

# Environmental Health and Sustainability Practices in the Child Care Sector in Canada: Preliminary Data Analysis of CPCHE/CCCF Survey of Child Care Professionals

April 2022

CANADIAN PARTNERSHIP FOR CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT (CPCHE)

CANADIAN CHILD CARE FEDERATION (CCCF)

This report was prepared by Virginia McFarland for the Canadian Partnership for Children’s Health and Environment (CPCHE) and the Canadian Child Care Federation (CCCF).

April 2022

**Note to readers:**

The findings in this report should be considered preliminary, as recoding of open-ended (write-in) responses has yet to be conducted.

In the interest of enhancing public access to information and supporting informed dialogue among stakeholders, CPCHE and CCCF are pleased to provide this interim report on the occasion of [Healthy Environments for Learning Day](#) (HELD), April 28, 2022. This year’s HELD campaign is promoting children’s environmental health protection and ecological sustainability in child care settings across Canada.

CPCHE and CCCF will provide an updated report once additional analyses have been conducted.

---

For more information on the survey or the collaborative efforts of CPCHE and CCCF to advance children’s environmental health and sustainability in the child care sector, please contact:

Erica Phipps, Executive Director, CPCHE: [erica@healthyenvironmentforkids.ca](mailto:erica@healthyenvironmentforkids.ca)

Don Giesbrecht, CEO, CCCF: [dgiesbrecht@cccf-fcsge.ca](mailto:dgiesbrecht@cccf-fcsge.ca)

Gillian Petrini, Healthy Environments for Learning Day Project Coordinator: [gillian@healthyenvironmentforkids.ca](mailto:gillian@healthyenvironmentforkids.ca)

or visit: [www.healthyenvironmentforkids.ca](http://www.healthyenvironmentforkids.ca) | [www.environnementsainspourenfants.ca](http://www.environnementsainspourenfants.ca)

Environmental Health and Sustainability Practices in the Child Care Sector in Canada:  
Preliminary Data Analysis of CPCHE/CCCF Survey of Child Care Professionals

**CONTENTS**

About the Survey .....1

Key Findings .....1

Data Processing & Analysis .....5

Overall Results .....5

    Content Questions .....5

    Respondent & Child Care Centre Characteristics .....52

Appendix .....57

    Respondent Information .....57

    Content .....59

## ABOUT THE SURVEY

The survey of child care professionals, conducted by CPCHE and CCCF in collaboration with University of Ottawa researchers, opened on March 17, 2022 and closed at midnight April 15, 2022. The voluntary, anonymous survey was conducted in English and French and was open to child care professionals currently or recently (since 2020) working in child care in Canada. Prior to its dissemination, the survey was reviewed and approved by the University of Ottawa Research Ethics Board.

Survey respondents were invited to share their views, observations and practices related to environmental health and ecological sustainability in child care settings, including topics such as reducing children's exposures to toxic chemicals in cleaning products, toys and plastics; improving indoor air quality; reducing energy consumption; and increasing children's access to natural play spaces.

This report should be considered preliminary analysis.

## KEY FINDINGS

Overall, most respondents (78.4%) felt they were knowledgeable about the ways in which environmental factors, such as air pollution and toxic chemicals, can affect children's health and well-being.

When asked a series of questions about their level of concern for various environmental hazards or features that could impact child health, approximately two thirds of respondents were consistently somewhat to very concerned about these issues:

- 69.2% Toxic chemicals in products
- 68.7% Outdoor air pollution
- 68.5% Children lacking connection with nature
- 67.8% Climate change
- 65.3% Contaminants in food
- 65.1% Contaminants in water
- 64.4% Poor indoor air quality
- 64.6% Hazardous chemicals in cleaning, sanitizing and disinfecting products
- 63.2% Plastics such as BPA and microplastics

Half of respondents (49.9%) felt that the child care sector definitely has a role to play in reducing children's exposures to toxic chemicals and pollutants, and more than four out of five (83.6%) felt it was very or somewhat important for child care programs to strive to be ecologically sustainable or "green".

Nearly half of respondents (48.5%) felt that there were unhealthy conditions in the child care setting where they were working (somewhat or definitely).

When asked a series of questions about the presence of certain systems/conditions/factors in their child care program, responses were as follows:

- 32.9% Windows that cannot be opened in rooms where children spend time
- 30.6% Peeling paint on walls, woodwork or other surfaces
- 30.4% Basement area(s) where children spend time

- 28.8% Noticeable air pollution or fumes
  - 28.6% Excessive noise
  - 73.3% Air conditioning (26.7% without)
  - 26.2% Wall-to-wall or extensive carpeting
  - 26.0% Rodent or other animal infestation within the past 12 months
  - 24.5% Insect infestation within the past 12 months
  - 23.9% Use of air fresheners
  - 23.6% Windowless rooms where children spend time
  - 23.4% Structural disrepair
  - 23.1% Indoor artificial turf
  - 21.9% Pesticides used indoors on a routine basis
  - 21.6% Lead in water supply lines
  - 21.6% Mould or mouldy smell
  - 20.3% Excessive moisture
- 
- 38.8% Composting on site or municipal (61.2% without)
  - 57.0% Adequate shade in outdoor play area (43.0% without)
  - 35.8% Outdoor artificial turf
  - 35.6% Pavement on most/all of the outdoor play area
  - 74.1% Natural vegetation in the outdoor play area (25.9% without)
  - 77.6% Outdoor play area adjacent to the child care program (23.4% without)
  - 21.5% Lawn or garden pesticides/herbicides used on a routine basis

Half of respondents (49.1%) reported their child care program was within 1 kilometre of the nearest highway. Nearly four fifths (78.6%) of respondents reported that their child care program was within 1 kilometre of the nearest major roadway. And more than one third reported that their child care program was within 5 kilometres of the nearest polluting industry or other potential source of contaminants (e.g., mining or agricultural operation).

More than one third (34.7%) of respondents reported that their child care program had been affected by wildfire smoke in the past 2 years.

One in five (19.8%) of respondents reported that their child care program had been tested for radon.

Nearly half (44.5%) of respondents reported that their child care program heated food or drinks in, or put hot food or drinks into, plastic containers.

More than one third (34.2%) of respondents reported that their child care program serves locally grown or organic food when feasible, or grows some of their own food.

More than one third (38.9%) of respondents reported that there had been renovations in their child care facility in the past 5 years. Of these, nearly one quarter (24.2%) indicated that there were noticeable fumes, dust and/or debris when children and staff were present during these renovations.

Nearly half (45.7%) of respondents reported that their child care program uses spray-on sunscreen.

More than half (53.3%) of respondents reported that children at their child care program play with toys made of PVC.

Two out of five (42.6%) respondents reported that their child care program uses vinyl-covered sleeping mats or cot mattresses.

One out of five (22.4%) respondents reported that their child care program uses sleeping mats or cot mattresses made of polyurethane foam.

Nearly two thirds (62.7%) of respondents reported that their child care program was accessible to children who are differently abled.

When asked if measures have been taken to increase ventilation or otherwise improve the air quality inside the child care program since the start of the COVID pandemic, 46.3% indicated that measures had been taken.

- 67.2% opened windows more frequently
- 52.7% used portable air cleaners (e.g., devices with HEPA filters)
- 41.3% increased ventilation using the building's existing heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) system (e.g., more air exchanges per hour)
- 32.4% increased filtration in the existing HVAC system (e.g., a switch to HEPA filters)
- 23.2% used fans to bring in more fresh air
- 11.8% used 'fogging' devices that propel disinfecting/sanitizing chemicals into the air
- 10.6% installed a new HVAC system
- 6.7% used ozone air purifiers
- 6.0% used handheld UV sanitizers (e.g., for toys)
- 5.1% used ultraviolet (UV) sanitizer boxes

Respondents were asked a series of questions about whether their child care program has policies/plans in place in the event of certain situations:

- 74.3% Extreme heat
- 73.9% Extreme cold
- 73.5% Storm or extreme weather event
- 67.4% High UV days
- 62.2% Poor air quality days
- 53.4% Accident or incident at a nearby industrial facility or transport corridor

Respondents were asked a series of questions about the degree to which their child care program is engaged in various actions related to environmental health and sustainability. Following are the proportions of responses indicating the respondent's child care program is undertaking this action at least to some extent:

- 78.0% Ensuring children have regular access to green/natural play spaces
- 77.7% Representing cultural diversity (e.g., artwork, furnishing, play items)
- 75.6% Ensuring children have adequate shade (in their play area)
- 73.7% Choosing/using toys and crafts supplies that do not contain toxic chemicals

- 73.3% Minimizing the use of pesticides
- 68.7% Ensuring a fragrance-free environment
- 68.5% Reducing/avoiding the use of cleaning products that contain hazardous chemicals
- 64.5% Making efforts to conserve energy
- 64.5% Following a “shoes off at the door” policy
- 63.7% Reducing use of plastics
- 57.9% Avoiding the use of antibacterial soap
- 55.2% Taking action to reduce children’s exposure to traffic pollution
- 50.0% Reducing/prohibiting vehicle idling during drop-off and pick-up times
- 45.7% Taking action to reduce carbon emissions / address climate change

Overall, 60.8% of respondents assessed their program’s overall commitment to environmental health and sustainability as good to excellent. More than two thirds of respondents reported support from their leadership (73.2%), interest among staff (72.2%) and support from families (62.6%) for improving environmental health and sustainability in their child care. Nearly three quarters (72.0%) reported that children are involved in their child care program’s efforts to improve environmental health and sustainability as part of their educational practice.

Respondents were asked to select which, if any, of the following are barriers to action to improve environmental health and sustainability that their child care program:

- 53.4% Lack of funding
- 46.9% Lack of information, guidance and/or training
- 44.6% Lack of support from government
- 36.9% We don’t own the building
- 31.2% Competing priorities
- 27.0% Lack of interest/support from families
- 25.4% Problems are ‘invisible’ and thus don’t receive attention
- 22.7% Lack of support from management, board, co-workers, etc.
- 20.4% Benefits are not likely to justify the effort/cost

When asked if they would refer to a website with trustworthy information and tips on how to make child care settings healthier and more sustainable, a majority (88.4%) of respondents said they would. When asked to select among a list of actions that they might take if a self-assessment checklist on environmental health and sustainability measures in child care programs was available:

- 51.0% would complete it together with colleagues
- 43.7% would use it on their own
- 39.5% would use results to prioritize actions
- 36.9% would share results with the board
- 34.5% would share results with client families
- and 2.8% noted they would not use the checklist

## DATA PROCESSING & ANALYSIS

The survey, conducted by CPCHE and CCCF in collaboration with University of Ottawa researchers, opened on March 17, 2022 and closed at midnight April 15, 2022. The voluntary, anonymous survey was conducted online in English and French using the Survey Monkey platform and was open to child care professionals currently or recently (since 2020) working in child care in Canada. Data were recoded and analysed using Stata version 12.1.

This report should be considered preliminary analysis, as open-ended variable recoding has yet to be performed.

## OVERALL RESULTS

There were 2083 respondents to the survey. Of these, 60 were not child care professionals currently or recently (2020 or later) working in a child care program in Canada, and were thus excluded from the survey, leaving 2023 valid respondents to the survey proper.

## CONTENT QUESTIONS

---

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE WAYS IN WHICH ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS, SUCH AS AIR POLLUTION AND TOXIC CHEMICALS, CAN AFFECT CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND WELL-BEING?

There were 1778 valid responses to this question:

- 22.9% Very knowledgeable
- 55.5% Somewhat knowledgeable
- 15.2% Not very knowledgeable
- 6.4% Not at all knowledgeable

Overall, 78.4% considered themselves to be somewhat to very knowledgeable in this area.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of respondent age, respondent gender, respondent's years working in child care, and respondent's role on their self-assessed of knowledge of climate change. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Gender was a significant predictor of self-assessed knowledge.
  - Female > Male ( $p = .006$ ).
- Role was a significant predictor of self-assessed knowledge.
  - ECE > Support Staff ( $p < .001$ )
  - ECE > Owner ( $p = .019$ )
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of self-assessed knowledge.
  - 11 to 20 years > 5 years or fewer ( $p = .001$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 5 years or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )



---

THINKING ABOUT THE FOLLOWING POTENTIAL RISKS TO THE HEALTH AND WELL-BEING OF CHILDREN, NOW AND INTO THE FUTURE, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR DEGREE OF CONCERN, IF ANY, ABOUT THE FOLLOWING:

Respondents were asked to rate a series of issues by level of concern. In total, 1785 respondents provided an answer to at least one of these questions.

