Child Care and Development Fund
How Research Informed the Final Rule
CCDF Reauthorization

• In 2014, Congress on a bipartisan basis reauthorized Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) Act. This was an historic re-envisioning of child care.

• HHS published a final rule on September 30, 2016 to update Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) regulations.
What Are the Major Provisions of CCDF Reauthorization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety standards and training, background checks, and monitoring of providers.</td>
<td>Increased share of funds directed towards maintaining and improving quality.</td>
<td>Consumer education available to parents, the public, and child care providers.</td>
<td>Eligibility practices that promote stability of care; strengthened provider payment rates and practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health and Safety Provisions
(Licensing, Training, & Monitoring)
Criminal Background Checks

The law requires comprehensive background checks be completed (by Sept. 30, 2017) for child care staff members of:

- All licensed, regulated, or registered providers;
- All providers eligible to deliver CCDF-funded services.
Help Parents Make Informed Consumer Choices and Access Information to Support Child Development
Enhance the Quality of Child Care and the Early Childhood Workforce
• Equal Access Provisions
• Payment Rates
• Co-Payments
• Payment Practices
Subsidy Eligibility & Homeless Provisions

- Lengthened Eligibility & Continuity
- Flexibility for Working Parents
- Continued Assistance/Job Search
- Graduated Phase-out
- Homeless Provisions
The Role of Research in Shaping the CCDF Final Rule

• The rule’s policies and provisions are based on the CCDBG Act of 2014
• The rule provides additional details and clarifications, which are informed by research
• The rule’s preamble—which provides rationale, background and context—cites numerous research studies
• Much of the research was funded by CCDF, administered by OPRE, and conducted by members of the Child Care and Early Education Policy Research Consortium
Health and Safety

- Used research-informed Caring for Our Children, 3rd Edition to support health and safety standards.
- Used data from the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) to help estimate the potential impact and scope of the rule.
- Cited research that licensing not only raises standards of quality, but serves as an important mechanism for identifying high-risk facilities that pose the greatest risk to child safety. (Dreby, J., Wrigley, J., Fatalities and the Organization of Child Care in the United States, 1985-2003, American Sociological Review, 2005)
Quality

- Large studies on the long-term impacts of quality support the increased quality set-aside and new quality activities. *(e.g., National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development, 2010)*

- Research on infant and toddler brain development support an increased focus on improving quality for infants and toddlers. *(e.g., National Research Council and Institute of Medicine, From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development, Board on Children, Youth, and Families, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, 2000)*
Consumer Education

• One study showed posting inspection reports online improved quality, specifically the classroom environment. (Witte, A. and Queralt, M., What Happens When Child Care Inspections and Complaints Are Made Available on the Internet? National Bureau of Economic Research, 2004)

• Research informed the preamble’s recommended framework for designing a QRIS. (e.g., Mitchell, A., Stair Steps to Quality: A Guide for State and Communities Developing Quality Rating Systems for Early Care and Education. United Way of America, 2005)

• A study showed many families were not accessing all the assistance programs for which they might be eligible (e.g., Medicaid or CHIP, SNAP, etc.) (Mills, G., Compton, J. and Golden, O., Assessing the Evidence about Work Support Benefits and Low-Income Families, Urban Institute, 2011)
Subsidy Eligibility

• Short subsidy spells and “churning” was detrimental to children and families and inefficient for States. (*Forry, et. al., Child Care Decision-Making Literature Review, Child Trends 2013; Grobe, Weber, and Davis, Why do they leave? Child care subsidy use in Oregon, 2006.)*

• Stability of child care arrangements can affect children’s healthy development, especially for vulnerable children. (*Adams, G., and Rohacek, M., Child Care Instability: Definitions, Context and Policy Implications, Urban Institute, 2010)*

• Frequent changes in child care arrangements is associated with children’s negative behavior. (*de Schipper, J.C., Van Ijzendoorn, M. & Tavecchio, L., Stability in Center Day Care: Relations with Children’s Well-being and Problem Behavior in Day Care, Social Development, 2004; Howes, C. & Hamilton, C.E., Children’s Relationships with Caregivers: Mothers and Child Care Teachers, Child Development, 1992)*
Subsidy Equal Access


• Research focusing on the experiences of child care providers informed improvements to payment practices—e.g. timeliness, processes for resolving disputes, etc. (Adams, G., Rohacek, M., and Snyder, K., *Child Care Voucher Programs: Provider Experiences in Five Counties*, The Urban Institute, 2008)
Opportunities to Partner with States, Territories, Tribes and with ACF

• Track impacts of implementing reauthorization on children, families, and providers.
• Conduct analysis using new data elements and reports (e.g., homeless status, child fatalities, quality expenditures).
• Provide expertise to help States meet new requirements (e.g., valid market rate surveys, alternative methodologies for rate-setting).