TECHNICAL REPORT

District of Columbia Child Care Policy Research Partnership Study

Early Care and Education Workforce Survey

Heather Sandstrom   *Peter Willenborg*   *Fernando Hernandez-Lepe*
Timothy Triplett   *Erica Greenberg*
January 2022

URBAN
INSTITUTE · ELEVATE · THE · DEBATE

ABOUT THE URBAN INSTITUTE

The nonprofit Urban Institute is a leading research organization dedicated to developing evidence-based insights that improve people's lives and strengthen communities. For 50 years, Urban has been the trusted source for rigorous analysis of complex social and economic issues; strategic advice to policymakers, philanthropists, and practitioners; and new, promising ideas that expand opportunities for all. Our work inspires effective decisions that advance fairness and enhance the well-being of people and places.

.

Contents

Acknowledgments

DC Child Care Policy Research Partnership Study: Early Care and Education Workforce Survey

This report documents the steps we took to design and administer a survey of the early care and education workforce in facilities participating in Capital Quality, the District of Columbia's quality rating and improvement system (QRIS), in early 2021. We describe the survey development process, survey procedures, response rates, characteristics of the target population and survey sample, and steps taken to weight, clean, and analyze survey data. A companion research brief series presents survey findings.[1]

Motivation for the Survey

The survey is part of the four-year project (September 30, 2019–September 29, 2023) *Access to a Supply of Quality Child Care in the District of Columbia: Project ASQC ("Ask")*, funded through a Child Care Policy Research Partnership Grant from the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (OPRE) in the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). Project ASQC addresses the pressing need for research on the local supply of quality child care and investments in quality improvement initiatives. We are partnering with the District of Columbia's Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) on this work.

The purpose of the survey was to examine the perspectives of early educators working in licensed child development centers and homes that participate in Capital Quality (box 1). The survey gathered information on pressing issues related to their work, including their knowledge of and experiences with Capital Quality, their training needs, and more sensitive questions related to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on their employment, physical and mental health, and economic well-being. Facilities that participate in Capital Quality include those who receive child care subsidies (required participants), as well as some volunteer participants that do not receive subsidies. All early educators working in licensed child development facilities in the District that participate in Capital Quality and had active accounts in a contracted online learning platform used in the District (Quorum e-Learning) were invited to participate in this voluntary, web-based survey in spring 2021.

The survey was conducted to address the following research questions:

1. How did the pandemic affect early educators in DC? Did they lose employment? Did their work hours or earnings change?

2. How is the physical and mental health and financial well-being of the workforce?

3. What are early educators' career plans? What percentage plan to stay in their jobs or the larger early care and education field in the next two years? What are the main reasons they plan to leave?

4. What are early educators' perspectives on Capital Quality? Are they aware of Capital Quality and their facilities' quality designation? What are the perceived benefits of Capital Quality?

5. What were early educators' experiences with virtual training during the COVID-19 pandemic? What are their perceived training needs and preferences on format?

6. How do early educators in child development centers feel about their work environments?

7. What are characteristics of early educators working in QRIS-rated programs, including their qualifications, demographics, compensation, and benefits?

BOX 1
Capital Quality

What Is Capital Quality?

Capital Quality, the District of Columbia's QRIS, offers an example of child care quality improvement spurred by new federal regulations under the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) Act of 2014. Launched in 2016 and fully implemented by 2018, Capital Quality differs from its predecessor, Going for the Gold, in three important ways: it provides more consistent, research-based measures of program quality across settings; an enhanced focus on continuous quality improvement; and public-facing profiles with transparent information on the quality of licensed child care. A website called My Child Care DC (http://mychildcaredc.com/, accessed December 23, 2021) allows families to search for care based on Capital Quality designation and was designed so families could easily identify, review, and compare available options to make more informed decisions.

Who Participates?

Licensed child development facilities in the District that primarily serve children from birth through age 5 with a signed agreement with OSSE for subsidized child care are automatically enrolled in Capital Quality. Other licensed child development facilities are encouraged to participate as volunteers. After a pilot phase, child care providers could participate in one of five cohorts spaced over the course of two years, from March 2017 to January 2019. If providers did not respond, they were assigned to one of the

groups. One key difference between Capital Quality and its predecessor is that Capital Quality exempts providers that receive subsidies but primarily serve school-age children in before- or after-school care. OSSE is still considering ways to include these providers in the QRIS.

What Does Capital Quality Offer Early Educators?

All facilities participating in Capital Quality are observed annually using a validated tool—the Environment Rating Scales® (ERS®) or the Classroom Assessment Scoring System Pre-K® (CLASS Pre-K®), depending on their facility type and ages served. In addition, professional supports are offered to help child care providers reach higher levels of quality and focus on continuous quality improvement. Quality facilitators are ERS® and CLASS Pre-K®-certified coaches that work with providers, specifically center directors and lead home caregivers, to develop and implement a continuous quality improvement plan. Providers receive ongoing technical assistance, incentives, and resources, and participate in communities of practice. Providers that participate in the child care subsidy program are incentivized by a tiered reimbursement rate based on Capital Quality designation. Center-based classroom teachers and support staff in child development homes are not the primary recipients of Capital Quality supports, but the QRIS supports and features are intended to reach them indirectly through program directors.[a]

How Does Capital Quality Determine Designations?

Two years of ERS® and/or CLASS Pre-K® data are combined to determine one of five Capital Quality designations: developing, progressing, quality, high-quality, and preliminary (for facilities still being observed). Designations are based on the extent of evidence (considerable, good, adequate, or minimal) that "the program provides a nurturing environment with supportive interactions (e.g., responsive scheduling, warm/positive interactions) that promotes children's cognitive, physical and social-emotional development." Beginning in fall 2021, newly participating facilities with one year of observation will receive a Capital Quality designation that will remain in place until two years of valid observation data are collected.

[a] OSSE (District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education), "Capital Quality Theory of Change" (Washington, DC: OSSE, 2019), https://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/page_content/attachments/Capital%20Quality%20Theory%20of%20Change%20Infographic_English.pdf.

Survey Sample

Data Sources

We identified early educators eligible for the survey based on user account data from the Quorum e-Learning database maintained by OSSE. Quorum is a membership-based online training platform used by child care facilities in the District to participate in online training courses (https://www.quorumlearning.com/state-initiatives/, accessed December 23, 2021). Quorum membership is voluntary and free to DC early educators, and it is encouraged for staff to maintain their health and safety training requirements. OSSE pays for a subscription for this e-learning service. Child care providers register their staff in the system with their name and email address. Staff complete trainings and can track their progress against licensing requirements. OSSE owns and maintains these records. We used Quorum to identify local early educators, because it was the best available data source that included email addresses, which allowed us to reach out directly to staff rather than going through their employers or other intermediaries. OSSE notes that participation in Quorum is not universal but very high.

