

**Summary**  
**Advisory Committee for Market Rate Survey Meeting**

February 17, 2005  
Melrose Hotel  
Washington, DC

**Meeting Participants**

<i>Name</i>	<i>Organization</i>
Mark Anderson	Oregon Department of Human Services
Doug Baird	Associated Early Care and Education, Inc.
Rick Brandon	Human Services Policy Center, University of Washington
Ann Collins	Abt Associates
Marsha Engquist	National Child Care Association
Eric Karolak	National Child Care Information Center
Pauline Koch	National Association for Regulatory Administration
Cherie Kotilinek	Children and Family Services, Minnesota Department of Human Services
Janet Marsh	Institute on Family and Neighborhood Life, Clemson University
David McDonald	National Association for the Education of Young Children
Deborah Neill	Child Care, Adult, and Community Programs, Tennessee Department of Human Services
Peggy Strain-O'Brien	SPHERE Institute
Erin Oldham	Glenwood Research
Laura Schrager	Washington Department of Social and Health Services
Joyce Shortt	National Institute on Out-of-School Time
Nina Stanton	Tribal Child Care Technical Assistance Center
Marsha Thompson	Indiana Association for Child Care Resource and Referral
<i>Child Care Bureau Staff</i>	
Ivelisse Martinez-Beck	Child Care Bureau
Dawn Ramsburg	Child Care Bureau
Karen Tvedt	Child Care Bureau
<i>Research Team</i>	
Elizabeth Davis	Department of Applied Economics, University of Minnesota
Deana Grobe	Family Policy Program, Oregon State University
Lee Kreader	Research Connections, National Center for Children in Poverty
Sharmila Lawrence	Research Connections, National Center for Children in Poverty
Clara Pratt	Family Policy Program, Oregon State University
Bobbie Weber	Family Policy Program, Oregon State University

The *Guidance for Validating Child Care Market Rate Surveys* project is a study of how states currently conduct market rate surveys, methods to validate market rate survey findings, and the effects of child care subsidies on the larger child care market. Specifically, the three objectives of the project are:

- *Objective 1:* Describe key elements of market rate survey methods, policies, and practices in order to capture current practice of states, tribes and territories, and to refine the proposed research design for validating market rate survey findings.
- *Objective 2:* Evaluate the effect of using various samples and methods on validity, market representation, and cost effectiveness in producing child care market rate findings at the level of community and state, territory, or tribe.
- *Objective 3:* Explore the effects of subsidies on child care prices in different policy environments.

In order to ensure that the research is well informed and relevant, an Advisory Committee, composed of representatives of key stakeholder groups was established to advise researchers throughout the project. Members include representatives from state Lead Agencies for the Child Care and Development Fund, market rate survey and other child care researchers, the National Child Care Information Center, organizations representing the range of child care providers, association of regulatory agencies, and child care resource and referral agencies.

The specific purposes of the first meeting of the Advisory Committee were to:

- a. Provide members with a working understanding of the project objectives, expected deliverables, project timeline, and the Advisory Committee member role.
- b. Solicit input on methods and survey constructs and variables for the survey of states, territories and tribes.
- c. Identify an effective communication system between the research team and advisory committee members.

The meeting opened with introductions, which were followed by an overview of the study describing the three key objectives. Following this was a discussion of effective methods for surveying the states, territories and tribes. The members were then asked to work individually and in groups to identify constructs and variables for inclusion in the survey. After this was a brief presentation and discussion on the third objective of the study. The meeting concluded with a discussion of the next steps in terms of establishing a communication system, survey development, and a future advisory committee meeting.

## **Introductions**

The meeting began with introductions and each member was asked to identify what they felt was important to know about market rate surveys. The research team was aware that the project would not answer all questions about market rate studies. The goal of the exercise was to create a context for the study being undertaken and to nest the questions that the study does address within the broader set of questions about market rate studies.

Advisory Committee member responses are captured in Table 1. Responses are clustered by content area and members whose comments fell within each content area are listed. The final column relates the content area to the project, noting those areas that are outside the scope of the current project.

Next the research team provided a PowerPoint overview of the three main objectives of the study. The team highlighted that the first meeting of the Advisory Committee was designed to address the first

objective and would also provide a more detailed overview of the third objective. The second objective would be discussed in detail at the year two meeting.

