NSECE Guest Webinar:
Using the 2012 NSECE to Learn about ECE Providers
Today’s Presenters

Marcy Whitebook and Bethany Edwards
The Center for the Study of Child Care Employment at the University of California, Berkeley
- California’s ECE Workforce: What We Know Now and the Data Deficit That Remains
- The Early Childhood Workforce Index 2018

Erica Greenberg
Urban Institute
- Are Higher Subsidy Payment Rates and Provider-Friendly Payment Policies Associated with Child Care Quality?
Asking Questions

• The phone line will be muted
• To ask a question:
  ➢ Use the chat function in the lower right hand corner
  ➢ From the menu at the top of the chat box on the right, select “chat with presenter”
  ➢ Type your question and hit enter
• We will break periodically to answer questions.
Overview of the NSECE
National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)

Sponsored by Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

OPRE: Ivelisse Martinez-Beck and Ann Rivera
(Federal Project Officers)

Contract Team: NORC with partners Child Trends and Chapin Hall and a panel of substantive ECE experts from the research community.
Purpose of the NSECE

The NSECE provides information on:

- early care and education (ECE) services available to families with children ages birth through 5 years, not yet in kindergarten;
- characteristics of the workforce providing these child care and early education services; and
- households with children under age 13 years.
2012 NSECE

• Provided much needed, nationally representative data about early care and education (ECE) through four integrated surveys

• Captured the full spectrum of those who use and provide ECE, including:
  » Center-based providers to children not yet in kindergarten
  » Home-based providers to children under age 13 years
  » Households with children under age 13
  » Center-based classroom staff

• Measured how the availability of care interacted with how families use that care
2 Samples, 4 Surveys
2019 NSECE

• Data were collected in 2019 to repeat the full design of the 2012 study with some questionnaire modifications.

• Findings will be shared starting in spring 2020, with data files beginning in summer 2020.

• As with the 2012 NSECE, OPRE expects to make available public-use data files and mechanisms for researchers to access restricted-use data.

  ➢ Release of 2019 data files expected to begin in summer 2020 on the Child & Family Data Archive
Using the 2012 NSECE in CSCCE Research

Marcy Whitebook and Bethany Edwards

Center for the Study of Child Care Employment
University of California, Berkeley

Connect with us:
www.cscce.berkeley.edu
@CSCCEUCB
facebook.com/cscceucb
Utilized NSECE data to report:

- Workforce demographics
- Wage gaps across funding source, age of children served, and educator race/ethnicity
California’s ECE Workforce: What We Know Now and the Data Deficit that Reminds

- Utilized state-level NSECE data
- Comprehensive and ongoing data about the early childhood workforce are essential in efforts to inform policy and resource decisions and to track impact.

Figure 8. Average Hourly Wage of Center-Based Workforce in California, by Funding Source and Sponsorship, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source and Sponsorship</th>
<th>Average Hourly Wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Public Pre-K</td>
<td>$14.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ECE Center</td>
<td>$15.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Sponsored Public Pre-K</td>
<td>$17.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>$18.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2006, to provide an in-depth portrait of the center-based and licensed family child care workforce across the state and regionally, the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment (CSCE) and the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network conducted the California Early Care and Education Workforce Study. This study built on California’s long history of leadership in early childhood workforce research, which reaches back to the late 1970s. Yet, 13 years after this study, California lags behind a majority of other states when it comes to the status of its workforce data.

The absence of an updated statewide survey or a statewide workforce registry creates numerous challenges to the implementation of evidence-based decision-making. Too often, determinations about the workforce are made with scant information, which can lead to deciding that a policy does not work and moving on to developing new initiatives without sufficient or accurate information to assess impact and effectiveness or guide new approaches.

Additionally, the workforce data collected prior to 2006 are likely to be of little help with informing current and future needs, as the workforce has significantly changed since then. Thus, it is likely that using the previous approach to be deemed ineffective or failing. Additionally, numerous changes in the political, economic, and cultural environment in the past 13 years render the 2006 study severely out of date and underscore the urgency for current and ongoing data to accurately assess the consequences of policy approaches and interventions.
Racial Wage Gaps in Early Education Employment

- Wage gaps vary across
  - Funding source
  - The ages of children served
  - The race/ethnicity of the educators

- While the wage gaps vary by state, discernable patterns persist in which African American and Hispanic educators endure wage gaps when compared to their white peers.

![Data Snapshot: Racial Wage Gaps in Early Education Employment](image-url)

The current early education system is built on racial inequities. Racial wage gaps and limitations to professional opportunities exist for women of color across occupations. Regardless of their job or field, women of color experience the greatest wage gaps when compared to white, non-Hispanic men (Regewicki, Pliskin, & Smith, 2019). These structural inequities impact not only their immediate circumstances, but widen economic inequalities that follow them into retirement (Kha & Bernard, 2003).