In February 2021, OSSE provided us with the most recent download of active Quorum users (as of February 3, 2021), which we used to identify potential survey respondents. This data file had details on all users in the system, including name, email address, child care facility name, facility license number (where they are employed), position, level of education, and certifications.

We merged the Quorum data file with licensing records and Capital Quality data from November 2019, which we also received from OSSE. This data merge linked early educators' records to details on the facilities in which they were working, including facility location (District Ward), Capital Quality participation status, current quality designation (i.e., *developing*, *progressing*, *quality*, and *high-quality*), and facility type (i.e., center, home, or expanded home).

Eligibility Requirements

We cleaned the Quorum account data to produce a list of early educators eligible for the survey. This involved restricting the list to staff employed in child care facilities that participate in Capital Quality and then to staff with job titles reflecting the following target positions: lead teacher (in centers), assistant teacher (in centers), home caregiver, and associate home caregiver.[2] Directors or owners from homes or expanded homes were also eligible for the survey, as they might have a teacher or caregiver role too. However, we excluded them from certain survey sections only applicable to child care staff not

receiving direct coaching though Capital Quality (see "Survey Development" section for further details). We excluded owners or directors from child development centers, volunteer teachers, administrative staff, cooks, and other support staff with nonteaching roles. In total, 2,613, or about 38 percent, of the total 6,865 staff in the Quorum data were eligible for the survey, based on these criteria (being employed in a facility participating in Capital Quality and having a title reflective of being an educator or eligible director).

We decided to conduct a census of early educators rather than sampling to produce a sufficient sample size for analysis. Knowing the survey was web-based, voluntary, and administered during the COVID-19 pandemic, we expected the response rate may be lower than usual. We emailed a survey invitation to all 2,613 eligible staff with a unique survey link that we used for tracking responses and sending reminders. See tables in the "Response Rates" section for further details on the total number of eligible staff, broken into different groupings based on facility type, staff position, facility quality designation, and District ward, as well as the response rates from each of those groupings.

Survey Questionnaire

Targeted Research Constructs

Before drafting a survey questionnaire, we developed a set of research constructs that aligned with the survey purpose and key research questions. We used these research constructs to help identify existing survey questions, draft new questions, and organize the survey sections. Table 1 shows a list of targeted research constructs for each survey section.

TABLE 1

Crosswalk of Research Constructs by Survey Section

Survey section	Targeted research constructs
Section A. Effects of COVID-19 on Employment[a]	▪ Changes in employment or temporary unemployment ▪ Changes in income ▪ Changes in total hours worked
Section B. Capital Quality[b]	▪ Awareness of Capital Quality ▪ Experiences with Capital Quality ▪ Perceptions of Capital Quality and its components ▪ Benefits of Capital Quality
Section C. Professional Development	▪ Virtual training experiences during the pandemic ▪ Perceived training needs ▪ Preferred training format
Section D. Career Plans	▪ Job satisfaction ▪ Turnover intentions ▪ Career motivation

Survey section	Targeted research constructs
Section E. Qualifications	▪ Work experience ▪ Highest educational attainment
Section F. Employee Benefits and Compensation	▪ Job earnings ▪ Employee benefits
Section G. Work Environment for Center Staff [c]	▪ Quality of working conditions
Section H. Demographics	▪ Sex ▪ Age ▪ Ethnicity ▪ Race ▪ Languages spoken ▪ Country of origin; recency of arrival in US for foreign-born ▪ Marital status ▪ Dependent children in household ▪ Household income
Section I. Health and Well-Being	▪ Physical health status ▪ Mental health (anxiety and depression) ▪ Food insecurity ▪ Economic needs ▪ Public benefits receipt

[a] Respondents who indicated in section A that they were not currently working as an early childhood educator in the selected facility in the District of Columbia and did not plan to return skipped most survey sections designed for the current workforce and were only asked to complete sections A (Effects of COVID-19 on Employment), E (Qualifications), H (Demographics), and I (Health and Well-Being).

[b] Respondents who reported being listed as the director or owner on the licensing record for their child care facility skipped this section. These staff receive direct support from quality facilitators in Capital Quality and have different work experiences than classroom teachers and home caregivers, so we excluded them from this section.

[c] Respondents who indicated they worked in a child development home or expanded home skipped this section designed for center-based teaching staff.

Survey Development

Once we had a draft survey questionnaire, we conducted cognitive testing in English with two quality facilitators—coaches who work directly with child care directors in Capital Quality to support their quality improvement. Because all early educators in Capital Quality–participating facilities were eligible for the survey, we avoided cognitive testing with potential survey respondents. We found the quality facilitators to be very knowledgeable and capable of providing useful feedback on the clarity, relevance, and flow of survey questions. We implemented changes to the questionnaire based on cognitive testing.

A native, fluent Spanish speaker on the research team translated the survey questionnaire into Spanish and a second native, fluent Spanish speaker at the Urban Institute reviewed the translation and made improvements. Then, we shared the Spanish survey questionnaire with a Spanish-speaking quality facilitator and asked her to review and provide feedback on the translation, with particular attention to terminology specific to early care and education and Capital Quality.

Once survey questionnaires were finalized, we used Qualtrics software to program the web-based survey with an option to administer it in English or Spanish. We tested the survey internally to check accuracy of text and skip patterns and test for length. The target length was 20 minutes, and we modified the questionnaire further to reduce length given the results of internal testing.

We administered the survey in stages. First, we launched a pilot survey with 5 percent of the eligible early educators; then administered the "main sample" survey to the remaining list of potential respondents. Through the pilot survey, we were able to get a sense of initial response rates, survey length with respondents from the ECE workforce, and technical issues. We slightly revised the survey questionnaire based on this information, cutting some questions to reduce length and reorganizing others to promote survey participation and completion. We then prepared the main sample survey for fielding. See the appendix for the survey questionnaire used for the main sample.

As we tracked survey responses, we noted a small group of respondents (54 total) in the main sample answered some of the questions in section A (Effects of COVID-19 on Employment) but did not get past that first section. To increase sample sizes for individual survey items, we sought and received approval from our Institutional Review Board to recontact these participants and invite them to complete their surveys if desired. We revised the main sample survey questionnaire (removing much of section A) and created a truncated version for these 54 respondents. We sent them tailored email messages inviting them to finish the survey before the closing deadline. Response rates are included in a later report section.

Recruitment and Data Collection Procedures

Recruitment and Outreach

Table 2 shows the dates when each stage of the survey was fielded. The pilot survey was open for slightly more than nine weeks, while the main sample survey was open for about six weeks. The truncated survey was open for about one week. All three stages closed on the same day, May 3, 2021.

