Family and Provider Teacher Relationship Quality Project Webinar for Researchers Video Transcript

Alicia Torres: Project webinar. We are going to wait a couple of minutes to give others a chance to also join us. So will hear silence for a couple of minutes. So will hear silence for a couple of minutes and we'll be back with you. Good afternoon and welcome. My name is Alicia Torres I am the director of Communications at Child Trends and on behalf of the family and provider teacher relationship quality project or FPTRQ I'd like to welcome you to the webinar. The project offers unique tool for measuring the relationship between families and the providers and teachers who care fortheirsmall children. And as you know these relationships are key factor in promoting positive outcomes for children. And families. The FPTRQ project is funded by the administration for children and families Office of Head Start and the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. The project has been led by Westat and by Child Trends. Westat is a research organization that for more than fifty years has specialized in statistical design, data collection and management and research analysis. Child Trends is a non-profit research organization that for more than thirty-five years has produced the dissemination research, data and analysis on programs, policies and issues that impact the wellbeing and the lives of children. And families. So throughout the webinar if you have any technical questions please submit them online. You will see a box on theright hand side of your screen and you can easily submit questions to our team and we will get back to you. This is also the same place where you will submit question for the panelist. We will queue them up the questions and present them to the different panelist after the presentations has been completed. We estimate that we will have about fifteen minutes for Q & A. So today you'll hear from several panelists. You will first hear some introductory remarks from Laura Hoard social science researcher and analysts at the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. She has served as the project manager on this program in this Office. Then you will hear from four of the researchers who have lead and conducted the research and development of these measures for this project. So in the order in which they will be speaking you will first hear from Dr. Lina Guzman, a senior researcher and director at Child Trends with expertise and measurement development among other areas. She has served as the co-PI for this project. You would then hear from Toni Porter, Early Care and Education consulting. Formerly she was a senior researcher at Bank Street College of Education. Toni's research focus has been in home-based child care conceptualization and measurement of family provider relationship with early care and education as well as evaluation of ECE programs. Then you will hear from Dr. Manica Ramus she is a research scientist at Child Trends and project manager for this project. Monica has a doctorate in child development psychology, developmental psychology and specializes in research on early care and education programs family engagement and cultural sensitivity. She also brings to this project an expertise in survey development. Finally you will hear from Dr. Kwang Kim he is the project director for this project. Kwang is a senior study director at Westat and he his research experience is in survey research, early education research, and implementation large-scale data collection and data analysis and reporting. He holds doctorate in education research. I will now turn it over to Laura for introductory remarks and then Lina Guzman will kick of the presentation.

Thank you and good morning everyone and welcome. We are very excited to beat this phase in this project. And I just wanted to let you know a little bit of background about how we got where we are. So family engagement has been a cornerstone for Head Start since its inception. And more recently it’s become a focus across ECE programs. For example within state QRIS systems seeking better ways of measuring family engagement and with as a focus on Race to the Top grantees. So five years ago family engagement was beginning to gain attention and interest and OPRE where I work. Office of Research, Planning and Evaluation in collaboration with Office of Head Start in the Office of Childcare held a two-day meeting of researchers, policymakers programs staff to really discuss what the next steps for the

area of family engagement and early childhood education needed to be. And based on that meeting the consensus was, that what was really need was a good measure of family engagement. It was also determined that not all programs have the same expectations or requirements for family engagement. However, good family/provider relationships was something that all programs really needed to build and were key to having good family engagement. Luckily for us, at that time the Office of Head Start had funds that they were interested in putting towards building better measures of the quality of early care and education programs. And see the need highlighted by that meeting for the better family engagement measures, OHS Office of Head State and OPRE used the funds to create the FPTRQ project which you will hear about today. It is important to note that the Office of Head Start was really interested in broadly supporting the development of a measure that could be used across ECE programs and rather than just for Head Start. So that which you will hear about the FPTRQ measure is applicable within child care setting that are center-based family and Head Start centers. I just want to mention someone that wasn't unfortunately able to be with us today but Kiersten Beigel someone that I work with in the Office of Head Start. She is the family engagement lead within the Office of Head Start. And serves as the federal project Officer for the National Center on Parent Family and Community Engagement and she has had a very strong role in the development and work on this project. And I will hand it over, thanks.

Lina Guzman: Thank you Laura, and good morning everyone. We are delighted to be her to be presenting to you the new family and provider teacher relationship quality measure. The measure that you will be hearing from us today are really culmination of roughly four years of work. They were developed though a multi-step and iterative process, which you will hear about in a minute. And we believe led to a rigorous and reliable measure. Let me think about mentioned what looks hotter and will begin with an introductions to the project, then we will describe the development of conceptual model that guided the development of the measure as wells describe the various measures that were developed. Kwang will then describe the pilot and field settings that were conducted as well as the psychometric analysis that resulted from that data. We'll then discuss the uses of the measures, the development of specifically the measure of the family services staff measure for those in Head Start and Early Head Start programs as well as limitations and implications of the measures. Next slide please. So as you've already heard the project is carry out in partnership between Westat and Child Trends and was funded by the Administration of Children and Families, Office of Head Start and OPRE. The purpose of the project was to develop measures that could be used researchers, policymakers and practitioners to assess the quality of family provider relationship in early care and education settings. More specifically a key goal was to develop measures that were applicable across several settings including Head Start and appropriate for use with racially ethnically and economically diverse populations. So to this end we develop five separate measures depending on the respondent and target relationship. The first is a measures for provided and teachers about their relationship with their families. The second is a measure for parents about their relationship with their children provider and teachers. The third is a measure for center directors about the features or environment the environmental features of their programs. And fourth is a measure for family services staff about their relationship with the families that they work with. And last a measure for parents about their relationship with their family services staff member. So why do we need a family provider teacher relationship quality measures. Well as you know sixty percent of children young children under the age of five spend time in early care and education settings. And these can lead to many positive outcomes such as school readiness, includes family engagement as well as strengthening the home family program connection. Which is an important contributor to child success. Yet there is no single measure that incorporates all elements of provider/relationship quality. Such as knowledge, practice and attitude which Toni will be talking about

