## 1. Descriptive Information

| **Workshop ID and Title-** D2- Building More Culturally Responsive and Valid Research: Considering Different Methods with Underrepresented Populations<br><br>Traditional methodologies in mainstream research allow for little opportunity for participants to initiate, contribute, critique, or evaluate work. Additionally, due to concerns about research and past abuses, many minority and marginalized populations and communities have been historically excluded from policy research. This roundtable discussion will explore recent and ongoing research efforts to develop more culturally valid and responsive research and the ways that this work can more effectively advance our knowledge base and inform early childhood policy. This breakout will include a discussion regarding planning for and implementing studies, including measure development and validation, as well as reporting findings respectfully, in consideration of past abuses and the vulnerable status of study participants. It will also allow for a discussion of the implications for policy. | **Facilitator**<br>• Aleta Meyer, OPRE, ACF<br><br>**Presenters**<br>• Lizabeth Malone, Mathematica Policy Research<br>• Sandra Barrueco, Catholic University of America<br>• Jessica Barnes-Najor, Michigan State University and Tribal Early Childhood Research<br><br>**Scribe**<br>• Maya Cook, Child Trends |
|---|---|

## 2. Documents in Session Folder
   a. Slides will be available on Research Connections
      i. Included in the slides is a link to the roadmap referenced in presentation 1

## 3. Brief Summary of Presentations

**Summary of Presentation #1:** Aleta Meyer, OPRE
- At OPRE, the work we do is grounded in ACF's evaluation policy. When working with tribal communities, it is important that we maximize and consider what is being done more broadly in OPRE.
- The Roadmap for Collaborative and Effective Evaluation in Tribal Communities was a 17-month project where they put together a whitepaper, or what they are calling a roadmap that explains what is working in communities in order to create a new, empowering story about tribal communities.
  o The roadmap is an ecological model grounded in historical context
  o The idea is that we build a "new narrative", and the drivers of this change are relationship building and knowledge and skill building
    ▪ Previously, people felt disempowered because of the relationship building process- they felt that they did not have anyone to relate to
  o Another important aspect of the roadmap is the stakeholder groups, which are grounded in values
  o While there is a lot on the roadmap, it has been helpful in building a new narrative

**Summary of Presentation #2:** The migrant and seasonal head start study- Sandra Barrueco
- Most Head Start studies have not included Migrant Seasonal Head Start (MSHS) programs
  o This is because it is a different system of early childcare and education. Families are moving, and usually during the summer time, so it doesn't fit in the traditional academic calendar year
- National MSHS Survey Design
  o It can be difficult to work with programs who do not have a set schedules; the program year for MSHS programs follow the agricultural calendar and when crops are ready to be planted and harvested.
  o Migrant and sessional Head Start has been serving infants and toddlers since the 70s, so the centers have a mix of ages. We have to think about how to study children that vary in terms of age and time of school entry
  o As part of the study design, in-person meetings, meetings with parents, and conference calls were all helpful to get input and fine tune the study.

- This study is the first like it to include direct child assessment and it is capturing information at the center level Contextual model for MSHS Children- the center is always the child, and outer rings include family and home life experiences and the programs themselves
  - The programs, and therefore providers, are very varied and have no set schedule.
  - For families, time and the weather is very important and makes this model very fluid.
- Timeline of the study
  - We are launching the actual study now and doing a years' worth of data collection in the field
  - We have also continued to do a lot of outreach.
- Lessons learned from the pilot study
  - The original survey gave options for preventing staff turnover. However, it did not mention personal connections and empowering staff, which many center and program directors cited as a way that that they tried to prevent turnover from their staff.
  - The pilot also failed to ask the multiple ways in which staff are supporting families (cook, bus driver, etc.)
  - Finally, many centers are very isolated so the children are usually bussed to the programs. They wanted questions around transportation because they find it difficult to find adequate bus drivers.
- Race/ethnicity original questions
  - There was a lot of confusion when participants were asked for their ethnicity
    - The families did not feel that the races listed accurately reflected their Hispanic heritage.
- Resources original questions
  - When true or false questions were asked in the first person, respondents were confused. Researchers reworded it to make the language more direct.
- Family Conflict Original Context
  - The families did not understand what was meant by "agree" or "disagree" when they were responses on a likert scale. Therefore, researchers reworded it to be more direct and changed the response options to "never, rarely, sometimes, always, and don't know" scale.
- Key Connections to Roadmap
  - It takes a long time to build trust with communities, and we continue to be in times where there is a lot of worry. Therefore, it is important for researchers to get their faces out in communities and gain their trust .