TABLE 2

Dates for Each Stage of the Survey Implementation Process

Type of survey	Dates
Pilot survey	February 24, 2021, to May 3, 2021
Main sample survey	March 17, 2021, to May 3, 2021
Truncated survey	April 27, 2021, to May 3, 2021

We distributed the pilot, main sample, and truncated surveys by email using the email addresses on record in the Quorum data. The pilot survey was sent to 141 of the 2,613 educators eligible for the survey (about 5 percent of the entire eligible sample). The main sample survey was sent out to the remaining 2,472 educators in the sample for completion. We sent the truncated survey out to 54 respondents who did not get past section A in the main sample survey. Additionally, we sent retake links to 25 other respondents from the main survey sample who consented to participate (by opening the survey and advancing) but did not answer any questions.

We broke up the survey distribution list for the main sample into four batches given its large size. This was done to avoid overloading email servers and limit the possibility of our survey distribution being blocked. Gmail accounts were the most common in the Quorum data (1,495 email addresses out of the total 2,613 in the Quorum list), so we split those emails up across the four batches and timed the email delivery for each batch one hour apart.

Before sending survey links through Qualtrics, we sent initial outreach emails to eligible early educators through Outlook mail merge. The initial outreach message informed staff of the upcoming survey and that they would soon receive a unique survey link and not to share it. We also used Outlook to send the 25 retake links (on April 26, 2021) to staff in the main survey sample who consented to participate but did not submit any responses.

Survey Administration and Reminders

While fielding the survey, we used Qualtrics to distribute up to eight reminders for the pilot survey and up to seven reminders for the main sample survey, all in both English and Spanish. We sent weekly reminders on different days of the week and times of day, a three-days-left reminder, a two-days-left reminder, and a last-day reminder. Although we kept the pilot survey open until May 3 to align with the closing date for all survey respondents, we only sent weekly reminder emails about it through April 2 to avoid overburdening potential respondents.

Overall, the survey response time for complete surveys was approximately 30 minutes, excluding outliers who took longer than 60 minutes to complete the survey (there were 31 outliers out of 209 complete responses). This was about 10 minutes longer on average than anticipated. The length could be the result of respondents multitasking or dealing with interruptions while filling out the survey or some respondents simply needing more time to read and respond.

Lottery

At the end of the survey, respondents had the option to enter a lottery to win a $50 Amazon gift card. They clicked on a link that would direct them to a secure site where they could enter their name and email address. In all, 180 survey respondents chose to enter, and we randomly selected 100 lottery winners. Randomization was based on a uniform distribution, giving each of the 180 respondents an equal chance of winning a gift card. Winning respondents were informed by email that they won the lottery, and their gift cards were sent via email through the gift card provider's website. This ensured that the gift cards could be used at their leisure. The lottery only collected enough information to get the gift cards to the pool of potential winners, and the information was collected so that their lottery information could not be connected to their survey results.

Response Rates

Of the 2,613 initial survey invitations we sent, 94 bounced back mainly because of invalid email addresses. We excluded these 94 educators from our list of eligible respondents when calculating response rates. Therefore, we had 2,519 eligible survey respondents. Table 3 lists the number of respondents for each survey. The total sample size across survey versions was 417, for an overall survey response rate of 17 percent.

TABLE 3

Responses by Survey Type

Survey type	Respondents (complete and partial)
Pilot survey	22
Main sample survey (original links)	385
Main sample survey (retake links)	2
Truncated survey	8
Total	**417**

Table 4 describes response rates by different characteristics, combining survey versions. Complete responses reflect when respondents made it all the way through the survey, whereas partial responses reflect when respondents started the survey but exited before reaching the end. Total responses are the number of complete and partial responses. Nonrespondents reflect those who did not start the survey but were invited. Opt-outs were those who received a survey invite but chose to opt out of future survey communications. The total eligible column refers to the number of people that received the invitation (excluding invalid email addresses). The response rate reflects the total responses divided by the total number of eligible participants.

Compared with the overall response rate of 17 percent, there were relatively high response rates from respondents in child development homes (24 percent) and expanded homes (20 percent), respondents in facilities with a *high-quality* designation (27 percent), associate home caregivers (28 percent) and lead home caregivers (21 percent), and respondents from facilities in ward 1 (29 percent). There were relatively low response rates from respondents in facilities with a Capital Quality designation of *preliminary* (13 percent), *developing* (5 percent), or *progressing* (11 percent), and from respondents in facilities in ward 2 (12 percent), ward 5 (11 percent), ward 6 (11 percent), and ward 8 (11 percent).

BOX 2

District of Columbia Wards

The District of Columbia is divided geographically into eight wards, each with different population characteristics, contexts, and histories. Below are brief summary data about each ward in the District based on our analysis of US Census data, to contextualize survey results.

- Wards 7 and 8 are home to majority-Black residents and also have the largest child populations. These wards have the lowest average family incomes and the highest unemployment, child poverty, and violent crime rates in the District by a large margin. Wards 7 and 8 have faced historic disinvestment and structural discrimination since the mid-1900s, when Black residents were displaced from the city center and forced to move out to the Southeast quadrant,[a] contributing to the high unemployment, poverty, and crime rates seen in these wards today.

- Wards 2 and 3 have the highest average family income and lowest unemployment and child poverty rates in the District. These wards are also home to a majority-white population.

- Ward 6, the most populous ward, follows behind wards 2 and 3 in terms of average family income and unemployment rate, though has a much higher child poverty rate, similar to wards 1 and 7. Ward 6 also has majority-white residents, though about a third of the population is Black.

- Wards 1, 4, and 5 fall between other wards across various categories, including average family income, unemployment rate, poverty, and child population. These wards also have more racial and ethnic diversity than other wards.

[a] Mary Bogle, Somala Diby, and Mychal Cohen, *Equitable Development and Urban Park Space: Results and Insights from the First Two Years of Implementation of the Equitable Development Plan of DC's 11th Street Bridge Park Project* (Washington, DC: Urban Institute, 2019), https://www.urban.org/research/publication/equitable-development-and-urban-park-space-results-and-insights-first-two-years-implementation-equitable-development-plan-dcs-11th-street-bridge-park-project.