---

#### OUTDOOR AIR POLLUTION

There were 1778 valid responses to this question:

- 28.1% Very concerned
- 40.7% Somewhat concerned
- 15.0% Neither concerned nor unconcerned
- 8.7% Somewhat unconcerned
- 7.5% Not at all concerned

Overall, 68.7% were somewhat to very concerned about outdoor air pollution.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of respondent age, respondent gender, respondent's years working in child care, and respondent's role on their concern about outdoor air pollution. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Gender was a significant predictor of concern about outdoor air pollution.
  - Female > Male ( $p < .001$ )
- Role was a significant predictor of concern about outdoor air pollution.
  - ECE > Support Staff ( $p < .001$ )
  - ECE > Owner ( $p = .011$ )
  - Administrator > Support Staff ( $p = .013$ )
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of concern about outdoor air pollution.
  - More than 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 11 to 20 years ( $p = .019$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 6 to 11 years ( $p = .011$ )

---

#### POOR INDOOR AIR QUALITY

There were 1742 valid responses to the question:

- 32.2% Very concerned
- 32.1% Somewhat concerned
- 17.0% Neither concerned nor unconcerned
- 9.5% Somewhat unconcerned
- 9.1% Not at all concerned

Overall, 64.4% were somewhat to very concerned about poor indoor air quality.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of respondent age, respondent gender, respondent's years working in child care, and respondent's role on their concern about poor indoor air quality. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Gender was a significant predictor of concern about indoor air quality.
  - Female > Male ( $p < .001$ ).
- Age group was a significant predictor of concern about indoor air quality.
  - 30 to 49 years > 18 to 29 years ( $p = .031$ )
- Role was a significant predictor of concern about indoor air quality.
  - ECE > Administrator ( $p < .001$ )
  - ECE > Owner ( $p = .013$ )
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of concern about indoor air quality.
  - More than 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 11 to 20 years ( $p = .045$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p = .002$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )

---

#### HAZARDOUS CHEMICALS IN CLEANING, SANITIZING AND DISINFECTING PRODUCTS

There were 1780 valid responses to the question:

- 34.2% Very concerned
- 30.3% Somewhat concerned
- 13.5% Neither concerned nor unconcerned
- 12.1% Somewhat unconcerned
- 9.8% Not at all concerned

Overall, 64.6% were somewhat to very concerned about hazardous chemicals in cleaning, sanitizing and disinfecting products.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of respondent age, respondent gender, respondent's years working in child care, and respondent's role on their concern about hazardous chemicals. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Gender was a significant predictor of concern about hazardous chemicals.
  - Female > Male ( $p < .001$ )
- Role was a significant predictor of concern about hazardous chemicals.
  - ECE > Support Staff ( $p = .012$ )
  - ECE > Administrator ( $p < .001$ )
  - Owner > Administrator ( $p = .037$ )
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of concern about hazardous chemicals.
  - More than 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 11 to 20 years ( $p = .042$ )

- 11 to 20 years > 6 to 10 years (p = .044)
- 11 to 20 years > 5 years or less (p < .001)

---

### PLASTICS, SUCH AS BPA AND MICROPLASTICS

There were 1778 valid responses to the question:

- 29.2% Very concerned
- 34.0% Somewhat concerned
- 19.6% Neither concerned nor unconcerned
- 8.9% Somewhat unconcerned
- 8.3% Not at all concerned

Overall, 63.2% were somewhat to very concerned about plastics, such as BPA and microplastics.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of respondent age, respondent gender, respondent's years working in child care, and respondent's role on their concern about hazardous chemicals. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Role was a significant predictor of concern about plastics.
  - ECE > Support Staff (p = .001)
  - ECE > Administrators (p < .001)
  - ECE > Owner (p = .013)
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of concern about plastics.
  - More than 20 years > 5 years or less (p < .001)
  - More than 20 years > 6 to 10 years (p < .001)
  - 11 to 20 years > 6 to 10 years (p = .001)
  - 11 to 20 years > 5 years or less (p < .001)

---

### CLIMATE CHANGE

There were 1764 valid responses to the question:

- 37.2% Very concerned
- 30.6% Somewhat concerned
- 17.9% Neither concerned nor unconcerned
- 7.3% Somewhat unconcerned
- 7.0% Not at all concerned

Overall, 67.8% were somewhat to very concerned about climate change.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of respondent age, respondent gender, respondent's years working in child care, and respondent's role on their concern about climate change. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Age group was a significant predictor of concern about climate change.
  - 18 to 29 years > 30 to 49 years (p = .003)

- 18 to 29 years > 50 years and over ( $p = .004$ )
- Role was a significant predictor of concern about climate change.
  - ECE > Support Staff ( $p = .002$ )
  - ECE > Administrator ( $p < .001$ )
  - ECE > Owner ( $p = .021$ )
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of concern about climate change.
  - More than 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 11 to 20 years ( $p = .004$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p = .002$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )

---

#### TOXIC CHEMICALS IN PRODUCTS (E.G., TOYS, ARTS AND CRAFT MATERIALS, FURNISHINGS)

There were 1782 valid responses to the question:

- 35.6% Very concerned
- 33.6% Somewhat concerned
- 13.0% Neither concerned nor unconcerned
- 9.9% Somewhat unconcerned
- 7.9% Not at all concerned

Overall, 69.2% were somewhat to very concerned about toxic chemicals in products.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of respondent age, respondent gender, respondent's years working in child care, and respondent's role on their concern about toxic chemicals in products. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Gender was a significant predictor of concern about toxic chemicals in products.
  - Female > Male ( $p = .005$ )
- Role was a significant predictor of concern about toxic chemicals in products.
  - ECE > Support Staff ( $p < .001$ )
  - ECE > Owner ( $p = .038$ )
  - Administrator > Support Staff ( $p = .004$ )
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of concern about toxic chemicals in products.
  - More than 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p = .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p = .008$ )

---

## CONTAMINANTS IN FOOD (E.G., PESTICIDE RESIDUES)

There were 1782 valid responses to the question:

- 34.0% Very concerned
- 31.3% Somewhat concerned
- 17.2% Neither concerned nor unconcerned
- 9.2% Somewhat unconcerned
- 8.4% Not at all concerned

Overall, 65.3% were somewhat to very concerned about contaminants in food.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of respondent age, respondent gender, respondent's years working in child care, and respondent's role on their concern about contaminants in food. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Gender was a significant predictor of concern about contaminants in food.
  - Female > Male ( $p < .001$ )
- Age group was a significant predictor of concern about contaminants in food.
  - 18 to 29 years > 30 to 49 years ( $p = .021$ )
  - 18 to 29 years > 50 years and over ( $p = .005$ )
- Role was a significant predictor of concern about contaminants in food.
  - ECE > Administrator ( $p = .001$ )
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of concern about contaminants in food.
  - More than 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 11 to 20 years ( $p = .002$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p = .005$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 5 or years or less ( $p < .001$ )

---

## CONTAMINANTS IN WATER (E.G., LEAD IN DRINKING WATER)

There were 1780 valid responses to the question:

- 36.1% Very concerned
- 29.0% Somewhat concerned
- 13.7% Neither concerned nor unconcerned
- 12.5% Somewhat unconcerned
- 8.8% Not at all concerned

Overall, 65.1% were somewhat to very concerned about contaminants in water.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of respondent age, respondent gender, respondent's years working in child care, and respondent's role on their concern about contaminants in water. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Age group was a significant predictor of concern about contaminants in water.
  - 18 to 29 years > 30 to 49 ( $p = .002$ )
  - 18 to 29 years > 50 years and over ( $p = .001$ )
- Role was a significant predictor of concern about contaminants in water.
  - ECE > Support Staff ( $p = .002$ )
  - ECE > Administrator ( $p < .001$ )
  - ECE > Owner ( $p = .043$ )
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of concern about contaminants in water.
  - More than 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p = .003$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p = .002$ )

---

#### CHILDREN LACKING CONNECTION WITH NATURE

There were 1781 valid responses to the question:

- 40.4% Very concerned
- 27.7% Somewhat concerned
- 15.0% Neither concerned nor unconcerned
- 8.0% Somewhat unconcerned
- 8.9% Not at all concerned

Overall, 68.5% were somewhat to very concerned about children lacking connection with nature.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of respondent age, respondent gender, respondent's years working in child care, and respondent's role on their concern about children lacking connection with nature. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Age group was a significant predictor of concern about children lacking connection with nature.
  - 18 to 29 years > 30 to 49 years ( $p = .001$ )
  - 18 to 29 years > 50 years and over ( $p < .001$ )
- Role was a significant predictor of concern about children lacking connection with nature.
  - ECE > Support Staff ( $p = .001$ )
  - ECE > Owner ( $p = .001$ )
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of concern about children lacking connection with nature.
  - More than 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )

---

DO YOU FEEL THE CHILD CARE SECTOR HAS A ROLE TO PLAY IN REDUCING CHILDREN'S EXPOSURES TO TOXIC CHEMICALS AND POLLUTANTS (E.G., TOXIC CHEMICALS IN PRODUCTS AND FURNISHINGS, POLLUTANTS IN INDOOR AIR OR WATER, ETC.)?

There were 1726 valid responses to this question:

- 49.9% Definitely
- 31.3% Somewhat
- 10.8% Not really
- 7.9% Not at all

Twenty-one (21) respondents answered "Not sure" to the question.

Overall, 49.9% of respondents definitely felt that the child care sector definitely has a role to play in reducing children's exposures to toxic chemicals and pollutants.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of respondent age, respondent gender, respondent's years working in child care, respondent's role, the facility's regulated/licensing status, the program type (facility or home-based), the child care capacity, the type of community (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and sociodemographic<sup>1</sup> factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on the feeling that the child care sector definitely has a role to play in reducing children's exposures to toxic chemicals and pollutants. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Gender was a significant predictor of feeling that the child care sector definitely has a role to play in reducing children's exposures to toxic chemicals and pollutants.
  - Female > Male ( $p = .047$ )
- Role was a significant predictor of feeling that the child care sector definitely has a role to play in reducing children's exposures to toxic chemicals and pollutants.
  - ECE > Support Staff ( $p = .035$ )
  - ECE > Administrator ( $p = .031$ )
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of feeling that the child care sector definitely has a role to play in reducing children's exposures to toxic chemicals and pollutants.
  - More than 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p = .006$ )
  - More than 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )
- Program type was a significant predictor of feeling that the child care sector definitely has a role to play in reducing children's exposures to toxic chemicals an pollutants.
  - Home-based > Facility ( $p = .015$ )
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of feeling that the child care sector definitely has a role to play in reducing children's exposures to toxic chemicals an pollutants.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sociodemographic questions (page 58) are dichotomized to responses of about 75% (a higher proportion) or more and about 50% or less (a lower proportion).

- More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
- 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .001$ )
- Community type was a significant predictor of feeling that the child care sector definitely has a role to play in reducing children's exposures to toxic chemicals and pollutants.
  - Rural/On reserve > Urban ( $p < .001$ )
  - Suburban > Urban ( $p = .001$ )

---

TO WHAT EXTENT, IF AT ALL, DO YOU FEEL IT IS IMPORTANT FOR CHILD CARE PROGRAMS TO STRIVE TO BE ECOLOGICALLY SUSTAINABLE OR "GREEN" (E.G., BY REDUCING ENERGY CONSUMPTION, MINIMIZING WASTE, GREENING OUTDOOR PLAY SPACES, PROMOTING ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION, ETC.)?

There were 1732 valid responses to this question:

- 48.2% Very important
- 35.5% Somewhat important
- 8.9% Somewhat unimportant
- 7.5% Not at all important

Thirteen (13) respondents answered "Not sure" to the question.

Overall, 83.6% of respondents felt it was very or somewhat important for child care programs to strive to be ecologically sustainable or "green".

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of respondent age, respondent gender, respondent's years working in child care, respondent's role, the facility's regulated/licensing status, the program type (facility or home-based), the child care capacity, the type of community (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on the feeling that it is important for child care programs to strive to be ecologically sustainable or "green". Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Gender was a significant predictor of feeling that it is important for child care programs to strive to be ecologically sustainable or "green".
  - Female > Male ( $p = .002$ )
- Age group was a significant predictor in feeling that it is important for child care programs to strive to be ecologically sustainable or "green".
  - 18 to 29 years > 50 years and over ( $p = .043$ )
- Role was a significant predictor of feeling that it is important for child care programs to strive to be ecologically sustainable or "green".
  - ECE > Support Staff ( $p = .038$ )
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of feeling that it is important for child care programs to strive to be ecologically sustainable or "green".
  - More than 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )



- 11 to 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of feeling that it is important for child care programs to strive to be ecologically sustainable or “green”.
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p = .010$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .001$ )
- The child care having a lower proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of feeling that it is important for child care programs to strive to be ecologically sustainable or “green” ( $p = .006$ ).

---

#### DO YOU FEEL THAT THERE ARE UNHEALTHY CONDITIONS IN THE CHILD CARE SETTING WHERE YOU WORK?

There were 1708 valid responses to this question:

- 14.2% Definitely
- 34.3% Somewhat
- 30.8% Not really
- 20.7% Not at all

Forty (40) respondents answered “Not sure” to the question.

