

D1: What Do We Know About Professional Development for Home-Based Child Care Providers?

Thursday, February 8, 2018

10:15 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. | Washington I

1. Descriptive Information

D1: What Do We Know About Professional Development for Home-Based Child Care Providers?

This session will build on existing projects (i.e., Power to the Profession and the National Academy of Sciences Workforce Development Report), policy (i.e., the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014), and research data as frameworks to enhance our understanding of professional development for home-based child care providers. Presenters will engage in an ‘inverted’ session, which focuses the presentation on the integration and synthesis across research findings rather than individual presentations of research. The presentation will draw on findings from the National Study of Family Child Care Networks, the LA Advance Study, and the evaluation of Stars Plus, part of the Delaware Quality Rating and Improvement System, to inform a broader conversation about the professional development of HBCC providers within the context of the aforementioned national projects and regulation.

Facilitator

Chrishana M. Lloyd, Child Trends

Panelists

Juliet Bromer, Erikson Institute and
Toni Porter, Early Care and Education Consulting | *Unpacking Family Child Care Network Support: Findings from the National Study of Family Child Care Networks*

Elizabeth Cavadel and Emily Moiduddin, Mathematica Policy Research | *The LA Advance Study: Family Child Care Providers’ Perspectives on Professional Development*

Rena Hallam, University of Delaware | *Promoting Quality in Licensed Family Child Care: An Examination of Stars Plus*

Discussant

Katherine Kempe, National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)

Scribe

J.R. Sayoc, ICF

2. Documents Available on Website

- Workforce Development for Early Educators in Los Angeles: A portrait of FCCs from the LA Advance study

3. Brief Summary of Presentations

Comment: Folks running business are also the providers in home based child care

Summary of Presentation #1: Mathematica – LA Advance Study: Family Child Care Providers’ Perspectives on Professional Development

- LA Advance is an evaluation of 5 workforce and professional development programs for early educators in Los Angeles. Funded by First 5 LA.
 - Evaluation 2014-2017: included center based; family child care (FCC); and school-based
- Primary goal of study:

- Who are the early educators participating in the workforce programs and design experience?
 - What are the outcomes and impacts associated with taking part in the workforce program?
- This presentation focuses on FCC participants
- Selected description information for FCC and centers
 - Early educators were highly motivated in participating in PD
 - Gaining knowledge (higher rate in FCC than child care centers)
 - Improve qualifications (higher rate in center)
 - Desired training
 - Want more information about how children grow and develop
 - 87% FCC, 79% centers
 - Barriers to participating in professional development between FCC and centers
 - Time has an equal rating as a barrier to PD between FCC and centers
 - Money (fewer FCC than centers)
 - English language skills – higher rates of being barrier in FCC homes than centers
- Closer look at FCC program participant goals
 - Program provider
 - Child development course work
 - Advising
 - Bilingual tutoring
 - Tech training module
 - Professional development
 - Program goals
 - Knowledge of and participation in higher education opportunities
 - Program participants
 - Characteristics
 - 82% work in FCC (55% are owners of FCC programs)
 - 95% participants are women, majority Hispanic
 - Satisfaction
 - Most were satisfied with program and felt it increased their knowledge
 - Participant outcomes
 - Increase in AA degree or higher
 - Increase in permit holders
 - Qualifications (education and permit) improved over time
 - These outcomes paralleled those found in the overall LA Advance study which included center-based and school-based settings in addition to FCCs
- Conclusions
 - FCC staff are interested in PD and want more of it
 - Very motivated
 - Improving knowledge and practice
 - Tutoring and advising occurred in high levels
 - English language skills were a challenge
 - Program participants improved in education level and permits
 - Programs were not successful in improving classroom quality. Interventions focused directly on components of quality may be more successful.
 - Program highlighted mainly focuses on FCC
 - Staff in study were recruited and found out through CCR&R
 - Worth looking at how to connect with less connected FCCs
- Questions
 - Report is available online: first 5 LA's website