TABLE 4
Survey Response Rates

Number of responses and response rates by facility type, quality designation, staff position, and ward

	Complete response	Partial response	Total responses	Non respondents	Opt-outs	Total eligible	Response rate (responses/ Total)
Overall	**209**	**208**	**417**	**2,065**	**37**	**2,519**	**17%**
Facility type							
Center	196	191	387	1,962	34	2,383	16%
Home	8	9	17	52	2	71	24%
Expanded home	5	8	13	51	1	65	20%
Capital Quality designation							
Preliminary	9	18	27	181	1	209	13%
Developing	2	1	3	52	3	58	5%
Progressing	44	53	97	752	8	857	11%
Quality	76	83	159	737	13	909	17%
High-quality	78	53	131	343	12	486	27%
Staff position							
Center assistant teachers	86	102	188	921	18	1,127	17%
Center lead teachers	110	90	200	1,040	16	1,256	16%
Associate home caregivers	6	7	13	32	1	46	28%
Lead home caregivers	4	6	10	36	1	47	21%
Eligible home directors	3	3	6	36	1	43	14%
District ward							
Ward 1	61	51	112	276	5	393	28%
Ward 2	6	11	17	127	0	144	12%
Ward 3	7	7	14	78	4	96	15%
Ward 4	35	42	77	316	6	399	19%
Ward 5	11	18	29	232	5	266	11%
Ward 6	12	10	22	181	5	208	11%
Ward 7	50	28	78	327	8	413	19%
Ward 8	27	41	68	528	4	600	11%

Sources: DC Early Care and Education Workforce Survey, Quorum e-learning data, child care licensing records, and Capital Quality administrative data

Notes: What respondents reported in the survey for their facility type and position may have differed from what was listed for respondents in the Quorum data. To determine facility type and position for each respondent, we relied primarily on survey responses and supplemented data on facility type and staff position from Quorum records if missing survey data. For this analysis only, we used administrative data to study characteristics of all survey respondents. We did not link any actual survey responses to administrative data, rather we created a binary indicator for survey participation based on whether an eligible respondent opened the survey and then linked that indicator with administrative data.

Data Cleaning, Weighting, and Analysis

Survey Data Cleaning and Linking

After closing the survey, we downloaded the data from Qualtrics and used Stata software to merge the datasets from the different survey versions together to create a single survey data file. Through the cleaning process, we grouped data by the corresponding survey section, constructed new indicators, and harmonized variables across the three survey versions.

We then merged select variables from administrative data (e.g., Capital Quality designation, District ward) to the survey responses for any respondent that consented in the survey to having their survey responses linked to these administrative data. The data linking allowed us to examine differences in survey responses by characteristics of early educators' workplaces and local communities. (See table 5 for more information on how the distribution of survey respondents compares with the distribution of eligible respondents.). Two variables, facility type and staff position, were collected as part of the survey and were also available in the administrative data. For these, we constructed new variables relying primarily on self-report on the survey and supplementing with administrative data when missing survey responses, for all respondents who consented to having their survey responses linked to administrative data.

Survey Weights

The final survey sample included early educators from different wards, sizes of facilities, facility types, and facility Capital Quality designations, among other variances. About half the sample completed the full survey and half provided partial responses (209 and 208, respectively). Lack of survey completion may be because of survey length and/or lack of respondents' availability or interest to engage.

To adjust for nonresponse bias and improve representation in the analytic sample of the eligible workforce, we developed two sets of survey weights to use in our analyses: one survey weight for when working only with respondents who completed the full survey ("weight_complete_only") and another survey weight when including respondents who completed part of the survey ("weight_complete_partials"). These survey weights reduce potential nonresponse bias by adjusting the sample so the respondents and nonrespondents end up with the same characteristics that we have information on for the full population. However, we cannot adjust for impacts such as not working or suffering hardships during the pandemic, which likely contribute to the lower response rate. The weights primarily adjust for the lower response rates in District wards 2, 5, 6, and 8, as well as lower response rates for early educators working in facilities with a Capital Quality designation of

preliminary, developing, or progressing. The weights also adjust for facility type, because staff in homes and expanded homes were more likely to participate than staff in centers, though this adjustment was much smaller after applying the ward and quality designation adjustments.

Survey weights affect variance estimates and, as a result, tests of significance and confidence intervals. Variance estimates derived from standard statistical software packages that assume simple random sampling are generally too low, which can lead to overstated significance levels and overly narrow confidence intervals. The impact of the survey weight on variance estimates is measured by the design effect and explained in the next section of this document.

Design Effects

Post–data collection statistical adjustments are required because of disproportionate participation rates of eligible early educators. The post–data collection adjustments require analytic procedures that adjust the standard errors we would obtain had we done a simple random sample that involved no adjustments. Therefore, when using survey weights, variance estimation requires estimating the survey design effect associated with the weighted estimate. The term "design effect" is used to describe the variance of the weighted sample estimate relative to the variance of an estimate that assumes a simple random sample.

In a wide range of situations, the adjusted standard error of a statistic should be calculated by multiplying the usual formula by the design effect (deft). Thus, the formula for computing the 95 percent confidence interval around a percentage is

$$\hat{p} \pm \left(deft \times 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})}{n}} \right)$$

where $\hat{p}$ is the sample estimate and n is the unweighted number of sample cases in the group being considered.

To get a more accurate estimate of the standard errors associated with a weighted estimate, we would multiply the unweighted standard error by the appropriate "deft" value. The deft value for "weight_complete_only" is **1.21** and the deft value for "weight_complete_partials" is **1.18**. For example, if using the "weight_complete_partials" weight on a survey measure that had an unweighted standard error of .0212, the weighted estimate would not change; however, the standard error of the estimate would be .0250 (.0212 x 1.18).

Survey Data Analysis

We analyzed the survey data to respond to our target research questions, gaining insights into the perspectives of early educators toward Capital Quality, their training needs, and more sensitive issues related to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on their employment, the quality of their workplace experiences, compensation and benefits, physical and mental health, and economic well-being.

In terms of analytic procedures, we used Stata to clean the survey dataset and produce weighted frequencies and descriptive statistics. Of the 417 respondents, 344 consented to have their survey responses linked to administrative data, which the research team obtained from OSSE. For the respondents that consented to data linking, we disaggregated survey responses in several ways, such as to examine differences by quality designation.

We used partial weights when a significant portion of partial respondents completed the question at hand and complete weights otherwise. To determine whether to use a partial or complete weight, we used the rule of thumb of using partial weights when at least two-thirds of the question's responses were valid (not including skip patterns). We used complete weights in instances where less than two-thirds are valid responses, meaning those who responded were mostly the respondents that completed the full survey. The selected weight affects the estimation of standard errors around the mean but generally does not affect the estimation of means.

Survey Sample Characteristics

Survey respondents represent a group of early educators diverse across their facility types, designated quality levels, roles, and geographic locations. Of the 417 who responded, most (93 percent) worked in child development centers (table 5) and a plurality had a Capital Quality designation of *quality* (38 percent). Respondents were roughly split between center lead teachers (48 percent) and center assistant teachers (45 percent). Most worked in facilities in one of four District wards: ward 1 (27 percent), ward 4 (19 percent), ward 7 (19 percent), or ward 8 (16 percent).

