

Oregon Child Care Research Partnership
July 2, 2008
Minutes

Attendance: Bobbie Weber, Deana Grobe, Becky Vorpapel, Art Emlen, Kim Cardona, Tom Olsen, Beverly Briggs, Dawn Norris, Diana Kruse, Rhonda Prodzinski, Peggy Cain, Robi Henifin,

I. 2008 Market Rate Survey

Deana presented more results and sought input from the group on a number of issues:

- The price trend graphs were adjusted for the value of the dollar over time. The group felt these graphs were interesting and suggested including them in the report.
- We also talked about how we measure accessibility or the percent of child care slots that can be purchased at the licensed rate maximums. Deana suggested that instead of using the specific licensed rate maximums as the cutoff for whether a price is considered accessible or not, that we could use a range from the licensed rate maximums to 5% greater than the maximums. The group agreed to this change.
- The group decided to add county level price results to the report this year because we usually receive at least one request for this information. The group suggested using medians instead of means in the table, and also include the state numbers in the table for comparison purposes.

Next Steps:

- Deana will send a final draft of the report to DHS for review by July 9th.
- Robi will look into adding exempt back into the type of care trend data – are more providers switching from exempt to licensed?
- Rhonda will send relevant tables to Bobbie that deal with trends in exempt versus license care
- Tom thought it would be good to produce a summary report that indicated the affect of policy change on accessibility to facilities. This would be a separate document from the market rate study.

Feedback for Minnesota – Minnesota had some questions for Oregon regarding how we make decisions on geographic groupings: (1) how do we define community, (2) who are our community informants, and (3) what are provider perceptions/attitudes regarding clustering/rate areas? Bobbie took notes of the groups' responses to the questions, and relayed this information to Minnesota (see attached document).

II. Child Care Pricing Practices

Bobbie presented information on child care pricing practices that have been learned through the national market price study and a study being done in Minnesota (see handouts). The three key points were:

- Converting prices in a market price study assumes that facilities are using a standardize way to come up with their pricing. We found that facilities do not price in a standardized way, therefore, we also found that conversions distort prices.
- Facilities that only charge hourly are a different market than those who charge in a different single mode (daily, weekly, monthly) or in multiple-modes. In these other modes there is a prevalence of volume pricing (this is a business practice to maximum income by encouraging parents to pay weekly or monthly).

- There is large variance in volume pricing within areas and between areas.

III. Effective Investments in Early Childhood Professions

OCF has contracted with OSU to provide a literature review on 'Effective Investments in the Early Childhood Professions'. Bobbie shared with the group a document (see handout) that lists the content areas and research questions. She also shared what top 3 areas the project advisory committee indicated were the most important. Bobbie thought this document might be useful in planning the professional development panel for the Researchers Roundtable (see below).

IV. 2008 Researchers Roundtable

Topics: The group primarily discussed the Professional Development panel. What was decided on was the following:

- Karen Tvedt will present in the morning. Her topic is on the generosity of subsidy policies and the relationship of these policies across states. Bobbie will be the discussant.
- The afternoon will consist of a panel on Professional Development. It will start with a thesis that it takes a multi-pronged approach to change provider behavior – e.g., training, mentoring, and association. The panel will consist of the following and will inform the group on what we know and don't know about the above thesis both nationally and in Oregon:
 - NPC Research – CCEP project [describe their intervention, outcomes, and theorize about future research]
 - OSU graduate student (Molly) - literature review for OCF [Bobbie will ask her to focus on the research that discusses both the Director and staff committing to doing training together]
 - Bobbie Weber – Logic model that was proposed in OPRE grant proposal
 - Sue Doescher – LBCC project [need for mentors and life coaches]
 - Pam at Western – missed exactly what they are doing
 - Moderator: Dave Mandell

Next Steps:

- Bobbie will talk with NPC Research again about this new approach
- Bobbie will see whether Sue Doescher wants to talk about the LBCC project, and she will talk with Pam at Western.
- Bobbie will also talk with Molly about focusing part of the literature review on studies that have looked at both the Director and staff committing to doing training together.

