

1. Descriptive Information

<p>Breakout Session A3 11:00 am -12:15 pm</p> <p>Title <i>Capacity-Building for State- and Territory-Level Child Care and Development Block Grant Implementation Research and Evaluation</i></p> <p>Description This session offers participants an overview of work being undertaken through two newly-funded ACF projects and a chance to share their own insights and experiences to support states and territories in building research and evaluation capacity. In part 1, panelists will briefly describe the two newly-funded ACF projects: Research and Evaluation Planning Grants awarded to CCDF Lead Agencies; and the Center for Supporting Research on CCDBG Implementation In part 2, representatives from CCDF Lead Agencies that recently received planning grants will share information about their research grant and capacity-building priorities. In part 3, panelists and participants will engage in a discussion about current Lead Agency research capacity, capacity-building needs, and opportunities for more effectively supporting state and territory capacity-building efforts.</p>	<p>Facilitator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Julia Isaacs, Urban Institute <p>Presenters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meryl Barofsky, OPRE • Monica Rohacek, Urban Institute • Bentley Ponder, GA Dept. of Early Care and Learning • Bruce Bendix, IL Dept. of Human Services • Jocelyn Bowne, MA Dept. of Early Education and Care • Maribel Loste, Northern Mariana Islands Dept. of Community & Cultural Affairs • Amanda Haboush-Deloye, University of Nevada, Las Vegas • Naneida Lazarte Alcalá, OK Dept. of Human Services • Bridget Hatfield, Oregon State University • Vickie Ybarra, WA Department of Early Learning <p>Discussant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a <p>Scribe</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brenda Miranda, Child Trends
--	---

2. Documents in Session Folder (Please list any electronic documents or web links used during the session.)

- Slides
- Handout: Center for Supporting Research on CCDBG Implementation

3. Brief Summary of Presentations

- Meryl Barofsky-Brief Intro to CCDBG Implementation Research and Evaluation Planning Grants and Center to Support CCDBG Implementation Research and Evaluation
 - CCDBG Implementation and evaluation grant program- 2 phases: planning and implementation
 - Planning: 18 months to develop a research plan, increase the capacity to conduct and use research, build and solidify research partnerships
 - Implementation: fund the plan developed in phase 1
 - Center- assessments of grantees’ policy interests, support ACF in building research and data capacity, facilitate cross-project collaboration, and inform ACF regarding the benefit and drawbacks of the two-phase grant structure
- Monica Rohacek, Urban Institute
 - Center

- 2 main goals: 1) support CCDF lead agencies in building research capacity, especially in implementing CCDBG –regulations, and 2) facilitate learning from state- and territory-level research
 - Examine the pros and cons of the two-phase grant structure
 - Assess needs and existing resources
 - Disseminate research findings
 - Capacity-building support for grantees: monthly web conferences and a yearly in-person meetings focused on peer support, website, ad hoc peer learning groups, conference sessions, and a webinar series, if the optional services component is funded
- Grantee Projects
 - Bentley Ponder, GA Dept. of Early Care and Learning
 - 4 objectives when writing grant: develop cohesive research agenda, use administrative data to conduct research on CCDF goals, process evaluation of CCDF initiatives, plan for large-scale rigorous evaluation to measure impact of CCDF policies and programs on access to high quality
 - Strengths: internal research and evaluation unit, experience with data analysis and research, value research and the use of data
 - Capacity areas: finding time to reflect, disseminating information, prioritizing projects
 - Bruce Bendix, IL Dept. of Human Services
(unable to attend due to last minute emergency– slides summarized below)
 - Planning grant objective is to evaluate effect of extending CCDF redeterminations from 6 months to 12 months on parental employment, continuity of care, and access to good quality child care
 - Strengths: long-standing partnership with Chapin Hall, and across state agencies
 - Capacity areas: statewide data sharing portal, advanced analytics
 - Jocelyn Bowne, MA Dept. of Early Education and Care
 - Great time for changes with new regulations, all while rethinking happening around may areas including QRIS
 - Focus: Identify key policies to promote stability of access to high-quality ECE programs and conduct ongoing research on this topic
 - Strengths: commitment to using research to support decision-making, continued investments in data systems, great relationships with external firms/partners
 - Capacity areas: internal capacity for conducting research has been limited, research viewed as one-time and not continuous, data quality has been variable
 - Maribel Lose, Northern Mariana Islands Dept. of Community & Cultural Affairs
 - In the process of identifying research partner
 - Focus: gaining knowledge about conducting rigorous ECE research: conduct monthly professional community meetings and establish a task force to draft research plan
 - Formalize research plan examining 2 questions: 1) effectiveness of increasing infant and toddler set-aside on families’ access to high-quality care, 2) how can investments and their impact be maximized?
 - Strengths: partners are interested and accessible, data is available and accessible, partners value this unique opportunity to collect data and conduct rigorous research in the CNMI
 - Capacity: create a database that is accessible and usable, build capacity to conduct research
 - Amanda Haboush-Deloye, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
 - Monthly meetings through another initiative with Child Trends to understand how to maximize existing data
 - Focus: the quality of family, friend, and neighbor (FFN) providers
 - Determining whether measurement is solely assessing quality in terms of health and safety or also considering children’s developmental outcomes?
 - Strengths: Lead agency values research, program managers involved in research, mechanisms in place to communicate research internally and to legislators (although not to parents, yet)
 - Capacity areas: data system to track kids as early as they enter any of the subsidized providers, building capacity at the higher state level, better processes to incorporate the use of data for decision-making
 - Naneida Lazarte Alcala, OK Dept. of Human Services