## **Survey Methods**

The next agenda item was discussion of the methods for the survey of states, territories, and tribes—asking participants for recommendations and strategies for: (1) effectively reaching state child care administrators, (2) reaching the appropriate target informant(s), (3) designing web-based surveys (experiences of what works, what doesn't), (4) achieving high response rates, and (5) weighing the tradeoffs between promising states anonymity and identifying findings with specific states. Table 2 summarizes the methods and includes the participant responses to the above questions. The research team will use these recommendations and strategies to refine the methods, in particular, the process for reaching the most appropriate respondent(s) and improving response rates.

The following was drafted in response to the Advisory Committee suggestion to write and distribute a short summary of the project to appropriate groups prior to surveying the states, territories and tribes:

The 1998 federal Child Care and Development Fund Final Rule requires states, territories and tribes to conduct a child care market rate survey within 2 years of their currently approved CCDF plan. Market rate surveys describe prices that are set in the open market by child care providers. Great variation exists in the costs, methods and utility of market rate surveys across the nation. As part of a study funded by the federal Child Care Bureau, we will be surveying all the states, territories and tribes to capture their current market rate practices. A national Advisory Committee of state child care administrators, child care researchers and leaders representing all types of child care are helping guide this study. Oregon State University, University of Minnesota, and the National Center on Children in Poverty are carrying out the study. Ultimately, the study will describe best practices and guidelines for states, territories and tribes.

## **Survey Instrument Development**

Participants then engaged in a '1,3, 6' exercise. The exercise required participants to spend five minutes individually writing down ideas on what would be important to include on the survey. Following this, in groups of three, they consolidated their lists. Finally, they worked in groups of six to compare their lists with the constructs and variables identified by the research team. Table 3 consolidates all of the variables the groups generated in addition to the constructs and variables proposed by the research team. It also lists the prioritization of each variable by group (see Table 3 for lists of group members).

The research team reorganized the variables under specific functions we felt represented the market rate survey process at the state level. This document provides the structure for the first draft of the survey instrument. Prior to field-testing the instrument, we will solicit feedback from the entire advisory committee. Once we have a final draft of the survey instrument, we will ask the state administrators on the advisory committee to field test the instrument and provide feedback.

## **Next Steps**

Finally, in discussing next steps, the research team was interested in identifying ways to continue communicating with the Advisory Committee, and to move forward with the survey development. It was agreed that the research team would set up a listserv specifically for the group. In addition, based on the discussions at the meeting, the study team will develop a survey instrument and share it with the group for feedback. Lastly, participants agreed that the next meeting should be held in November or December, 2005. The purpose of the second meeting will be to discuss findings of the survey of states, territories and tribes, and to use these findings to refine the methodology for objective 2.

**Table 1.** Advisory Committee Responses to the Question “What Do We Need to Know About Market Rate Surveys?”

Advisory Committee’s Responses by Content Area	Members Who Articulated Ideas For this Content Area	Ability of Project to Address Ideas Raised by Advisory Committee	
		Where Ideas are Included in Objectives of This Project	Where Ideas are Outside of Current Project Scope

Market(s): Definition and Issues

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relationships between licensing categories and market rate survey categories</li> </ul>	Pauline Koch, Ivelisse Martinez-Beck, Davida McDonald , Marsha Thompson, Peggy Strain-O’Brien, Joyce Shortt, Deborah Neill, Cherie Kotilinek, Ann Collins, Doug Baird, Karen Tvedt, Kathy Modigliani, Mildred Warner	Obj. 1 – Information from states, territories, and tribes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What about R&amp;R data?</li> <li>What is the role of R&amp;R’s in market rate surveys? Rate structure, rate clusters, county as unit? How many different rates?</li> </ul>		Obj. 1 – Document what states are using R&R data and how they are using it. Obj. 2 – Partially addressed by evaluating R&R data inclusions & exclusions.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The child care market is a weird animal. How do we view the market itself without government influences on it? Given the size of the government effect on markets when government is a major player, is a market rate survey the right tool for measuring prices?</li> <li>How about geographic areas where government is a major (over 50%) payer (subsidy, Head Start, pre-K)?</li> <li>What about providers for whom the majority of children in care are subsidized?</li> <li>What percent of the market is affected by prices? What about areas in which government is major purchaser of care?</li> </ul>		Obj. 2 – Partially addressed by looking at how the different data sources used in market rate surveys are representative of the child care market	X (government effect on markets)