Examining Sample Bias

To examine potential sample bias, we compared the 344 respondents who consented to having their survey responses linked to administrative data with all 417 surveys. These 344 consenting respondents were similar to the full survey sample in terms of the select characteristics identified in table 5. We observe few differences between respondents who consented to data linking and those who declined.

TABLE 5
Survey Sample Characteristics

Comparison across total survey sample, sample consenting to data linking, and survey-eligible population

	Respondents (*N*)	Share of respondents	Respondents linked to administrative data (*N*)	Share of linked respondents	Total invited	Share of total invited
Overall	**417**	**100%**	**344**	**100%**	**2,519**	**100%**
Facility type						
Centers	387	93%	319	93%	2,383	95%
Homes	17	4%	13	4%	71	3%
Expanded homes	13	3%	12	3%	65	3%
Capital Quality designation						
Preliminary	27	6%	24	7%	209	8%
Developing	3	1%	3	1%	58	2%
Progressing	97	23%	76	22%	857	34%
Quality	159	38%	125	36%	909	36%
High-quality	131	31%	116	34%	486	19%
Staff position						
Center assistant teachers	188	45%	155	45%	1,127	45%
Center lead teachers	200	48%	165	48%	1,256	50%
Associate home caregivers	13	3%	11	3%	46	2%
Lead home caregivers	10	2%	8	2%	47	2%
Eligible home directors	6	1%	5	1%	43	2%
District ward						
Ward 1	112	27%	94	27%	393	16%
Ward 2	17	4%	15	4%	144	6%
Ward 3	14	3%	12	3%	96	4%
Ward 4	77	18%	60	17%	399	16%
Ward 5	29	7%	21	6%	266	11%
Ward 6	22	5%	18	5%	208	8%
Ward 7	78	19%	70	20%	413	16%
Ward 8	68	16%	54	16%	600	24%

Sources: DC Early Care and Education Workforce Survey, Quorum e-learning data, child care licensing records, and Capital Quality administrative data.

Notes: For this analysis only, we used administrative data to compare characteristics of the full sample with the restricted sample of respondents consenting to data linking. We did not link any actual survey responses to administrative data—rather we created an indicator for whether a respondent opened the survey and linked that indicator to administrative data.

We also compared survey respondents with the broader population of early educators invited to participate in the survey to identify possible differences. For instance, our findings reflect

- a smaller share of early educators in "progressing" facilities than were invited (23 percent versus 34 percent);

- a greater share of early educators from "high-quality" facilities than were invited (31 percent versus 19 percent);

- a greater share of early educators from facilities in ward 1 than were invited (27 percent versus 16 percent);

- and a smaller share of early educators from facilities in ward 8 than were invited (16 percent versus 24 percent).

As described, sampling weights aim to adjust for variation in participation levels across wards and quality designations.

Demographics of Survey Sample

In this section, we present survey findings describing the demographic and economic characteristics of participating early educators. Most respondents identify as women of color, and they vary widely in age (table 6). About a third of respondents (32 percent) were born outside the United States and come from many different parts of the world, including Central America (28 percent), Asia (22 percent), Africa (13 percent), the Caribbean (13 percent), South America (11 percent), and Mexico (9 percent). Most foreign-born respondents came to the United States post-2000. Of the 32 percent born outside of the United States, 40 percent came to the US in the last decade or so—2010 or later—and a slightly higher share arrived in the preceding decade—between 2000 and 2009 (47 percent). Respondents also speak a variety of languages when caring for children, reflecting the District's linguistic diversity. English is the most prevalent language used with children (87 percent) followed by Spanish (25 percent) and Amharic (7 percent).

TABLE 6
Demographic Characteristics of Survey Sample

	n	%
Age		
20 to 30	50	25%
31 to 40	56	28%
41 to 50	45	19%
51 and older	58	29%
Sex		
Female	205	96.8%
Male	–	–
Nonbinary	–	–
Race/ethnicity		
Non-Hispanic American Indian/Alaska Native	–	–
Non-Hispanic Asian	11	7%
Non-Hispanic Black	118	63%
Hispanic	64	21%
Non-Hispanic White	–	–
Other race/ethnicity	–	–
Two or more races/ethnicities reported	–	–
Language spoken when caring for children		
English	175	87%
Spanish	83	25%
Amharic	20	7%
Other	13	5%
Birth country/region		
Asia	11	22%
Caribbean or South America	18	24%
Central America or Mexico	44	38%
Year last moved to US to stay		
1999 or earlier	13	13%
Between 2000 and 2009	33	47%
2010 or later	39	40%

Source: DC Early Care and Education Workforce Survey.

Note: Cells with fewer than 10 observations are suppressed.

Appendix. Survey Instrument

Project ASQC (Access to a Supply of Quality Care)

District of Columbia Child Care Policy Research Partnership Study
Early Care and Education Workforce Survey Consent Form and Questionnaire

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the DC Early Care and Education Workforce Survey! The information you provide will be extremely valuable to future government planning and to the early care and education field.

Just a few reminders before you begin!

This study is being conducted by the Urban Institute, a nonprofit research organization in the District. The project is funded with a grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

The survey will take about **15–20 minutes** to complete. For data security reasons, the survey must be completed in one session. **At the end of the survey, you may choose to enter into a lottery to win a $50 Amazon gift card. We will pick 100 winners**.

Your participation is completely voluntary. Your answers will not be shared with your employer or anyone outside the research team. Your responses will be combined with responses from other early childhood educators. To protect your privacy, no individual responses will ever be reported. We will publish study findings in a final report at the end of our study. Your name and your program's name will not appear anywhere in the report.

You have the right to refuse a question and stop at any time, but we appreciate complete responses when possible so our study findings can accurately reflect your experiences and perspectives. If you are unsure how to answer a question, please give the best answer you can rather than leaving it blank.

If you have any questions about this survey or this research, please contact the project director, Dr. Heather Sandstrom, at DCChildCarePartnership@urban.org.

Click the arrow to begin.

With your permission, your survey responses will be linked with records we receive from the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE), such as the Quorum eLearning training system, the Professional Development Information System (PDIS), and Capital Quality, the District's quality rating and improvement system. Linking these data helps us better understand the characteristics of the early childhood workforce. Agreeing to have your survey responses linked is completely voluntary. Declining to have your survey responses linked will have no negative consequences. Please indicate below if you agree to have your survey responses linked with OSSE records.

I agree to allow my responses from this survey to be linked to records from OSSE.

Yes

No

SECTION A. EFFECTS OF COVID-19 ON EMPLOYMENT

The first set of questions is related to COVID-19 and its effects on your employment.

A1. Are you **currently working** as an early childhood educator in a child care facility in the District of Columbia? If your program facility **remains closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic**, please indicate if you plan to return to your job when your facility reopens.

    Yes, currently working

    No, not currently working but plan to return to work

    No, not working at this job and do not plan to return

    [If A1 = Not working and do not plan to return, ask A2 through A7.]

