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IL/NY Child Care Research Partnership

- Partnership with Univ. of Chicago & Urban Institute & State Child Care Administrators
  - PI: Julia Henly; Co-PIs: Heather Sandstrom & Amy Claessens
  - Funded by OPRE/ACF, Grants #90YE0133 & #90YE0151-01-00

- To gain knowledge about child care subsidy dynamics and factors associated with subsidy (in)stability and its implications for child care quality and continuity

- 4 Targeted Regions
  - New York – Nassau and Westchester Counties
  - Illinois – Cook County and Southwestern IL

- Non-school aged new entrants in subsidy program

- Multi-component, mixed-method study, including admin. records over 18 months in 4 regions
Potential Challenges
Potential Challenges

Level of the records across states

• How do states collect and store the data?
• e.g., family vs. child
• Implications for:
  – making comparisons across states
  – research questions
Potential Challenges

**Type of information**

- Differences in state definitions of variables, in what is collected, and in reliability/validity.
- e.g., type of care
- Useful to consult with program administrators
- Recommend analyzing data from each state separately
Potential Challenges

Time Unit

- Weekly vs. Monthly Records
- Example from MN/MD Child Care Research Partnership (Liz Davis)
Spells with the same number of weeks may include a different number of months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE NUM</th>
<th>Month 1</th>
<th>Month 2</th>
<th>Month 3</th>
<th>Month 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Week 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential Challenges

Interpreting results

• Inadequate control of contexts
  – state economy
  – influence of other state programs, e.g., TANF

• Programs vary in many ways
  – caseload composition

• Important to understand local context and also examine within state differences
Potential Benefits
Benefits to using data from multiple states

• Administrative data is useful for comparing longitudinal patterns in program use
  – How do patterns of subsidy use vary across states?
  – How does the continuity of subsidized care arrangements vary across states?
  – How do caseload compositions vary across states?

• Advantages/Disadvantages
Kaplan-Meier Survival Curve of First Subsidy Spell, 18-month window

- **New York**
  - Nassau: 12 months
  - Westchester: 10 months

- **Illinois**
  - Cook County: 9 months
  - Southwestern IL: 6 months
Smoothed Hazard Curve of the First Subsidy Spell, 18-month window

- New York
- Illinois
Illinois: Exit and Re-entry Into Subsidy Program Over 18 months (N=5893)

- Continuous use for 12 mos.+, 33%
- Exit within 12 mos., 67%
- Re-enter in 1-3 mos., 32%
- Re-enter in 4-6 mos., 8%
- Re-enter after 6 mos. or no re-entry, 60%

New York: Exit and Re-entry Into Subsidy Program Over 18 months (N=1819)

- Continuous use for 12 mos.+, 44%
- Exit within 12 mos., 56%
- Re-enter in 1-3 mos., 32%
- Re-enter in 4-6 mos., 9%
- Re-enter after 6 mos. or no re-entry, 59%
Summary

- Multi-state comparisons can be interesting and useful
- But present challenges
  - Need to create comparable measures
  - Understand local context and consult with program administrators
  - Use caution in interpreting results
It takes a lot of people to do multi-state, multi-method research

- **Program Officers**: Susan Jekielek; Ivelisse Martinez-Beck; Ann Rivera
- **Investigators. PI**: Julia Henly; Co-PI’s: Amy Claessens, UC-Harris & Heather Sandstrom, Urban Institute
- **Key Research Staff**: Alejandra Ros Pilarz, JaeSeung Kim, Carolyn Barnes, University of Chicago; Julia Gelatt & Olivia Healy, Urban Institute
Thank you!

Alejandra Ros Pilarz

pilarz@wisc.edu
Extra Slides
Linking administrative data with additional data sources

• Admin data have advantage of telling story over time for large sample

• But story only as good as the data

• Several advantages to linking admin data to other sources
  – Surveys, qualitative interviews, participant observation, etc.
IL/NY Child Care Research Partnership:

Relationship between Data Components

**Phase 1**
- Family-level child care payment records
  - Parent Telephone Survey
  - Parent In-Depth Interviews

**Phase 2**
- Provider Database (R&Rs)
  - Provider Interviews

- Policy Stakeholder IW’s & Document Review
# Continuity in Subsidized Child Care Providers over 18 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Illinois</th>
<th>New York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of total provider changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within spell change</strong> during first subsidy spell</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between spell change</strong> during first exit &amp; re-entry (if 2+ spells)</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>5,092</td>
<td>1,819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>