Advisory Committee's Responses by Content Area	Members Who Articulated Ideas For this Content Area	Ability of Project to Address Ideas Raised by Advisory Committee	
		Where Ideas are Included in Objectives of This Project	Where Ideas are Outside of Current Project Scope

Market(s) (continued)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Variance in rates by geography.</li> <li>▪ Market is defined differently by different states.</li> <li>▪ Child care is micro-geographic in terms of rates. What is the meaning of averages when very different values are average (i.e., when low prices are averaged with higher prices from an adjoining area within the same county).</li> <li>▪ Neighborhood variation</li> <li>▪ How to define the market – geography, age?</li> <li>▪ How does care that carries no price for parents affect the market?</li> <li>▪ Effect of pre-K (and other programs that charge no fees) on market.</li> <li>▪ Diversity in school-age programming. What about programs with no fees?</li> </ul>		Obj. 2 – Definitional clarity of market; partially looking at preschool and school-age definition of rates and the inclusion/exclusion of programs with no fees; documenting geographic differences by zip code and counties; will consider zip code versus county in methods	X (unlikely we will find neighborhood differences in survey of states and through surveys in Obj. 2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Validation of market representation</li> <li>▪ Market is diverse. How does a state get rates that accurately describe the market?</li> </ul>		Obj. 2 – Comparing the representation of data sources, used to collect market rate data, with the child care market	

Advisory Committee's Responses by Content Area	Members Who Articulated Ideas For this Content Area	Ability of Project to Address Ideas Raised by Advisory Committee	
		Where Ideas are Included in Objectives of This Project	Where Ideas are Outside of Current Project Scope

#### Access: Definition and Issues

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fair? Do market rate surveys lead to equity in access to child care – do questions consistently describe market diversity and do payment rates result in equity of access?</li> <li>Issue of access</li> <li>What do you think you are doing?</li> <li>CCB sets age and other data categories. Are they going to define the measure of access? How do we get an access measure that is accurate?</li> </ul>	Cherie Kotilinek, Ivelisse Martinez-Beck, Karen Tvedt, Erik Karolak, Laura Schrager	<p>Obj. 1 – Describe how states measure access for those using vouchers/certificates if they do measure it</p> <p>Obj. 2 – Partially addressed through looking at the household survey data and market rate survey findings together</p>	X (impact of payment rates on access )
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How and in what ways market rate studies are used – challenge of access calculations.</li> </ul>		Obj. 1 – Gathering information on how states use rate findings in setting rates	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slippage in payment rates – time gap between market rate survey and setting payment rates</li> </ul>		Obj. 1 & 2 – Documenting variance between market rate survey price findings and payment rates	

#### Cost Effectiveness

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How to make market rate studies more efficient/cost effective</li> <li>Mechanisms that give useful information</li> </ul>	Janet Marsh, Dawn Ramsburg	<p>Obj. 1 – Cost information on last market rate survey</p> <p>Obj. 2 – Documenting cost of different methods</p>	
--	----------------------------	---	--

Advisory Committee's Responses by Content Area	Members Who Articulated Ideas For this Content Area	Ability of Project to Address Ideas Raised by Advisory Committee	
		Where Ideas are Included in Objectives of This Project	Where Ideas are Outside of Current Project Scope

### Provider Survey

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Find out how many states do provider surveys (additional questions beyond those needed to identify prices)</li> <li>Use market rate survey to collect child care workforce data.</li> <li>Workforce data categories and variable definitions</li> <li>Opportunity to learn about providers – longitudinal if IDs are used across years.</li> <li>Market rate survey as a vehicle to get other information.</li> </ul>	Rick Brandon, Ivelisse Martinez-Beck, Karen Tvedt	Obj. 1 – Partially addressed by documenting the number of states that are doing provider surveys as part of market rate survey	X
--	---	--	---

