

Oregon Child Care Research Partnership
March 3, 2010
Minutes

Attendance: Bobbie Weber, Deana Grobe, Shiela Carter, Mark Anderson, Becky Vorpagel, Dawn Norris, Rhonda Prodzinski, Sonja Worcel, David Mandell (by phone)

I. Market Price Study Subcommittee Report

Deana reported on decisions from the market price study subcommittee meeting at the end of December. The decisions included:

- R&R's have been working since January on improving their update collection efforts and keeping track of how they are updating (telephone, mail, email).
- Keep all prices collected 6 months prior to data collection period (for example, October 1, 2009 – March 31, 2010), and discard those beyond 6 months during data analysis.
- At some point, we would like to test our current method of creating geographic rate areas (for example, Rate Area A, B, and C) with a cluster analysis technique used by Minnesota.
- Test our current system of using toddler prices as the average of all prices with principal component analysis.
- Verify the dominant mode by type of care.
- Analyze National Market Price Study data and provide relevant information to DHS on part-time schedule and part-time preschool program prices.
- Becky will ask for November 2009 subsidy data in April 2010 when she is working on the supply estimate project. She will incorporate a new variable in the market price survey data she sends to Deana that will be the number of enrolled subsidy kids by provider. This data will be analyzed to determine if prices for facilities with a high percent of subsidized children are similar to those charged for private pay children.

Next Steps:

- Deana will think about whether it might make sense to cluster preschool program data between those that are under regulation requirements (<4 hours per week) versus those that are licensed to see if this is a better way to capture preschool program prices.

II. Definition of Child Care Workforce for Training and Education Database

The group spent some time on two aspects of defining the child care workforce for TED. First, we now have a new estimate of the child care workforce – 28,546. The question is do we want to use different workforce definitions for different projects. The group landed on using the 28,546 estimate when talking about economic impact. When talking about the target for professional development policy, the definition would be restricted and decided upon by the EQUIP project.

Second, the group talked about whether the Data Elements table (see handout) would capture the workforce that we want to define in TED. After some discussion the group felt as though more political work needed to be done before counting and data integration. More work needed to be done on getting different entities on board with this project (Early Childhood Advisory Council, State Commission on Children & Families), and that work needed to be done on aligning the TED enrollment form with the Data Elements table. A few thoughts the group had on the Data Elements table and TED were:

- TED should not include the 10,946 home-based providers who provide care regularly to both related and unrelated children. This group is too difficult to locate.
- Hours worked columns should be by the week.
- Consider adding a column “Caring for only related children”

Next Steps:

- Dawn will send the TED enrollment form to Bobbie.
- Bobbie will align the data elements handout with the TED enrollment form.
- Bobbie will bring back either an update to this group or further decisions to be made.
- Bring to the EQUIP group the question: What does EQUIP want as the estimate of the child care workforce? Who should be counted?

III. Where Do They Work – Study of Employment of Child Care Subsidy Recipients

Rhonda shared the findings from the where do child care subsidy recipients work study (see handouts). Two-thirds of subsidy recipients work in health care and social assistance (27%), accommodation and food service (20%), and retail trade (19%). Bobbie was able to compare the results from 2009 with 1996 by matching the 2009 NAICS codes with the 1996 SIC codes used in the wage data (although it wasn’t a one-to-one match). The results showed similar trends, although there were more subsidy recipients in health care and less in retail trade in 2009. The group then brainstormed about what questions could be answered to provide meaning to these findings:

- Compare these findings with the overall workforce, and possibly with a subset of low-income workers (lowest fifth) – John Glen in the Employment Department may have a breakdown of overall workforce industry sectors.
- Background information – what percent of subsidy recipients are single-parents?
- Background information – average age of parents receiving subsidies? Might be able to show a career path relationship between younger participants and those in the healthcare sector (greater possibility to move up).
- Does John Glen have information on what industries have predominantly odd hour/rotating shifts? Does he have information on average pay by industries? This information can be compared with where subsidy recipients work to help show the complexity of their lives (i.e., low paying, lack of flexibility jobs).

Next Steps:

- Rhonda and Robi will talk about which of the above they will pursue.
- Rhonda will be reporting the findings to the Child Care Commission in April

IV. Quality Indicator Web Site – search terminology for type of care and evaluation questions

First, the group discussed how the QI website could present type of care options that parents would understand. The group landed on the following three options, which will allow for multiple selects:

- child care center / preschool [the next screen would ask whether the parent was interested in full-time or part-time care]
- private home (home-based program)
- before and/or after school program

Second, the group reviewed the evaluation questions for the QI website. The group felt the survey needed to be much shorter, and see it as a pop-up survey on the Parent page(s) of the Quality Indicator Project website. Below are the questions the group felt would be appropriate (in no particular order). Also, consider starting with the statement “Help Us Help You” as the lead in.

1. Is this website easy to read and understand? [Yes, Mostly, Somewhat, No] [Q2]
2. Why did you visit this site? or What were you looking for on this site? Information on options in my community,, information on child care options I am already considering, information on my current provider, want to compare my business to others in my community.
3. Does this website have the information about child care quality that you are looking for? [Yes, Mostly, Somewhat, No][Q3]
4. How much do you think this information will affect the choices you make about child care? [a lot, some, a little bit, not very much][Q9]

The numbers refer to those suggested by Shannon Williams in her QIP evaluation report and attached to the mailing with the meeting agenda.

V. DHS Draft Policy Options for 2011-2013

Rhonda shared with the group a draft document of ERDC Policy Option Package Concepts for 2011-2013. She is interested in feedback on (1) suggested priorities, and (2) any comments or other ideas by *March 12*.

VI. Agenda Items for April meeting

- Professional Development System Framework Paper
- Updates: (a) Quality Indicator Program, (b) Subsidy Policy Impact Study

Next Meeting: Wednesday, April 7, 2010,
9:30am – 12pm, Oregon Child Care Resource and Referral Network