

Oregon Child Care Research Partnership
December 5, 2007
Minutes

Attendance: Bobbie Weber, Clara Pratt, Deana Grobe, Becky Vorpagel, Dawn Norris, David Mandell, Tom Olsen, Sonja Worcel, Diana Kruse, Kim Cardona

I. Timeline for OCCRP projects: Estimating Supply, Oregon Population Survey child care analysis, and Market Rate Survey

Bobbie made some changes to the timeline and extended it through 2009 (see attached timeline).

- Estimating Supply – Becky will be estimating supply every other year, and in the same year as the OPS. The dates on the timeline look correct.
- OPS – there seems to be a continuing issue of whether the OPS will be conducted. However, the current plan is for data to be collected in August and September, even though they ask for information related to the previous school year.
- MRS – what is indicated on the timeline is correct.

II. Learning from Oregon program evaluations

The group had a discussion on how we could work towards coming up with a system that would allow us to learn from the evaluations happening in the state around child care. That is, how can we catalog and keep track of what is happening. Tom and Heidi McGowen (joined by phone for this conversation) indicated that they were most interested in knowing how these projects impacted the quality performance measures. Tom said that when he goes to the legislature he needs to tell them that this worked and why it is important. Here are a few summary points from the conversation:

- The group was in agreement that we were interested in the comparability of outcomes from the projects, where the outcomes were the following four quality structural indicators at the facility level: (1) education, (2) training, (3) compensation, and (4) retention. [Example: As an outcome did provider training increase and how much did it cost to increase provider training?]
- Priority outcomes can be written into an RFP. “Every project should be able to show change in one or more of the structural indicators” and be comparable across projects. Establishing a core minimum group of outcomes assumes that people who are developing training use the knowledge.
- Unintended consequences: policy concern – training done cheaper. What kind of training changes behavior? How do people who are doing training use the knowledge?
- A few notes on the Table Bobbie showed the group: need more information on the projects themselves, whether they were evaluated or not; shift organization of the columns so that the table is organized by outcomes; include the dates of the projects; costs associated with evaluation.

Next Steps:

- Bobbie and Clara will draft a document on how this system will work (i.e., framing).
- Bobbie and Clara will invite a group of evaluators (primarily those funded by CCDF funds) to review the above framing and to work on what the common measures will be.
- Tom will work with Bobbie to convene a group of state contractors and funders to let them know what we are going to do and see if they are interested in joining.

III. Calculating Family Child Care Retention

The group talked about how to go about consistently calculating retention. The question we believe we want answered is “how long on average do family child care providers stay in business?” Another question for down the road is “how long do they stay in the field”. Here is the plan we talked about for measuring the retention question (first one above):

- Becky will use R&R data to calculate family child care retention with the above question in mind.
- She will begin with January 2005 data and select only those providers who have entered the R&R system since that date.
- Becky will then look at their first in and out or “spell” of being a provider.
- For a given time period (e.g., two years) she will divide the number of providers who have left the field within that time period over all those who entered during that time period. Becky could also look at the average amount of time these providers stay in business. Or a statistical program could be used to determine the duration of time providing care in this first spell.
- We decided to use 3 months as indicating a real break from providing care given past information available to the Network.
- There is still the question of how to deal with specific requests from counties who need retention information on a specific set of providers (e.g., Health Consultation project and Medford retention study).

Next Steps:

- Becky will work on completing the above analysis and writing up the procedure. Deana can be contacted with any questions or assistance with the analysis.

IV. Data from the USDA Food Program

Yes, we would like to get the USDA Food Program data so we can merge it with the other data sources and answer the question of what percent of providers are participating in the food program.

Next Steps:

- Bobbie will email Lynn and let her know we are interested in the data.

V. Child Care Supply Benchmark

Kim asked Bobbie where the 25 slots per 100 children came from for the Supply Benchmark. Bobbie indicated that it came from national demand side studies in the early 1990’s. It seems to work at the state level, but not at the local level because it does not take into account county level dynamics (e.g., women’s labor force participation, number of children under 13, urban versus rural, etc.). We have talked at various times about possible changes to the benchmark that would make more sense at the local level.

One idea has been to change the benchmark to “percent of counties that met or exceeded their child care supply goals”. A group could provide a packet of information to counties in helping them to figure out what factors to take into effect in order to set their goals. Clara did not think the Progress Board would like the idea of counties deciding what goal they should have.

David suggested that an alternative way of having the counties set the goal is to give them a formula they could use to plug in information from the crucial factors in their communities (e.g., labor force participation of women, number of children under 13, % urban, household income). Clara then suggested that we could use the three counties whose supply is in good shape as our test counties (Lane, Washington, Benton). David also suggested that we could use all the county data and do a regression equation.

There are other issues about the availability of hard to find care (infant/toddler care, school-age care, special needs) that local commissions need to work with local RR's to obtain the data needed to determine need in their area. These are issues that the supply benchmark isn't able to capture.

Next Steps:

- Bobbie and Deana will work on coming up with a formula for calculating a supply benchmark by county.
- Bobbie will bring the results back to this group to discuss and decide whether we want to change the benchmark.
- Tom will bring the potential new benchmark to the Progress Board.

VI. Date for January OCCRP meeting

The group decided to cancel the meeting in January. The next meeting will be on February 6, 2008.

Next Steps:

- Bobbie will email the OCCRP group notifying them of this change.

VII. Updates

OCCF Evaluation of Family, Friend, and Neighbor project – there are plans for a FFN orientation training and partners are recruiting as well as sending postcards to all providers. At these trainings and through one-on-one recruiters, providers can request receive a toolkit if they fill out an invoice request and a survey form. Six months down the road the providers will be asked to complete another survey related to the trainings and toolkit. There are interested in two questions: (1) does the toolkit change behaviors, and (2) did anything else change behavior such as trainings?

Region X – is planning on having 4 technical assistance meetings in this next year. One will be focused on regional research, similar to the Researchers' Roundtable. Tom will keep us posted.

David Mandell informed the group of a couple of publications we may be interested in. One was an article in *Life Chances* and the other on child care regulation in *The Columbian*, a Clark County newspaper. If interested contact David for more information on these articles.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, February 6, 2008 – 9:30am-12:00pm

NO MEETING IN JANUARY