### Tribes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relationship between tribes and states on market rate surveys</li> <li>Are the issues between states and tribes similar enough to use the same survey?</li> </ul>	Nina Stanton, Mildred Warner	Obj. 1 – Survey of Tribes	
--	------------------------------	---------------------------	--

### Comparability Across States

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How to make market rate survey findings comparable? Consider national education statistics as a model – the common core data work group and product.</li> <li>Consistency across states – problems with comparability.</li> </ul>	Rick Brandon, Mark Anderson, Davida McDonald	Obj. 1 – Document the amount of state comparability Obj. 2 – Will partially address comparability of data elements	X (Requiring comparable data definitions beyond scope of this study)
--	--	---	---

Advisory Committee's Responses by Content Area	Members Who Articulated Ideas For this Content Area	Ability of Project to Address Ideas Raised by Advisory Committee	
		Where Ideas are Included in Objectives of This Project	Where Ideas are Outside of Current Project Scope

Child Care System Effects on Market Rate Survey  
and Effects of Survey on Child Care System

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The effect of licensing on market rates</li> </ul>	Pauline Koch, Mark Anderson, Erin Oldham, Marsha Engquist, Erik Karolak, Doug Baird, Laura Schrager	Obj. 1 – Partially met in survey of states by asking about relationship of licensing and survey types of care categories	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ways that parents and providers negotiate rates.</li> <li>Confounding of existing state rates and provider-reported rates.</li> </ul>		Obj. 2 – Partially addressed through comparison of rates across various methods at the same time.	X (family/provider rate negotiation)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Be sure to understand impact of market rate study on providers.</li> <li>“The Government is the largest supporter of poor quality care through its payment system.”</li> <li>Government as the “perpetrator” of rates.</li> </ul>			X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Challenges of inter-relating data sets (market rate survey and administrative records on which providers receive subsidy payments).</li> </ul>		Obj. 2—Partially addressed by merging administrative data sets	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effect of “living wage” initiatives on prices.</li> <li>Effect of tiered reimbursement on rates.</li> </ul>		Obj. 1 – Partially addressed by asking states with tiered reimbursement rates to describe observed effects of tiered rates on market rate surveys	X (effects of living wage and tiered reimbursement on child care prices)



Advisory Committee's Responses by Content Area	Members Who Articulated Ideas For this Content Area	Ability of Project to Address Ideas Raised by Advisory Committee	
		Where Ideas are Included in Objectives of This Project	Where Ideas are Outside of Current Project Scope

### Methods

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Weighting schemes – rules vary across states.</li> <li>▪ Methods for getting representative samples, better response rates, and carefully worded questions.</li> <li>▪ How to capture rates and how to use in rate setting?</li> <li>▪ Issues of methodology – some are not valid.</li> <li>▪ How does the data deal with cells with little or no data? Small numbers in some categories?</li> <li>▪ How does the survey deal with seasonality and privacy?</li> <li>▪ How are geographic areas selected? Income, density, other?</li> <li>▪ How are sampling and representational issues addressed?</li> <li>▪ Propensity to inflate repeated charges</li> </ul>	Laura Schrager, Kathy Modigliani, Mildred Warner	<p>Obj. 1 – Document survey methods of the states</p> <p>Obj. 2 – Assessing weighting, samples, ways to achieve better response rates, and question wording</p>	
--	--	---	--

### Other

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Relationship to wage survey. Look to other sectors for BLS wage survey method for setting prevailing wage.</li> </ul>	Erik Karolak	Obj. 3 – Liz Davis will look into BLS wage survey method for setting prevailing wage	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Survey process as experienced by providers</li> <li>▪ Experience of parents and providers regarding rates.</li> </ul>	Marsha Engquist, Erin Oldham, Erik Karolak		X

### **Comments on Areas of Interest Outside of Current Project Scope**

Not all areas of Advisory Committee interest are addressed in the study as currently designed and funded. Several of these areas appeared to be of high interest. In addition, concern was expressed that testing methodology (as proposed in Objective 2) in only one state may limit the ability to generalize findings to all states.

