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CCDBG Implementation Research and Evaluation Grants

Phase I: Planning Grant (1.5 Year)
- Identify policy changes related to 2014 CCDBG Reauthorization
- Construct and test pre-measures
- Create implementation research and evaluation design

Phase II: Implementation Research and Evaluation Grant (4 Years)
If awarded:
- Execute implementation research and evaluation plan
Evaluating CCDBG Policy Changes
New MA CCDBG Authorization Policy

12 Month Authorization Period
All families will have a 12 month authorization period
Time for job search
Easier mid-authorization reporting policies

MA System Improvements
- Reduces inflexibility to changes in employment
- Less paperwork to process TANF/DCF families
- Reduces interim reporting requirements

Improved Subsidy Stability
- Family Stability: Stabilizes utilization of subsidies
- Provider Subsidy Enrollment Stability: Decreases churning of subsidized children in care

Positive CCDBG Outcomes
- Stabilizes parent employment
- Stabilizes child care arrangements
- Stabilizes provider revenue streams
Pre-Measures: Stability in Child Care Subsidy Use and Care Arrangement for Children in MA
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Data and Sample

• Data
  - Administrative data from Jan. 2012 to Jun. 2015

• Sample (n=53,692)
  - All children, excluding homeless and teen parent children, with a new subsidy-receipt spell between January and December 2012
  - Followed for at least 30 months after starting a new spell (maximum 42 months)
### Average Number of Spells and Providers Used, All Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>Number of Subsidy-Receipt Spells</th>
<th>Number of Providers Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TANF</td>
<td>23,307 (42%)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Eligible</td>
<td>21,166 (38%)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare</td>
<td>9,219 (17%)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>53,692 (100%)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre-Measures (Phase I):
Providers’ Subsidy Stability
Provider Level Measures

- **Turnover Rate**
  - Number of subsidized children that left during the school year divided by the total number of subsidized children served during the school year.

- **Return Rate**
  - Among the subsidized children who left, how many children returned to the providers that they previously attended.
Data and Sample

• **Data**
  - Provider-level data (merged subsidy data with data from Licensing Manager)

• **Sample (n=3,597)**
  - Providers that served at least one subsidized child during the time period
  - Excluded any providers with licensing issues or providers that went out of business during the time period
Annual Turnover Rate of Subsidized Children, by Child Age Served

- All: 41%
- Infant and/or Toddler: 43%
- Preschooler: 40%
- School-Age: 57%
- Others: 40%
Annual Turnover Rate of Subsidized Children, by Eligibility Group Served

- All: 41%
- Income-Eligible: 35%
- TANF-Eligible: 42%
- Receiving Child Welfare Service: 38%
- Others: 43%
Return Rate of Subsidized Children, by Child Age Served

- All: 19%
- Infant and/or Toddler: 22%
- Preschooler: 25%
- School-Age: 40%
- Others: 17%
Return Rate of Subsidized Children, by Eligibility Group Served

- All: 19%
- Income-Eligible: 25%
- TANF-Eligible: 30%
- Receiving Child Welfare Service: 6%
- Others: 18%
Phase II: Evaluating CCDBG Authorization Policy Changes
Key Design Components

• **CCDBG Policy Changes:** longer authorization period, job search, reduce mid-authorization reporting

• **Outcomes:**
  – Family stability: Subsidy receipt, continuity of care
  – Provider stability: Turnover rate, return rate

• **Mixed Methods Design:** Policy Impact and Implementation
Mixed Method Evaluation

Implementation Study:
Design, roll out and changes at all levels
New policy begins August 2018

Continuous Quality Improvement Built In:
Evaluate updates/changes to policy implementation

Impact Study:
Comparing stability patterns before and after policy changes
Impact Data: Family, Payment, Licensing
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