Counting and Characterizing the ECE Workforce: Center-Based

Richard N. Brandon
Lekha Venkataraman, NORC
MOTIVATIONS FOR WORKFORCE COMPONENT OF NSECE
Primary Objectives for Workforce Data

• Provide first complete, nationally representative sample of entire ECE workforce and caregiving population: center/home-based; formal vs. FFN providers, including nannies (prior presn).
• Examine workers/caregivers in context of workplace and community.
• Include items predictive of observed quality.
Examine Workers in Context

• Individual WF sample from selected classrooms allows linkage of individual R’s to organizational characteristics collected from Directors.
• Age of children responsible for.
• Representative geographic sample (low-income oversample) allows linkage to demographic, workforce and price-availability data.
Include Items Linked to Observed Quality

• *Qualifications*: education, age, experience, ECE certification, compensation.

• *Attitudes and orientations*: Modernity Scale; stress, depression, professional identification and motivation scales.

• *Leadership and Morale*: Turnover.

• *Professional development/training* support and participation.

• *Activities*: use of curriculum, planning, structure, screen time, vigorous physical.
SAMPLING AND DATA COLLECTION ISSUES IN THE WORKFORCE SURVEY
Center-based Workers

- Random age group chosen from CB questionnaire
- Random classroom from selected age group chosen.
- Roster of classroom staff collected
- Only classroom/group-assigned (non-specialist) staff were eligible for the center-based workforce component
Spawning a WF Provider Respondent

• Roster of staff members who work in selected classroom
  – Name
  – Job Title
  – Hours worked
• Questionnaire is programmed to pick WF R from all eligible classroom staff
• Probability of selection was higher for those who worked more hours in the classroom.
Data Collection Modes

• Web
• With field interviewer (in-person or over the phone)
• Self administered questionnaire (SAQ)
Eligible WF Respondents

- ~8,200 completed Center based questionnaires.
- ~84% spawned a “workable” WF case
- ~10% of questionnaires did not provide sufficient information to spawn a WF case (insufficient or bad classroom or staff information)
Issues in Spawning

• Issue
  – CB director respondents very protective of staff
  – Wouldn’t provide classroom staff names
  – Approximately 700 cases provided inadequate information to spawn
  – No bias found in which centers or staff types didn’t spawn

• Resolution
  – Informed CB respondent of the WF survey early on
  – Allowed them to use initials, job titles, etc.
  – Ability to follow up with CB R to determine who was selected
  – Utilized demographic info to determine who selected staff was
Issues in Spawning (continued)

• Issue
  – Mobility of staff
  – Selected staff members were no longer at the provider location
  – Approximately 140 cases required NORC to select a new WF R

• Resolution
  – Field Interviewers notified central office of cases where the selected worker was no longer at location
  – NORC randomly selected a new staff member from roster collected in quex
  – Contacted CB R to obtain new roster for selection
Gaining Cooperation

- Workers were contacted in batches as their associated CB interview was completed.
- Five batches total
- Initial letter, follow-up postcard, self-administered paper questionnaire (SAQ)
General Response Findings

• Staff were actually very cooperative once selected.

• ~80% interview completion rates among eligible WF cases
  – ~49% of cases completed via Web
  – ~48% of cases completed with a field interviewer
  – ~3% completed via SAQ
IMPLICATIONS FOR ANALYSIS OF WORKFORCE DATA
Best Estimate of # ECE WF, Unpaid Caregivers

• Limitations of Federal Labor Statistics (see NAS report); required demand-based estimates (Brandon & Whitebook)

• Representative sampling and questions reflecting federal workforce concepts allows an estimation of number of ECE workers, including by age of child and type of setting.

• Home-based include but distinguish unpaid caregivers.
Comparing Workforce Sub-groups

- See if different components (CB, FCC, FFN) of the WF vary with regard to predictors of quality.

- Distinguish sub-groups of staff who may vary: high/low SES; large/small programs; auspices; high/low price; related/unrelated; caregiver home (FCC) vs. child home (nannies).

- Sub-group analyses may be limited by sample sizes.
Examining WF in Context

• Compare staff serving low-income or high-minority communities, urban/rural, high/low percentages of subsidized, ELL or special-needs children, on wide range of characteristics.

• Examine relation of staff characteristics to center leadership, compensation, prices, subsidies, auspices funding sources.
Limitations for Analysis

- Staff data not appropriate to understand quality of individual centers.
- Partial Sample of SAC staff for Center-based. Both ECE and SAC for home-based; but only centers providing ECE in sample; get SAC if both ages.
Discussion
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Logic Model for NSECE Workforce Data

Demographic Characteristics
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Effective Leadership

Quality Improvement Support, Incentives
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Attitudes, Orientation, Engagement, Neg. Depression, Stress

Staff Stability

Compensation: wages, benefits
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Child Development Outcomes
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