In response the Research Team is exploring the feasibility and estimated cost of:

1. Revising the study to use multiple methods in Minnesota as well as Oregon.
2. Include workforce descriptor questions in the Minnesota study to ensure that findings are not due to idiosyncrasies of a single state, and to estimate the cost of adding a provider survey to a market rate survey.
2. Extending the study of the relationship of the portion of the child care market whose prices are surveyed to the broader market captured in a statewide household survey to one or more other states that have recent household surveys (e.g., South Carolina, Maine).

Current funding is not adequate to fund either expansion of the current study. If Advisory Committee members believe it is important to attempt to do either or both, the Research Team is willing to look for funding and would welcome ideas of funders who would be interested in the question(s). We will be sending a short survey soon to get your thoughts.

**Table 2.** Methods for Survey of States, Territories, and Tribes

Elements	Description	Questions for Advisory Committee
<p>Study population</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sample criteria</li> <li>- Sample frame</li> <li>- Sample recruitment</li> <li>- Sample size</li> </ul>	<p><i>Sample criteria.</i> The person(s) in each state, territory and tribe with knowledge of: (a) organizational roles and policy related to market rate surveys, and (b) research practice and methodological problems and issues related to their market rate survey.</p> <p><i>Sample frame.</i> State and territory contact lists of Lead Agency staff have been obtained from the National Child Care Information Center (NCCIC) website. The Tribal Child Care Technical Assistance Center (TriTAC) has provided a contact list for all of the tribes.</p> <p><i>Sample recruitment.</i> Contact those from the sample frame and ask who they feel would be most knowledgeable person(s) in their state, territory, or tribe based on the sample criteria above. Obtain the target informant(s) contact information.</p> <p><i>Sample size.</i> All 50 states and the District of Columbia, 5 territories, and 267 tribes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ideas on efficient strategies for reaching Lead Agency staff? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Start with the state child care administrator</li> <li>- Carefully select the person doing the asking. It should be someone who understands the issues and with whom child care administrators feel comfortable</li> <li>- Indicate the intent to share results, indicate when they will be available, and follow through.</li> <li>- Ideas of sharing that will meet state administrator needs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Conference call of administrators after report is available, have copy of report on web for review</li> <li>▪ Presentation at SAM</li> <li>▪ 5 to 8 case studies – interesting information on what states are doing</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Frame overall study in a non-threatening way</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Suggestions on how to reach the appropriate target informant(s)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Send a copy of the survey questions in advance so the state administrators can indicate who are the best people to fill out the survey</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Survey questionnaires</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Focus</li> <li>- Variables and constructs</li> <li>- Design</li> </ul>	<p><i>Focus.</i> Two different survey questionnaires will be designed. One will focus on organizational roles and policy related to market rate surveys, and the other will focus on research practice and methodological problems and issues. In some cases, the same informant will fill out both surveys.</p> <p><i>Variables and constructs.</i> The survey questionnaires will be constructed from the constructs and variables refined and prioritized by the Advisory Committee.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recommendations or experiences with designing web surveys? What works, what does not work? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide mail version as well as Web-based version</li> <li>- Provide worksheet for them to fill out prior to getting on the web</li> <li>- Consider one survey with multiple sections rather than two separate surveys</li> <li>- Be sure that respondents can save their own responses and view them as they complete other sections</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p><i>Design.</i> Use of Dillman's<sup>1</sup> principles for constructing web surveys. A paper version of the survey will also be available for those who prefer not to complete the survey via the web.</p>	
<p>Data collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Administration</li> <li>- Confidentiality</li> <li>- Anonymity</li> </ul>	<p><i>Administration.</i> Web-based interactive technology will be used to administer the survey. The web survey will be accessible through a specific link created for this project. Dillman's (2000) elements for achieving high response rates will be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Targeted informants will receive a notice explaining the study and the goals of the survey a few days prior to being able to access the web survey.</li> <li>- A thank you card will be sent a week following the availability of the survey as a reminder to those who have not completed the questionnaire.</li> <li>- Another reminder will be sent to those who have not completed the survey.</li> <li>- A week or so after the last contact, a final contact by phone will be made.</li> </ul> <p><i>Confidentiality.</i> A respondent number and pin number will be required to access the web survey. The respondent number will be linked to the target informants contact information, in order to track who has completed the survey. The pin number will limit questionnaire access to target informants.</p> <p><i>Anonymity.</i> Respondents will be assured that their responses will not be connected to their specific state, territory, or tribe when analyzed and reported.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ideas for achieving high response rates? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use advisory committee project ambassadors; sharing their view of the value of the study with state administrators</li> <li>- Consistently use the same title to identify project</li> <li>- Warming up – make personal calls</li> <li>- Follow-up calls to get non-respondents and clarify information from respondents</li> <li>- Pre-survey Q &amp; A conference calls with those who are filling out the survey (at 2 different times) – assemble questions and responses and send to all state administrators</li> <li>- send 2-3 sentences that describe the project to the following groups so they are aware the survey is happening: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NCCIC staff in all regions</li> <li>• CCB staff and regional contacts</li> <li>• NACRRA</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ What are the tradeoffs between anonymity and identifying findings to a specific state, territory, or tribe? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fear of ranking</li> <li>- If some states are doing innovative methods it would be nice to know</li> <li>- Concern with comparing states – will depend on questions</li> <li>- Anonymity will undermine ability to include other place differences</li> <li>- Commit to giving states the opportunity to review for accuracy state descriptions developed from the survey</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Table 3.** Consolidation of Constructs and Variables in Survey of States, Territories, and Tribes

