

Oregon Child Care Research Partnership
November 7, 2007
Minutes

Attendance: Art Emlen, Deana Grobe, Becky Vorpagel, Mark Anderson, Robi Henifin, Dawn Norris, David Mandell, Mary Nemmers, Tom Olsen, Sonja Worcel, Diana Kruse, Maureen Short, Michelle Knapp

I. Debrief the 2007 Oregon Child Care Research Roundtable

Overall, the group felt this was one of the better Roundtables. The group likes being at McMenamins and liked the structure of the room. Mary felt (and Deana agreed) that the framing of the sharing time (ask burning questions or share research projects) by Bobbie helped to stimulate discussion. The one thing missing from the day was more in-depth conversation about the presentations. Another issue was keeping things moving so presenters weren't asked to shorten their presentations. Here were some other suggestions for changes next year:

- Tom suggested having the sharing, or the second sharing if we break it up, towards the end of the day.
- Tom indicated that Region 10 would like to join this meeting. We need to discuss whether there should be two meetings, or a combined meeting.
- Be clear to presenters how much time they have. Build in more time for questions and discussion.
- Another suggestion (by Art) was to assign a discussant to each presentation to help open up a more critical discussion of the research project. Along these same lines, David suggested having only two presentations and have the presenter provide both a paper and power point presentation prior to the Roundtable for participants to read. Many in the group thought this was a good idea. David also suggested starting with someone from this group as a model.
- At the end of the day have someone (e.g., Bobbie) draw conclusions / pull together common themes from the day.
- Think about asking participants to indicate what they will be sharing either prior to the Roundtable or during/after and provide a template for the information we are interested in: (1) name of project, (2) county, (3) 2 to 3 sentence description, (4) website link if available. This information will be posted on the Network's website after the Roundtable.

The group thought we should post the notes from the day without editing unless they were too cryptic to be useful.

Next Steps:

- Bobbie will put the Roundtable planning on the OCCRP agenda a month or two earlier than usual in order to have time to implement some of the above suggestions
- Bobbie will send Becky the notes from the day if she feels they would be useful as is.

II. Oregon Employment Department Employer Survey

There is a CCD performance measure that tracks the “% of OR employers providing child care benefits to full-time employees”. The target was set at 14%, but the employer survey data used to obtain this information indicates only 3% of employers provide child care benefits. Three separate questions were asked of the group:

- Should the current questions of child care benefits be broadened (e.g., to include work/life benefits such as leave and flextime). *The group felt this was a worthwhile move.*
- If we change the survey questions then we will lose comparability with previous years' data. Did anyone have any concerns with this? *No one voiced any concerns. Most felt changing the survey made sense.*
- The employer survey hasn't been done since 2003. In 2005 Tom asked the research office to do a postcard survey of the three or four child care questions. Dawn said that they do plan on doing the employer survey in 2008. Tom thought it might be better to continue with the postcard survey to make sure we were getting the data needed for the performance measure every two years. *Mark wondered whether this approach would bias the sample towards those who provide child care benefits versus if the employer was filling out the entire survey.*

The group felt we needed more information to determine if and how the survey questions should be rewritten. See next steps.

Next Steps:

- Dawn will talk to Cynthia who is doing training/education around this issue and come back to the group with the following: (1) list of benefits Cynthia includes in her training, (2) past survey questions including the ones on the postcard, and (3) analysis of who filled out the postcard in 2005 versus the survey in 2003.

III. 2008 Market Rate Survey – strategies for capturing possible effects of subsidy

The 2008 Market Rate Survey will be conducted next year. We talked about possible changes with the market rate survey given the substantial increase in subsidy payments that went into effect October 1, 2007.

Timing of the survey – Becky brought up a couple of issues that influenced when to download the R&R data. One is the increase in subsidy rates as of October 1. Another is the increase in minimum wage on January 1 from \$7.80 to \$7.95. A couple of local R&Rs indicated to her that providers will be increasing their rates as of the first of the year. Part of the timing had to do with the increase in minimum wage on January 1. The group talked about downloading the R&R data at the end of first quarter (March 31, 2008). The third issue has to do with DHS needing the market rate numbers to do their policy report. Mark thought this timeline would work because they could submit preliminary numbers and update later in the summer when we had the final numbers. So, here is the timeline we came to agreement on:

- Download data March 31, 2008 (this would give Becky time to inform the R&Rs)
- Becky cleans the data and gets it to Deana in early May.
- Deana analyzes the data, brings preliminary results to the OCCRP group, and completes the report by June 30, 2008.

Footnote: David pointed out that by waiting until March 31 to do the download, the market rate results will include both the minimum wage increase from January 2007 and January 2008. He felt it was important to keep this information in mind (as well as include a note) when interpreting potential increases in prices.

Capturing the percent of children in care on subsidy – we talked about asking the R&Rs to capture current enrollment numbers by age of child. Becky talked with Mary and they felt that without more lead time and compensation it wasn't very feasible. The group moved the discussion to linking the data used for the market rate with DHS data on the number of children on subsidy by provider. This data would provide: (a) some sense of the percent of children in care on subsidy for providers who are captured in the

market rate survey, and (b) help us to better understand whether prices in particular zip codes may have increased because of the increase in subsidy rates. That is, if there is a large proportion of subsidy children in a particular area it may suggest that prices increased in that area because of the rate increases. The plan is for Robi to provide the necessary DHS data and Becky will match the DHS data to the providers in the market rate survey. This data will then go to Deana for analyses.

Other changes – Over time we have talked about creating additional price tables: (1) licensed versus exempt providers, and (2) prices by county.

IV. Learning from Oregon program evaluations

Bobbie had an idea for building a body of knowledge from the evaluations that have been conducted in Oregon around child care. She thought it would be useful to convene a group of organizations and evaluators that have used CCDF dollars to fund program evaluations since 2000. The charge for this group would be to come to consensus on a few pieces of information they could collect that would help build this body of knowledge. For example, what questions did the research project ask, who was targeted, what was the intervention/methods, and what were the key findings. She wanted the group to brainstorm about who were these organizations and evaluators.

First, the group thought this was a great idea. Second, they felt that we shouldn't limit the group to only those funded with CCDF dollars. We can ask others to participate and they can decline if they want to. Below is a list the group came up with taking into consideration that we would broaden the group. We also asked for assistance from Dawn (see next steps).

- 7 CARE projects
- Great Beginnings
- Quality Indicator project (in process)
- Lane County infant and toddler network (in process)
- Contribution tax credit – not funded through CCDF
- Child Care Improvement Project evaluated by Marlene Farnham – not funded through CCDF

Next Steps:

- Dawn will check the CCD contracts and create a list.
- Dawn will ask Kim to create a similar list for OCCF, although that will be a more involved process.

V. Updates

OCCF Evaluation of Family, Friend, and Neighbor project – No update since Kim was not at the meeting. No one knew whether an evaluator had been hired yet.

New Child Care Contribution Tax Credit Project evaluation – NPC Research have begun collecting baseline data on the providers entering the project. The project coordinators have had a hard time recruiting providers, and are convening a meeting next week to discuss this issue.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, December 5, 2007 – 9:30am-12:00pm