V. Updates

Oregon Population Survey 2008 – field testing questions this week. Starting interviews next week. Made some cuts in questions because of limited funds. Bobbie wasn't sure which questions were cut.

Percent of CCDF eligible served – Bobbie recently received the data from Deb. She plans on completing the analysis by early August.

OCCF Evaluation of Family, Friend, and Neighbor Project – moving along. 350 have attended orientation. An interim evaluation report is expected mid-September.

Measuring turnover in family child care – Becky has been working on a program to measure turnover. She still has concerns that this approach won't answer the questions people have about turnover.

PATT (system accountability work group) – Meeting in the fall to come up with a process to annually review the system.

Framework for learning from Oregon program evaluations – [Bobbie needs to get together with Clara Pratt to set this up – anticipated timeline: Fall]

Child Care Supply Benchmark formula development – [waiting for OPS data from Bobbie]

Child Care Tax Credit projects evaluation – Nothing too new. They are working on cross matching quarterly report definitions across programs in Lane and Multnomah counties. Lane County final evaluation report should be completed soon.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, September 3, 2008 – 9:30am-12:00pm

Feedback for Minnesota Response

The Oregon Child Care Research Partnership met this morning and I asked for feedback on Brenda's questions. Their responses are listed along with the questions below:

- 1) How does Oregon define community in creating zip code groupings?
 - a. City is the default—almost always a community is synonymous with a city
 - b. The most basic question we ask is where the majority of parents would seek care. Even though limited numbers of parents may take their child to another community in which they are employed, our focus is on the predominant pattern. An important point is that when a parent does take a child to a neighboring community with higher prices that would not result in higher prices in their community of origin. Those providers in their community of origin are selling their services to parents who are purchasing care in that community.
 - c. Distance to the next community may or may not be relevant. As we have all experienced, parents in a more affluent community often will not travel even to a nearby less affluent community for services such as education or care.
- 2) When it is unclear into which rate area a community falls, who are considered as appropriate informants?
 - a. R&R staff
 - b. Representatives of child care provider organizations
 - c. Representative of the local NAEYC chapter
 - d. Known residents of the community
- 3) Why hasn't Oregon experienced engagement/pushback/questioning about our market rate survey methods?
 - a. This was the most fun question to address but we really don't know the answer. That did not stop the group from creating theories, though.
 - b. The basic MRS methodology was developed in 1990. We had three rate areas based on a combination of counties and zip codes. By 1992 the rate areas were based on zip codes only. Testing of rate areas created by the method has continued up to the most current study.
 - c. Stakeholder groups were heavily involved in the early 1990s in the creation of the methods but interest waned over the years. Stakeholders remain welcome to participate. We think their involvement in development of methods may have built confidence in the methods. We also think that continuous testing of the method is key to confidence in it.
 - d. DHS receives very few questions about MRS methods. The only questions people could remember related to providers in rural Oregon who convinced their legislator that it was not fair for rates to be based on prices, and those questions have been resolved through sharing information on what the federal rule requires of states.
 - e. The biggest reason for lack of engagement may be that the findings did not make any difference. Although interesting, MRS results did not impact providers. Rates were not updated based on MRS findings from 1993 to 2007—there were some COLAs. The 2007 rates are based on the 75th percentile from 2006 MRS. DHS has had few, if any, questions on MRS methods even though 2006 findings did impact providers as 2007 rates are based on them..
 - f. Interest in MRS methods could grow—especially if we get to peg rates to MRS findings on an ongoing basis. Currently, the Oregon Child Care Research Partnership advises DHS on the MRS. Agenda showing that MRS topics are on the agenda go out to a large list—I think it includes most, if not all, stakeholder groups. Meetings are open so it is easy for people to participate in discussions and they may if interest does grow. As a point of interest, for years there was an MRS committee that existed only to advise DHS on MRS. As conducting the study became more routine, DHS decided they did not need a separate group and MRS issues/questions are now addressed at Research Partnership meetings, although we do create a MRS workgroup that meets when needed.