*Group A Participants* – Doug Baird, Ann Collins, Marsha Engquist, Erik Karolak, Lee Kreader, Laura Schrager, Nina Stanton

*Group B Participants* – Rick Brandon, Liz Davis, Cherie Kotilinek, Janet Marsh, Peggy Strain-O'Brien, Marsha Thompson

*Group C Participants* – Mark Anderson, Ivelisse Martinez-Beck, Davida McDonald, Erin Oldham, Dawn Ramsburg,

*Group D Participants* – Pauline Koch, Deborah Neill, Clara Pratt, Joyce Shortt

Functions	Variables/Questions	Priority by Groups				Notes
		A	B	C	D	
Administration of Market Rate Survey	Entity (state, territory, tribe)	A	A	A	A	All questions should clarify most recent or latest MRS
	Organizational affiliation	A	A	A	A	Repeat for other functions?
	Position/role in organization	A	A	A	A	Repeat for other functions?
	Years of experience with market rate	A	C	A	C	Repeat for other functions?
	Date of first market rate survey	C	C	B	C	Some of these questions may only be relevant to some data sources (survey versus administrative data)
	Date of most recent market rate survey and effective date of rates	A	A	A	A	
	Organization responsible for market rate survey	?	A	A	C	Lead Agency is by regulation responsible; Responsible in what way? Won't all be CCDF? Does this mean an in-house versus contract?
	Organizations involved in survey development and implementation	B	A	A	A	
	Organizational roles in survey development and implementation	B	A	A	B/C	
	Organization responsible for conducting survey	A	A	A	A	
	Organization responsible for analyzing survey	A	A	A	A	

Functions	Variables/Questions	Priority by Groups				Notes
		A	B	C	D	
Administration of Market Rate Survey (continued)	Is market rate survey done under state legislative mandate or administrative discretion? Are there state statutes pertaining to the MRS that affect the survey or rates?		B	A		
	Sources of guidance and/or technical assistance for doing market rate surveys / how did you learn about MRS methods and policies / have you consulted with other states	B	C	A		Not sure how you'd capture this? Publications by other states?
	Specific budgeted amount for MRS and estimated amount embedded in more general budget	C	C	C	A	Interested in general answers but not detailed; costs for whom?
	Cost categories and components	C	C	B	A	
	Amount spent for most recent survey	C	A	A	A	
	Cost effectiveness of survey			B/C		
	How believable, accurate, useful, feasible, and cost-effective do you perceive the last MRS to be?				A	
	Time allocated to collect and analyze data – time allocated by agency in planning/supervising MRS, data collection/entry, analysis/report	C	C	A	A	
	Is survey blended with other data collection efforts – what costs?; Purpose of data collection (MRS and other uses/purposes)		A			
	How were decisions about methods, policies and who collects information made?			A		
	How did key players interact throughout decision making process?			B		case study?
	Are providers, R&Rs, others involved in piloting/developing surveys			A		
	Did characteristics and capacity of providers' impact decisions?			C		case study?
	Does lead agency do survey or delegate or contract?					
	Professional qualifications/experience of those conducting survey and analysis?	A				
	Is market rate survey conducted at one point in time or constant update?					
	What do they do to ensure consistency overtime?					In sample and methodology
	Describe relationship with tribes within state					