    [If A1 = Yes, currently working, or No, but plan to return to work, SKIP to A8.]

A2. What is the primary reason you are not currently working and do not plan to return to work at this job?

    [Note to programmer: rotate response options]

    I have to care for my own child(ren)

    I have health and safety concerns

    My program is still closed and I do not know when it will reopen

    My position is no longer available

    I cannot find a job near me as an early childhood educator

    I have taken another job in the early childhood field

    I have taken another job outside the early childhood field

    I have decided to retire

    I or a family member have symptoms of COVID-19

    I am experiencing stress and related challenges

    Other (please specify): ─────────────────

A3. In what type of facility did you work?

    A child development center

    An expanded child development home

    A child development home

    [If CENTER, continue to A4 then Skip to A6. If expanded home or home, skip to A5.]

A4. [CENTERS ONLY] Please select the **job role** that **best matches** your most recent position.

Lead classroom teacher in a child development center

Assistant teacher/aide in a child development center

Floater/substitute in a child development center

A5. [HOMES ONLY] Please select the **job role** that **best matches** your most recent position.

Lead home caregiver/teacher

Associate home caregiver, assistant or aide

Owner of one or more expanded homes, with less direct care for children

A6. What **age group(s)** did you teach/care for in your most recent position?

Infants under 12 months	Yes	No
Toddlers (12–35 months)	Yes	No
Preschoolers (3- to 5-year-olds)	Yes	No
School-age	Yes	No

A7. How long did you work in your most recent position? (If less than a year, please fill in 0 in Years)

__ Years __ Months

 [SKIP to A14]

A8. In what type of facility do you work?

A child development center

An expanded child development home

A child development home

 [If CENTER, continue to A9 then SKIP to A11. If expanded home or home, skip to A10.]

A9. [CENTERS ONLY] Please select the **job role** that **best matches** yours.

Lead classroom teacher in a child development center

Assistant teacher/aide in a child development center

Floater/substitute in a child development center

A10. [HOMES ONLY] Please select the **job role** that **best matches** yours.

Lead home caregiver/teacher

Associate home caregiver, assistant or aide

Owner of one or more expanded homes, with less direct care for children

A11. Are you listed as a director or owner on the licensing record for your child care facility?

Yes

No

A12. What age group(s) do you currently teach/care for? If you care for your own children ages 12 and under as you work and care for other children, you can include their age groups.

Infants under 12 months	Yes	No
Toddlers (12–35 months)	Yes	No
Preschoolers (3- to 5-year-olds)	Yes	No
School-age	Yes	No

A13. How long have you worked in this child development center or home? (If less than a year, please fill in 0 in Years)

___ Years ___ Months

A14. Did your center or home stay open during spring 2020 when most businesses shut down in the District because of COVID-19?

Yes, we were **open** for child care services

No, we were **physically closed**, but offered virtual programming for children and families

No, we were **completely closed**; no in-person or virtual services offered

[If A14 = physically closed or completely closed, proceed to A15; otherwise skip to A16.]

A15. Did you receive **pay during this time** when your program was **closed or operating** with reduced enrollment?

Yes, full pay

Yes, partial pay

No

A16. Is the center or home **currently open and serving children**?

Yes

No, physically closed, but offering virtual programming for children and families

No, completely closed; no in-person or virtual services offered

A17. Since the pandemic began (March 2020), did the following things stay the same, increase, or decrease?

	Decreased	Stayed the same	Increased
Number of hours worked each week	○	○	○
Job earnings	○	○	○
Total household income	○	○	○

A18. Since the pandemic started, were you ever laid off, even temporarily?

Yes

No

[If A18 = yes, continue to A19; otherwise, skip to Section B.]

A19. Did you file for unemployment?

Yes

No

[If A19 = yes, continue to A20; otherwise, skip to Section B.]

A20. Have you received unemployment payments?

Yes

No

[Note to programmer: for respondents no longer working at site (A1 = Not working and do not plan to return), skip to Section F. They will complete Sections F, H, and I only.]

[If A11 = Yes (a director or owner on licensing record), skip to Section C.)

SECTION B. CAPITAL QUALITY

The next set of questions is about *Capital Quality*, the District of Columbia's system for rating and providing supports to child care programs/facilities.

B1. Before receiving this survey, had you ever heard of **Capital Quality**?

    Yes

    No

B2. On a scale of 1 to 5, how much would you say you know about **Capital Quality**?

Nothing		Some		A lot
1	2	3	4	5

B3. Do you know your program's quality designation in **Capital Quality**?

    Yes

    No

    Unsure

    [If B3 = yes, continue to B4; otherwise skip to B5.]

B4. Do you think the quality designation reflects your program's quality?

    Yes, I think the quality designation reflects my program's quality.

    No, I think my program is higher quality than the designation says.

    No, I think my program is lower quality than the designation says.

    I am not sure.

B5. A **Capital Quality** quality facilitator may visit your program to meet with your director and offer coaching and tips for how to set up the care environment and improve teaching. This person is different from trained observers who conduct environment ratings. Please indicate if any of these statements are true about your program's quality facilitator.

	Yes	No
My program's quality facilitator meets only with my program director when she visits and does not speak with me.		
My program director shares with me what he or she learns from the quality facilitator.		
I have participated in a training with my program's assigned quality facilitator.		
My program's quality facilitator has observed me working with children at least once.		
My program's quality facilitator has given me feedback or advice.		
My program's quality facilitator has modeled developmentally appropriate practices to help me learn.		

B6. How do you feel about the amount of professional development you personally receive from your program's quality facilitator? The amount is:

　Too much

　Just right

　Not enough

B7. On a scale of 1 to 5, how would you rate the following aspects of **Capital Quality**?

If you do not know about **Capital Quality**, select DK for "don't know."

	Poor - 1	2	3	4	Excellent - 5	DK
Professional development opportunities						
Feedback from environment observations (ITERS-R, CLASS, FCCERS-R)						
Access to resources						
Support from the quality facilitator						

B8. Please indicate how much you agree with these statements about ways you have benefited from **Capital Quality**.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I better understand how to arrange the care environment to best support children.					
I improved my skills in engaging with children's families.					
I better understand how to individualize my engagement with children.					
I learned how to better support diversity and equity in the care environment.					
I am better able to implement our early learning curriculum.					
I learned new ways of handling things that were hard for me before.					
I learned how to better structure the day to support children's learning.					
I have learned how to reflect on my practice so I can improve.					
My working conditions have improved.					

SECTION C. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The next set of questions is about your professional development.

C1. Approximately how many hours per week do you work at your job as an early childhood educator?

_____Hours

C2. In the past 12 months, did you develop or update a plan for your professional development?