The historical and pervasive underwriting of labor performed by women and minorities in the United States has combined to create one of the most underpaid workforces in the country. Those who care for and teach young children. The early care and education (ECE) sector is comprised almost exclusively of women, up to 99 percent of whom are people of color. These educators represent the most racially diverse sector of the labor market workforce, compared to K-12 and postsecondary education in which nearly three-quarters of educators are white (Barnes & Golding, 2011; NCCLC, 2014; NAEYC, 2014). Early educators are among the least-paid workers in every state (Whitebook, 2010, Missouri, Austin, AEDwards, 2013), which creates especially precarious financial burdens for African American and Hispanic women in this profession.

Such economic hardship not only undermines educators’ ability to deliver on the promise of high-quality early care and education, but harms those performing this work and their families. Additionally, the complex skills and knowledge required of educators to effectively foster the learning and development of young children is at odds with the low status currently accorded to this work.

This paper was generously supported by the Alliances for Early Success, the H. Clement and Alice K. Smith Foundation, and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The views presented in this report are those of the authors and may not reflect the views of the sponsors.

© Center for the Study of Child Care Employment
Limitations

● Analytical Limitations
  ○ Sample size
  ○ Missing data

● Limitations Related to Policy Formulation and Assessment
  ○ Specificity of data
  ○ Intervals between studies
  ○ Differential impacts
Center for the Study of Child Care Employment

Conducting research and proposing policy solutions aimed at improving how our nation prepares, supports, and rewards the early care and education workforce since 1999.

CONTACT US!

cscce.berkeley.edu

facebook.com/cscceucb

cscceinfo@berkeley.edu

@CSCCEUCB
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Learning about ECE Providers through Large-Scale Research and Quick-Turnaround Analysis

Erica Greenberg
A Tale of Two Studies

1. Are Higher Subsidy Payment Rates and Provider-Friendly Payment Policies Associated with Child Care Quality? (Greenberg, Isaacs, Derrick-Mills, Michie, & Stevens, 2018)

2. Segregated from the Start (Greenberg & Monarrez, 2019)
Learning about ECE Providers through Large-Scale Research
Are Higher Subsidy Payment Rates and Provider-Friendly Payment Policies Associated with Child Care Quality?

- Goal: to identify how state subsidy payment rates and policies [in the CCDF Policies Database and ACF-800 data] relate to child care quality [in the NSECE], controlling for state characteristics [in other publicly available sources]

- Three-year project: 2015-2018

- Supported by Grant No. 90YE0177-01-00 from the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (OPRE) in the Administration for Children and Families, US Department of Health and Human Services as part of the Secondary Analysis of Data in Early Care and Education grant program
Research Questions and Methods

1. How much do payment rates and policies vary across states?

2. How much variation is there in the quality of child care centers and homes serving subsidized children?
   - Descriptive statistics, including summary and distributional statistics, and correlations

3. And the key analytical question: What is the association between payment rates and policies and the quality of child care providers serving subsidized children?
   - Multivariate regression (OLS, logistic) with robust standard errors clustered by state
Data: NSECE

- Level 2 Restricted-Use Geographic Files
- Workforce, Center-based Provider, and Home-based Provider files (Level 1), with attached state names (Level 2)
- All files accessible through VPN, with Data Use and Non-Disclosure Agreements
- Analysis restricted to providers participating in the subsidy system
- Six measures of quality, plus provider and community controls
  - Turnover (centers), ECE-related degree or certification (homes), quality rating, use of specific curriculum, support for professional development, and a quality composite (2 of the last 3 indicators)
Data: Publicly Available Sources

- CCDF Policies Database (2011)
  - Variables selected based on data quality and maximal variation (minimal disclosure risk) in the NSECE
  - Subsidy reimbursement rates
  - Use of tiered reimbursement and payment difference
  - Provider-friendly policy index: family fee policy, payment for absences, payment for closings, redetermination

- ACF-800 data
  - Share of subsidies paid via contracts

- NACCRRRA licensing ratings

- OCC data on CCDF spending per child and funds for quality set-aside

- GDP per capita (BEA) and poverty rate (CPS)

- Enrollment in state prekindergarten and Head Start (NIEER)
Findings

Subsidized provider quality varies substantially.

- Centers
  - Has a quality rating: 52%
  - Uses specific curriculum: 70%
  - Offers professional development support: 70%
  - Meets at least two indicators: 66%

- Homes
  - Has a quality rating: 60%
  - Uses specific curriculum: 51%
  - Offers professional development support: 18%
  - Meets at least two indicators: 39%

Source: National Survey of Early Care and Education.
Findings

In centers, money matters for composite quality.