Functions	Variables/Questions	Priority by Groups				Notes
		A	B	C	D	
Data Source (provider population)	Provider database(s) used/What are the data source(s)? How did you choose?	A	A	A	A	
	Population of children under age 13 – from census? Do you mean what is your states # + % of children under 13?				C	Aspect of market definition earlier? Don't ask, look up in census.
Sampling (market definition)	Working definition of the child care market – how much of cc universe do they think is covered? Types of care, by business type, by regulatory status, by payment source. What rationale is used for each?	A		A	A	
	Provider database(s) used – who's missing? which categories are excluded? who's included? Are subsidized providers omitted from sample? (licensed, licensed exempt, head start, state pre-k tribes, migrant care, no fee centers)	A		A	A	
	Provider type (types of care included in database, eg., school-age, part-day/part-week preschools, legally exempt); How do they construct sample for non-legal care?	A	A	A	A	
	Percent of provider population surveyed	A	A	A	A	
	Type of sample (random, stratified random, other) + size of sample	A	A	A	A	
	Number of providers and slots in database(s) used?	A	B	A	A	
	Geographic breakdown and identifier		A			
	Other breakdown/sampling frame		A			
	Providers with X% subsidized children					
	Sample or census?	A				
	Do you ask about vacancy rates?					
Survey Content	Descriptives of respondents and nonrespondents	A	B	A	C	
	Do they have unique provider IDs in the dataset		B			
	Provider option versus state defined (age + price reporting)					
	Converted rates, each mode, or actual reported					

Functions	Variables/Questions	Priority by Groups				Notes
		A	B	C	D	
Survey Content (continued)	Do they collect detailed data on services provided related to rates and other fees?					
	Do they collect quality measures and how are they used?					
	Rates collected by age categories, other fees, PT definitions, special needs, non-standard hours, type, mode, geo-code id, auspice, quality rating, workforce					
	Are these collected – rates, costs, revenues, characteristic of staff, structural quality measures, characteristics of kids (subsidized, low income), shift care, discounts					
	How do you collect rate data? (a) are rate categories presented to which providers respond? Or (b) do respondents tell you what they charge and you categorize? If (a) what categories used? If (b) how are conversions done to compare (if at all)?				A	
	Is the data collected at the slot level? Facility level?					
	Considering the last MRS your state did, how did the MRS capture or reflect FFN care, if at all?					
	Do you collect data on number of children served of licensed capacity (if collecting rate data by slot)					
	Do you ask for percent of children served who are funded through subsidy?					
	How is information collected from providers with high populations of subsidized children?			A		
	Do you ask whether provider accepts subsidies? Do you ask what share of payment is made by state? By parent via copay?			A		
	What type of “other provider” information is collected?			A		
	Do you account for monies providers receive through tiered quality rating systems in the survey?					
	Use of in-kind grants, other subsidies?					
	Consistency of terms as used in MRS, other sources such as regulations					
	Does state ask for difference (size of) between rate ceiling and provider rate?					



Functions	Variables/Questions	Priority by Groups				Notes
		A	B	C	D	
Data Collection	Representativeness of respondents to market / is provider population well represented?	A				Duplicative? Is this related to response rates? Who responds? These are all questions relevant to ask providers.
	Survey type (mail, telephone, R&R updates, other)	A	A	A	A	
	Frequency of survey / Any efforts at consistency over time?	A	A/B	A		
	Core questions every time + rotating module?					
	Number/percent valid respondents (in-business, active phone)	A	B	A	A	What is the meaning of valid?
	Response rate (number/percent completed surveys) / does state set a goal for response rate?	A	A	A		
	What does state do to increase response rate?		A			
	What incentives are used?			B		case study
	What type of letters are sent (ex: letter from child care administration to encourage participation)			B		
	Is MRS field tested?		C			
	Who is the responder?		B			
	Provider understanding of survey					
	Provider concerns about survey			B		Combine with question about how providers are involved in developing MRS.
	Required participation or voluntary?		B			
	Training or TA on how to respond?					
	Does collection of MRS data lead to standards, for example, for R&R data collection? Are there standards for the data collection?					

