

# **Collaboration in Early Care and Education: Establishing a Framework for a Research Agenda *Logic Model***

Child Care Policy Research Consortium Annual  
Meeting  
October 21-22, 2010

Darrin Hicks, University of Denver  
Barbara Smith, University of Colorado Denver  
Jessica E. Sowa, University of Colorado Denver

# Design of the Logic Model

- Intended for general use for state-level collaborations
  - Can be tailored for different program designs and goals
- Addresses the process of collaboration, with process variables being both activities and outcomes
- Includes multiple levels of analysis

# Logic Model-Underlying Assumptions

- This logic model is a theory of change model (drawing on the Kellogg Foundation logic model types)
- Built on the following assumptions:
  - Actors involved at state level are the policy level actors—referred to as participants
  - When examining how the inputs into the collaboration are converted into a process; concerned with the quality of the process
  - Context matters—need to assess the environment in which these collaborations are being implemented

**A: Inputs to Collaboration**

**B: Process Components**

**C: Collaborative Outcomes-  
State Level**

**D: Collaborative  
Outcomes-Service Level**

**E: Collaborative Outcomes-  
Family and Child Level**

Stakeholder Inputs-  
Organizational time and resource commitment to the collaboration; sending a powerful agent (see definition); level of commitment to the collaborative mission (e.g. buy-in, ownership, stewardship)

Design Components-correct number and representation of stakeholders, clear decision-making rules, delineated roles and responsibilities, including such roles as manager to provide administrative support, facilitator, and entrepreneur who is championing the collaborative effort, clear meeting design, and explicated purpose for the collaboration

(See definition sheet)

- Norms
- Inclusion
- Authenticity
- Equality
- Problem Focus
- Support
- Identification
- Facilitation
- Generative Purpose

- Changes to understandings of the policy problem— policy learning, shared problem definitions
- Reduction of fragmentation
- Improved relationships and trust between the stakeholders
- Increased collaborative activity-for stakeholders and for the policy field
- Increased adaptive capacity for stakeholders
- Access to new resources— for stakeholders and for the policy field
- Increased political will
- Explicit goals of the collaboration achieved
- Changes to stakeholder organizations

- Shared professional knowledge in the field
- Improved quality of services provided, including higher quality staff
- Improved consistency in care delivery
- Improved care infrastructure in a community—more and higher quality providers
- Better communication with the state level; establishment of a feedback loop from service delivery level

- Improved outcomes for children—better status re service, improved child well-being
- Improved outcomes for families-stability, improved family well-being
- Improved ability to track outcomes for children and families

Moderators of Collaboration (See Definition Sheet)



# Inputs to Collaboration

- Internal Design Features
  - Stakeholder inputs
    - What each stakeholder need to contribute in order to design a quality process of collaboration
  - Design components
    - Number of stakeholders
    - Roles and responsibilities
    - Decision-making process

# Process Components

- The generative design features that arise through the operation of the collaboration
  - Norms
  - Inclusion
  - Authenticity
  - Equality
  - Problem focus
  - Support
  - Identification
  - Facilitation
  - Generative purpose

# Collaborative Outcomes—State Level

- These outcomes will be geared toward the particular purpose of the collaborative effort
- Could include such measures as:
  - Changes to understandings of the policy problem
  - Reduction of fragmentation in the system
  - Improved trust and relationships among stakeholders
  - Increased adaptive capacity
  - Access to new resources
  - Changes to stakeholder organizations
  - Accomplishment of the explicit goals of the collaboration

# Collaborative Outcomes-Service Level

- The service level will depend on the policy area—could be county or city level
- Need to consider where to measure or bound the community
- Could include such outcomes as:
  - Shared problem definitions, shared goals, and shared outcomes for set of services
  - Improved service coordination
  - Increased supply of quality providers
  - Fewer families and children not being served



# Collaborative Outcomes—Child and Family Level

- How these are measured will depend on the particular set of services
- Includes such outcomes as:
  - Improved outcomes for children—changes in well-being
  - Improved outcomes for families—changes in well-being, stability
  - Improved ability to track outcomes for families and children

# Issues to Consider

- Examples of how this would work in practice
- Designed for research, but could be tailored for evaluation purposes
- Could unpack the different components (A, B, C, D, and E) depending on the type of evaluation or the research question being explored
- Still a work in progress—needs to be applied to fully explicate the connections between the components

# For copy of presentation:

- Please email:
- Jessica Sowa, School of Public Affairs,  
University of Colorado Denver  
– [jessica.sowa@ucdenver.edu](mailto:jessica.sowa@ucdenver.edu)
- Thank you to the Child Care Policy Research Consortium