

**Child Care Policy Research Consortium Annual Meeting  
Renaissance Washington, D.C. Hotel  
April 13–16, 2004**

**SESSION 10**

**What are the issues and next steps for developing common definitions and measuring professional development, training, and experience in formal education of the early care and education workforce?**

*This discussion session will report on, and continue the conversation about, issues raised during a recent meeting on the same topic hosted by the Child Care Bureau and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE). Major questions included: Can we develop some common definitions taking into account the perspectives from research, policy and practice? Do we have evidence from our own or others' research on which definitions and categories have more explanatory power in our analyses? In developing categories/definitions that could be used across diverse data collection efforts, which units of analyses are most relevant to use (content of training, intensity of training, motivation for training, etc.)?*

Discussants: Marty Zaslow, Child Trends  
Bobbie Weber, Oregon State University  
Linda Smith, National Association of Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies (NACCRRA)  
Rick Brandon, University of Washington  
Cathy Feild, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Scribes: Deanna Schexnayder, University of Texas  
Tracy Cooley, University of Southern Maine

**Rick Brandon Presentation: *Child Care Workforce Data: Issues, and Opportunities at National and State Levels***

Defining the “it”: An occupation? Or child care sector? Who are the child care workers? (Conceptual issues discussed)

Three approaches: pros and cons for estimating totals

- General population
- Surveys of providers, administrative data, demand-based estimates

Second phase: looked at State data sources  
Lessons about data adequacy

Opportunities for better national and State ECE workforce

- Common core: NCEES, successful use of data
- ECE could replicate this model

**Cathy Field Presentation: *Defining and Measuring Professional Development in EC Research***

- Measures
- Only used “lead teacher” in various settings, 50 or more teachers. Components of Professional Development
- Education within formal system
- Training outside formal system
- Credential certificates and licenses
  - Training definition—difficult to get consensus on
  - Credential—confusing definitions: generic vs. CDA credential

**Bobbie Weber Presentation: *Families and Subsidy: Overview of Consortium Research on Families and Subsidy***

States trying to use:

- Administrative data to understand the child care workforce
- All the data capacity grantees are looking at this administrative data set

Definitional issues: broadly defined: teaching staff only, family child care, exempt providers – what to do with them?

Providers in subsidy system:

- In-home caregivers: little data
- Continuum from grandma to professional provider (no State has a database with all of the continuum from grandma to professional provider)

Population surveys: Oregon added

- Does an adult over 18 care for children for pay?
- Got data: 1 in 2 households has an adult over 18 for pay caring for 1–2 children

Keep using difficult data sources gives you only....?

- Capacity grants States—looking at the use of criminal record identifier/number and the legal concerns

Looking at trying to get unduplicated counts:

- Professional registries hold promise with all the information they hold
- Have to create a registry of outreach for people to move into the system and move forward
- USDA ID numbers, all over the board

Head Start: Can data be shared? Some say yes, others question the data

Estimating the child care workforce in Oregon, 3 ways:

- 14,000 employed in teaching positions
- 41,000 have criminal record checks...will keep working on this
- Have merged some data, with some results
- What if we had same ID? Could have some strategies to work through this problem

Issues:

- Common core: great idea
- State level: human relations/willing to change the way data is collected; as a volunteer participant
- Reducing fear, creating shared vision; this has happened with R&Rs

*State of Cross-State Definitional Concerns*

- Definitions are in rules/law; hard to change
- Counting varies State to State, i.e., household income: in TANF or child support?
- Sharing common identifiers: legal and ethical concerns (social security numbers, concerns about privacy)

Group discussion about professional organizations—in child care, they're not there yet

### **Linda Smith Presentation**

Talked about her experience with building a military child care system and relating it to the national system.

- Differences between training and education – what do we mean by those
- Difference in training agenda – no intentionality of the system; child care workers taking same over and over
- Need to look at the R&R community-based training and begin to put a structure around this community-based training; move from high school diploma to an AA degree and beyond
- Models to look at: military, Head Start

How can R&Rs help and move the field forward?

- Training infrastructure needs to be developed
- More than registry of hours
- Trainers providing training and their qualifications
- Link to CEUs needed
- Cannot do this in isolation without managerial support
- An advocate for training for all vs. pull out staff to go to a training

Taking on issue of data sharing and the R&R system:

- NACCRRRA ware—new reporting tool to link up to R&R for local needs; by end of year 2004, early 2005

**Group Discussion/Q&A**

- Question: Connecticut starting to convert to NACCRRA ware and give us a provider database. Have a registry—do it by paper files vs. automate it; so few records not worth it as a database. Is there a way to use a provider database on an individual level as an add-on and once a year survey that workforce as a data link—or more fields? *Answer:* NACRRRA is looking at this. Not developed yet; based on individuals concept in place.
- Question: Can this be a requirement to be part of registry for everyone (Massachusetts model)? *Answer:* Based on individual who moves around vs. the program
- Comment: Still don't know who the workforce is.
- Question: What are the categories so there is mobility from State to State?
- High level of consensus of CDA core knowledge now; need to create a consensus process on this
- Minnesota wants to do a CCR integrated database; putting an RFP out to link NACCRRA ware, TEACH, training registry and building a provider/training database
- Core competencies: look at Grow Smart—could be the impetus for States. Maryland has done good work with schools.
- Discussion about National Cooperative Extension:
  - Challenged to track trainings for State to national levels
  - All trainers required to pick a main subject and two other levels
  - Standardized scanned forms for trainees with identifier/ID number
  - State moderator looks at this database and can use this tool; may be useful model for ECC
- Linda Smith noted that with military, they kept it simple; five levels of definitions, five steps; simple is sometimes better
- Connecticut has all the pieces of a developmental system (not funding): clear ladder, 180-hour training system; with core knowledge, registry approval board; still don't know who they are.
- Need to operationalize these components. Is the 10 hours in one State the same as another State?
- Question asked of Rick Brandon: Who is working on the 2010 Census definitions and counting? *Answer:* His Senate experience was trying to change a piece of the Census and found it very challenging
- Suggestion: Get to one of the focus groups at Department of Commerce with Child Care Bureau (and Dept. of Labor, for Census)
- Need to have a conversation about what is in the middle
- Have to get at the population who will not sign up on a registry; with a market rate requirement, ask additional data on the workforce (e.g., South Carolina: combine market rate survey and licensing and build a common database, and a site visit is included when getting the information).