

2015 CCPRC Annual Meeting

1. Descriptive Information

<p>Closing – Plenary 5 (<i>Independence Ballroom A</i>)</p> <p><i>Child Care Policy Research Consortium: Looking Forward</i></p> <p>Description During this Closing Plenary, panelists will share visions of CCPRC’s future as it continues to evolve. Using what has been learned from its first 20 years, panelists will describe how those lessons can be used to make the consortium best able to meet current and future needs for policy-relevant research on an increasingly integrated ECE system.</p>	<p>Panelists</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bobbie Weber, Oregon State University• Shannon Rudisill, Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Early Childhood Development, ACF, HHS• Martha Zaslow, SRCD and Child Trends• Alejandra Ros Pilarz, University of Wisconsin – Madison <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: Bobbie Weber

- The CCPRC Steering Committee views this celebration of the Consortium’s 20th Anniversary as an opportunity to review our history in order to intentionally move forward in light of the emerging integrated early learning system.
- In this closing plenary, we bring multiple perspectives to this question. Marty will highlight CCPRC’s methodology. Alejandra will share CCPRC from a Scholar perspective and Shannon brings a policy perspective. I will open with reflections on how CCPRC does its work.
- Prior to and during this meeting we used a variety of methods we have elicited members’ insights into what distinguishes the CCPRC and where we need to move.
- Key words appeared frequently in member responses: collaborative, community of learning, network, multidisciplinary. In our work, several fields come together and interact collaboratively; economists, social workers, psychologists, and other professionals all work together, even though their knowledge and training vary. There is a shared commitment to provide research.
- One distinguishing characteristic is the inclusion of State and practitioner perspectives.
- CCPRC research has informed national and state policy. At the same time CCPRC work is rigorous and appears into peer-review journals.
- Collegiality is evident in the work of CCPRC including Residency Roundtables and topical workgroups which bring together people with expertise on a particular topic.
- Topical workgroups delve deeply in certain areas and move hard issues forward.
- Collegiality has positively impacted the substance and relevance of CCPRC research.

Summary of Presentation #2: Martha Zaslow

- Thanked the CCPRC leadership for their hard work.
- CCPRC takes deep dive by looking at literature, measuring, and developing new measures. CCPRC challenges long-held assumptions and engages in myth busting.
- Suggestions for moving forward should be grounded in reality, not myth.
 - Subsidy continuity was an example of this. There was no information on how long parents received a subsidy or children stayed in an arrangement, so we needed to develop new methodologies of measurements.

- It was assumed that home-based care providers were not interested in quality improvement, but the National Survey helped determine that this was a myth.
- We are taking stock through the INQUIRE work group.
- We think models are enough to determine effectiveness, but this is not enough. Work groups look at fidelity as well as systems. They follow a process of delving deep, carefully describing a phenomenon, doing a literature search, determining common definitions, and moving ahead with suggestions.

Summary of Presentation #3: Alejandra Ros Pilarz

- The Scholars Program serves as a model for how to conduct meaningful policy research that engages state administrators and policymakers. Consortium members have set examples for early career scholars for how to do this.
- The Consortium brings together people from different disciplines and facilitates meaningful dialogue on key issues in early care and education. A scholar feels at home during the meeting because it is a place for people who are passionate about early care and education to come together.
- Bringing together researchers from different theoretical and methodological perspectives to this shared interest also helps to strengthen the quality of the research.
- The Consortium has laid a foundation for next generation of scholars by creating a space for meaningful dialogue; by laying a foundation for collaboration; and setting examples for how to tackle difficult and important questions in the field.
- It is important to try to keep integrating across systems, bringing the child care and education fields closer together, and continuing to break down silos. As we do this, it will be important to keep bringing in multiple, diverse perspectives to move research forward.

Summary of Presentation #4: Shannon Rudisill

- Shannon opened by sharing that she values her relationships with CCPRC members.
- ACF is interested in intentionally cross-sectoring.
- She wants to be more intentional in what has been developed and wants to include multidisciplinary approaches.
- She works with both Child Care and Head Start and asked, "How can we reach other people? How can the Consortium open up more?" There has been discussion about opening up the Head Start research conference to include early child care. Over time, there has been overlap, and most questions pertain to both disciplines, although there are still some aspects that do not overlap.
- We need to have policy and program lenses.
- Important to consider the child as well as staff.
- Should determine the benefits and costs of teacher looping and mixed age groups.
- Need to engage state partners in Head Start.
- Need good program models and think about how policies can flourish.
- Should think about financing--how much does it cost a program to do a good job? Head Start has differently funded enrollment across the U.S. Head Start should think about future cost models.
- We should scale up good practices. QRIS does not get to the level of an exact classroom practice.
- Head Start will be a laboratory on how approach works.
- Most of the child care children are not in Head Start.
- We should talk to the State regarding higher education.
- Focus on infants and toddlers is important. Early Head Start is great program, has been expanded.
- What can we do regarding vertical integration? Most individuals work in both child care and early Head Start over their career. We want to integrate the knowledge.

Comments from Participants

- Suggested new names for the group: Early Childhood Research, Early Childhood Connections.
- Liz Davis wants to see child care in the title. Adding education is good, but we should not lose the care aspect. Care is important to families.
- Amie Lapp Payne said she discovered that during the Labor market session, providers do not identify as educators.

- Shannon Lipscomb treasures CCPRC and the way it thinks forward. We should not lose the intimacy and dialogue of the group, and we have good structure to work together.
- Gina Adams worries about the care piece and is concerned that we are losing the care component—we need to focus on meeting the needs of parents and kids.
- Important to have policy makers, program staff, and researchers in same room.
- Shannon—states face the same challenges as does the Office of Head Start. In QRIS presentation, Head Start has monitoring issues.
- Vertical and horizontal intersections are important, and a word like “intersection” would be good to include. Work, care, and education are important.
- It is good that CCPRC has “Research” and “Policy” included in its title. Policies could be Head Start regulations and can inform the work this group does.
- Fewer State Administrators came to this year’s CCPRC meeting. There were thirteen of them listed, and not all of them came. It would be good to determine the cause of this — is there something that makes states feel unwelcomed or is the content not relevant? If so, how do we make the meeting more welcoming and useful? Perhaps funding is an issue.
- A State Administrator from South Carolina mentioned that their state has a good relationship with researchers. She wants to help others understand that connection.
- A colleague mentioned that Meghan Broadstone studied the nature of collaboration among state-level administrators. She found that one-third of child care administrators have been in their positions for five years or less. This outlines the importance of making new people know that they are invited to the CCPRC meeting.
- TA partners here provide a valuable connection.
- Shannon Rudisill said that communication with participants is sometimes difficult. There are more locally D.C.-based participants attending the meeting. Since intimacy is important, should we have other opportunities to meet so the meeting does not get larger?
- Ivelisse Martinez-Beck commented that the consortium is an open group, meaning it is so large because it includes individuals in several different points of their careers. She encouraged participants interested in joining the Consortium Steering Committee to let Aime and Ann know if they want to be included. Steering Committee members are volunteers and meet monthly for one hour, spending additional time in between planning the yearly meeting and receiving feedback on other issues.
- Ann Rivera thanked the Steering Committee members for all of the work they have done and mentioned that it takes an entire year to plan the annual meeting.
- Dr. Martinez-Beck thanked the Steering Committee and BLH staff for all of their work planning and implementing this year’s annual CCPRC meeting. She reminded participants to complete and hand in their evaluations.

4. Summary of Discussion

5. **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’re looking for) Not applicable for this session.

- *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?*