

2015 CCPRC Annual Meeting

1. Descriptive Information

<p>Opening (<i>Independence Ballroom A</i>)</p> <p><i>Federal Early Care and Education Policy Developments and Implications for Research</i></p> <p>Description Federal leaders will provide an overview of current priorities and major policy developments to improve the quality of and access to ECE, including an overview of recent efforts to strengthen connections among Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), Head Start (HS), and prekindergarten (pre-K) programs. Leaders will highlight their burning questions for research.</p>	<p>Facilitators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ann Rivera, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE), Administration for Children and Families (ACF) • Ivelisse Martinez-Beck, OPRE, ACF <p>Presenters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Greenberg, Acting Assistant Secretary, ACF, HHS • Linda K. Smith, Deputy Assistant Secretary and Inter-Departmental Liaison for Early Childhood Development, ACF, HHS <p>Scribe</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Janet Kreitman, BLH Technologies, Inc.
---	---

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

3. Brief Summary of Presentations

Summary of Presentation #1: Welcome by Ann Rivera

- Asked current and past recipients of ACF grants, ACF training, TA partners, State or county administrators or staff, and current and past Child Care or Head Start scholars to stand. Participants in these categories have been tagged.
- Encouraged participants to make new connections and ask others about their work and the different hats they wear.
- Good to make partnerships with States. Take discussions back to improve research.
- Policy landscape has changed.
- Do not shy away from hard questions.
- Learn from each other and find ways to improve research and how we communicate about it.
- Share with communities tackling different policy areas. Discussions will inspire new connections.

Summary of Presentation #2: Introductions by Ivelisse Martinez-Beck

- Thanked Ann Rivera for her commitment to the Consortium.
- We will hear about the future of the Consortium during the no-host reception this evening.

- Introduced Mark Greenberg, Acting Assistant Secretary of ACF and Linda Smith, Deputy Assistant Secretary and Inter-Departmental Liaison for Early Childhood Development for ACF.

Summary of Presentation #3: Mark Greenberg

- The landscape has changed since the early 1990s, when he was involved in the early implementation of CCDBG and transitional and at-risk child care.
- At that time, there was little research on a wide range of issues relevant to child care policy, but there has been a transformation since then.
- The work of the Consortium has been instrumental in guiding policy for the administration and across the U.S.
- Early agenda included quality and supporting inclusion, promoting integration.
- Need to develop set of supports for birth through early childhood; all children should receive a high quality early learning experience.
- We emphasize interagency partnerships with Departments of Education and HUD and others.
- Look at preventing expulsions in early learning settings and high quality care for children with disabilities.
- When we issue policy statements, we draw heavily from research findings in those statements.
- ACF supports research and draws on research findings.
- Quality of ACF research has been recognized; in 2012, we published an evaluation policy that:
 - Formally committed ACF to conduct research that is transparent
 - Recognized the importance of diversity in research
 - Highlighted the importance of dissemination of research that is accessible and useful
 - Committed ACF to publishing all research results, whatever their findings, when research is completed, and that decisions about release would be made by career, not political, staff
 - Emphasized that evaluations should be conducted in an ethical manner and consider the privacy of participants.
- Last month, a new Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning, Research and Evaluation position was created; Naomi Goldstein holds this position. The creation of the position underscores ACF's commitment to be a learning organization; ACF welcomes thoughts from participants about this.
- As a learning organization, ACF is committed to sharing research findings with ACF grantees.
- ACF promotes its emphasis on the importance of two-generation, whole family strategies; better outcomes for children require working with parents and addressing parents' dual role as breadwinners and caregivers.
- Important research questions for two-generation strategies: what should this approach mean for what programs would do differently? And, how do we build an evidence base regarding whether two-generation approaches result in better outcomes for children, families, or both?

- More research needed on neuroscience, such as trauma and adverse child experiences, trauma-informed services, and toxic stress. Need to examine how prolonged stress can interrupt development and affect individuals in their adult years. Should address key stresses that impact health and development. Want to reduce stress in Head Start settings.
- Research should examine linkages of work with parenting, self-regulation, and scarcity.