Functions	Variables/Questions	Priority by Groups				Notes
		A	B	C	D	
Data Analysis	Effect of maximum rates on prices			A		
	Sources of guidance for doing analysis		C			
	Geographic areas/statewide/other groups	A	A	A	A	
	How do you handle limited markets (e.g., rural – do you have a rule for dealing with minimum # respondents in each cell)	A				
	Age categories	A	A	A	A	
	Types of care categories	A	A	A	A	
	Modes of price reporting /other fees/non standard	A	A	A	A	
	Prices by 25 <sup>th</sup> , 50 <sup>th</sup> , and 75 <sup>th</sup> percentiles	A	A	A	A	
	Part- versus full-time (what hours define PT or FT)?	A	A	A	A	
	75 <sup>th</sup> percentile of what?		-			
	Analyses unique to state, territory, or tribe	A	B	A	A	
	Validity tests (link to other state data (licensing, parent survey))	A	B	A	A	Do you do any validity testing? Or checks on accuracy of MRS data? If so, what is done?
	Measure number/percent under subsidized maximum					
	Studying link between price and quality					
	Trends of rates in last 3 years					
	How are subsidized children/providers treated in survey results? Do you do analyses by subsidy/nonsubsidy?					
	Method for determining percent of market to which families with vouchers have access to market					
	Number of rate categories / subgroups of prices	A	A	A	A	
	Calculation of price by provider or slots (based on legal capacity, desired capacity, current enrollment)	A	A	A	A	
	Do you account for impact of subsidy payments on market rates?				A	
	Rate conversions – e.g., across hourly, daily, weekly rates: If done, how?	A	A	A	A	

Functions	Variables/Questions	Priority by Groups				Notes
		A	B	C	D	
Data Analysis (continued)	Is a correction factor used in conversion (so daily x 5 is not > weekly) (registration fees, activity fees, transportation fees)		A			
	Open ended question on methodological problems and issues			A		
	Impact of self reporting?					
	Did characteristics of providers and capacity of providers (computer literacy) influence choice of methods?					
Report and Dissemination	Method(s) of dissemination (printed report, web posting, other)	A		A	B	
	What happens with information? Is it shared with legislators? Who gets the results? Who is the target audience?			A		
	Who handles dissemination to providers?					
Rate Setting Policy	What agency is responsible for actually setting maximum payment rates	C/D	A	A	A	
	Relationship of survey findings to rate setting (voucher, contract) – to what extent did each of the factors listed below influence your states’ setting of rates? (Assign numbers corresponding to level of importance). Current state TANF rolls, current state dollars into child care, current federal dollars into child care, access issues, quality incentive issues, federal mandate to serve maximum number of children, other.	A	A	A	A	What other factors influence rate setting? Describe rate setting process.
	Maximum payment rate at what percentile of market rate	A		C		Available in other places, not-comparable data; how this is defined? Can we define these clearly?
	Number of (What are) payment rate categories and individual rates (e.g., age groups, type of care, geographic areas)	A	A	B		Duplicative – can get elsewhere; Can we define these clearly?
	Amount of state dollars above federal (political context)		A			

Functions	Variables/Questions	Priority by Groups				Notes
		A	B	C	D	
Rate Setting Policy (continued)	How is MRS used to set family, friend, neighbor payment rate? Considering the last MRS your state did, how did the MRS affect reimbursement rates for FFN care?		B			
	Can MRS reduce confusion in copays and differential pay					
	Relationship between MRS findings, rate ceiling and “effective rate”. Do you ask for information regarding fees, policies, these are real factors	A				
	Relationship of survey findings to other policies (state agencies, R&R, Professional Development, increase funding)			A		
	Are other fees / other rate data used to set rates? If so, how?					
	Are there exclusions when setting rates (such as homeless centers, private, tribal, recreational)?					