

Oregon Child Care Research Partnership
February 6, 2008
Minutes

Attendance: Bobbie Weber, Deana Grobe, Becky Vorpagel, Mary Nemmers, Robi Henifin, Beverly Briggs, Art Emlen, Sonja Worcel, Diana Kruse, Kim Cardona, Mark Anderson

I. Learning from Oregon program evaluations

Bobbie provided 2 handouts that were revised based on input from the December 2007 OCCRP meeting. The group provided the following feedback on the one-page framework document:

- How do you define a project or program? The issue was that some quality improvement projects are embedded within a program and wouldn't necessarily be evaluated. After discussion, the group provide the following feedback:
 - Indicate in the document that a project is defined as having a fixed life and is not funded as part of an on-going contract (e.g., Mentoring, Home visits).
 - Kim also asked "how can this be integrated into the performance measurement system?" That is, the quality projects being done by programs should have a similar way of rolling-up to a performance measurement.
 - Have the TQC (training and quality committee) discuss how to evaluate the quality projects within programs. They can then bring their recommendations to the Accountability workgroup.
- There was also discussion about expectations and whether they would be in-line with what can be done. Art felt there needed to be some indications of when the projects work and when they don't. He felt there should be control variables that everyone should collect so that the data could be accurately compared. Bobbie followed this up with the question of "how to keep this learning from being high stakes". That is, it is equally valuable to know that a project didn't work as it is to know it succeeded.
- Someone recommended that the last sentence under the first paragraph of Proposed Solution "evaluations are encouraged to address whatever additional research questions are appropriate for the project" should be repeated right before Next Steps.
- Under Rationale indicate "Six of the seven structural characteristics" instead of just "Six". Also, is education and training one or two indicators? The group felt the wording should be consistent with what is written about the seven structural indicators.
- In the paragraph before Next Steps don't bold the text (it puts more emphasis on that area than is necessary) and use the word "caregiver" instead of "provider".
- An additional step in the Next Steps of the document is to share the approved framework with the Training and Quality Committee.

The main comment on the table of *projects to improve quality of child care* was to add a column titled "# of targeted audience affected" right next to Target Audience. The group also talked about including the "# of children indirectly affected" as an advocacy tool.

Next Steps:

- Bobbie will update the documents based on the above feedback and proceed with next steps.

II. Findings from national study of Market Rate Survey validity

Bobbie and Deana presented findings from the national study on the validity of market rate surveys. By looking at how complete the different data sources (licensing, RR, subsidy) were, Bobbie discovered that school-age care wasn't represented in the data sources. This led to the next discussion (see III.) about how we might be able to get more information on school-age care through the OPS. This study did give us a lot of confidence in the R&R administrative data. The R&Rs are doing a great job of collecting current prices, and the dataset is the most complete and geographically representative of all the data sources.

Bobbie and Deana will be presenting these findings to the national advisory committee for this project next week. We will be finalizing the report this spring/early summer.

III. Oregon Population Survey

The Oregon Population Survey is happening again this year, with data collection this spring. Bobbie will be attending the first OPS meeting next week. Bobbie asked the group their thoughts on whether we wanted to think about capturing more information on school-age care in the upcoming OPS. The group felt that it would be important information to know; that is, where are kids going before and after school. However, the group struggled with how the OPS could help inform this issue. We weren't sure parents would accurately be able to distinguish whether their school-age care was child care or not (especially when there isn't even agreement among the field on this issue).

We did talk about there being value in splitting out the sequence of questions we asked 0-5 year olds who aren't yet in kindergarten versus school-age children. This would give us the ability to pull out specific data on 0-5 years olds (who aren't in school). Another suggestion was to remove the word "child care" from the school-age sequence. Becky felt that might reduce confusion and give us better data for school-age care.

Next Steps:

- Bobbie will inquire with the survey firm that conducts the OPS whether splitting up the sequence of questions for 0-5 and school-age would increase response burden and/or costs.

IV. Child Care Supply Benchmark

Bobbie shared with the group a one-page description of the background, problem, and proposed solution (handout) on the child care supply benchmark. Overall the group thought it was great. Here were a couple of suggestions:

- Another rationale for proceeding in this new direction would be the ability to compare county supply benchmarks. This may be something worth thinking about adding to the one-page document.
- Becky was wondering whether there needed to be more written on what the actual benchmark will be. Bobbie indicated that we don't know yet whether the benchmark will actually be changed.

Next Steps:

- Bobbie will be bringing this document to the Coordinating Council for their feedback.
- Mary will be distributing this draft document to the local R&Rs.

V. Updates

OCCF Evaluation of Family, Friend, and Neighbor project – there are currently 10 pre-surveys at the RR Network. However, there have been 38 requests for stipend checks and Kim did not know how many tool-kits had been delivered or how many trainings have occurred. There should be an equal number of pre-surveys and tool-kits delivered. Kim is checking into this. *Evaluator update* – there is no evaluator currently on board. They have a contract ready, but need to flush out the scope of work. Pat at OCCF felt they shouldn't have an evaluator on board until they have delivered ½ of the desired tool-kits (goal is to deliver 400 in total). Bobbie disagreed with this plan. She feels they should get an evaluator on board as soon as possible. They can pay the evaluator based on the deliverables. The advisory group for this project is meeting next week.

Next Steps:

- Bobbie will send Kim an email with her thoughts on getting an evaluator on board asap (see above) because she will miss the meeting next week.

Measuring turnover in family child care – nothing new to report.

PATT-system accountability work group – has developed a document that indicates the outcomes to be measured, activities, where the state wants to be, and where they think they can be. The document will help in determining where the state should put their energy in regards to child care initiatives. The System Accountability Work Group will be asking for final approval from the Coordinating Council on February 7th.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 5, 2008 – 9:30am-12:00pm