Yes

No

C3. In the past 12 months, how often did you access virtual trainings through Quorum or the

Professional Development Information System (PDIS) online resources for early childhood educators?

Once in the past year

Several times

About once a month

A few times a month

Once a week

More than once a week

Never

C4. Overall, how much would you say you benefited from virtual trainings in the past year?

A lot

Somewhat

A little

Not at all

C5. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 5 whether you could benefit from additional training on any of the following topics. A score of 1 means you would benefit very little (do not need this training) and 5 means you would benefit a lot from additional training in this area.

	Very little - 1	2	3	4	A lot - 5
Child growth and development					
Observing, documenting, and assessing young children					
Health and safety					
Child nutrition					
Curriculum planning					
Inclusive practices for children with developmental delays and disabilities					
Creating developmentally appropriate learning environments					
Family and community engagement					

C6. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 5 whether you could benefit from additional training on any of the following topics. A score of 1 means you would benefit very little (do not need this training) and 5 means you would benefit a lot from additional training in this area. (Continued from last question).

	Very little - 1	2	3	4	A lot - 5
Family trauma and trauma-informed practices					
Knowledge of community services and resources for families (e.g., child care subsidies, early intervention)					
Diversity and differences: anti-bias approaches					
Best practices in teaching dual language learners					
Social-emotional development and mental health					
Effective strategies to handle challenging behaviors					
Self-reflection and self-care					
Use of technology to support data use and management (e.g., data systems, Excel)					

C7. How would you like to receive training?

Live video visits (e.g., Zoom meetings) with a consultant	Yes	Maybe	No
Recorded video trainings that I can view at my convenience	Yes	Maybe	No
Live webinars	Yes	Maybe	No
In-person workshop/training course	Yes	Maybe	No
Printed materials	Yes	Maybe	No
Individual support from a trained coach	Yes	Maybe	No

SECTION D. CAREER PLANS

The next set of questions is about your career plans.

D1. In the past 3 months, have you done anything to look for a new job or an additional job?

Yes

No

[If D1 = yes, continue to D2; otherwise skip to D4]

D2. Why have you looked for work?

To find a second job?	Yes	No
To find a job that pays more?	Yes	No
To find a job with better hours?	Yes	No
To find a job with more job security?	Yes	No
To find a job that offers better training and experience?	Yes	No
To find better work conditions?	Yes	No
To find a job with less exposure to COVID-19?	Yes	No
To reduce commute?	Yes	No
Want to leave child care field?	Yes	No
Want to see what else is available?	Yes	No

D3. What is the main reason you have looked for work (SELECT ONLY ONE)?

To find a second job

To find a job that pays more

To find a job with better hours

To find a job with more job security

To find a job that offers better training and experience

To find better work conditions

To find a job with less exposure to COVID-19

To reduce commute

Want to leave child care field

Want to see what else is available

Other (please specify): _____

D4. How likely is each of the following in the next two years?

	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Very Unlikely
Remain in current position				
Seek new job opportunity in early care and education field				
Find employment outside early care and education field				
Retire or stop working				

D5. We would like you to think about the type of work you do in your job.

Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the type of job you now have, what would you decide?

    I would decide without hesitation to take the same job.

    I would have some second thoughts.

    I would decide definitely NOT to take this type of job.

D6. If a friend of yours told you he/she was interested in working in a job like yours, what would you tell him/her?

    I would strongly recommend it.

    I would have doubts about recommending it.

    I would advise against it.

D7. All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?

    I am very satisfied.

    I am somewhat satisfied.

    I am not too satisfied.

    I am not at all satisfied.

SECTION E. WORK ENVIRONMENT FOR CENTER STAFF

[Center-based staff only based on response to A8.]

The next set of questions is about the environment you work in.

E1. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about working in this program?

	Strongly disagree (1) / Disagree (2) / Neither agree nor disagree (3) / Agree (4) / Strongly agree (5)
I am kept well informed about program changes.	1 2 3 4 5
I feel like I am working too hard on my job.	1 2 3 4 5
I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1 2 3 4 5
There are enough teaching staff available to help during breaks.	1 2 3 4 5
I can rely on supervisors and coworkers for help when issues arise.	1 2 3 4 5
If someone resigns, everything possible will be done to hire qualified new staff.	1 2 3 4 5
I am treated with less respect than my coworkers because of my racial identity.	1 2 3 4 5
All teaching staff are invited to give input into program policies that affect them.	1 2 3 4 5
My teaching team works well together to plan learning experiences for children.	1 2 3 4 5

E2. Think about your program's leadership. How well does your program do the following things on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (very well)?

	Not at all - 1	2	3	4	Very well - 5
Address bias and exclusion.					
Work to improve program culture.					
Build connections to the community.					
Support staff in using data to help with planning and decision-making					

SECTION F. QUALIFICATIONS

The next set of questions is about your qualifications.

F1. How many years of paid experience do you have working with children (other than your own) who are under age 13? Please include any paid experience in a home or center-based setting, including relatives, or paid experience you may have from another country.

 ___ Years ___ Months

F2. Do you have a Child Development Associate (CDA) credential?

 Yes

 No

 No, but I am currently working toward a CDA.

F3. What is the highest level of schooling that you have ever completed?

 8th grade or less

 9th–12th grade no diploma

 GED or high school equivalency

 High school graduate

 Some college credit but no degree

 Associate Degree (AA, AS)

 Bachelor's Degree (BA, BS, AB)

 Graduate or professional degree (MA, PhD)

 [Display F4 only if the respond selects "Some college credit but no degree", "Associate Degree (AA, AS)", "Bachelor's Degree (BA, BS, AB)", or "Graduate or professional degree (MA, PhD)"]

F4. What was your major for the highest degree you have or have studied for?

 Early childhood education

 Elementary education

 Special education

 Child development or human development

 Psychology

 Family studies or family science

 Other (please specify): _____

F5. Are you currently enrolled in a college or university?

Yes, a credentialing program to get a CDA or similar credential

Yes, enrolled in an associate's degree program

Yes, enrolled in a bachelor's degree program

Yes, enrolled in a graduate degree program

No, not enrolled

SECTION G. EMPLOYEE BENEFITS AND COMPENSATION

The next set of questions is about employee benefits and compensation.

G1. Do you currently have health insurance coverage?

    Yes

    No

G2. Are you eligible to receive health insurance through your employer?

    Yes

    No

G3. What types of paid leave are available to you?

Sick leave (taken for your own illness or to care for an ill relative)	Yes	No
Vacation or personal days	Yes	No
Paid holidays	Yes	No

G4. If you or a family member got sick, would you have at least two weeks of paid sick days or personal days that you could use?

    Yes

    No

G5. How much are you paid before taxes and deductions?