Overall, 48.5% of respondents felt that there were unhealthy conditions in the child care setting where they worked (somewhat/definitely).

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children’s sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on this indicator. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Program type was a significant predictor of feeling that there were unhealthy conditions in the child care setting.
  - Facility > Home-based ( $p = .001$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of feeling that there were unhealthy conditions in the child care setting ( $p = .003$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of feeling that there were unhealthy conditions in the child care setting ( $p < .001$ ).

---

#### DOES YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM HAVE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING?

Respondents were asked to about the presence of certain systems/conditions/factors in their child care program. In total, 1739 respondents provided an answer to at least one of these questions.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children’s

sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on each indicator. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

---

#### AIR CONDITIONING

There were 1731 valid responses to this question, with 73.3% indicating their facility had air conditioning.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the presence of air conditioning.
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of visible minorities was a significant predictor of the presence of air conditioning ( $p = .048$ ).

---

#### BASEMENT AREA(S) WHERE CHILDREN SPEND TIME

There were 1725 valid responses to this question, with 30.4% indicating their facility had a basement where children spend time.

- Program type was a significant predictor of the presence of a basement where children spend time.
  - Home-based > Facility ( $p = .001$ )
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the presence of a basement where children spend time.
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p = .015$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the presence of a basement where children spend time ( $p = .001$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of the presence of a basement where children spend time ( $p = .037$ ).

---

#### STRUCTURAL DISREPAIR (E.G., LEAKING ROOF)

There were 1730 valid responses to this question, with 23.4% indicating the facility had some structural disrepair.

- Unregulated/unlicensed status was a significant predictor of the presence of structural disrepair ( $p = .033$ ).
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the presence of structural disrepair.
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .003$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of the presence of structural disrepair ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the presence of structural disrepair ( $p = .021$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of the presence of a basement where children spend time ( $p = .001$ ).

---

#### LEAD IN WATER SUPPLY PIPES (E.G., IN OLDER BUILDINGS)

There were 1732 valid responses to this question, with 21.6% indicating the facility had lead in the water supply pipes.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the presence of lead in the water supply pipes.
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of the presence of lead in the water supply pipes ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of lead in the water supply pipes ( $p = .001$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of the presence lead in the water supply pipes ( $p = .027$ ).

---

#### PEELING PAINT ON WALLS, WOODWORK OR OTHER SURFACES

There were 1730 valid responses to this question, with 30.6% indicating the facility had peeling paint on walls, woodwork or other surfaces.

- The child care program having a higher proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of the presence of peeling paint on walls, woodwork or other surfaces ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the presence of peeling paint on walls, woodwork or other surfaces ( $p = .016$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of the presence of peeling paint on walls, woodwork or other surfaces ( $p = .023$ ).

---

#### WALL-TO-WALL CARPETING OR EXTENSIVE CARPETING

There were 1730 valid responses to this question, with 26.2% indicating the facility had wall-to-wall carpeting or extensive carpeting.

- Regulated/licensed status was a significant predictor of the presence of extensive carpeting ( $p = .029$ ).
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the presence of extensive carpeting.
  - 10 or fewer > 11 to 50 ( $p < 0.001$ )
  - 10 or fewer > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 50 > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- Community type was a significant predictor of the presence of extensive carpeting.
  - Suburban > Urban ( $p = .006$ )

- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the presence of extensive carpeting ( $p < .001$ ).

---

#### WINDOWLESS ROOMS WHERE CHILDREN SPEND TIME

There were 1734 valid responses to this question, with 23.6% indicating the facility had windowless rooms where children spend time.

- Unregulated/unlicensed status was a significant predictor of the presence of windowless rooms where children spend time ( $p = .017$ ).
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the presence of windowless rooms where children spend time.
  - 10 or fewer > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 50 > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )

---

#### WINDOWS THAT CANNOT BE OPENED IN ROOMS WHERE CHILDREN SPEND TIME

There were 1729 valid responses to this question, with 32.9% indicating the facility had windows that cannot be opened in rooms where children spend time.

- Unregulated/unlicensed status was a significant predictor of the presence of windows that cannot be opened in rooms where children spend time ( $p = .002$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of windows that cannot be opened in rooms where children spend time ( $p = .012$ ).

---

#### INSECT INFESTATION WITHIN THE PAST 12 MONTHS (E.G., COCKROACHES, BED BUGS)

There were 1713 valid responses to this question, with 24.5% indicating the facility had had an insect infestation within the past 12 months.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of insect infestation within the past 12 months.
  - 10 or fewer > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 50 > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- Community type was a significant predictor of insect infestation within the past 12 months.
  - Suburban > Urban ( $p = .002$ )
  - Rural/On reserve > Suburban ( $p = .044$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of insect infestation within the past 12 months ( $p = .045$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of insect infestation within the past 12 months ( $p = .010$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of insect infestation within the past 12 months ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of insect infestation within the past 12 months ( $p = .007$ ).

---

#### RODENT OR OTHER ANIMAL INFESTATION WITHIN THE PAST 12 MONTHS (MICE, RATS, BIRDS, BATS, ETC.)

There were 1717 valid responses to this question, with 26.0% indicating the facility had had a rodent or other animal infestation within the past 12 months.

- Unregulated/unlicensed status was a significant predictor of rodent or other animal infestation within the past 12 months ( $p = .003$ ).
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of rodent or other animal infestation within the past 12 months.
  - 50 or more > 11 to 50 ( $p = .001$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of rodent or other animal infestation within the past 12 months ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of rodent or other animal infestation within the past 12 months ( $p = .006$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of rodent or other animal infestation within the past 12 months ( $p = .007$ ).

---

#### PESTICIDES USED INDOORS ON A ROUTINE BASIS

There were 1718 valid responses to this question, with 21.9% indicating that pesticides were used indoors on a routine basis.

- Unregulated/unlicensed status was a significant predictor of pesticides used indoors on a routine basis ( $p = .041$ ).
- Program type was a significant predictor of pesticides used indoors on a routine basis.
  - Facility > Home-based ( $p = .048$ )
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of pesticides used indoors on a routine basis.
  - 10 or fewer > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 10 or fewer > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 50 > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children who are visible minorities is a significant predictor of pesticides used indoors on a routine basis ( $p = .002$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents is a significant predictor of pesticides used indoors on a routine basis ( $p < .001$ ).

---

#### LAWN OR GARDEN PESTICIDES/HERBICIDES USED ON A ROUTINE BASIS

There were 1718 valid responses this question, with 21.5% indicating that lawn or garden pesticides/herbicides were used on a routine basis.

- Program type was a significant predictor of lawn or garden pesticides or herbicides used on a routine basis.
  - Facility > Home-based ( $p = .038$ )

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of lawn or garden pesticides or herbicides used on a routine basis.
  - 10 or fewer > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 10 or fewer > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 50 > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents is a significant predictor of lawn or garden pesticides or herbicides used on a routine basis ( $p < .001$ ).

---

#### MOULD OR MOULDY SMELL

There were 1714 valid responses to this question, with 21.6% indicating that their child care had mould or a mouldy smell.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of mould or mouldy smell.
  - 10 or fewer > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 50 > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of mould or mouldy smell ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French is a significant predictor of mould or mouldy smell ( $p = .001$ ).

---

#### EXCESSIVE MOISTURE (E.G., CONDENSATION ON WINDOWS)

There were 1716 valid responses to this question, with 20.3% indicating that their child care had excessive moisture.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of excessive moisture.
  - 10 or fewer > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 50 > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of excessive moisture ( $p = .007$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of excessive moisture ( $p = .014$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of excessive moisture ( $p = .034$ ).

---

#### NOTICEABLE AIR POLLUTION OR FUMES (E.G., FROM RENOVATIONS, NEARBY INDUSTRY, BUSINESS, OR ROADWAY, ETC.)

There were 1716 valid responses to this question, with 28.8% indicating there was noticeable air pollution or fumes at their child care.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of noticeable air pollution or fumes.
  - 10 or fewer > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 50 > More than 50 ( $p = .038$ )

- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of noticeable air pollution or fumes ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of noticeable air pollution or fumes ( $p = .021$ ).

---

#### EXCESSIVE NOISE (E.G., FROM NEARBY ROADWAY, INDUSTRIAL FACILITY, OR AIRPORT)

There were 1715 valid responses to this question, with 28.6% indicating that there was excessive noise at their child care.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of excessive noise.
  - 10 or fewer > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 50 > More than 50 ( $p = .008$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of excessive noise ( $p = .025$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of excessive noise ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of excessive noise ( $p = .043$ ).

---

#### AIR FRESHENERS (DEVICES THAT RELEASE FRAGRANCE INTO THE AIR)

There were 1714 valid responses to this question, with 23.9% indicating that there was use of air fresheners at their child care.

- Program type was a significant predictor of the use of air fresheners.
  - Home-based > Facility ( $p = .021$ )
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the use of air fresheners.
  - 10 or fewer > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 50 > More than 50 ( $p = .005$ )
- Community type was a significant predictor of the use of air fresheners.
  - Rural/On-reserve > Urban ( $p = .022$ )
  - Rural/On-reserve > Suburban ( $p = .042$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of the use of air fresheners ( $p = .001$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the use of air fresheners ( $p = .011$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of the use of air fresheners ( $p = .036$ ).

---

#### ARTIFICIAL TURF – INDOORS

There were 1700 valid responses to this question, with 23.1% indicating that their child care had artificial turf indoors.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the presence of indoor artificial turf.

- 10 or fewer > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- 10 or fewer > 50 or more ( $p < .001$ )
- 11 to 50 > 50 or more ( $p < .001$ )
- Community type was a significant predictor of the presence of indoor artificial turf.
  - Suburban > Urban ( $p = .001$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the presence of indoor artificial turf ( $p < .001$ ).

---

#### ARTIFICIAL TURF – OUTDOORS

There were 1700 valid responses to this question, with 35.8% indicating that their child care had artificial turf outdoors.

- The child care program having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of the presence of outdoor artificial turf ( $p < .001$ )

---

#### OUTDOOR PLAY AREA ADJACENT TO THE CHILD CARE PROGRAM

There were 1697 valid responses to this question, with 77.6% indicating that their child care had an outdoor play area adjacent to the child care program.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the presence of an outdoor play area adjacent to the child care program.
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the presence of an outdoor play area adjacent to the child care program ( $p = .003$ ).
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of the presence of an outdoor play area adjacent to the child care program ( $p < .001$ ).

---

#### NATURAL VEGETATION (TREES, GRASS, PLANTS) IN THE OUTDOOR PLAY AREA

There were 1704 valid responses to this question, with 74.1% indicating that their child care had natural vegetation in the outdoor play area.

- Regulated/licensed status was a significant predictor of the presence of natural vegetation in the outdoor play area ( $p = .020$ ).
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the presence of natural vegetation in the outdoor play area.
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p = .001$ )
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of the presence of natural vegetation in the outdoor play area ( $p = .019$ )



- The child care program having a higher proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the presence of natural vegetation in the outdoor play area ( $p = .019$ )
- The child care program having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the presence of natural vegetation in the outdoor play area ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of the presence of natural vegetation in the outdoor play area ( $p = .016$ ).

---

#### PAVEMENT ON MOST/ALL OF THE OUTDOOR PLAY AREA

There were 1703 valid responses to this question, with 35.6% indicating that their child care had pavement on most/all of the outdoor play area.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of pavement on most/all of the outdoor play area.
  - 11 to 50 > 50 or more ( $p = .008$ )
- Community type was a significant predictor of pavement on most/all of the outdoor play area.
  - Urban > Suburban ( $p = .006$ )
  - Urban > Rural/On reserve ( $p = .005$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of pavement on most/all of the outdoor play area ( $p < .001$ ).

---

#### ADEQUATE SHADE IN OUTDOOR PLAY AREA

There were 1701 valid responses to this question, with 57.0% indicating that their child care had adequate shade in the outdoor play area.

- Program type was a significant predictor of adequate shade in the outdoor play area.
  - Home-based > Facility ( $p = .009$ )
- The child care program having a lower proportion of visible minorities was a significant predictor of adequate shade in the outdoor play area ( $p = .017$ ).
- The child care program having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of adequate shade in the outdoor play area ( $p < .0001$ ).

---

#### COMPOSTING (EITHER ON-SITE OR MUNICIPAL)

There were 1698 valid responses to this question, with 38.8% indicating that their child care participated in composting.

- Program type was a significant predictor of on-site or municipal composting at the child care .
  - Home-based > Facility ( $p = .001$ )
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of on-site or municipal composting at the child care .
  - 10 or fewer > 11 to 50 ( $p = .017$ )
  - 10 or fewer > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- Community type was a significant predictor of on-site or municipal composting at the child care .

