

2011 STAM – CCPRC Meeting
Plenary Session 6
November 17, 2011, 3:45-4:30 pm

What We Have Learned and Emerging Issues

Description

Child Care Policy Research Consortium (CCPRC) members briefly reflected on the key findings and issues addressed during the meeting and shared their thoughts about the implications of these findings. Administration for Children and Families (ACF) leaders closed the meeting with their reflections about what we have learned and how this highlights the importance of using research to inform policy and practice, especially in challenging times.

Facilitator

Ivelisse Martinez-Beck, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation

Presenters

Toni Porter, Bank Street College of Education
Julia Henly, University of Chicago
Beth Meloy, Georgetown University
Richard (Rick) Brandon, RNB Consulting

Reflections and Next Steps from ACF Leaders

Shannon Rudisill, Office of Child Care
Naomi Goldstein, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Mark Greenberg, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, ACF

Scribe

Sarah LeMoine, National Center on Child Care Professional Development Systems and Workforce Initiatives

1. Documents in Session Folder

- None

2. Summary of Presentations

- **Summary of Presentation #1:** Toni Porter
 - Speaking from the perspective of the Parents and Family Theme Group: Historically we have viewed parents as part of the system, and focused on supporting outcomes related to work and child development. Taking a page from Head Start, we are moving toward a deeper, more nuanced view of how to support parents including helping low-income parents access high-quality care. This includes reducing barriers to quality services for families using subsidies. We are moving toward viewing parents as partners and need to know more about how parents and providers think and feel.

- **Summary of Presentation #2: Julia Henly**
 - Julia presented for the Subsidy Policies and Practices Theme Group and indicated that we now have a better understanding of the trade-offs policy-makers face as well as the information that should help them in making tough decisions. Subsidy-related issues that were highlighted during the meeting included: implications of multiple systems for subsidy policy (prek, Head Start, Child Welfare etc.); variations in State context and the need to take this into consideration in research; understanding the perceptions of parents; State specific issues around stability and instability of care; mediating pathways between subsidy receipt and outcomes (including questions around child well-being); and the importance of building consensus on best practices for measuring subsidy outcomes.

- **Summary of Presentation #3: Beth Meloy**
 - As a Child Care Research Scholar and co-chair of the Collaborations, Coordination, and Linkages Theme Group, Beth indicated her appreciation that speakers throughout the meeting acknowledged the importance of treating children in comprehensive ways. She noted a number of challenges to collaboration including: definitions; difficulties in applying a common set of constructs across multiple services; data linkages; and how to most effectively and efficiently improve outcomes. While there are multiple challenges, Beth indicated that this is a critical time to capitalize on opportunities that exist.

- **Summary of Presentation #4: Rick Brandon**
 - Rick represented the Quality Theme Group indicating that he agrees that conversations within the CCPRC have become deeper and more complex. Among promising directions are: studies that are examining the shape of the curve and thresholds in the relationship between quality and outcomes; quality being examined in a differentiated way across groups including immigrants and English language learners; consideration of workforce supports including technical assistance and compensation in the context of QRIS and efforts to better understand patterns of quality; integrated data systems across education and human services departments; and Federal agencies coming together to support studies (for example, the National Survey of Early Care and Education). He ended by making a case for better definitions of the occupational categories that relate to the ECE workforce; this would give us opportunities for insight about the workforce on an annual basis

- **Summary of Presentation #5: Shannon Rudisill**
 - On behalf of the Office of Child Care (OCC), Shannon shared her thoughts and insights from the meeting:
 - Recognizing that linking quality and subsidy is a priority for OCC, Shannon indicated her appreciation for CCPRC's work in this area. This is a new direction and adjustments will likely be required along the way. CCPRC's work will be helpful in this regard.
 - In the area of school readiness and child care, OCC is interested in exploring more about school readiness connections such as is illustrated by the Chicago Community Partners example.

- Some people still think about QRIS as an intervention as opposed to a way of organizing interventions. Research seems to be in tune with OCC...and the notion that as a way of organizing interventions, we can ask “what part works” and do fine-tuning of QRIS based on validation and evaluation efforts.
 - Shannon noted that throughout the meeting, administrators noted that research tools (such as logic models and implementation science) have potential to help them in their day-to-day management of programs.
 - We need to help States better understand the potential administrative data has to support management purposes (such as understanding continuity of care and encouraging States to promote longer access for children in higher quality care).
 - The RTT-ELC applications/process has been helpful in supporting integration efforts; OPRE and the Office of Head Start are working together to develop an infant-toddler observation tool that will be appropriate for classrooms and home-based care.
 - Future: some of the issues being raised in QRIS (e.g., around use of the CLASS) overlap with issues being considered by Head Start researchers. Need to strengthen collaboration between child care and Head Start researchers.
 - Finally, Shannon urged that we consider repeating some sessions (so that participants don’t have to make hard choices between sessions of interest).
- **Summary of Presentation #6: Naomi Goldstein**
 - Naomi noted that convergence is occurring in a number of areas including interest in implementation science. This is viewed as a way to strengthen results in early childhood and other areas. She noted three other projects where there will be results related to implementation: home visiting, the Head Start study around promoting social-emotional development, and the health professions study.
 - She also noted that we need to be thinking about how we can better use new technologies including social media in our dissemination of information, management of subsidies and communications with parents.
- **Summary of Presentation #7: Mark Greenberg**
 - This is a very evidence-based Administration, with research guiding and informing policy and policy informing research. In this regard, CCPRC is a model.
 - Collaboration is also an important theme. We need a cross-program focus on broader goals that allows us to learn from each other and emerge with “comprehensive, coordinated approaches” for serving children and families.
 - Programs too often operate in silos. ACF strongly supports and encourages States to look at intersections across programs including child welfare, child care, child support, asset policy, etc.
 - Data is an important part of collaboration and linking across systems.
 - In our research efforts, there is an ongoing tension and need to strike a balance between larger research projects versus immediate information that States need. We welcome your feedback in this regard.

3. Summary of Discussion with Presenters and Participants

- Shannon Christian raised a question about challenges in local coordination and how even greater visibility/clarity for families can be helpful. Mark Greenberg indicated ACF’s

interest in such efforts and suggested that often there is more flexibility across programs than States think. ACF would be happy to bring people together to work with States on this. Additionally, Mark indicated that there will be opportunities for systems-building under the Affordable Care Act that will make it easier to connect health with human services.