providers reporting each kind of funding normally received but do not reflect whether the public funding was substantial or minimal. In six jurisdictions (NB, QC, ON, MB, BC, YT), more than half the providers reported that operational/grant funding was normally received. Very few providers reported receiving Indigenous program funding.

P/T	% Operational funding/ grant	% Funds for special needs children	% Equipment/ transportation	% Parent fee subsidies	% Funding for Indigenous programs	% No gov't funding	% Other public funding normally received	Total # homes
NL	17	0	47.2	39.6	0	20.8	20.8	53
PE	33.3	0	0	33.3	0	33.3	0	3
NS	10	1.4	1.4	82.9	0	12.9	4.3	70
NB	77.5	2.5	2.5	53.8	0	6.3	15	80
QC	50.3	13.9	1.3	44.4	0	5.3	6.6	151
ON	68.2	16.2	22.8	86.1	3.6	6.2	4.8	771
MB	64.4	2.5	0	35.6	0	31.4	1.7	118
SK	49.4	6.7	27	58.4	1.1	6.7	30.3	89
AB	45.2	7	0.6	73.9	0.3	16.4	8.8	330
BC	84	7.3	0.5	73.3	0.3	2.8	7.8	576
NU	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	1
YT	83.3	16.7	0	66.7	0	0	33.3	6
TOTAL	64	10	10.5	72	1.4	8.7	7.9	2248

50 How much of the normal (pre-COVID-19) government funding are you currently receiving?

Asked of all family child care homes

In five provinces, (NL, NS, NB, QC, MB), a majority of family child care providers said they were receiving all or more than normal government funding (they may have been receiving public funds to replace parent fees, for example, which would be "more" funding). As many as 20% to 25% – sometimes in the same provinces – reported receiving none of the normal government funding; these included NL (24%), NS (20%) and AB (21%).

P/T	% None of the normal government funding	% A portion of normal government funding	% All the normal government funding	% More than normal government funding	% Other	Total # homes
NL	24.4	11.1	37.8	11.1	15.6	45
PE	0	0	50	50	0	2
NS	20	16.7	45	10	8.3	60
NB	6.8	13.7	65.8	5.5	8.2	73
QC	14.5	8.4	62.6	3.1	11.5	131
ON	12.8	36.5	36.1	1.2	13.4	693
MB	14.8	13.6	65.4	0	6.2	81
SK	8.6	19.8	40.7	1.2	29.6	81
AB	20.9	21.3	45	0.4	12.4	258
BC	8.9	35.4	19	25	11.7	548
NU	0	0	0	100	0	1
YT	0	0	0	66.7	33.3	6
TOTAL	13	28.5	36.9	8.7	12.8	1979

51 Have you yourself applied for either the Canada Emergency Response Benefit (CERB), Temporary Top-up for Low Income Workers or Employment Insurance (EI)?

Asked of all family child care homes

All family child care providers were asked if they had applied for several federal government benefits for which they may have been eligible. The most frequent response by far was “Applied for none”, with NL (96%) and QC (96%), and YT the highest. The federal benefit most commonly applied for was CERB but this was also very uneven by province, with 52% reporting applying in SK but only 4% in NL and 4% in QC. The only province in which EI was applied for was Ontario (19%) and the only province in which providers reported applying for Temporary Top-Up for Low Income Workers was PE (25% of providers).

P/T	% Applied for CERB	% Applied for EI	% Applied for Temporary Top-up for Low Income Workers	% Applied for none of the above	Total # homes
NL	3.8	0	0	96.2	53
PE	25	0	25	75	4
NS	10	0	0	90	70
NB	32.5	1.3	2.6	64.9	77
QC	3.9	0	0	96.1	153
ON	43.3	19.2	3.4	54.9	739
MB	29.3	0.9	0	69.8	116
SK	51.7	1.1	0	48.3	89
AB	31.7	0.3	0.6	68	334
BC	42.8	0.5	1.6	56.5	559
NU	0	0	0	100	1
YT	0	0	0	100	6
Total	35.7	6.8	1.8	63.3	2201

52 Please rate your family child care home's current financial situation compared to before COVID-19.

Asked of all family child care homes

The responses to this question about the family child care home's financial situation were primarily in the mid category "About the same", "Somewhat worse" and "Much worse" than before COVID-19, with 81% of QC providers reporting "About the same". SK providers were most likely to respond "Much worse" (52%). More than 60% responded "Worse" in both categories in four jurisdictions (ON, SK, AB, BC).

P/T	% Much better than pre-COVID-19	% Somewhat better than pre-COVID-19	% About the same as pre-COVID-19	% Somewhat worse than pre-COVID-19	% Much worse than pre-COVID-19	% Not sure	Total # homes
NL	0	17	37.7	37.7	5.7	1.9	53
PE	0	0	50	0	25	25	4
NS	4.2	4.2	59.2	21.1	7	4.2	71
NB	5.1	7.7	33.3	29.5	15.4	9	78
QC	1.3	1.3	81	7.2	5.9	3.3	153
ON	5.7	1.6	12.7	34.7	40.8	4.6	741
MB	6.9	2.6	27.6	31.9	28.4	2.6	116
SK	4.4	1.1	12.1	28.6	51.6	2.2	91
AB	4.5	2.4	11.7	42.5	37.7	1.2	334
BC	2.5	2.9	20.2	34.5	36.4	3.6	560
NU	0	0	0	100	0	0	1
YT	0	0	50	50	0	0	6
TOTAL	4.2	2.7	22.9	33	33.6	3.6	2208

53 Which of the following are causing these financial difficulties your family child care home is currently experiencing? Check all that apply.