- Urban > Suburban ( $p = .004$ )
- Urban > Rural/On reserve ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of on-site or municipal composting at the child care ( $p = .025$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of on-site or municipal composting at the child care ( $p = .016$ ).

---

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES THE DISTANCE BETWEEN YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM AND THE NEAREST HIGHWAY?

There were 1548 valid responses to this question:

- 22.6% reported 500 metres or closer
- 26.5% reported more than 500 metres but less than 1 kilometre
- 50.9% reported more than 1 kilometre

One hundred twenty (120) respondents answered “Not sure” to this question.

Overall, 49.1% of respondents reported their child care program to be situated within 1 kilometre of the nearest highway.

Binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of respondent age, respondent gender, respondent’s years working in child care, and respondent’s role on their responses to this question. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program being situated within 1 kilometre of the nearest highway.
  - 10 or fewer > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 50 > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- Community type was a significant predictor of the child care program being situated within 1 kilometre of the nearest highway.
  - Suburban > Urban ( $p = .001$ )
  - Rural/On reserve > Urban ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program being situated within 1 kilometre of the nearest highway ( $p = .002$ ).

---

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES THE DISTANCE BETWEEN YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM AND THE NEAREST MAJOR ROADWAY (I.E., A STREET/ROAD THAT HAS TWO OR MORE LANES OF TRAFFIC IN EACH DIRECTION), OTHER THAN A HIGHWAY?

There were 1601 valid responses to this question:

- 53.5% responded 500 metres or closer
- 25.1% responded more than 500 metres but less than 1 kilometre
- 21.4% responded more than 1 kilometre

Sixty-seven (67) respondents answered “Not sure” to this question.

Overall, 78.6% of respondents reported their child care program to be situated within 1 kilometre of the nearest major roadway.

Binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of respondent age, respondent gender, respondent’s years working in child care, and respondent’s role on their responses to this question. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Community type was a significant predictor of the child care program being situated within 1 kilometre of the nearest major roadway.
  - Urban > Rural/On reserve ( $p < .001$ )
  - Suburban > Rural/On reserve ( $p < .001$ )
- A higher proportion children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the child care program being situated within 1 kilometre of the nearest major roadway ( $p = .036$ ).

---

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES THE DISTANCE BETWEEN YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM AND THE NEAREST POLLUTING INDUSTRY (E.G., OIL REFINERY, FACTORY) OR OTHER POTENTIAL SOURCE OF CONTAMINANTS, SUCH AS A LANDFILL, MINING OPERATION, OR AGRICULTURAL OPERATION WHERE PESTICIDES OR OTHER AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ARE USED?

There were 1664 valid responses to this question. Because so many respondents indicated “Not sure”, they have been counted as valid responses for the purpose of this analysis.

- 14.8% responded within a kilometre
- 22.2% responded within 1 to 5 kilometres
- 40.4% responded more than 5 kilometres
- 22.5% responded Not sure

Overall, 37.1% responded reported their child care program to be situated within 5 kilometres of the nearest polluting industry.

Binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of respondent age, respondent gender, respondent’s years working in child care, and respondent’s role on their responses to this question. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Unregulated/unlicensed status was a significant predictor the child care program being situated within 5 kilometres of the nearest polluting industry ( $p = .025$ ).
- Program type was a significant predictor of the child care program being situated within 5 kilometres of the nearest polluting industry.
  - Facility > Home-based ( $p = .021$ )
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program being situated within 5 kilometres of the nearest polluting industry.
  - 10 or fewer > 11 to 50 ( $p = .002$ )
  - 10 or fewer > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 50 > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )

- Community type was a significant predictor of the child care program being situated within 5 kilometres of the nearest polluting industry
  - Suburban > Urban ( $p = .001$ )
  - Rural > Urban ( $p < .001$ )
- A higher proportion Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program being situated think 5 kilometres of the nearest polluting industry ( $p < .001$ ).

---

#### HAS YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM BEEN AFFECTED BY WILDFIRE SMOKE IN THE PAST 2 YEARS?

There were 1668 valid responses to this question, with 34.7% indicating that their child care had been affected by wildfire smoke in the past 2 years.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children's sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on this indicator. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Regulated/licensed status was a significant predictor of having been affected by wildfire smoke in the past 2 years ( $p = .001$ ).
- Community type was a significant predictor of having been affected by wildfire smoke in the past 2 years.
  - Suburban > Urban ( $p = .018$ )
  - Rural/On-reserve > Urban ( $p = .018$ )
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of having been affected by wildfire smoke in the past 2 years ( $p = .039$ ).
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of having been affected by wildfire smoke in the past 2 years ( $p = .008$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of having been affected by wildfire smoke in the past 2 years ( $p = .011$ ).
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of having been affected by wildfire smoke in the past 3 years ( $p = .037$ ).

---

#### HAS YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM BEEN TESTED FOR RADON?

There were 1667 valid responses to this question, with 19.8% indicating that their child care had been tested for radon.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children's sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on this indicator. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Program type was a significant predictor of having been tested for radon.
  - Home-based > Facility ( $p = .011$ )

- The child care program having a higher proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of having been tested for radon ( $p = .012$ ).
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of having been tested for radon ( $p = .003$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of having been tested for radon ( $p = .042$ ).

---

DOES YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM HEAT FOOD OR DRINKS IN, OR PUT HOT FOOD OR DRINKS INTO, PLASTIC CONTAINERS? THIS CAN INCLUDE PLASTIC FOOD SERVICE ITEMS (E.G., BOWLS, SIPPY CUPS), PLASTIC FOOD STORAGE CONTAINERS, OR OTHER CONTAINERS MADE OF PLASTIC.

There were 1666 valid responses to this question, with 44.5% indicating that their child care heats or serves hot food or drinks in plastic containers.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children's sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on this indicator. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of heating or serving hot food or drinks in plastic containers.
  - 10 or fewer > 11 to 50 ( $p = .041$ )
  - 50 or more > 11 to 50 ( $p = .011$ )
- Community type was a significant predictor of heating or serving hot food or drinks in plastic containers.
  - Suburban > Urban ( $p = .043$ )
  - Rural/On-reserve > Urban ( $p = .022$ )
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of heating or serving hot food or drinks in plastic containers ( $p = .007$ ).

---

DOES YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM SERVE LOCALLY GROWN OR ORGANIC FOODS, WHEN FEASIBLE, OR GROW SOME OF ITS OWN FOOD?

There were 1668 valid responses to this question, with 34.2% indicating that their child care serves locally grown or organic foods when feasible, or grows some of its own food.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children's sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on this indicator. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Regulated/licensed status was a significant predictor of a child care serving locally grown or organic foods or growing its own food ( $p = .011$ ).

- Program type was a significant predictor of a child care serving locally grown or organic foods or growing its own food.
  - Home-based > Facility ( $p < .001$ )
- Community type was a significant predictor of a child care serving locally grown or organic foods or growing its own food.
  - Rural/On reserve > Suburban ( $p = .004$ )
  - Rural/On reserve > Urban ( $p = .040$ )
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of a child care serving locally grown or organic foods or growing its own food ( $p = .024$ ).

---

#### HAVE THERE BEEN RENOVATIONS IN YOUR CHILD CARE FACILITY IN THE PAST 5 YEARS?

There were 1670 valid responses to this question, with 38.9% indicating that their child care facility had had renovations in the past 5 years.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children's sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on this indicator. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Regulated/licensed status was a significant predictor of renovations having been undertaken within the last 5 years ( $p = .001$ ).
- Program type was a significant predictor of renovations having been undertaken within the last 5 years.
  - Facility > Home-based ( $p = .031$ )
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of renovations having been undertaken within the last 5 years.
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of renovations having been undertaken within the last 5 years ( $p = .007$ ).
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of renovations having been undertaken within the last 5 years ( $p = .003$ ).

---

#### REGARDING THE RENOVATIONS, WERE THERE NOTICEABLE FUMES, DUST AND/OR DEBRIS WHEN CHILDREN AND STAFF WERE PRESENT?

There were 640 valid responses to this question, with 24.2% indicating that there were noticeable fumes, dust and/or debris when children and staff were present during these renovations.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children's

sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on this indicator. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of noticeable fumes, dust and/or debris when children and staff were present during renovations.
  - 10 or fewer > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 10 or fewer > More than 50 ( $p = .002$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of noticeable fumes, dust and/or debris when children and staff were present during renovations ( $p < .001$ ).

---

#### DOES YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM USE SPRAY-ON SUNSCREEN?

There were 1647 valid responses to this question, with 45.7% indicating that their child care used spray-on sunscreen.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children's sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on this indicator. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Community type was a significant predictor of a program's use of spray-on sunscreen.
  - Suburban > Urban ( $p = .018$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of a program's use of spray-on sunscreen ( $p = .022$ ).

---

#### DO THE CHILDREN PLAY WITH TOYS MADE OF PVC (VINYL), SUCH AS BEACH BALLS OR 'RUBBER' DUCKIES?

There were 1652 valid responses to this question, with 53.3% indicating that children played with toys made of PVC.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children's sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on this indicator. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of children playing with toys made of PVC.
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .002$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of children playing with toys made of PVC ( $p = .032$ ).
- The child care program having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of children playing with toys made of PVC ( $p = .023$ ).

---

#### DOES YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM USE VINYL-COVERED SLEEPING MATS OR COT MATTRESSES?

There were 1647 valid responses to this question, with 42.6% indicating that their child care uses vinyl-covered sleeping mats or cot mattresses.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children's sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on this indicator. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Community type was a significant predictor of the child care program's use of vinyl-covered sleeping mats or cot mattresses.
  - Suburban > Urban ( $p = .002$ )
  - Rural/On reserve > Urban ( $p = .026$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program's use of vinyl-covered sleeping mats or cot mattresses ( $p < .001$ ).

---

#### DOES YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM USE SLEEPING MATS OR COT MATTRESSES MADE OF POLYURETHANE FOAM?

There were 1646 valid responses to this question, with 22.4% indicating that their child care uses sleeping mats or cot mattresses made of polyurethane foam.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children's sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on this indicator. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Unregulated/unlicensed status was a significant predictor of the use of sleeping mats or cot mattresses made of polyurethane foam ( $p = .029$ ).
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the use of sleeping mats or cot mattresses made of polyurethane foam.
  - 11 to 50 > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 10 or fewer > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the use of sleeping mats or cot mattresses made of polyurethane foam ( $p = .030$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of the use of sleeping mats or cot mattresses made of polyurethane foam ( $p = .044$ ).

---

#### ARE CLEANING/SANITIZING/DISINFECTING CHEMICALS USED IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO CHILDREN (E.G., SPRAYING A TABLE WHILE CHILDREN ARE SEATED)?



There were 1649 valid responses to this question, with 29.1% indicating that cleaning/sanitizing/disinfecting chemicals were used in close proximity to children.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children's sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on this indicator. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Being unregulated was a significant predictor of the use of cleaning/sanitizing/disinfecting chemicals in close proximity to children ( $p = .030$ ).
- Program type was a significant predictor of the use of cleaning/sanitizing/disinfecting chemicals in close proximity to children.
  - Facility > Home-based ( $p = .002$ )
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the use of cleaning/sanitizing/disinfecting chemicals in close proximity to children.
  - 10 or fewer > 11 to 50 ( $p = .003$ )
  - 10 or fewer > More than 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 50 > More than 50 ( $p = .002$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or Indigenous families was a significant predictor of the use of cleaning/sanitizing/disinfecting chemicals in close proximity to children ( $p < .001$ ).

---

#### IS YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM ACCESSIBLE TO CHILDREN WHO ARE DIFFERENTLY ABLED (E.G., IN A WHEELCHAIR, VISUALLY IMPAIRED, ETC.)?

There were 1649 valid responses to this question, with 62.7% indicating that their child care was accessible to children who are differently abled.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children's sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on this indicator. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Program type was a significant predictor of program accessibility to differently abled children.
  - Facility > Home-based ( $p < .001$ )
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of program accessibility to differently abled children.
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .018$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of program accessibility to differently abled children ( $p = .022$ ).

---

## HAVE MEASURES BEEN TAKEN TO INCREASE VENTILATION OR OTHERWISE IMPROVE THE AIR QUALITY INSIDE THE CHILD CARE PROGRAM SINCE THE START OF THE COVID PANDEMIC?

