

2012 CCPRC Annual Meeting
Plenary Session 1
October 24, 2012, 8:30-9:15 a.m.

Opening and Welcome from ACF Leadership/Policy Context and Priorities

Description

Administration for Children and Families (ACF) leaders involved with early childhood development and child care policy-related research welcomed attendees, discussed Administration priorities in supporting low-income families and children, and challenged participants to think deeply about how the research findings, questions and methodologies discussed throughout the meeting can help shape the policies and research of the future.

Facilitator

Ivelisse Martinez-Beck, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE)

Presenters

Linda Smith, Deputy Assistant Secretary and Inter-Departmental Liaison for Early Childhood Development
Shannon Rudisill, Director, Office of Child Care (OCC)

Scribe

Meg Soli, Child Trends

1. Documents in Session Folder

None

2. Brief Summary of Presentations

- **Summary of Presentation #1:** Ivelisse Martinez-Beck
 - Ivelisse acknowledged the many people who contributed to planning this meeting: the CCRPC and its Steering Committee; ACF leadership including Linda Smith, Naomi Goldstein, Shannon Rudisill and Mary Bruce Webb; and the OPRE child care research team. She also thanked the organizations that support the work of OPRE and the CCPRC including Child Trends, Research Connections and BLH Technologies. In addition, she provided an overview of meeting logistics and introduced Linda Smith.
- **Summary of Presentation #2:** Linda Smith
 - Linda started her presentation by discussing the importance of talking about child care in the context of other investments and initiatives and reauthorization of CCDF as an opportunity to address quality.
 - Questions she is hearing include: how are we improving the quality of care for children who need it the most? What are the impacts of what we are doing on children, providers and parents?

- *Workforce* is the single biggest thing that impacts school readiness. What are we doing to ensure that we making changes in the classroom to impact children’s learning; what is the minimum amount of training the entry level the workforce needs; what matters in terms of the management of the programs; what is the continuum we need to create with QRIS and professional development systems? What do we know and what is working?
- *Financing*: how much money does it take to make a difference? What are the effects of the flat line of money over the past decade and squeezed reimbursement rates?
- *Alignment of programs*: Head Start, home visiting, preK, child care, etc. need to be communicating and using the same terms. ACF is working on alignment in monitoring; what is the minimum we need in all programs, e.g., how many inspections are enough, and how do we move the needle? We need current research on monitoring; we need to learn from things that are going on. Where can we use administrative data and partnerships to get timely answers to questions about monitoring and other issues?
- **Summary of Presentation #3: Shannon Rudisill**
 - Shannon introduced the OCC’s new Deputy Director, Calvin Moore. Calvin brings background in family child care and Head Start.
 - Shannon talked about the need to move forward simultaneously on systems change and interventions, i.e., what is directly happening in classrooms. She noted that child care tends to think in terms of systems and Head Start at the program or classroom level. We can benefit from both perspectives.
 - We have been lucky in getting our agenda into the President’s budget with Race to the Top and Head Start funding. However, we don’t know what makes the biggest difference; how much money do we need; how would we measure it in terms of realities for teachers, families and children?
 - We spend a billion dollars on quality. If we got this money now, would we do the same thing? How much could we promise? A GAO Report on Early Childhood Professional Development found that with 37 States responding, States spent 1.4 billion dollars on professional development: 60 percent or more was spent on training, coaching, and technical assistance; 20 percent on scholarships; and 5 percent on wages and benefits. Are we spending too much on training and not enough on retention? What can we learn from other fields, e.g., about adult behavior change?

3. Brief Summary of Discussion

- Ivelisse commented that many ACF funded projects cut across programs and indicated her hope that these projects will result in more conversation, shared findings and synergy across Head Start and child care.

4. Summary of Key Issues Raised by ACF Leadership

- We need to be thinking about child care in the context of other investments and initiatives including CCDF reauthorization; child care, Head Start, home visiting and preK need to be communicating and using the same terms; what about alignment on monitoring?

- What are we doing to make changes in the classroom to impact children's learning? We need to be moving forward simultaneously on systems change and interventions. How are we improving the quality of care for the children who need it most?
- What is the minimum amount of training the entry level workforce needs? What matters in the management of programs? What do we know and what is working?
- How much money does it take to make a difference and what makes the biggest difference? How much money do we need and how would we measure effectiveness in terms of the reality for teachers, families and children? Are we spending too much on PD training and not enough on retention?
- When can we use administrative data and partnerships to get timely answers about monitoring and other issues?