**Summary of Presentation #3:** Tribal Participatory Research on a National Scale: The story of the First National Study of American Indian and Alaska Native Head Start- Lizabeth Malone and Jessica Barnes
- Historically, Region XI Head Start programs have not been included in FACES
  - Therefore national estimates of Head Start data did not include data from Region XI
- The development of the process of the current study was informed by the American Indian and Alaska Native FACES workgroup
  - The workgroup also included 6 subgroups who met more frequently and reported out to the larger workgroup about decisions and recommendations
  - The workgroup meets very often, both in person and through virtual/phone meetings
    - Consultants were compensated for their time as workgroup members
- Major phases of the study- what do we want to do
  - The first step was to decide the population to include in the study. Ultimately it was decided that it should be Region XI as a whole.
  - Then researchers had to figure out how to measure what they wanted to know and determine how a AI/AN FACES might align with the FACES design
    - They presented their plan to the Secretary's Tribal Advisory Council and the Office of Head Start a to inform community partners
  - Before the researchers sent out recruitment letters they held a webinar so that all of Region XI was aware of the study
  - Mathematica (the contractor team) and the workgroup worked together to pair the Mathematica staff member and a researcher together that worked to reach out to programs for recruitment
    - It was very individualized based on the needs of the community
    - They also had an agreement of collaboration and participation in order to list off what Mathematica was doing and what the community was doing

- Once the design was developed they decided that field staff with experience with FACES were the best people to collect the data
- Researchers also incorporated videos into the child assessment and had resources within the workgroup that made it so they could have examples of how the interactions they were trying to study were actually working
- Data reporting- the researchers are in the process of deciding what their priorities are and then talking about how they are going to present it to tribal communities
  - The data will also be available for secondary analysis
- Goal- move past cultural sensitivity and figure out how to do more culturally responsive work

## 4. Brief Summary of Discussion

The discussion began by evaluating the difficulties that researchers face when disseminating results from studies done with migrant workers and other vulnerable populations. The panelists explained that many of the individuals included in the studies actually wanted the information to be disseminated because they wanted people to understand their culture and the unique struggles that they face.  Therefore, there is a momentum to get information out because it is important to the populations studied.

Panelists and audience members also discussed the importance of bi-directional communication, because it makes it easier to describe and talk more clearly about this type of work.  A gold standard that has existed in this field is to translate materials from English to Spanish, and then to hire a professional to translate the responses back. However, there is this new idea to use a community approach, or use a group of people to help translate and get a more holistic picture of the response. The discussion then turned to the use of the word "immigrant". It can be seen as a "dirty" word because of the stigma that comes with it, so as researchers we have to be mindful of the connotations behind some of the words that we use.

## 5. Summary of Key issues raised

a. It is important to consider what rigorous research means when doing research with understudied communities. Rigor means putting everything in place so that you feel confident that everything you are putting out is accurate.  However, rigor might mean something different for each community that you work with. Standardized measures are usually seen as rigorous research instruments, yet they often have to be adapted for or altogether cannot be used with these communities, so rigor must be achieved in other ways.

b. When doing research with migrant populations, researchers must be flexible as changes in schedule often occur.

c. Dissemination is important because it allows the greater public to better understand underserved populations.

d. When doing work with underserved populations, relationship building is especially important because builds trust between the researchers and community members.

e. We want to move past cultural sensitivity and move into doing more culturally responsive work