Summary of Presentation #4: Linda Smith

- The purpose of the new Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Reauthorization and Head Start (HS) Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) is to break down barriers of Child Care and Head Start and have the two work together as one unit.
- There was an \$82.6 billion request for Child Care.
- The quality of child care and early learning should be raised regardless of setting.
- We should not give up on Head Start standards and raise the standards of early learning to this level.
- Clear strategies are outlined, and there is an alignment of programs—Child Care to pre-k to Head Start. We should strive for continuity and consistency for the sake of the children.
- We should think of the different programs as one unit. How to move Child Care to a higher level of quality that is the same as the quality of Head Start? What is it about Head Start that has made a difference? What do we want to replicate? As we look at Head Start and Child Care, what works and does not work? What are the issues?
- Dosage is complicated—should we offer more hours per day, days per week, total years? We lack research on what is right way to go.
- We need to look at curriculum for birth to 5. We can have the best teachers, but it does not help much if they are not working with best curriculum.
- National Academy of Sciences report addressed the workforce that provides services to the birth to 3 population.
- The impact on neuroscience is clear and cannot be ignored.
- Continuity of care needs to be examined – what is impact when children lack continuous, high quality care? What is the impact of comprehensive services?
- What works with parent engagement?
- Social/emotional development of children needs to be addressed.
- Monitoring studies are limited and need to be based on continuous quality strategy. We need to look at monitoring tools—what works and what does not. A document will be published on shared monitoring systems.
- We need to have common definitions and a framework that applies to all early childhood programs, and we need to educate state administrators on that framework.
- We need to determine how to create better workforce pathways. Child care needs to be affordable.
- We want to double average subsidy rate, raising it from \$5,500 per child to \$10,000 or \$11,000 per child. We need data, research, and stories to support this increase. All three of these contribute to good policy and good law.
- Linda Smith relayed a story of when she visited a pre-k program and encountered a child who was crying during lunch. She asked him what was wrong. The person with her said he was always that way. She saw him later in the day, and he was still crying. She asked

him why he was crying, and he said that he wanted his mother. Ms. Smith met his mother, and she said they should just let him cry it out. She knew he was upset, but the services were free and she did not have any other choice. The boy was upset, and it was only one month into the year. This story outlined the importance of working with the parents and providers on social and emotional implications.

Questions and Answers

- Dr. Martinez-Beck asked Mr. Greenberg to describe when the Consortium started. He said he was working in the early 1990's on welfare reform. When Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) was discussed, there was extensive research on caseloads, why families came in and out of the program, and the nature of services; these issues were not discussed relating to child care. It is important to see how far things have come since then in that area.
- Kim Boller from Mathematica Policy Research said that the increase of rigor in research is great, but some research does not look at standards. What is ACF's role in moving toward more rigorous research? Ms. Smith said there is an Interagency Policy Board that meets quarterly that looks at research. We should look at what is needed regarding research. She said this is a good question and that we should present how to frame research in the next few years.
- Julie Henly from the University of Chicago said that Child Care, pre-k, and Head Start need to align with parents' work schedules. We need to provide child care during parents' work hours, and a family-friendly focus is needed. What happens when parents are working and programs are not available? Ms. Smith said that we need to learn more about non-traditional working hours and what parents need so we can align the services. For example, the Race to the Top program in Phoenix pulled data from public sources to look at people working irregular hours. Mr. Greenberg said we need to study the needs of parents on nights and weekends, as well as those with irregular schedules. Some efforts have raised concerns over whether work should be structured that way and that parents should have more control over their schedules. Regarding child care, reauthorization focuses on 12-month eligibility periods. In absence of rules, we hope to push toward continuity and stability.
- Helen Raikes from University of Nebraska stated that the Child Care and Head Start data systems are not coordinated. She asked how we can break down barriers and create unified data systems. Ms. Smith said that work has been done with the Department of Education on shared data. As well, Phoenix is looking at how to pull data out of public systems. Mr. Greenberg said we should look at issues cutting across human services, including the health care system and Medicaid. A confidentiality toolkit has been developed regarding information sharing. Helpful TA products should be coming out this year.
- Jim Elicker from Purdue University said he was concerned about the dichotomy between care and education. We need to break down structural barriers and change this mindset. We are missing the young child's perspective. It is most effective when we start the conversation with a discussion of the importance of bioscience — people can understand this. Ms. Smith stated that Blanca Enriquez said that regarding Head Start, partnerships are creating a new paradigm. Individuals are now working together. Head Start and Child Care need to operate the same way. We need to study partnerships. There is interest at

every level of government and concerns every party. Mr. Greenberg said that the dichotomy between Child Care and Head Start is less now than before. The Child Care and Head Start roles are becoming more similar, and CCDBG has helped with this effort.

- 4. Summary of Key Issues Raised** (facilitators are encouraged to spend the last 3-5 minutes of workshops summarizing the key issues raised during the session; bullets below are prompts for capturing the kinds of issues we are looking for)
- *Emerging findings that may be of particular interest to policy-makers and ACF?*
 - *Methodological issues including innovative methodologies that may help maximize resources available for research and evaluation?*
 - *Follow-up activities suggested to address questions and gaps (e.g., secondary analyses of data, consensus meetings of experts, research synthesis or brief, webinar, etc.)?*
 - *Recommendations about future ACF child care research directions and priorities?*

N/A for this session.