There were 1647 valid responses to this question, with 46.3% indicating that measures have been taken to increase ventilation or otherwise improve the air quality inside the child care program since the start of the pandemic.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children's sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on this and the subsequent subset of indicators. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

- Regulated/licensed status was a significant predictor of having taken measures to increase ventilation or otherwise improve indoor air quality since the start of the COVID pandemic ( $p < .001$ ).
- Program type was a significant predictor of having taken measures to increase ventilation or otherwise improve indoor air quality since the start of the COVID pandemic.
  - Home-based > Facility ( $p = .023$ )
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of having taken measures to increase ventilation or otherwise improve indoor air quality since the start of the COVID pandemic.
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- Community type was a significant predictor of having taken measures to increase ventilation or otherwise improve indoor air quality since the start of the COVID pandemic.
  - Urban > Suburban ( $p < .001$ )
  - Urban > Rural/On reserve ( $p = .001$ )
- The child care program having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or Indigenous families was a significant predictor of having taken measures to increase ventilation or otherwise improve indoor air quality since the start of the COVID pandemic ( $p < .001$ ).

---

## WHICH MEASURES RELATED TO INDOOR AIR QUALITY HAVE BEEN TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO COVID? SELECT ALL THAT APPLY.

Respondents were asked to select from a checklist of measures that were taken to improve air quality in response to COVID. Of those who indicated that they had taken measures, the following were taken:

- 41.3% increased ventilation using the building's existing heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) system (e.g., more air exchanges per hour)
- 32.4% increased filtration in the existing HVAC system (e.g., a switch to HEPA filters)
- 10.6% installed a new HVAC system
- 67.2% opened windows more frequently
- 23.2% used fans to bring in more fresh air
- 52.7% used portable air cleaners (e.g., devices with HEPA filters)

- 5.1% used ultraviolet (UV) sanitizer boxes
- 6.0% used handheld UV sanitizers (e.g., for toys)
- 6.7% used ozone air purifiers
- 11.8% used ‘fogging’ devices that propel disinfecting/sanitizing chemicals into the air
- 5.0% used other measures

#### INCREASED VENTILATION

---

- Regulated/licensed status was a significant predictor of the child care program having increased ventilation using the building’s existing HVAC system ( $p = .020$ ).
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program having increased ventilation using the building’s existing HVAC system.
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- Community type was a significant predictor of the child care program having increased ventilation using the building’s existing HVAC system.
  - Urban > Rural/On reserve ( $p = .010$ )
- The child care program having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program having increased ventilation using the building’s existing HVAC system ( $p = .003$ ).

#### INCREASED FILTRATION

---

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program having increased filtration in the building’s existing HVAC system.
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- Community type was a significant predictor of the child care program having increased filtration in the building’s existing HVAC system.
  - Urban > Suburban ( $p = .047$ )
  - Urban > Rural/On reserve ( $p = .001$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the child care program having increased filtration in the building’s existing HVAC system ( $p = .038$ ).
- The child care program having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program having increased filtration in the building’s existing HVAC system ( $p = .002$ ).

#### INSTALLED NEW HVAC SYSTEM

---

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program having installed a new HVAC system.
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .001$ )

- More than 50 > 11 to 50 (p = .007)
- Community type was a significant predictor of the child care program having installed a new HVAC system.
  - Urban > Suburban (p = .044)

#### OPENED WINDOWS MORE FREQUENTLY

---

- Regulated/licensed status was a significant predictor of the child care program having opened windows more frequently (p = .001).
- Program type was a significant predictor of the child care program having opened windows more frequently
  - Home-based > Facility (p = .002)
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program having opened windows more frequently.
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer (p = .001)
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer (p < .001)
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 (p < .001)
- Community type was a significant predictor of the child care program having opened windows more frequently.
  - Urban > Suburban (p = .005)
  - Urban > Rural/On reserve (p < .001)
- The child care program having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program having opened windows more frequently (p < .001).

#### USED FANS TO BRING IN MORE FRESH AIR

---

- Regulated/licensed status was a significant predictor of the child care program having used fans to bring in more fresh air (p = .005).
- Program type was a significant predictor of the child care program having used fans to bring in more fresh air.
  - Home-based > Facility (p = .001)
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program having used fans to bring in more fresh air.
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer (p < .001)
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 (p < .001)
- Community type was a significant predictor of the child care program having used fans to bring in more fresh air.
  - Urban > Rural/On reserve (p = .036)
- The child care program having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program having used fans to bring in more fresh air (p = .010).

#### USED PORTABLE AIR CLEANERS

---

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program having used portable air cleaners.
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- Community type was a significant predictor of the child care program having used portable air cleaners.
  - Urban > Suburban ( $p = .012$ )
  - Urban > Rural/On reserve ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the child care program having used portable air cleaners ( $p = .004$ ).
- The child care program having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program having used portable air cleaners ( $p < .001$ ).

#### USED UV SANITIZER BOXES

---

- Program type was a significant predictor of the child care program having used UV sanitizer boxes.
  - Home-based > Facility ( $p = .016$ )
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program having used UV sanitizer boxes.
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .021$ )

#### USED HANDHELD UV SANITIZERS

---

There were differences among observed variables in the use of handheld UV sanitizers.

#### USED OZONE AIR PURIFIERS

---

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program having used ozone air purifiers.
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .006$ )

#### USED 'FOGGING' DEVICES THAT PROPEL DISINFECTING/SANITIZING CHEMICALS

---

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program having used 'fogging' devices that propel disinfecting/sanitizing chemicals.
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .023$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )

---

## DOES YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM HAVE POLICIES/PLANS IN PLACE IN THE EVENT OF ANY OF THE FOLLOWING?

Respondents were asked a matrix question about whether their child care program had policies/plans in place in the event of certain situations. Following are the responses confirming that the child care program had policies or plans in event of these situations:

- 62.2% Poor air quality days (valid N = 1612)
- 67.4% High UV days (valid N = 1618)
- 74.3% Extreme heat (valid N = 1618)
- 73.9% Extreme cold (valid N = 1563)
- 73.5% Storm or extreme weather event (tornado warning, heavy rain or snowfall, flooding, etc.; valid N = 1621)
- 53.4% Accident or incident at nearby industrial facility or transport corridor (e.g., fire, explosion, spill or release of toxic substance to air or nearby water body, etc.; valid N = 1620)

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children's sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on this and the subsequent subset of indicators. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

---

### POLICIES: POOR AIR QUALITY DAYS

There were no significant differences among subgroups tested in having policies for poor air quality days.

---

### POLICIES: HIGH UV DAYS

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the having policies to address high UV days.
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .019$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care program having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of having policies to address high UV days ( $p < .001$ ).

---

### POLICIES: EXTREME HEAT

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of having policies to address extreme heat.
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .013$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- Community size was a significant predictor of having policies to address extreme heat.
  - Urban > Suburban ( $p = .006$ )
- The child care program having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of having policies to address extreme heat ( $p < .001$ ).

---

### POLICIES: EXTREME COLD

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of having policies to address extreme cold.
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care program having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of having policies to address extreme cold ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of having policies to address extreme cold ( $p < .001$ ).

---

#### POLICIES: STORM OR EXTREME WEATHER EVENT

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of having policies to address storms or extreme weather events.
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p = .001$ )
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of having policies to address storms or extreme weather events ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of having policies to address storms of extreme weather events ( $p = .015$ ).
- The child care program having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of having policies to address storms of extreme weather events ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of having policies to address storms of extreme weather events ( $p = .015$ ).

---

#### POLICIES: ACCIDENT OR INCIDENT AT NEARBY INDUSTRIAL FACILITY OR TRANSPORT CORRIDOR

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of having policies to address an accident or incident at a nearby industrial facility or transport corridor.
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .019$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .001$ )
- The child care program having a lower proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of having policies to address an accident or incident at a nearby industrial facility or transport corridor ( $p = .019$ ).

---

#### PLEASE INDICATE THE DEGREE TO WHICH YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM IS ENGAGED ON THE FOLLOWING:

Respondents were asked a matrix question about their engagement on a series of actions related to environmental health and sustainability.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children's sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on each indicator. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

---

## REDUCING/PROHIBITING VEHICLE IDLING DURING DROP-OFF AND PICK-UP TIMES

There were 1405 valid responses to this question:

- 22.8% currently doing
- 27.2% doing this to some extent
- 32.0% not doing but interested
- 17.9% not doing and not interested

One hundred eighty-eight (188) responded “Not applicable” to the question.

Overall, 50.0% of respondents reported that their program is to some extent reducing/prohibiting idling during drop-off and pick-up times.

- The child care program having a lower proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in reducing/prohibiting vehicle idling during drop-off and pick-up times ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care program having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in reducing/prohibiting vehicle idling during drop-off and pick-up times ( $p = .039$ )

---

## TAKING ACTION TO REDUCE CHILDREN’S EXPOSURE TO TRAFFIC POLLUTION, FOR EXAMPLE BY KEEPING WINDOWS CLOSED DURING PEAK TRAFFIC PERIODS

There were 1197 valid responses to this question:

- 24.4% currently doing
- 30.8% doing this to some extent
- 26.8% not doing but interested
- 18.0% not doing and not interested

Three hundred ninety-two (392) responded “Not applicable” to the question.

Overall, 55.2% of respondents reported that their program is to some extent acting to reduce children’s exposure to traffic pollution.

- Program type was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in taking action to reduce children’s exposure to traffic pollution.
  - Home-based > Facility ( $p = .014$ )
- The child care having a higher proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in taking action to reduce children’s exposure to traffic pollution ( $p = .001$ ).



---

## REDUCING/AVOIDING THE USE OF CLEANING PRODUCTS THAT CONTAIN HAZARDOUS CHEMICALS (OTHER THAN THOSE REQUIRED TO MEET PUBLIC HEALTH STANDARDS)

There were 1534 valid responses to this question:

- 44.7% currently doing
- 23.8% doing this to some extent
- 16.9% not doing but interested
- 14.6% not doing and not interested

Fifty-seven (57) responded “Not applicable” to the question.

Overall, 68.5% of respondents reported that their program is to some extent reducing/avoiding the use of cleaning products that contain hazardous chemicals.

- Regulated/licensed status was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in reducing/avoiding the use of cleaning products that contain hazardous chemicals ( $p = .029$ ).
- Program type was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in reducing/avoiding the use of cleaning products that contain hazardous chemicals.
  - Home-based > Facility ( $p = .033$ )
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in reducing/avoiding the use of cleaning products that contain hazardous chemicals.
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- Community type was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in reducing/avoiding the use of cleaning products that contain hazardous chemicals.
  - Urban > Suburban ( $p = .032$ )
- The child care having a lower proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in reducing/avoiding the use of cleaning products that contain hazardous chemicals ( $p = .018$ ).
- The child care having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in reducing/avoiding the use of cleaning products that contain hazardous chemicals ( $p < .001$ ).

---

## ENSURING A FRAGRANCE-FREE ENVIRONMENT

There were 1554 valid responses to this question:

- 42.7% currently doing
- 26.0% doing this to some extent

- 19.2% not doing but interested
- 12.0% not doing and not interested

Thirty (30) responded “Not applicable” to the question.

Overall, 68.7% of respondents reported that their program is to some extent ensuring a fragrance-free environment

- Regulated/licensed status was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in ensuring a fragrance-free environment ( $p = .014$ ).
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in ensuring a fragrance-free environment.
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .001$ )
  - 50 or more > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - 50 or more > 11 to 50 ( $p = .037$ )
- The child care having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in ensuring a fragrance-free environment ( $p < .001$ ).

---

#### SHOES OFF AT THE DOOR POLICY

There were 1482 valid responses to this question:

- 36.4% currently doing
- 28.1% doing this to some extent
- 17.7% not doing but interested
- 17.7% not doing and not interested

One hundred six (106) responded “Not applicable” to the question.

Overall, 64.5% of respondents reported that their program is to some extent following a shoes off at the door policy.

- Regulated/licensed status was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in having a shoes off at the door policy ( $p < .001$ ).
- Program type was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in having a shoes off at the door policy.
  - Home-based > Facility ( $p = .007$ )
- The child care having a lower proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in having a shoes off at the door policy ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care having a lower proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in having a shoes off at the door policy ( $p = .004$ ).

---

## MINIMIZING THE USE OF PESTICIDES

There were 1286 valid responses to this question:

- 49.3% currently doing
- 24.0% doing this to some extent
- 16.0% not doing but interested
- 10.7% not doing and not interested

Two hundred seventy-five (275) responded “Not applicable” to the question.

Overall, 73.3% of respondents reported that their program is to some extent minimizing the use of pesticides.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in minimizing the use of pesticides.
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in minimizing the use of pesticides ( $p = .005$ ).
- The child care having a low proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in minimizing the use of pesticides ( $p < .001$ ).

---

## CHOOSING/USING TOYS AND CRAFTS SUPPLIES THAT DO NOT CONTAIN TOXIC CHEMICALS

There were 1560 valid responses to this question:

- 44.3% currently doing
- 29.4% doing this to some extent
- 14.2% not doing but interested
- 12.1% not doing and not interested

Thirteen (13) responded “Not applicable” to the question.