State Subsidy Rates and Policies

Notes: + p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001. Control variables include provider-, neighborhood-, and state-level characteristics.
Findings

In homes, money still matters for composite quality -- and use of contracts does, too.

State Subsidy Rates and Policies

Notes: + p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001. Control variables include provider-, neighborhood-, and state-level characteristics.
Learning about ECE Providers through Quick-Turnaround Analysis
Segregated from the Start

- Goal: to compare segregation in early childhood programs [in the NSECE] and schools [in the Common Core of Data and Private School Universe Survey] given the early roots of racial bias and importance of positive peer interactions for school readiness
- Six-month project: 2019
- Supported by the Overdeck Family Foundation
Research Questions and Methods

1. How does segregation in early education compare with segregation in K–12 education?

2. How does segregation vary among early education settings?
   - Descriptive statistics, including summary and distributional statistics, and segregation measures common in other fields

3. How can we address segregation in early education?
Data

- NSECE
  - Public-Use Center-based and Home-based Provider Files
  - Files downloaded from Research Connections
  - Focus on the racial and ethnic composition of children enrolled, along with provider and community characteristics
    - Number and percentage of Hispanic, black, white, and “another race” students
- Common Core of Data (2011-12)
- Private School Universe Survey (2011-12)
Findings

How Early Childhood Programs Compare with Kindergarten and First Grade in Black or Hispanic Enrollment Share


Note: Estimates for early childhood education include programs with at least five students enrolled.
Findings

Early Childhood Education Is More Segregated Than Any Other School Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Dissimilarity Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K–5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–8</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Authors’ calculations of the distribution of black or Hispanic students using the 2012 National Survey of Early Care and Education, 2011–12 data from the Common Core of Data, and the 2011–12 Private School Universe Survey.

**Notes:** ECE = early childhood education. Estimates for early childhood education include programs with at least five students enrolled. The dissimilarity index is a summary measure of segregation that represents the share of black or Hispanic students that would need to move to achieve perfect integration. Findings are robust to alternative segregation indexes. See the technical appendix for more details.
Findings

Segregation in Early Childhood Education Programs by Ages Served, Urbanicity, and Region

**Dissimilarity index**

- Birth to age 3: 0.71
- Ages 3 to 5: 0.70

**Urbanicity**

- Highly urban: 0.70
- Moderately urban: 0.66
- Highly rural: 0.70

**Region**

- Northeast: 0.77
- South: 0.69
- West: 0.68
- Midwest: 0.66

Source: Authors’ calculations of the distribution of black or Hispanic students using the 2012 National Survey of Early Care and Education.

Notes: Estimates include programs with at least five students enrolled. The dissimilarity index is a summary measure of segregation that represents the share of black or Hispanic students that would need to move to achieve perfect integration. Findings are robust to alternative segregation indexes. See the technical appendix for more details. Suburban programs are located in moderately urban census tracts according to the National Survey of Early Care and Education.
Findings

Home-Based ECE Programs Are Far More Segregated Than Center-Based Programs

Dissimilarity index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dissimilarity Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home based</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center based</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Authors’ calculations of the distribution of black or Hispanic students using the 2012 National Survey of Early Care and Education.

Notes: ECE = early childhood education. Estimates include programs with at least five students enrolled. The dissimilarity index is a summary measure of segregation that represents the share of black or Hispanic students that would need to move to achieve perfect integration. Findings are robust to alternative segregation indexes. See the technical appendix for more details.
Learning about ECE Providers with the NSECE
Lessons Learned about Working with the NSECE

- Only source for learning about all providers, nationwide
- Experience depends on the files: restricted- versus public-use
  - Data quality and availability, including geographic identifiers
  - DUA and NDAs
  - VPN environment
  - Linking to other data
  - Extraction review process, including rounding, suppression, and documentation
- Public-use files as opportunities to investigate emerging research ideas (at least)
Lessons Learned about Working with the NSECE

- Use the documentation, existing reports from NORC, and emerging body of evidence based on the NSECE
- For analyses of centers and homes, crosswalk provider and workforce surveys early on, and identify differences in data availability by provider type
- Prepare to explain the NSECE to collaborators in related fields
- Be nice to the NSECE team (thank you, Rupa, Carolina, and Bryan!)
Thank You!

Contact | egreenberg@urban.org
For more information

NSECE resources page

https://www.researchconnections.org/content/childcare/find/nsec e.html

Questions about the NSECE data

nsece@norc.org