

2012 CCPRC Annual Meeting  
Plenary Session 3  
October 24, 2013, 1:45-2:30 p.m.

## **Post-Data Collection Updates from the National Survey of Early Care and Education**

### **Description**

This session provided an update on the status of the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE), which includes surveys of a nationally representative sample of households, providers (center-based, home-based and informal home-based care), and staff assigned to center classrooms across the country. The project is documenting current use and availability of early care and education (ECE) to permit better understanding of how well families' needs and preferences coordinate with providers' offerings and constraints.

### **Facilitator**

Ivelisse Martinez-Beck, OPRE

### **Presenters**

Robert Goerge, University of Chicago

Lisa Gennetian, National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER)

### **Scribe**

Sam Goldhagen, Child Trends

### **1. Documents in Session Folder**

- “National Survey of Early Care and Education—CCPRC Presentation, October 24, 2012;” Rupa Datta and Lisa Gennetian

### **2. Brief Summary of Presentations**

- **Summary of Presentation #1:** Robert Goerge
  - The context for the study includes increased public and policy interest in early care and education (ECE).
  - Overview/Definitions: NSECE includes four surveys (households with children under age 13, home-based providers, center-based providers, and classroom staff working in centers). The main topics being addressed include: availability of ECE for young children (including preK and Head Start); preferences for, needs and usage of ECE/school-age care among households; and a description of the workforce in home-based care and center classrooms.
  - Shared ECE Communities: child care use is highly localized but varies by demographic characteristics, provider type, and geography. Little is known about how parents define the geographic boundaries of their search areas.
  - Opportunities for Policy Research: NSECE will provide opportunities for an endless amount of analyses with these data. It will profile parental needs and preferences and document the availability of providers at community level. The data set is ready to be

- linked with policy-relevant databases such as census, CCDF, licensing regulations, etc. It should expand understanding of children's (and family) experiences.
- Case Counts: the study includes nationally-representative samples in all 50 States and DC—755 clusters (500 of which are low income) and 11,600 households with children.
  - Design: address-based sampling was used with multi-mode data collection and oversamples of low-income families.
  - Challenges in documenting providers: no single data source of ECE supply exists across public and private sectors.
    - The NSECE includes family, friend, and neighbor (FFN) care and nannies providing regular care; the researchers used address-based sampling design for the demand survey and included a screener for home-based providers, defined as “anyone caring for children other than their own in a home-based setting at least 5 hours per week.” A customized approach was used for unintentional providers or others who do not self-identify as providing child care.
- **Summary of Presentation #2: Lisa Gennetian**
    - The household was the unit of analysis with data collected on all children in the household (under age 13). The study provides a first opportunity to look nationally at the spectrum of child care use across siblings, age-spacing, and socio-economic status. It can help us answer questions about where and to whom our programs are targeted.
    - Data was collected on what each child was doing in 15 minute increments for one week. This gives us the ability to look at incremental quantification of time in care, by type, and timing of coverage for parental employment and to respond to questions such as are certain employment schedules and child care use associated with take-up of child care subsidies or other types of subsidized early care programs?
    - Parental Search Preferences include parent reports of what they considered during their search and factors that constrict choices.
    - Examples of key topics include: public investment and use of public dollars for early and out of school care, use and availability of school-age care, predictors and perceptions of child care quality, availability of care for low income and high poverty, and the extent to which FFN care is used in response to availability and affordability.
    - The study should also help in answering questions about public support for ECE, e.g., parent self report on receipt of public programs and do programs blend some funding sources more than others?
    - It will also provide insights about school-age care, e.g., the types of arrangements parents are choosing and does this differ for low-income families?
    - The study does not include objective indicators of quality, but it does include provider side quality predictors such as staff qualifications and PD and participation in quality regulation. This may be the first time we can patch together different aspects of child care as relates to quality at the provider, classroom, program and community levels.
    - Findings are not yet available, but interim findings expected in the Fall of 2013.

### **3. Brief Summary of Discussion/Q&A**

- Parental perceptions of care were collected by type of setting as opposed to other factors, e.g., licensing and accreditation (parents typically don't have good information about these things).
  - The study does have predictors of quality from the supply side including QRIS participation, professional development, ratios and inspections (Ann Witte).
  - Nikki Forry: ideally, we would have been able to observe quality in facilities, but given that we were unable to do so, we settled for correlates of quality including training, family-provider relations, curricula, and special needs.
  - Marty Zaslow: our language was careful i.e., "predictors of quality." These were based on a review of the literature.
  - Bobbie Weber: while we would have liked on-site observations, we had to take the middle ground, which was to use indicators based on the literature (which allows us to say some things but not others).
  - Rick Brandon: as relates to the ECE workforce, we were able to survey individuals across types of care on aspects such as attitudes and stress. This will allow comparisons at the individual level.
- Gina Adams: how does the study deal with subsidy use from the perspective of parents and providers?
  - Bob Goerge: we assumed that parents could not identify funding sources and will rely on a combination of items to examine subsidy use. While this part of the study is not funded at this point, we will be able to link NSECE data with administrative data and already have informed consent to do so.
  - Ann Witte: the study uses a probabilistic approach to the issue of subsidies.

### **4. Summary of Key Issues Raised**

- There has been no nationally-representative study of all sectors of the ECE workforce. (Many data sources exclude home-based providers and almost all exclude informal providers.)
  - These data will be useful in thinking about professional development, reducing staff turnover, and understanding challenges to increasing supply of high quality programs.
  - The study will also provide a first opportunity to look nationally at spectrum of child care use across siblings, age-spacing, and socio-economic status. It can help us answer questions about where and to whom our programs are targeted.
- Core workforce data items include: qualifications and professional development; attitudes toward child development and caregiving; and activities with children.
- The study breaks new ground in survey methodologies including using quality predictors and multiple items to estimate subsidy use through probabilistic methods.
- With nationally-representative data about households and ECE (both programs and individual staff), this study will afford tremendous opportunities for secondary data analysis including studies involving linkages with administrative data.