Overall, 73.7% of respondents reported that their program is to some extent choosing/using toys and craft supplies that do not contain toxic chemicals.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in choosing/using toys and crafts supplies that do not contain toxic chemicals.
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- Community type was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in choosing/using toys and crafts supplies that do not contain toxic chemicals.

- Urban > Suburban ( $p = .003$ )
- Rural/On reserve > Suburban ( $p = .008$ )
- The child care having a lower proportion children from low income households was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in choosing/using toys and crafts supplies that do not contain toxic chemicals ( $p = .010$ ).
- The child care having a lower proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in choosing/using toys and crafts supplies that do not contain toxic chemicals ( $p = .045$ ).
- The child care having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in choosing/using toys and crafts supplies that do not contain toxic chemicals ( $p < .001$ ).

---

#### AVOIDING THE USE OF ANTIBACTERIAL SOAP

There were 1501 valid responses to this question:

- 35.2% currently doing
- 22.7% doing this to some extent
- 26.0% not doing but interested
- 16.1% not doing and not interested

Seventy (70) responded “Not applicable” to the question.

Overall 57.9% of respondents reported that their program is to some extent avoiding the use of antibacterial soap.

- Program type was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in avoiding the use of antibacterial soap.
  - Home-based > Facility ( $p = .019$ )
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in avoiding the use of antibacterial soap.
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .024$ )
- The child care having a lower proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in avoiding the use of antibacterial soap ( $p = .003$ ).
- The child care having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or families was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in avoiding the use of antibacterial soap ( $p = .032$ ).

---

#### ENSURING CHILDREN HAVE REGULAR ACCESS TO GREEN/NATURAL PLAY SPACES

There were 1555 valid responses to this question:

- 54.8% currently doing
- 23.2% doing this to some extent
- 13.2% not doing but interested

- 8.8% not doing and not interested

Eighteen (18) responded “Not applicable” to the question.

Overall, 78.0% of respondents reported that their program is to some extent ensuring children have regular access to green/natural play spaces.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in ensuring children have regular access to green/natural play spaces.
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care having a lower proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in ensuring children have regular access to green/natural play spaces ( $p < .001$ ).

---

#### ENSURING ADEQUATE SHADE

There were 1549 valid responses to this question:

- 46.8% currently doing
- 28.8% doing this to some extent
- 15.7% not doing but interested
- 8.7% not doing and not interested

Twenty-one (21) responded “Not applicable” to the question.

Overall, 75.6% of respondents reported that their program is to some extent ensuring that children have adequate shade in their play area.

- Regulated/licensed status was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in ensuring children have adequate shade in their play area ( $p = .013$ ).
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in ensuring children have adequate shade in their play area.
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care having a higher proportion children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in ensuring children have adequate shade in their play area ( $p = .044$ ).
- The child care having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in ensuring children have adequate shade in their play area ( $p = .001$ ).
- The child care having a lower proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in ensuring children have adequate shade in their play area ( $p = .016$ ).

---

## CONSERVING ENERGY

There were 1511 valid responses to this question:

- 33.6% currently doing
- 30.9% doing this to some extent
- 24.8% not doing but interested
- 10.7% not doing and not interested

Fifty-two (52) responded “Not applicable” to the question.

Overall, 64.5% of respondents reported that their program is to some extent making efforts to conserve energy.

- Regulated/licensed status was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in conserving energy ( $p = .009$ ).
- Program type was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in conserving energy.
  - Home-based > Facility ( $p < .001$ )
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in conserving energy.
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .025$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .001$ )
- The child care having a lower proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in conserving energy ( $p = .002$ ).
- The child care having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in conserving energy ( $p < .001$ ).

---

## REDUCING USE OF PLASTICS

There were 1539 valid responses to this question:

- 29.6% currently doing
- 34.1% doing this to some extent
- 22.0% not doing but interested
- 14.2% not doing and not interested

Thirty (30) responded “Not applicable” to the question.

Overall, 63.7% of respondents reported that their program is to some extent reducing their use of plastics.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in reducing use of plastics.
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .030$ )

- Community type was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in reducing use of plastics.
  - Urban > Suburban ( $p = .007$ )
- The child care having a lower proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in reducing use of plastics ( $p = .002$ ).
- The child care having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program being currently at least somewhat engaged in reducing use of plastics ( $p = .002$ ).

---

#### TAKING ACTION TO REDUCE CARBON EMISSIONS / ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE

There were 1410 valid responses to this question:

- 19.9% currently doing
- 25.8% doing this to some extent
- 38.7% not doing but interested
- 15.6% not doing and not interested

One hundred fifty-eight (158) responded “Not applicable” to the question.

Overall, 45.7% of respondents reported that their program is to some extent taking action to reduce carbon emissions / address climate change.

- Program type was a significant predictor of the child care to at least some extent taking action to reduce carbon emissions / address climate change.
  - Home-based > Facility ( $p < .001$ )

---

#### REPRESENTING CULTURAL DIVERSITY (E.G., ARTWORK, FURNISHINGS, PLAY ITEMS)

There were 1558 valid responses to this question:

- 46.0% currently doing
- 31.8% doing this to some extent
- 12.3% not doing but interested
- 9.9% not doing and not interested

Twelve (12) responded “Not applicable” to the question.

Overall, 77.7% of respondents reported that their program is to some extent representing cultural diversity.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care program to at least some extent representing cultural diversity.
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )

- Community type was a significant predictor of the child care program to at least some extent representing cultural diversity.
  - Urban > Rural/On reserve ( $p = .007$ )
- The child care having a lower proportion of children from low income households was a significant predictor of the child care program to at least some extent representing cultural diversity ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care having a higher proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the child care program to at least some extent representing cultural diversity High visible minority ( $p = .030$ ).
- The child care having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care program to at least some extent representing cultural diversity High visible minority ( $p = .043$ ).

---

#### HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM'S OVERALL COMMITMENT TO ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SUSTAINABILITY?

There were 1554 valid responses to this question:

- 17.8% excellent
- 42.9% good
- 27.2% fair
- 12.0% poor

Twelve (12) responded “Not sure” to this question.

Overall, 60.8% assessed their program's overall commitment to environmental health and sustainability as good to excellent.

- Program type was a significant predictor of rating the child care's overall commitment to environmental health and sustainability as good to excellent.
  - Home-based > Facility ( $p = .029$ )

---

#### PLEASE INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS APPLIES TO YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM:

Respondents were asked a series of questions about support or involvement of certain actors in improving environmental health and sustainability in the child care program.

A binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of regulation, program type (facility or home-based), child care capacity, community type (urban, suburban, rural/reserve), and children's sociodemographic factors (low income, visible minority, Indigenous and non-official home language) on each indicator. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.



---

THERE IS TOP-LEVEL SUPPORT (E.G., FROM THE OWNER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, MANAGER, BOARD) FOR IMPROVING ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SUSTAINABILITY IN OUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM

There were 1527 valid responses to this question:

- 35.3% definitely
- 37.9% somewhat
- 26.8% not sure / not at all

Overall, 73.2% of respondents indicated there was at least some top-level support for improving environmental health and sustainability in their child care program.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of having top-level support for improving environmental health and sustainability in their child care program.
  - 50 or more > 11 to 50 ( $p = .001$ )
  - 50 or more > Fewer than 10 ( $p = .044$ )
- The child care having a lower proportion children from low income households was a significant predictor of the child care having top level support for improving environmental health and sustainability in their child care program ( $p = .010$ ).

---

THERE IS INTEREST AMONG STAFF IN IMPROVING ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SUSTAINABILITY IN OUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM

There were 1531 valid responses to this question:

- 30.8% definitely
- 41.4% somewhat
- 27.8% not sure / not at all

Overall, 72.2% of respondents indicated there was at least some staff interest for improving environmental health and sustainability in their child care program.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of having staff interest for improving environmental health and sustainability in their child care program.
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p = .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care having a lower proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the child care having staff interest for improving environmental health and sustainability in their child care program ( $p = .001$ ).
- The child care having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care having staff interest for improving environmental health and sustainability in their child care program ( $p < .001$ ).

---

## FAMILIES SUPPORT ACTION ON ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SUSTAINABILITY IN OUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM

There were 1531 valid responses to this question:

- 23.7% definitely
- 38.9% somewhat
- 37.4% not sure / not at all

Overall, 62.6 of respondents indicated there was at least some support from families for improving environmental health and sustainability in their child care program.

- Regulated/licensed status was a significant predictor of the child care having support from families for improving environmental health and sustainability in their child care program ( $p = .004$ ).
- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care having support from families for improving environmental health and sustainability in their child care program.
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
- The child care having a lower proportion of children who are visible minorities was a significant predictor of the child care having support from families for improving environmental health and sustainability in their child care program ( $p < .001$ ).
- The child care having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care having support from families for improving environmental health and sustainability in their child care program ( $p = .014$ ).
- The child care having a higher proportion of children with a home language other than English or French was a significant predictor of the child care having support from families for improving environmental health and sustainability in their child care program ( $p = .027$ ).

---

## CHILDREN ARE INVOLVED IN OUR PROGRAM'S EFFORTS TO IMPROVE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SUSTAINABILITY AS PART OF OUR EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

There were 1534 valid responses to this question:

- 26.3% definitely
- 45.6% somewhat
- 28.0% not at all

Overall, 72.0% of respondents indicated their children were at least to some extent involved in their child care's efforts to improve environmental health and sustainability in their child care program as part of their educational practice.

- Child care capacity was a significant predictor of the child care involving children to at least some extent in their child care's efforts to improve environmental health and sustainability in their child care program as part of their educational practice.
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p = .003$ )

- More than 50 > 10 or fewer (p = .005)
- The child care having a lower proportion of children from a low income household was a significant predictor of the child care involving children to at least some extent in their child care's efforts to improve environmental health and sustainability in their child care program as part of their educational practice (p = .011).
- The child care having a lower proportion of Indigenous children or parents was a significant predictor of the child care involving children to at least some extent in their child care's efforts to improve environmental health and sustainability in their child care program as part of their educational practice (p = .023).

---

WHICH, IF ANY, OF THE FOLLOWING ARE BARRIERS TO ACTION TO IMPROVE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROTECTION AND SUSTAINABILITY IN YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM? SELECT ALL THAT APPLY

Respondents were asked to select barriers from a checklist. There were 1492 responses that included at least one barrier from among this list.

- 46.9% lack of information, guidance and/or training
- 53.4% lack of funding
- 22.7% lack of support from management, board, co-workers, etc.
- 44.6% lack of support from government (this could include municipal, provincial/territorial and/or federal agencies, local officials, etc.)
- 27.0% lack of interest/support from families
- 31.2% competing priorities
- 20.4% benefits are not likely to justify the effort/cost
- 36.9% we don't own the building
- 25.4% problems are 'invisible' and thus don't receive attention
- 2.2% other (to be analysed)

---

**BARRIER: LACK OF INFORMATION/GUIDANCE/TRAINING**

- Capacity
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer (p < .001)
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer (p < .001)
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 (p = .001)
- Community type
  - Urban > Suburban (p = .008)
- Low Indigenous (p = .017)

---

**BARRIER: LACK OF FUNDING**

- Home-based > Facility (p = .011)
- Capacity
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer (p = .003)
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer (p < .001)

- More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p < .001$ )
- Low Indigenous ( $p < .001$ )
- Low home language other than English or French ( $p = .020$ )

#### BARRIER: LACK OF SUPPORT FROM MANAGEMENT/BOARD/CO-WORKERS

No significant differences across variables.

#### BARRIER: LACK OF SUPPORT FROM GOVERNMENT

- Capacity
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p = .003$ )
- High visible minorities ( $p = .003$ )
- Low home language other than English or French ( $p = .001$ )

#### BARRIER: LACK OF INTEREST/SUPPORT FROM FAMILIES

- Capacity
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .004$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .001$ )
- Low Indigenous ( $p = .033$ )

#### BARRIER: COMPETING PRIORITIES

- Capacity
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .006$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 11 to 50 ( $p = .011$ )

#### BARRIER: BENEFITS UNLIKELY TO JUSTIFY EFFORT/COST

No significant differences across variables.

#### BARRIER: BUILDING NOT OWNED BY CHILD CARE PROGRAM

- Capacity
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p < .001$ )
- Community type
  - Urban > Rural/On reserve ( $p = .031$ )
- Low Indigenous ( $p < .001$ )

#### BARRIER: PROBLEMS ARE 'INVISIBLE' AND THUS DON'T RECEIVE ATTENTION

- Capacity
  - 11 to 50 > 10 or fewer ( $p = .007$ )
  - 50 or more > 10 or fewer ( $p = .043$ )

IF THERE WAS A WEBSITE WITH TRUSTWORTHY INFORMATION AND TIPS ON HOW TO MAKE CHILD CARE SETTINGS HEALTHIER AND MORE SUSTAINABLE, WOULD YOU USE IT?

There were 1550 valid responses to this question, with 88.4% indicating they would use such a website.