    Dollar amount $ _____

    Is it per

    Hour

    Day

    Week

    Every 2 weeks

    Month

    Year

    Other (please specify):_____

G6. Approximately how much of your household income in 2020 came from your work with children under age 13?

All

Almost all

More than half

About half

Less than half

Very little

None

SECTION H. DEMOGRAPHICS

We are almost done! We have a few important questions about your background.

H1. How do you identify?

    Female

    Male

    Non-binary

H2. In what year were you born?

    [dropdown range 1920–2006]

H3. Which categories describe you? Mark all that apply.

    American Indian or Alaska Native

    Asian

    Black or African American

    Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin

    Middle Eastern or North African

    Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

    White

    Some other race, ethnicity, or origin (please specify): _____

H4. What language(s) do you speak with children as part of your job? Mark all that apply.

    Amharic

    English

    French

    Spanish

    Other language (please specify):_____

    [Dropdown with top 50 languages spoken in the District of Columbia]

H5. In what country were you born?

    [Dropdown with all countries of the world]

    [If born outside the US based on H5, continue to H6. Otherwise skip to I1.)

H6. In what year did you last move to the US to stay?

    [Dropdown with years]

SECTION I. HEALTH AND WELL-BEING

This is our **last** set of questions! We will ask about your health and well-being. Then you can submit your name to our lottery for a $50 Amazon gift card.

I1. Overall, would you say your physical health is excellent, very good, fair, or poor?

　　Excellent

　　Very good

　　Fair

　　Poor

I2. Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you been bothered by the following problems?

	Not at all	Several days	More than half the days	Nearly every day
Feeling nervous, anxious, or on edge.				
Not being able to stop or control worrying.				
Little interest or pleasure in doing things.				
Feeling down, depressed, or hopeless.				

I3. How much do you agree with these statements about you and your household?

Within the past month, we worried whether our food would run out before we got money to buy more.

　　Never true

　　Sometimes true

　　Often true

The food that we bought just did not last, and we did not have the money to get more.

　　Never true

　　Sometimes true

　　Often true

We could not afford to eat balanced meals.

　　Never true

　　Sometimes true

　　Often true

I4. Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic (March 2020), how difficult has it been for you to meet monthly payments on your bills?

Not difficult at all

Somewhat difficult

Difficult

Very difficult

I5. Do you currently receive assistance from any of the following government programs?

SNAP/Food stamps	Yes	No
Cash assistance (TANF/General Assistance for Children)	Yes	No
Medical Assistance (such as Medicaid)	Yes	No
Disability Assistance	Yes	No
Housing choice voucher	Yes	No
Public housing	Yes	No
Pandemic-EBT	Yes	No

I6. Do you currently receive assistance from any of the following government programs? (Continued)

Child care subsidy/voucher	Yes	No N/A-not a parent/guardian
WIC	Yes	No N/A-not a parent/guardian
Free or reduced priced lunch for your children	Yes	No N/A-not a parent/guardian

I7. Since the COVID-19 pandemic began (March 2020), has anyone in your household accessed the following:

Grocery assistance (e.g., food banks, donated grocery gift cards)	Yes	No
Free meals (e.g., donated home-delivered meals)	Yes	No
Rent or mortgage relief assistance	Yes	No
Stimulus check from federal government	Yes	No
Other relief	Yes	No

[Open-ended]

I8. Based on this survey, do you have any final comments, ideas or challenges to share?

I9. Tell us how you are feeling about the pandemic and the discussions about racial injustice happening around us. Your voice matters.

END AND LOTTERY

Thank you for completing the survey!

If you would like to enter into a lottery for a $50 Amazon e-gift card, please click NEXT to be directed to a secure site where you can enter your name and e-mail address. Your name will NOT be connected to your survey responses.

NEXT *[Direct to external survey to enter first name, last name, email address.]*

I DECLINE ENTERING THE LOTTERY. I AM SUBMITTING MY SURVEY RESPONSES.

If you are in need of speaking with someone to help you sort out and manage feelings of hopelessness, anger, grief, stress or whatever is troubling you, please contact:

Access HelpLine at 1(888)7WE-HELP or 1-888-793-4357

This 24-hour, seven-day-a-week telephone line is staffed by behavioral health professionals at the DC Department of Behavioral Health who can refer you to immediate help or ongoing care.

Notes

[1] Research briefs and other study products may be found on the project landing page on the Urban Institute website: "DC Child Care Policy Research Partnership," accessed December 23, 2021, https://www.urban.org/policy-centers/center-labor-human-services-and-population/projects/dc-child-care-policy-research-partnership.

[2] In the District, child care facilities fall into one of three licensing categories: child development centers, child development homes that can care for up to six children in the provider's home, and expanded child development homes that can care for between six and 12 children. "Home caregiver" or "lead home caregiver" is the title used for the main care provider in a home or expanded home whereas an "associate home caregiver" is used for support staff employed in a home or expanded home.

About the Authors

Heather Sandstrom is a senior fellow in the Center on Labor, Human Services, and Population and principal investigator of the District of Columbia Child Care Policy Research Partnership. Her research focuses on issues of child care access and quality as well as the work experiences and well-being of the early childhood workforce.

Peter Willenborg is a research analyst in the Center on Labor, Human Services, and Population. His research interests include early childhood education and development and policies that could support financial stability for families and individuals.

Fernando Hernandez is a research analyst in the Center on Labor, Human Services, and Population, where he focuses on topics related to early care and education, child food security, and immigration and the labor force, all through data analysis and qualitative research.

Tim Triplett is a senior research associate and senior survey methodologist with the Statistical Methods Group. His primary work involves working on studies that include survey data collection, complex sample designs, and random experimental designs. He conducts methodological research addressing issues such as estimating nonresponse bias, weighting strategies, and imputation procedures.

Erica Greenberg is a principal research associate in the Center on Education Data and Policy and coprincipal investigator of the District of Columbia Child Care Policy Research Partnership. Her research spans early childhood and K–12 education, focusing on programs and policies like public prekindergarten, Head Start, child care subsidies, and home visiting. She also investigates the causes, consequences, and measurement of educational inequality.

STATEMENT OF INDEPENDENCE

The Urban Institute strives to meet the highest standards of integrity and quality in its research and analyses and in the evidence-based policy recommendations offered by its researchers and experts. We believe that operating consistent with the values of independence, rigor, and transparency is essential to maintaining those standards. As an organization, the Urban Institute does not take positions on issues, but it does empower and support its experts in sharing their own evidence-based views and policy recommendations that have been shaped by scholarship. Funders do not determine our research findings or the insights and recommendations of our experts. Urban scholars and experts are expected to be objective and follow the evidence wherever it may lead.

URBAN INSTITUTE · ELEVATE · THE · DEBATE

500 L'Enfant Plaza SW
Washington, DC 20024

www.urban.org