Asked of family child care homes responding “worse” to describe current financial situation

Asked about what was causing the financial difficulties being experienced, family child care providers overwhelmingly said that “Lost or reduced parent fees” were responsible – many more than “Lost or reduced government funding”. This was the case everywhere but QC and YT, both of which had high rates of “Other current financial difficulties” (60% and 67% respectively – note that YT had only three providers answering this question). In ON, 98% identified lost parent fees while an additional 49% identified lost government funding. In other jurisdictions also identifying “lost or reduced parent fees” at a very high level, a smaller proportion also chose “lost/reduced government funding”.

P/T	Lost/ reduced parent fee revenues	Lost/ reduced government funding	Other current financial difficulties	Total # homes
NL	87	13	13	23
PE	100	0	0	1
NS	85	10	15	20
NB	100	0	0	34
QC	40	10	60	20
ON	98.4	49.3	1.3	558
MB	94.3	4.3	14.3	70
SK	84.5	33.8	16.9	71
AB	98.1	19.3	18.6	269
BC	98	32.1	5.6	396
NU	100	0	0	1
YT	0	33.3	66.7	3
TOTAL	96	33.4	8.3	1466

54 Which of the following problems do you anticipate in the short term (in the first month or two) after your family child care home is able to resume or re-open the pre-COVID operations? Check all that apply.

Asked of all family child care homes

Many providers indicated that they anticipated multiple problems in the short term – in the first month or two after re-opening. The most commonly identified problems in most province were higher health and safety costs and lower enrolment; QC, however, only had 13% identifying lower enrolment as an anticipated problem. In six jurisdictions (NL, PE, NS, NB, QC, ON), the costs of re-opening were also identified by 40% - 50% of providers. In YT, 50% of the six providers chose “Other”.

P/T	% Costs of re-opening	% Higher health and safety costs	% Lower enrol-ment	% Return to pre-COVID gov’t funding	% FCC unlikely to re-open	% None of the above	% Other	Total # homes
NL	41.5	71.7	58.5	15.1	5.7	13.2	1.9	53
PE	50	25	25	0	25	25	0	4
NS	47.8	73.9	79.7	17.4	4.3	2.9	8.7	69
NB	45.3	90.7	53.3	16	4	1.3	10.7	75
QC	46	77.3	13.3	22.7	6.7	10.7	8.7	150
ON	50.5	87.2	91.6	23.9	22.6	1.8	5.3	729
MB	15.5	46.4	50	8.2	2.7	27.3	8.2	110
SK	23.6	53.9	80.9	11.2	2.2	6.7	18	89
AB	11.3	47.6	76.8	21.6	1.8	10.1	4.6	328
BC	16.4	56.1	75.5	30	3.2	11.4	8.3	554
NU	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	1
YT	0	33.3	33.3	0	0	0	50	6
TOTAL	32.0	68.2	74.4	22.9	9.9	8	7.2	2168

55 Which of the following problems do you anticipate in the longer term (up to six months) after your family child care home is able to re-sume the pre-COVID operations? Check all that apply

Asked of all family child care homes

When asked about anticipated problems at six months after re-opening, providers in most jurisdictions continued to have rates of concern about higher health and safety costs and lower enrolment that were almost as high as short term concerns in the previous question. PE and YT, both with few providers responding to this question – four and six — stand out as having fewer concerns about these. It is interesting to note that on this question, in ON, 22% of the 727 providers said they were “Unlikely to re-open”.

P/T	% Higher health and safety costs	% Lower enrolment	% Return to pre-COVID gov’t funding	% FCC unlikely to re-open	% None of the above	% Other	Total # homes
NL	69.2	50	28.8	3.8	13.5	1.9	52
PE	25	25	0	25	25	0	4
NS	63.1	61.5	20	3.1	15.4	6.2	65
NB	80.3	47.4	15.8	3.9	7.9	6.6	76
QC	74.7	18.7	32	5.3	12.7	2.7	150
ON	75.5	87.9	30.1	21.5	2.8	1.4	727
MB	50.9	44.5	14.5	3.6	25.5	8.2	110
SK	70.5	72.7	15.9	2.3	8	5.7	88
AB	48.9	71.3	22.9	2.4	8.9	16.5	327
BC	57.8	61.1	31.8	3.6	15.1	6.2	548
NU	0	0	0	0	0	100	1
YT	33.3	33.3	16.7	0	16.7	16.7	6
TOTAL	64.9	67.5	27.3	9.6	9.8	5.9	2154