- Age group
  - 50 and over > 18 to 29 ( $p = .002$ )
  - 50 and over > 30 to 49 ( $p = .003$ )
- Role
  - Administrator > Support Staff ( $p = .012$ )
  - Administrator > Owner ( $p = .027$ )

---

#### IF THERE WAS A SELF-ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST ON ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SUSTAINABILITY MEASURES IN CHILD CARE PROGRAMS, WOULD YOU...

Respondents were asked to select as many responses from a checklist as applied. A total of 1548 responses checked at least one item.

- 43.7% use it on your own
- 51.0% complete it together with colleagues
- 36.9% share results with the board
- 34.5% share results with client families
- 39.5% use results to prioritize actions
- 2.8% not use it
- 1.3% other (to be analysed)

Binomial logistic regression was performed to understand the effects of respondent age, respondent gender, respondent's years working in child care, and respondent's role on their responses to this series of questions. Pairwise comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

---

#### USING A CHECKLIST ON THEIR OWN

- Age group was a significant predictor of willingness to use a checklist on their own.
  - 18 to 29 years > 30 to 49 years ( $p = .001$ )
  - 18 to 29 years > 50 years and over ( $p < .001$ )
- Role was a significant predictor of willingness to use a checklist on their own.
  - ECE > Support Staff ( $p = .003$ )
  - ECE > Administrator ( $p = .002$ )
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of willingness to use a checklist on their own.
  - More than 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p = .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )

---

#### COMPLETING A CHECKLIST TOGETHER WITH COLLEAGUES

- Gender was a significant predictor of willingness to complete a checklist together with others.
  - Female > Male ( $p < .001$ )
- Age group was a significant predictor of willingness to complete a checklist together with others.

- 18 to 29 years > 30 to 49 years ( $p = .003$ )
- 18 to 29 years > 50 years and over ( $p = .004$ )
- Role was a significant predictor of willingness to complete a checklist together with others.
  - ECE > Owner ( $p < .001$ )
  - Support Staff > Owner ( $p = .022$ )
  - Administrator > Owner ( $p < .001$ )
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of willingness to complete a checklist together with others.
  - More than 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )
  - More than 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )

---

#### SHARING RESULTS WITH THE BOARD

For this question, responses from Owners were omitted from the analysis because privately owned child care centres are unlikely to have a governing board.

- Role was a significant predictor of willingness to share results with the board.
  - Administrator > Support Staff ( $p < .001$ )
  - Administrator > ECE ( $p < .001$ )
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of willingness to share results with the board.
  - 11 to 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p = .010$ )

---

#### SHARING RESULTS WITH CLIENT FAMILIES

- Gender was a significant predictor of willingness to share results with the client families.
  - Female > Male ( $p = .022$ )
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of willingness to share results with client families.
  - More than 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )
  - 11 to 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ ).

---

#### USING RESULTS TO PRIORITIZE ACTION

- Gender was a significant predictor of willingness to use results to prioritize action.
  - Female > Male ( $p = .007$ )
- Age group was a significant predictor of willingness to use results to prioritize action.
  - 18 to 29 years > 30 to 49 years ( $p = .001$ )
  - 18 to 29 years > 50 years and over ( $p = .002$ )
- Role was a significant predictor of willingness to use results to prioritize action.
  - Administrator > ECE ( $p = .034$ )
- Experience in child care was a significant predictor of willingness to share results with client families.
  - More than 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )

- More than 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p < .001$ )
- 11 to 20 years > 6 to 10 years ( $p < .001$ )
- 11 to 20 years > 5 years or less ( $p = .001$ )

---

#### INTENDING NOT TO USE CHECKLIST

- Age group was a significant predictor of intent not to use the checklist.
  - 18 to 29 years > 30 to 49 years ( $p = .005$ )
  - 18 to 29 years > 50 years and over ( $p = .001$ )
  - 30 to 49 years > 50 years and over ( $p = .031$ )

#### RESPONDENT & CHILD CARE CENTRE CHARACTERISTICS

---

##### WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM?

There were 1900 valid responses to this question. Respondents reported their child care program to be located:

- 27.6% in a workplace, public building or other institution
- 26.3% in a stand-alone facility
- 22.7% in a school
- 14.6% in a regulated/licensed home
- 8.5% in an unregulated/unlicensed home

Overall, 85.4% of child care programs were regulated, and 76.8% were located in a facility rather than home-based.

---

##### IS THE SPACE WHERE YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM IS LOCATED ...

There were 1750 valid responses to this question, which asked about the ownership of the physical child care location. Respondents reported the physical location to be:

- 45.4% in a rented location
- 38.5% in a location owned by the child care program
- 16.1% in a location provided free of charge

An additional 153 respondents provided other responses which have not been recoded in this preliminary report.

---

##### HOW MANY CHILDREN ATTEND THE CHILD CARE PROGRAM WHERE YOU WORK?

There were 1923 valid responses to this question:

- 27.9% had more than 50 children
- 31.6% had 21 to 50 children
- 13.7% had 11 to 20 children
- 15.0% had 6 to 10 children
- 11.8% had 5 or fewer children

---

WHAT PROVINCE OR TERRITORY DO YOU WORK IN?

There were 1843 valid responses to this question:

- 26.2% Ontario
- 24.9% Alberta
- 15.1% Manitoba
- 7.8% British Columbia
- 4.7% Saskatchewan
- 3.7% Nova Scotia
- 3.6% Prince Edward Island
- 3.2% Newfoundland & Labrador
- 3.2% Northwest Territory
- 3.1% New Brunswick
- 2.8% Québec
- 1.5% Nunavut
- 0.1% Yukon



---

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES THE COMMUNITY WHERE YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM IS LOCATED?

There were 1511 valid responses to this question:

- 49.5% Urban
- 25.3% Suburban
- 22.9% Rural
- 2.3% On Reserve

An additional 20 respondents provided other responses which have not been recoded in this preliminary report.

---

TO THE BEST OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE, PLEASE INDICATE THE APPROXIMATE PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN IN YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM WHO FALL INTO THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES:

---

CHILDREN WHOSE FAMILIES LIVE ON LOW INCOME

There were 1365 valid responses to this question:

- 3.4% said approximately 100%
- 22.1% said approximately 75%
- 26.5% said approximately 50%
- 38.2% said approximately 25%
- 9.8% said approximately 0%

One hundred seventy-three (173) respondents indicated “Don’t know” to this question.

---

CHILDREN WHO BELONG TO A VISIBLE MINORITY (FOR EXAMPLE, ARAB, ASIAN, BLACK, HISPANIC)

There were 1502 valid responses to this question:

- 3.7% said approximately 100%
- 24.7% said approximately 75%
- 22.2% said approximately 50%
- 40.5% said approximately 25%
- 9.5% said approximately 0%

Sixty-five (65) respondents indicated “Don’t know” to this question.

---

#### CHILDREN WHO IDENTIFY AS INDIGENOUS OR WHOSE PARENTS IDENTIFY AS INDIGENOUS

There were 1318 valid responses to this question:

- 5.1% said approximately 100%
- 13.4% said approximately 75%
- 15.0% said approximately 50%
- 31.8% said approximately 25%
- 31.2% said approximately 0%

One hundred eighty-nine (189) respondents indicated “Don’t know” to this question.

---

#### CHILDREN WHO SPEAK A LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH OR FRENCH AT HOME

There were 1444 valid responses to this question:

- 3.3% said approximately 100%
- 22.4% said approximately 75%
- 24.0% said approximately 50%
- 44.5% said approximately 25%
- 11.6% said approximately 0%

Ninety-five (95) respondents indicated “Don’t know” to this question.

---

#### WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES YOUR JOB/ROLE?

There were 1516 valid responses to this question:

- 38.7% Early Childhood Educator (work directly with children)
- 32.6% Administrator (Executive Director / Director / Assistant Director)
- 11.7% Owner
- 9.6% Support staff (working directly with children)
- 7.3% Support staff (now working directly with children, e.g., kitchen or office staff)
- 0.2% Board member

---

#### HOW LONG HAVE YOU WORKED IN THE CHILD CARE SECTOR?

There were 1543 valid responses to this question:

- 28.2% Over 20 years
- 17.6% Between 11 and 20 years
- 26.6% Between 6 and 10 years
- 25.5% Between 1 and 5 years
- 2.1% Less than 1 year

---

#### GENDER: HOW DO YOU IDENTIFY?

There were 1503 valid responses provided to this question:

- 82.4% Woman
- 17.4% Man
- 0.2% Non-binary

Six (6) respondents preferred to self-describe in a text field which has not been recoded for this preliminary report, 26 respondents indicated “Prefer not to say” to this question.

---

#### WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES YOUR AGE?

There were 1515 valid responses to this question:

- 5.3% were aged 18 to 29 years
- 53.6% were aged 30 to 49 years
- 40.7% were aged 50 to 69 years
- 0.4% were aged 70 years or older

Eighteen (18) respondents indicated they preferred not to say their age.

## APPENDIX

### RESPONDENT INFORMATION

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM?

Location of Program	Count	Percentage
In a school	432	22.7%
In a workplace, public building or other institution	529	27.8%
Stand-alone facility	499	26.3%
In a home - regulated/licensed	278	14.6%
In a home - unregulated/unlicensed	162	8.5%

IS THE SPACE WHERE YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM IS LOCATED ...

Child care Space	Count	Percentage
Owned by the child care program	674	38.5%
Rented	795	45.4%
Provided free of charge	281	16.1%

HOW MANY CHILDREN ATTEND THE CHILD CARE PROGRAM WHERE YOU WORK?

Attendance	Count	Percentage
5 or fewer	227	11.8%
6 to 10	288	15.0%
11 to 20	264	13.7%
21 to 50	608	31.6%
More than 50	536	27.9%

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES YOUR JOB/ROLE?

Your Job/Role	Count	Percentage
ECE	586	38.7%
Owner	177	11.7%
Administrator	494	32.6%
Support - Indirect	145	9.6%
Support - Direct	111	7.3%
Board Member	3	0.2%

HOW LONG HAVE YOU WORKED IN THE CHILD CARE SECTOR?

Career in Child Care	Count	Percentage
Less than 1 year	32	2.1%
Between 1 and 5 years	394	25.5%
Between 6 and 10 years	410	26.6%
Between 11 and 20 years	272	17.6%

Career in Child Care	Count	Percentage
Over 20 years	435	28.2%

WHAT PROVINCE OR TERRITORY DO YOU WORK IN?

Province/Territory	Count	Percentage
Alberta	459	24.9%
British Columbia	143	7.8%
Manitoba	279	15.1%
New Brunswick	58	3.1%
Newfoundland & Labrador	59	3.2%
Northwest Territory	59	3.2%
Nova Scotia	68	3.7%
Nunavut	28	1.5%
Ontario	483	26.2%
Prince Edward Island	67	3.6%
Québec	52	2.8%
Saskatchewan	87	4.7%
Yukon	1	0.1%

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES THE COMMUNITY WHERE YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM IS LOCATED?

Community	Count	Percentage
Urban	748	49.5%
Suburban	383	25.3%
Rural	346	22.9%
On Reserve	34	2.3%

TO THE BEST OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE, PLEASE INDICATE THE APPROXIMATE PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN IN YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM WHO FALL INTO THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES:

Percentage of Children in These Sociodemographic Circumstances	Low-Income Families	Visible Minority	Identify as Indigenous or Parents Identify as Indigenous	Home Language Other than Official Language
0%	9.8%	9.5%	31.2%	11.6%
25%	38.2%	43.7%	31.8%	44.5%
50%	26.5%	26.2%	15.0%	24.0%
75%	22.1%	26.7%	13.4%	22.4%
100%	3.4%	4.0%	5.1%	3.3%

## CONTENT

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE WAYS IN WHICH ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS, SUCH AS AIR POLLUTION AND TOXIC CHEMICALS, CAN AFFECT CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND WELL-BEING?

Knowledge	Count	Percentage
Not at all	113	6.4%
Not very	271	15.2%
Somewhat	986	55.5%
Very	408	22.9%

THINKING ABOUT POTENTIAL RISKS TO THE HEALTH AND WELL-BEING OF CHILDREN, NOW AND INTO THE FUTURE, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR DEGREE OF CONCERN, IF ANY, ABOUT THE FOLLOWING:

Potential Risk	Not at all concerned	Somewhat unconcerned	Neither concerned nor unconcerned	Somewhat concerned	Very concerned	Total Responses
Outdoor Air Pollution	7.5%	8.7%	15.0%	40.7%	28.1%	1778
Indoor Air Quality	9.1%	9.5%	17.0%	32.1%	32.2%	1742
Hazardous Chemicals	9.8%	12.1%	13.5%	30.3%	34.2%	1780
Plastics	8.3%	8.9%	19.6%	34.0%	29.2%	1778
Climate Change	7.0%	7.3%	17.9%	30.6%	37.2%	1764
Toxic Chemicals in Products	7.9%	9.9%	13.0%	33.6%	35.6%	1782
Contaminants in Food	8.4%	9.2%	17.2%	31.3%	34.0%	1782
Contaminants in Water	8.8%	12.5%	13.7%	29.0%	36.1%	1780
Children Lacking Connection with Nature	8.9%	8.0%	15.0%	27.7%	40.4%	1781

DO YOU FEEL THE CHILD CARE SECTOR HAS A ROLE TO PLAY IN REDUCING CHILDREN’S EXPOSURES TO TOXIC CHEMICALS AND POLLUTANTS?

