

**Upacking Process Quality:
Developing the Child Care Assessment Tool for Relatives (CCAT-R)
- Toni Porter, Bank Street College**

Background

- Long-standing interest in care provided by relatives (and other home-based caregivers exempt from regulation/licensing requirements)
- Consensus from child care researchers and practitioners about need for special instrument for this type of care

Process

- Focus groups with relative and non-relative caregivers to elicit their views on quality they provide (see *Doting on Kids* poster)
- Identification of themes—individual attention, love stuff, activities, cg-parent relationships
- Development of constructs that emerge from themes
- Feedback from researchers and practitioners
- New view of quality: children experience child care in a variety of settings; don't have to have same experiences in each setting; cumulative measure of what children experience; some essential elements in every setting; others need only be present in some settings

Rationale

- Intended for relative care: to evaluate quality and assess cg needs
- Include essential elements: nurturing/attachment; sensitivity/responsiveness; language stimulation; opportunities for exploration stimulation; opportunities for fine/gross motor development; adequate supervision; discipline; safe environment
- Emphasis on cg-child interactions; include cg-parent because relationship between cg-parent and cg-child distinctive feature of relative care
- Uncouple materials from quality: grounded in two assumptions: present in some settings; don't know what is appropriate quantity and variety e.g. 1 vs. 10 books, potatoes vs. puzzles
- Work in progress

Process

- Work with Mathematica (more experience developing instruments)
- Review existing measures for constructs (with permission)
- Modify language for settings e.g. cg vs. teacher; classroom v. home
- Include measures for cg-parent
- Safety measures: practical and culture-free: based on common knowledge (Today show and K-Mart standard) as well as significant danger of harm (death within an hour) rather than middle class assumptions

Method

- Time-sampling (Action/Communication Snapshot): more fine-grained; capture degree and type of interactions (language, interactions)
- Context and other measures (Behavior Checklist): setting; child activity e.g. sleeping; fine motor; cg activity e.g. support for cognitive development; nurturing; supervision; and discipline
- Cg interview: attitudes towards child care, child and parent; understanding of child; scaffolding,
- Health and safety checklist: redflag items;
- Materials checklist: availability and variety, not quantity

Experience in Field Test: Measures

- Issues w/ global: lack of specificity: e.g. informal use of language: some vs. much? e.g. cg listens, asks questions: once vs. more often; e.g. helping children reason: some materials present v. variety of games

- Issues w/ global: materials conflated with interactions: e.g. helping children use language: some materials vs. many materials: some v. many? Materials limited to exclusive list
- Issues w/global: quantified minimum interactions and limited definitions of activities: e.g. helping children use language: at least two activities; e.g. helping children reason: at least one nature/ science activity a week
- Issues w/ global: rating: can have two items at higher level but can't score because don't have all the previous ones: e.g. tone: show kindness and respect; praises children (7) but must have physical contact and seem relaxed; discipline: negative mixed with positive: e.g. never uses physical punishment (3)

Experience in Field Test: Methods

- FDCRS tone/discipline for all children; CCAT-R focus child
- FDCRS: Must ask what don't see
- FDCRS: Over what period?
- Observer effect in home: clean-up (maybe put toys away?); maybe less language and less nurturing because stranger present;
- Length of observation: invading privacy