Webinar overview

- About CLASP’s project
- Background on home visiting
- Data on children in family, friend, and neighbor (FFN) care and family child care (FCC)
- Project findings: examples, considerations for implementation, opportunities, and recommendations for states
- Questions and answers
- Thanks to the Annie E. Casey Foundation for their generous support of today’s webinar
About CLASP’s Project
Project methods

- Project generously supported by the Birth to Five Policy Alliance
- Exploring how home visiting can be used in settings where vulnerable children are every day, regardless of who is caring for them
- Interviewed representatives from home visiting models, stakeholders and experts in the field
- Focused on kinship caregivers and FFN caregivers
- Some programs also reported serving FCC
Note on defining FFN and FCC

• Project definition of FFN: a caregiver providing regular child care who is legally exempt from state licensing requirements

• However, child care licensing rules on home-based care and support for these caregivers vary greatly by state

• 10 states require a caregiver caring for one unrelated child in the home to be licensed

• In other states, adults may provide home-based child care for two to 12 unrelated children before they must be licensed or regulated
Note on defining FFN and FCC

• In some states, there may be little practical difference between licensed (FCC) and unlicensed (FFN) home-based child care providers

• Further, fluidity often exists between these groups as providers move in and out of the licensing system

• FCC providers without much support may benefit from the kinds of home visiting we explore with FFN
Interviewed for this project

- Healthy Families America (HFA)
- Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY)
- Nurse-Family Partnership (NFP)
- Parents as Teachers (PAT)
- The Parent-Child Home Program (PCHP)
- Early Head Start re: the home-based program option
- Stakeholders and experts in the field
Background on Home Visiting
Home visiting programs

- Traditionally deliver family support services to parents with young children
- Often link parents to community services
- Part of a continuum of services for children birth to age five
- Significant interest in new federal program; see CLASP’s detailed summary:
Goals of home visiting programs

- Increasing positive parenting practices and improving parent-child relationships
- Reducing child abuse, neglect, and injury
- Improving child health and development
- Increasing school readiness and academic success
- Improving child’s emergent language and literacy skills
- Enhancing parents’ self-sufficiency
Often target specific age groups

- Pregnant women
- Infants and their families
- Toddlers and their families
- Preschool-age children and their families

- Some goals are applicable to all age groups; others tend to be more age-specific
No state-based programs

Data on Family, Friend, and Neighbor (FFN) Care and Family Child Care (FCC)
Percent of Children with a Weekly Non-parental Care Arrangement, by Age

- Under 1 year: 42%
- 1-2 years: 53%
- 3-5 years: 73%

Hours Spent in Nonparental Care by Children Under 5 with Employed Mothers, 2002

- 35 or More Hours, 42%
- 15-34 Hours, 20%
- 1-14 Hours, 17%
- No Hours in Care, 22%

Primary child care arrangements for children under age 5 with employed mothers

Low-Income Children (under 200 percent FPL)
- Parent/other, 31%
- Center-based, 25%
- Relative, 30%
- Family child care, 11%
- Nanny/baby-sitter, 4%

Higher-Income Children (200 percent of FPL and above)
- Parent/other, 25%
- Center-based, 31%
- Relative, 24%
- Family child care, 14%
- Nanny/baby-sitter, 5%

Vulnerable children are in FFN care

• Low-income children (living below 200% of the poverty level) are more likely to be in FFN care

• Children of immigrants are more likely to be in FFN care

• Nationally, about one-fifth (21 percent) of children receiving CCDBG subsidies were served in legally unregulated care, although it varies by state

Sources: NSAF 2002 data and FFY2008 CCDF Data Tables (Preliminary Estimates).
Subsidy receipt for FFN care, by state

Percentage of children receiving subsidies in legally unregulated, home-based care

Source: Child Care Bureau, FFY 2008 CCDF Data Tables (Preliminary Estimates), Table 6.
Project Findings and Three Examples
Visiting with FFN caregivers

- Joint visits with parent, child, and FFN caregiver
- Visiting with just the child and FFN caregiver
- New curricula or pilot programs
Caring for Quality, Rochester, NY

- Project of Family Child Care Satellites of Greater Rochester and Family Resource Centers of Crestwood
- Used curriculum adapted by Parents as Teachers, titled “Supporting Care Providers through Personal Visits,” and parts of Family Development Credential
Evaluation of *Caring for Quality*

- Participating child care providers increased their scores on the Family Day Care Environmental Rating Scale (FDCERS)
- Control group providers scores decreased
- Child care providers who were most engaged had largest quality improvements
- Group networking meetings not as helpful as home visits in improving quality
Parent-Child Home Program pilot for in-home child care

• Launched pilot project: sites across four states recruited FFN caregivers and FCC providers

• Project develops caregiver skills, but parent communication and involvement also required

• Preliminary findings from pilot: skills/activities introduced in child care are translating to home
  ▪ Example: children asking to be read to at home

• Led to new formalized program model, which will include evaluation of implementation
EHS Enhanced Home Visiting Pilot

• Early Head Start (EHS): 41% in home-based option
• Pilot: 23 programs across country serving infants and toddlers and their parents in home-based EHS, added visits to FFN caregivers
• Goals:
  ▪ Improve quality of FFN care
  ▪ Increase consistency of care
  ▪ Improve parents’ and caregivers’ communication
  ▪ Address caregivers’ needs
Evaluation of EHS Pilot with FFN

- Found that home visits, services, and materials were meeting the needs and interests of caregivers
- Quality of FFN care and interactions with children improved
- Home visitors improved communication between caregivers and parents
- Pilot benefitted both EHS and non-EHS children in the FFN care setting
Considerations for Implementation, Opportunities, and Recommendations
Considerations for implementation of home visits with FFN and FCC

• Program design/curricula may need modification
  ▪ Example: who has authority to arrange other services for children that a home visitor may make a referral for, such as early intervention

• Staffing issues
  ▪ Limited funding for additional staff
  ▪ Some different skills required

• Recruitment
Considerations for implementation of home visits with FFN and FCC

• Building trusting relationships
  ▪ Families and caregivers need to feel comfortable expressing their concerns, strengths, weaknesses, and problems
  ▪ Cultural and linguistic diversity in caregiving practice
• Identifying a neutral space for visiting services with certain populations that cannot be reached in homes
• Funding
Opportunities from visiting with FFN caregivers and FCC providers

- Serve more at-risk, hard-to-reach children and families
  - Can reach vulnerable children whose parents have difficulty participating in a home visiting program while juggling the demands of work or school

- Ripple effects between child, caregiver, parent
  - Caregivers serve more children
  - Caregivers interact with more parents
  - At home, children request activities done in care
Opportunities from visiting with FFN caregivers and FCC providers

- Consistency and quality in care that children experience
  - Multi-generational families may have different parenting ideas
- Improving care settings can positively affect the development of children
Recommendations for states

• Expand state home visiting investments to reach more children and caregivers
• Prioritize coordination of services to settings where vulnerable children are
• Provide sufficient and appropriate training, TA, and monitoring for staff conducting home visits through appropriate systems, i.e.
  ▪ State-based home visiting programs
  ▪ Child care licensing or child care resource and referral systems
  ▪ Child welfare agencies
Recommendations for states

• Facilitate links between home visiting and other state services/programs for vulnerable families and caregivers
• Collect data and evaluate programs conducting home visiting with FFN/FCC; share findings
• Include home visiting in state Early Childhood Advisory Councils
• Connect home visiting and Early Head Start
Questions and Answers
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