- **Summary of Presentation #2: Rena Hallam, University of Delaware, Stars plus (QRIS) Boosting FCC Success in QRIS**
 - FCC and QRIS – focus of study
 - Who participates vs who does not in QRIS?
 - Licensed FCC is an understudied caregiving setting
 - State system struggle to effectively engage in quality improvement and QRIS
 - Quality initiatives designed for FCC (clarification licensed FCC does not refer to home-based providers in this presentation)
 - Social support – FCC providers can be isolated from other providers or available support systems
 - Targeted PD – more applicable for FCC providers
 - On-site TA – easily accessible for FCC providers
 - What is Stars Plus?
 - Take what was known about FCC and embed in QRIS
 - Designed to engage providers who serve low-income children
 - To participate, needed to live or serve low income area
 - Four components
 - Community of practice (CoP) focused on quality Improvement – different groups shared how they tackled issues
 - Weekly TA – available, not always wanted or needed.
 - Coordinated PD – paying for credentials. Providers got to choose credential wanted (e.g. administrative credentials)
 - Additional grant funds - \$2,000
 - Brief overview
 - 5-star system
 - Hybrid model
 - Participation and Method
 - 278 programs – programs were paired by location to from CoP
 - 98 stars plus
 - 180 not in stars plus
 - Matched admin data – QRIS, Licensing, subsidy, and census
 - Do FCC programs in Stars Plus do better than those that are not?
 - In general providers who participated were more likely to move up a star level
 - Implication and next steps
 - QRIS are complex and FCC may need more support
 - What supports can be provided to help improve providers' star rating?
 - Individualized TA was most important
 - CoP more cost effective than individualized TA
- **Summary of Presentation #3: Juliet Bromer and Toni Porter – Erikson Institute, Unpacking Family Child Care Network Support**
 - What is a FCC network?
 - FCC networks offer a menu of ongoing supports to providers including visits to home, professional development, and other targeted supports through a qualified specialist
 - Networks may be stand alone or embedded in community based org
 - CCR&R, Head Start, etc.
 - Prior research on FCC networks
 - Very little research, only a few studies have been conducted
 - Small evidence that shows FCC networks can provide higher quality care (research conducted in Chicago, CT, OR)
 - Higher quality for providers in network vs those who are not
 - Unanswered questions

- What factors contributed to effective support services for FCC?
 - Which combination of services are effective and why?
 - How do effective services shape outcomes?
- National Study of FCC networks – research design
 - Web based survey
 - Director interviews (48)
 - Staff (184) and provider surveys (221)
- Types of Organizations in study -181 total organizations
 - Most are FCC networks and shared services and CCR&Rs
 - Fewer are Early Head Start, Head Start, and Migrant Head Start; FCC associations; unions
- Types of programs
 - Primary funding sources
 - Types of home-based providers served & where providers live
 - Help with systems or programs
- Types of services
 - Visits to provider homes
 - Frequency and duration of visits
 - Peer supports
 - Staff and/or provider peer groups
 - Peer mentoring
 - Training
 - Workshops
 - CDA
 - Help with curriculum
 - Operation assistance
 - Recruitment and enrollment of families
 - Business and admin supports
 - Materials and equipment
 - Language of service delivery
- Next steps
 - Analysis of interview data: and finding data on:
 - Implementation of services
 - Changes in supply
 - Integration with system (QRIS, subsidy, Pre-k)
 - Peer support
 - Provider recruitment and engagement
 - Program goals and objectives
 - Work with families
- **Summary of Presentation #4: Power to the Profession – Katherine Kemp – Discussant**
 - Power to the profession aligned with 15 organizations
 - Not a new or isolated conversation
 - Continuation of conversations of advocacy
 - Informed by past and current strategies
 - Aligns with other state and national efforts
 - Peer to Peer prices child care a bit different
 - Profession itself must take lead in conversations about professionalization of field
 - Compensation must be the goal
 - Families can't pay more and providers can't take less
 - Diversity and equity must be unassailable cornerstone of child care profession

- Profession must be structured like all other professions (e.g. nursing, teachers, etc.)
- Power to the profession
 - Three-pronged approach
 - Support image of profession with use of national campaigns
 - For example, Johnson and Johnson's Discover Nursing Initiative, as model
 - Defining and growing the profession
 - Investing in the profession
- Power to the profession goals
 - Establish a shared framework of careers pathways, knowledge and competencies
 - Develop a comprehensive policy and financing strategy
- Timeline
 - Define profession Jan 2017 to Dec 2018
 - Grow and advance the profession with aligned policy and funding 2019
 - Continuous improvement
- Decision making structure
 - Task force comprised of the 15 partnered organizations
 - The field of child care
 - Stakeholders
- Core components of a profession – being accountable for holding up standards of profession
 - Name
 - Distinct role and responsibilities
 - Code of ethics
 - Expectation and standards for practice
 - Competencies
 - Educational requirements for professional entry
 - Examination or assessment requirements for professional entry
 - Experience
- Decision making cycles Jan 2017 – Dec 2018
 - Professional identification and boundary
 - Competences (general)
 - Competencies (specialized)
 - Competency attainment source
 - Qualifications and pathways

4. Brief Summary of Discussion

Q&A and Discussion

- a. Are you learning about how providers are coming into contact with these networks?
 - i. In follow up interviews, we are asking many questions about engagement. How long providers are engaged, if they come back or not; what services were provided?
- b. Careers ladders, we don't see PD as focused on providers already in the field, getting current providers to the next level, PD is often focused on entering the field and entry level providers
 - i. Career trajectory is currently not supported
 - ii. In profession, current status, come to agreement on how to define entry level
 1. Next steps, look into advancement, supporting access to ongoing PD, trajectories
- c. Career ladder and trajectory far too linear for child care profession
 - i. Care is more human vs profession (e.g. Nursing field more focused on qualification and education now versus care)
 - ii. Providers can take years of training without having a degree but degree requirements can be barrier in system for advancement despite breadth of experience

- 5. Summary of Key issues raised** (facilitators are encouraged to spend the last 3-5 minutes of sessions summarizing the key issues raised during the session; bullets below are prompts for capturing the kinds of issues we're looking for)

N/A