- Partners: child care services agency staff, CCDF coordinator, scholars at Georgetown University
- Objectives: establish partnership, examine how parents use information about subsidized programs and select care (how to best assess impact on access), explore how to support providers' self-assessment and contribute some valid resources to improve past strategies aimed at promoting CQI, refine data system to link subsidy and licensing data
- Strengths: ample leadership support, in-house research and evaluation expertise
- Capacity areas: translate organizational commitment in research/evaluation to time and financial resources, integrate evaluation and research activities into program activities, communicate findings for decision-making
- Bridget Hatfield, Oregon State University
 - Oregon State University has a strong partnership with the Lead Agency
Objectives: build state data and research capacity (e.g., data sharing agreements, data merging), determine who the new regulations are actually affecting (underserved populations, providers, specifically home-based providers and how they are responding to changes), home-based provider participation in professional development and support activities
 - Strengths: long-standing collaboration (Oregon Child Care Research Partnership), comprehensive data infrastructure
 - Capacity: data sharing agreements, data expansion via merging of existing data and additional home-based provider PD data
- Vickie Ybarra, WA Department of Early Learning
 - Policies evaluated: 12-month eligibility, QRIS required participation
 - Outcomes: continuity of care, stability for subsidy providers, impact on vulnerable children and providers
 - Objectives: develop a research plan, identify valid and appropriate measures, increase research capacity
 - Strengths: research and analysis unit, data integration efforts with new data warehouse team, partner agencies also have early learning research capacity
 - Capacity areas: reporting and availability of administrative data, cross-agency collaboration

4. Brief Summary of Discussion

- Linking school readiness data
 - WA beginning to link school readiness and kindergarten data
 - OR has linked assessment data to census data and county-level data, plans to link subsidy data to school readiness in the future
 - GA developing school readiness assessments and will ultimately integrate data systems in ECE and into adulthood (labor department data)
 - NV making ECE a "school" so children will have a unique identifier starting in early childhood, pioneered at the state-level rather than county-level to avoid potential county-level complications
 - Challenge: school readiness assessments not rigorous and this causes problems
- Tips about communicating around research and data in ways that helps build capacity and facilitate use of data
 - Conduct annual roundtable: 80 people from around the state, discuss current topics, include different types of agencies/people (CCR&R, researchers, county early learning hubs, early learning division, foundations) and monthly 3-hour webinar (e.g., How should we ask this question on ethnicity/race?)
 - Identify priorities of Lead Agency staff on the ground, involve these staff in the research process
 - Translate research: developing different one-pagers for each audience (e.g., business community, legislators), identify how it is going to impact them and how can we highlight the importance of evidence-based practices
 - Think about what's coming? Laying the groundwork for future priorities
 - Leverage existing councils and getting these issues on the meeting agenda, so it doesn't have to be something new and you can infuse this info into pre-existing meetings
- Any data analyses on the effects of CCDF on parent employment outcomes?
 - GA currently working on connecting data to understand how child care participation impacts parents

- IL working with Chapin Hall to look at 12-month eligibility regulation on parental employment outcomes, child outcomes, and provider outcomes
 - OR is taking a longitudinal look at provider workforce outcomes, but haven't yet linked to parental employment outcomes
- How do you balance different methodological options (i.e., process and outcome evaluations)?
 - Process informs outcomes; process explains how or why this worked or didn't work and this is used to explain to stakeholders why the process piece needs to stay
 - GA wants to increase capacity around qualitative data analysis to provide some context and richer data to complement the quantitative data
- Qualitative data use
 - Challenge ensuring qualitative data reflect a representative group of providers
 - Must include all stakeholders: parents, families, providers, staff, and the public → challenge: what is the best way to collect this information from all of these groups?
- How are you using what you learn in this grant and what you learn via QRIS? Are they being linked?
 - OR: timing presents a challenge, but because info is housed in the same place we are currently using these data to understand things like how to provide training to providers
 - GA: in the process of a validation study and subsidy data pieces will be aligned with this process
 - OK: self-assessment to replace the use of environmental scales, state exploring the validity of different types of self-assessments to recommend for use