

2011 STAM – CCPRC Meeting
Plenary Session 4
November 17, 2011, 9:00-10:00 am

Welcome to the CCPRC Meeting and Preview of Cross-Cutting Child Care Research Design and Measurement Issues

Description

ACF leaders opened the session with opening remarks and a welcome to the CCPRC day. Across the major meeting themes—including subsidy policies and practices; quality frameworks; parents and families; and coordination, integration, and linkages—representatives from the Child Care Policy Research Consortium highlighted the key research design and measurement issues addressed in presentations, discussions, and problem-solving efforts throughout the meeting.

Facilitator

Karen Tvedt, Communications Management Center

Presenters

Amber Moodie-Dyer, Ohio State University
Roberta (Bobbie) Weber, Oregon State University
Michel Lahti, University of Southern Maine
Beth Rous, University of Kentucky
Margaret (Peg) Burchinal, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Scribe

Nina Chien, Child Trends

1. Documents in Session Folder

- None

2. Summary of Presentations

- **Summary of Welcome and Opening Remarks:** Ivelisse Martinez-Beck and Mary Bruce Webb (Director, Division of Child and Family Development, OPRE)
 - Ivelisse welcomed the group, saying that she is still reflecting on what she heard yesterday during the joint STAM-CCPRC day. While taking into account what we've heard from policy-makers and practitioners, today's sessions will focus primarily on child care research and measurement issues.
 - Mary Bruce Webb acknowledged the accomplishments of the CCPRC and the influence its research has had on initiatives such as the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Grants. She also recognized the research scholars and Ivelisse who has guided the CCPRC with vision and commitment.
- **Summary of Presentation #1:** Amber Moodie-Dyer
 - Amber served as co-chair of the Parent and Family Theme Group and represented it on the panel. While she highlighted two sessions in particular, she started by

- reflecting about how interconnected the issues we're dealing with are. The Parent and Family group focused on issues that relate to specific populations:
- Workshop D2 addresses child care decision-making among immigrant families. Among the findings to be discussed are parent and program characteristics associated with care choices, immigrant parents' concerns about child care, and how the decisions made by immigrant families compare with those of native-born families.
 - Workshop E2 looks at perspectives on family-provider relationships including current research on understanding and measuring these relationships and on the implications of this research for efforts to improve child care quality.
- **Summary of Presentation #2: Bobbie Weber**
 - Bobbie co-chaired the Subsidy Theme Group. Her reflections were as follows:
 - Mixed-methods designs are common now. For example, combining interview, administrative, and survey data in a single study.
 - We're moving toward consensus on measures across studies. For example, how does a study done in one State compare to other State studies? Methods strongly affect findings, so it would be great to move toward more comparability in methods.
 - Parent work schedules are important because they have strong impact on child care choices:
 - They *constrain* child care choices.
 - Raise measurement issues, for example, measurement of non-standard hours? Predictability of hours?
 - Low-wage workers often look like they have standard hours, but if you look deeper, you see many job disruptions.
 - Job changes often result in change in child care arrangement.
 - How long can parents continue to receive a subsidy after they lose a job? We're finding that job loss is related to short durations of subsidy receipt.
 - Trying to understand better how to ask parents about subsidy use in surveys, given that parents may not really understand subsidies.
 - Child and family well-being outcomes as relates to subsidy use.
 - What are parents' perceptions of subsidies? Mostly positive!
 - **Summary of Presentation #3: Michel Lahti**
 - Michel represented the Quality Theme Group and highlighted sessions on parent engagement with QRIS and QRIS validation.
 - What do we know about parent awareness or recognition of QRIS? Are they satisfied with services received?
 - Validation: does QRIS measure what they say they measure? Critical issues include what is the right time to implement a validation study; what are the differences between validation and evaluation studies; how much enrollment is enough to validate the components of QRIS; and what are some of the benefits and challenges of including the study of child and/or family-level outcomes in validating a QRIS?

- **Summary of Presentation #4:** Beth Rous
 - Beth co-chaired the Integration and Collaboration Theme Group. She highlighted the need to recognize:
 - Different contexts and different agencies, which can lead to different outcomes.
 - The importance of nomenclature: using the same words to mean the same things.
 - How do we measure “it?” How do we analyze “it?”
 - Transitions, because kids make so many transitions!

- **Summary of Presentation #5:** Peg Burchinal
 - Peg highlighted workshop D5, Methods for Examining the Associations Between Quality of Early Care and Education and Child Outcomes
 - There is evidence of thresholds in relationship between quality and child outcomes, but not completely consistent findings.
 - Findings suggest that program quality has to be at a sufficiently good level for quality to be related to child outcomes. That is, improving quality in poor quality programs probably will NOT improve child outcomes, UNTIL the program passes that threshold of quality. Improving quality at the higher end may be where you get results in terms of better child outcomes.