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Introduction

• Mixed methods study of an administrative change that took place in MA in 2012

• The change focused on making eligibility reassessment more “family friendly”
  – Reassessment responsibilities transitioned from 10 regional CCR&R offices to providers
  – Change aligns with the redetermination objectives of CCDBG reauthorization

• The change only applied to a subset of income-eligible voucher children, creating a “treatment” and “comparison” group
What we’re finding…

• We are finding local (within-state) variation in:
  ✓ Administrative practices
  ✓ Other administrative factors, like family travel distances (burden)
  ✓ The relationship between administrative factors and outcomes (subsidy stability)
Today’s purpose

• Provide examples of local variation in CCDF administrative factors from the MA study
  – Examples could help states anticipate local variation points as they implement new CCDF rules

• Summarize what our study results say about the relationship between local variation in administrative factors and subsidy stability
  – Highlight importance of local implementation research
Study Background
Overview of study

• **Research question:** Does changing reassessment from CCR&Rs to providers impact stability?

• **Sample:** 2,834 income-eligible voucher children with new subsidy receipt spell in 2012
  – Treatment: voucher children with contracted providers
  – Comparison: voucher children with voucher-only providers

• Treatment children reassess with provider; comparison children reassess with CCR&R
The MA “geography of reassessment”

Comparison children

Median distance to reassessment = 6.2 miles

Treatment children

Median distance to reassessment = 2.1 miles
Data sources

• Massachusetts CCDF administrative data, 2012-2013 (2014 in progress)

• Qualitative data obtained from:
  – Document reviews
  – Key stakeholder interviews
  – In-depth qualitative interviews and site visits to all seven main CCR&R regional offices
  – Provider interviews
  – Parent interviews (in progress)
Methods: How local variation fits into the analysis plan

1) Use spell analysis to study stability patterns
   • Spell analysis by CCR&R region

2) Use discrete-time event history analysis to assess impacts of the change on subsidy stability
   • Estimate impacts by CCR&R region

3) Incorporate measures of administrative factors that may vary locally
   • Motivated by findings of local variation in implementation and spatial research

4) Integrate impact/implementation findings to explain observed local variation
Examples of local variation in administrative practices/factors

- Reassessment practices
- Family travel distances
“Family friendliness” of reassessment practices, by CCRR region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reminders</th>
<th>Allow walk-ins</th>
<th>Remote Reassessment</th>
<th>Make appointments online</th>
<th>Wet signatures</th>
<th>Density of Outposts</th>
<th>Saturday appointments</th>
<th>Off-business hours</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distance to reassessment (in miles), by CCR&R region

**Children who reassess with provider***
(Treatment)

**Children who reassess with CCR&R***
(Comparison)

*Children who reassess with provider either visit the provider site (incurring no incremental travel distance to reassessment) or visit the umbrella agency office (if provider is part of an umbrella/system organization).
Results
Subsidy spell analysis by CCR&R region

Median length of first subsidy receipt spell in study period (in months)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Median Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 7</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Data for children in study sample (n=2,834; n=674 for children 5 and under), which includes income-eligible voucher children with new subsidy receipt spell starting in 2012 (excludes DTA, i.e. TANF, cases). Percentages after region names represent % of the study sample in each region.
(Selected) Impact model results

N=2,834. Solid blue bars represent statistically significant results, p<0.05. Additional significant covariates (p<0.05) not shown: subsidy amount, work hours, service code (special needs). Additional non-significant covariates (p>0.05): Race, number of children in care, provider type, provider structure, service code (post transitional, other), family income, father in house, July/August/Sept exit. FULL MODEL RESULTS AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST.
Children in the region with the highest “family friendliness” rating demonstrate greatest stability of subsidy receipt

N=2,834. **p<0.05; *p<=0.10
Odds of exit in lagged reassessment month, by CCR&R region

The odds of leaving subsidies in lagged reassessment month (i.e. month immediately after end of 12 month reassessment period, or month 13) varies by region

All results shown are statistically significant, p<0.05.
Summary of results

- Administrative factors are the strongest predictors of subsidy exits and are high across regions
  - But results do suggest that some regions may be better than others

- Results suggest that even in a state with many of the key CCDF provisions in place, local administrative factors may play a role in “moving the needle” on stability

- Next steps:
  - Assess impacts using an expanded sample
  - Incorporate data from parent interviews
Implications for evaluating CCDF policy changes

- When studying statewide impacts of policy changes, important to include several regions/counties

- Local variation in practices and lack of consistent local performance metrics are challenges in local implementation research

- Local implementation studies are key to understanding local variation in impacts (and statewide effects too)
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