Response	Count	Percentage
Definitely	862	49.9%
Somewhat	541	31.3%
Not really	186	10.8%
Not at all	137	7.9%

TO WHAT EXTENT, IF AT ALL, DO YOU FEEL IT IS IMPORTANT FOR CHILD CARE PROGRAMS TO STRIVE TO BE ECOLOGICALLY SUSTAINABLE OR 'GREEN'?

Importance	Count	Percentage
Very important	834	48.2%
Somewhat important	614	35.5%
Somewhat unimportant	154	8.9%
Not at all important	130	7.5%

DO YOU FEEL THAT THERE ARE UNHEALTHY CONDITIONS IN THE CHILD CARE SETTING WHERE YOU WORK?

Response	Count	Percentage
Definitely	242	14.2%
Somewhat	586	34.3%
Not really	526	30.8%
Not at all	354	20.7%

DOES YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM HAVE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING?

Condition	Yes	No	Not sure	Percentage (Yes)
Air Conditioning	1269	446	16	73.3%
Basement Where Children Spend Time	525	1184	16	30.4%
Structural Disrepair	405	1197	128	23.4%
Lead in Water Supply	374	1119	239	21.6%
Peeling Paint	530	1157	43	30.6%
Carpeting	453	1247	30	26.2%
Windowless Rooms Where Children Spend Time	410	1312	12	23.6%
Windows That Cannot Be Opened	569	1087	73	32.9%
Insect Infestation Past 12 Months	420	1230	63	24.5%
Rodent Infestation Past 12 Months	447	1204	66	26.0%
Pesticides Routinely Used Indoors	376	1200	142	21.9%
Pesticides/Herbicides Routinely Used Outdoors	369	1193	156	21.5%
Mould/mouldy smell	371	1258	85	21.6%
Excessive Moisture	348	1298	70	20.3%
Noticeable Air Pollution / Fumes	495	1170	51	28.8%
Excessive Noise	490	1207	18	28.6%
Use of Air Fresheners	410	1271	33	23.9%
Indoor Artificial Turf	392	1273	35	23.1%
Outdoor Artificial Turf	609	1054	37	35.8%
Adjacent Outdoor Play Area	1317	362	18	77.6%
Natural Vegetation in Outdoor Play Area	1263	432	9	74.1%
Pavement on Most/All of Outdoor Play Area	606	1077	20	35.6%

Condition	Yes	No	Not sure	Percentage (Yes)
Adequate Shade in Outdoor Play Area	969	715	17	57.0%
Composting	659	950	89	38.8%

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES THE DISTANCE BETWEEN YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM AND THE NEAREST HIGHWAY?

Distance to Nearest Highway	Count	Percentage
500 m or closer	350	22.6%
More than 500 m but less than 1 km	410	26.5%
More than 1 km	788	50.9%

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES THE DISTANCE BETWEEN YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM AND THE NEAREST MAJOR ROADWAY?

Distance to Nearest Major Roadway	Count	Percentage
500 m or closer	857	53.5%
More than 500 m but less than 1 km	402	25.1%
More than 1 km	342	21.4%

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES THE DISTANCE BETWEEN YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM AND THE NEAREST POLLUTING INDUSTRY OR OTHER POTENTIAL SOURCE OF CONTAMINANTS, SUCH AS LANDFILL, MINING OPERATION, OR AGRICULTURAL OPERATION WHERE PESTICIDES OR OTHER AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ARE USED?

Distance to Nearest Polluting Industry	Count	Percentage
Within 1 km	247	14.8%
1 to 5 km	370	22.2%
More than 5 km	672	40.4%
Not Sure	375	22.5%

HAS YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM BEEN AFFECTED BY WILDFIRE SMOKE IN THE PAST 2 YEARS?

Yes	No	Not sure	Percentage (Yes)
579	864	225	34.7%

HAS YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM BEEN TESTED FOR RADON?

Yes	No	Not sure	Percentage (Yes)
330	705	632	19.8%

DOES YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM HEAT FOOD OR DRINKS IN, OR PUT HOT FOOD OR DRINKS INTO, PLASTIC CONTAINERS?

Yes	No	Not sure	Percentage (Yes)
741	731	194	44.5%



---

DOES YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM SERVE LOCALLY GROWN OR ORGANIC FOODS, WHEN FEASIBLE, OR GROW SOME OF ITS OWN FOOD?

Yes	No	Not sure	Percentage (Yes)
570	836	262	34.2%

---

HAVE THERE BEEN RENOVATIONS IN YOUR CHILD CARE FACILITY IN THE PAST 5 YEARS?

Yes	No	Not sure	Percentage (Yes)
650	913	107	38.9%

---

REGARDING THE RENOVATIONS, WERE THERE NOTICEABLE FUMES, DUST AND/OR DEBRIS WHEN CHILDREN AND STAFF WERE PRESENT?

Yes	No	Not sure	Percentage (Yes)
155	436	49	24.2%

---

DOES YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM USE SPRAY-ON SUNSCREEN?

Yes	No	Not sure	Percentage (Yes)
753	827	67	45.7%

---

DO THE CHILDREN PLAY WITH TOYS MADE OF PVC (VINYL), SUCH AS BEACH BALLS OR 'RUBBER' DUCKIES?

Yes	No	Not sure	Percentage (Yes)
880	659	113	53.3%

---

DOES YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM USE VINYL-COVERED SLEEPING MATS OR COT MATTRESSES?

Yes	No	Not sure	Percentage (Yes)
701	779	167	42.6%

---

DOES YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM USE SLEEPING MATS OR COT MATTRESSES MADE OF POLYURETHANE FOAM?

Yes	No	Not sure	Percentage (Yes)
368	948	330	22.4%

---

ARE CLEANING/SANITIZING/DISINFECTING CHEMICALS USED IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO CHILDREN (E.G., SPRAYING A TABLE WHILE CHILDREN ARE SEATED)?

Yes	No	Not sure	Percentage (Yes)
480	1146	23	29.1%

---

IS YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM ACCESSIBLE TO CHILDREN WHO ARE DIFFERENTLY ABLED?

Yes	No	Not sure	Percentage (Yes)
1034	529	86	62.7%

HAVE MEASURES BEEN TAKEN TO INCREASE VENTILATION OR OTHERWISE IMPROVE THE AIR QUALITY INSIDE THE CHILD CARE PROGRAM SINCE THE START OF THE COVID PANDEMIC?

Yes	No	Not sure	Percentage (Yes)
763	787	97	46.3%

WHICH MEASURES RELATED TO INDOOR AIR QUALITY HAVE BEEN TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO COVID?

Measures to Improve Air Quality (COVID)	Selected	Percentage
Increased ventilation using the building's existing HVAC system	315	41.3%
Increased filtration in the existing HVAC system	247	32.4%
Installation of a new HVAC system	81	10.6%
Opening windows more frequently	513	67.2%
Use of fans to bring in more fresh air	177	23.2%
Use of portable air cleaners	402	52.7%
Use of UV sanitizer boxes	39	5.1%
Use of handheld UV sanitizers	46	6.0%
Use of ozone air purifiers	51	6.7%
Use of 'fogging' devices that propel disinfecting/sanitizing chemicals into the air	90	11.8%
Other Measures	38	5.0%

DOES YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM HAVE POLICIES/PLANS IN PLACE IN THE EVENT OF ANY OF THE FOLLOWING?

Policies/Procedures to Address	Yes	No	Not sure	Percentage (Yes)
Poor Air Quality Days	1002	501	109	62.2%
High UV Days	1087	467	64	67.4%
Extreme Heat	1197	396	25	74.3%
Extreme Cold	1191	344	28	73.9%
Extreme Weather Event	1185	363	73	73.5%
Incident - Industry/Transport	861	577	182	53.4%

PLEASE INDICATE THE DEGREE TO WHICH YOUR CHILD CARE IS ENGAGED ON THE FOLLOWING:

Action	Currently doing	Doing this to some extent	Not doing but interested	Not doing and not interested	Not Applicable	Total Responses
Reducing Idling	22.8%	27.2%	32.0%	17.9%	13.4%	1405
Reducing Exposure to Traffic Pollution	24.4%	30.8%	26.8%	18.0%	32.7%	1197
Reducing Use of Hazardous Chemicals	44.7%	23.8%	16.9%	14.6%	3.7%	1534
Ensuring Fragrance-Free Environment	42.7%	26.0%	19.2%	12.0%	1.9%	1554
Shoes Off at the Door Policy	36.4%	28.1%	17.7%	17.7%	7.2%	1482
Minimizing Use of Pesticides	49.3%	24.0%	16.0%	10.7%	21.4%	1286

Action	Currently doing	Doing this to some extent	Not doing but interested	Not doing and not interested	Not Applicable	Total Responses
Choosing Non-Toxic Toys/Supplies	44.3%	29.4%	14.2%	12.1%	0.8%	1560
Minimizing Use of Antibacterial Soap	35.2%	22.7%	26.0%	16.1%	4.7%	1501
Ensuring Access to Green Playspaces	54.8%	23.2%	13.2%	8.8%	1.2%	1555
Ensuring Adequate Shade	46.8%	28.8%	15.7%	8.7%	1.4%	1549
Conserving Energy	33.6%	30.9%	24.8%	10.7%	3.4%	1511
Reducing Use of Plastics	29.6%	34.1%	22.0%	14.2%	1.9%	1539
Taking Action to Address Climate	19.9%	25.8%	38.7%	15.6%	11.2%	1410
Representing Cultural Diversity	46.0%	31.8%	12.3%	9.9%	0.8%	1558

HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM'S OVERALL COMMITMENT TO ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SUSTAINABILITY?

Rating	Count	Percentage
Excellent	277	17.8%
Good	667	42.9%
Fair	423	27.2%
Poor	187	12.0%

PLEASE INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS APPLIES TO YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM:

Statement	Definitely	Somewhat	Not sure / not at all	Total Respondents
There is top-level support for improving environmental health and sustainability in our child care program	35.3%	37.9%	26.8%	1527
There is interest among staff in improving environmental health and sustainability in our child care program	30.8%	41.4%	27.8%	1531
Families support action on environmental health and sustainability in our child care program	23.7%	38.9%	37.4%	1531
Children are involved in our program's efforts to improve environmental health and sustainability as part of our educational practice	26.3%	45.6%	28.0%	1534

---

WHICH, IF ANY, OF THE FOLLOWING ARE BARRIERS TO ACTION TO IMPROVE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROTECTION AND SUSTAINABILITY IN YOUR CHILD CARE PROGRAM?

<b>Barrier</b>	<b>Selected</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Lack of information, guidance and/or training</b>	700	46.9%
<b>Lack of funding</b>	796	53.4%
<b>Lack of support from management, board, co-workers, etc.</b>	339	22.7%
<b>Lack of support from government</b>	665	44.6%
<b>Lack of interest/support from families</b>	403	27.0%
<b>Competing priorities</b>	465	31.2%
<b>Benefits are not likely to justify the effort/cost</b>	305	20.4%
<b>We don't own the building</b>	551	36.9%
<b>Problems are 'invisible' and don't receive attention</b>	379	25.4%
<b>Other</b>	33	2.2%

---

IF THERE WAS A WEBSITE WITH TRUSTWORTHY INFORMATION AND TIPS ON HOW TO MAKE CHILD CARE SETTINGS HEALTHIER AND MORE SUSTAINABLE, WOULD YOU USE IT?

<b>Response</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Yes</b>	1370	88.4%
<b>No</b>	42	2.7%
<b>Not Sure</b>	138	8.9%

---

IF THERE WAS A SELF-ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST ON ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SUSTAINABILITY MEASURES IN CHILD CARE PROGRAMS WOULD YOU ...

<b>Action</b>	<b>Selected</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Complete on My Own</b>	676	43.7%
<b>Complete with Colleagues</b>	790	51.0%
<b>Share Results with Board</b>	571	36.9%
<b>Share Results with Client Families</b>	534	34.5%
<b>Use Results to Prioritize Actions</b>	612	39.5%
<b>Not Use It</b>	44	2.8%
<b>Other</b>	20	1.3%