

Counting and Characterizing the ECE Workforce: Center-Based

Richard N. Brandon

Lekha Venkataraman, NORC



at the UNIVERSITY of CHICAGO



National Survey of Early Care & Education

MOTIVATIONS FOR WORKFORCE COMPONENT OF NSECE



National Survey of **Early Care & Education**

Primary Objectives for Workforce Data

- Provide first complete, nationally representative sample of entire ECE workforce and caregiving population: center/home-based; formal vs. FFN providers, including nannies (prior presn).
- Examine workers/caregivers in context of workplace and community.
- Include items predictive of observed quality.



Examine Workers in Context

- Individual WF sample from selected classrooms allows linkage of individual R's to organizational characteristics collected from Directors.
- Age of children responsible for.
- Representative geographic sample (low-income oversample) allows linkage to demographic, workforce and price-availability data.



Include Items Linked to Observed Quality

- *Qualifications*: education, age, experience, ECE certification, compensation.
- *Attitudes and orientations*: Modernity Scale; stress, depression, professional identification and motivation scales.
- *Leadership and Morale*. Turnover.
- *Professional development/training* support and participation.
- *Activities*: use of curriculum, planning, structure, screen time, vigorous physical.



SAMPLING AND DATA COLLECTION ISSUES IN THE WORKFORCE SURVEY



National Survey of **Early Care & Education**

Center-based Workers

- Random age group chosen from CB questionnaire
- Random classroom from selected age group chosen.
- Roster of classroom staff collected
- Only classroom/group-assigned (non-specialist) staff were eligible for the center-based workforce component



Spawning a WF Provider Respondent

- Roster of staff members who work in selected classroom
 - Name
 - Job Title
 - Hours worked
- Questionnaire is programmed to pick WF R from all eligible classroom staff
- Probability of selection was higher for those who worked more hours in the classroom.



Data Collection Modes

- Web
- With field interviewer (in-person or over the phone)
- Self administered questionnaire (SAQ)



Eligible WF Respondents

- ~8,200 completed Center based questionnaires.
- ~84% spawned a “workable” WF case
- ~10% of questionnaires did not provide sufficient information to spawn a WF case (insufficient or bad classroom or staff information)



Issues in Spawning

- Issue

- CB director respondents very protective of staff
- Wouldn't provide classroom staff names
- Approximately 700 cases provided inadequate information to spawn
- No bias found in which centers or staff types didn't spawn

- Resolution

- Informed CB respondent of the WF survey early on
- Allowed them to use initials, job titles, etc.
- Ability to follow up with CB R to determine who was selected
- Utilized demographic info to determine who selected staff was



Issues in Spawning (continued)

- Issue

- Mobility of staff
- Selected staff members were no longer at the provider location
- Approximately 140 cases required NORC to select a new WF R

- Resolution

- Field Interviewers notified central office of cases where the selected worker was no longer at location
- NORC randomly selected a new staff member from roster collected in quex
- Contacted CB R to obtain new roster for selection



Gaining Cooperation

- Workers were contacted in batches as their associated CB interview was completed.
- Five batches total
- Initial letter, follow-up postcard, self-administered paper questionnaire (SAQ)



General Response Findings

- Staff were actually very cooperative once selected.
- ~80% interview completion rates among eligible WF cases
 - ~49% of cases completed via Web
 - ~48% of cases completed with a field interviewer
 - ~3% completed via SAQ



IMPLICATIONS FOR ANALYSIS OF WORKFORCE DATA



National Survey of **Early Care & Education**

Best Estimate of # ECE WF, Unpaid Caregivers

- Limitations of Federal Labor Statistics (see NAS report); required demand-based estimates (Brandon & Whitebook)
- Representative sampling and questions reflecting federal workforce concepts allows an estimation of number of ECE workers, including by age of child and type of setting.
- Home-based include but distinguish unpaid caregivers.



Comparing Workforce Sub-groups

- See if *different components* (CB, FCC, FFN) of the WF vary with regard to predictors of quality.
- *Distinguish sub-groups of staff* who may vary: high/low SES; large/small programs; auspices; high/low price; related/unrelated; caregiver home (FCC) vs. child home (nannies).
- *Sub-group analyses may be limited* by sample sizes.



Examining WF in Context

- Compare staff serving low-income or high-minority communities, urban/rural, high/low percentages of subsidized, ELL or special-needs children, on wide range of characteristics.
- Examine relation of staff characteristics to center leadership, compensation, prices, subsidies, auspices funding sources.



Limitations for Analysis

- Staff data not appropriate to understand quality of individual centers .
- Partial Sample of SAC staff for Center-based. Both ECE and SAC for home-based; but only centers providing ECE in sample; get SAC if both ages.



Discussion



Extra Slides



Logic Model for NSECE Workforce Data