in a moment. There are a variety measures that currently exist that assess different aspect of this relationship though not all aspects. And many of the measures that are currently available are not necessarily applicable were designed or tested with economically and racially diverse populations. Nor are they available in Spanish and we'll talk a lot about how some of the measures are available in Spanish. In short there was a need for a new measure of family provider relationships that could include all element that empirical literature suggest are associated with positive child family and provider teacher outcomes. And this new and comprehensive measure fills a gap in the measurement field. It also informs programmatic and policy directions for measuring quality and family provider relationship as well as family engagement. And contributes to knowledge-based about the associations of specific elements of effective provider's teacher consultation and strong relationship with families and the children and families they serve. So let's talk a little bit about how he went about developing the measures. As you can see it was a multi-step stage process, it was a very iterative process. And by that I mean if we found a bump in the road we went back to the earlier steps and sort of examined took another look to see what we could do alternately. The first step was obviously to conduct and extensive literature review that led to the development of our conceptual model which then guided our measure developments. We also conducted focus groups parents' provider and family services staff to confirm that our conceptual model captured the key elements of family provider relationship quality. We also consulted with many experts and we also did a very extensive item review which led to the identification of items that we could use in the measures or that we could either adaptor as well as identify gaps in the measures where new items needed to be developed. We also did multiple rounds of cognitive testing to develop the parent and provider teacher survey. As well as two rounds of cognitive interviews to develop the family services staff surveys. And those cognitive interview were intended to assess the extent to which the questions were working as intended. We then conducted a pilot and field study across, in six cities across the country and conducted psychometric analysis of the resulting data. As Manica will talk about in a minute, it is important to note that we did not start the project expecting to develop for family services staff, but rather to use the provider teacher survey for them. However, as early as in the focus groups and confirmed in the later stages we saw evidence that suggested that it would best to develop a separate survey for family service staff. However, because of this the family service staff that we developed the family services staff surveys that we developed did not go through all stages of development. Notably while they cognitively tested, the were not piloted or field tested nor were they, except we don't have psychometric analysis to report on them. So for whom is the family provider teacher relationship quality measures useful? The can be used by state and local administrators to inform the development or revisions of the Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS). It can also be used by senior local administrators to better align the professional development system competencies. The measure can also be used by practitioner and professional development systems to identify or modify the quality relationship as well revise and focus a develop training and coursework to address area of weakness or challenges. I can also be used to understand programs progress and relationship building overtime. And lastly it could be used by researchers to test the associations between parent teacher attitudes knowledge and practices as well as specific child and family outcomes and impacts. And then it can also serve as a reliable and comprehensive tool. And now I am going to pass it over to Toni who is going to describe the conceptual model that guided much of our work. Toni. Thank You Lina.

Toni Porter: Good morning everybody. To develop a conceptual model as Lina indicate that we conducted an extensive review of the theoretical and empirical literature on family provider teacher relationship from a variety of fields including early care and education, K through social work, mental health and early intervention. In the model we in integrated common and unique elements from three

broad perspective on family provider teacher relationships. Family-centered care, parent involvement, family engagement and family-sensitive caregiving. The common elements of these perspectives includes an ecological view of child development a focus on child outcome through direct and indirect pathways. A focus on peer and social support for adults as well as adult outcomes. A strength based approach to relationships with family that focuses on families unique resources and assets and the centrality of family provider teacher relationships. The unique elements from the perspectives include the important the family capacity in empowerment, focus on strong family school family partnerships and shared responsibility for children's learning and an emphasis on the provider teacher responsiveness and sensitivity to working families. So what you see in front of you is conceptual model that we developed. As you can see from those two-way arrows the model is bi-directional. That is, families may be more likely to become engaged and involved in their children's development and learning activities when they feel supported, understood and empowered by programs and providers and at the same time providers and teachers may become more sensitive and responsive to the needs of families as parents become more involved and engaged in their program. This model is structured as a logic modeling effort to summarize a complex issue. Each construct has the potential to dynamic and there is no temporal assumption. Because the purpose the FPTRQ measures are to inform assessment and monitoring of ECE programs, the central focus of the conceptual model is column two effective provided facilitation of family provider relationship. The elements in this column are the ones that the empirical literature suggest are associated with positive child family and provider outcomes. The element that I will talk more about in the next slide are grouped into four primary constructs. One is attitudes, which relates to providers and teachers perceptions or beliefs related to their work but families. The second is knowledge that is specific information that providers and teachers have about individual families they are serving. The third is practice show providers attitudes and knowledge are translated into their interactions with parents. And the fourth is environmental features. The tone, physical environment, organizational climate and program level resources that foster strong provider teacher family relationship. And as you can see with the asterisks at the bottom of the column cultural responsiveness is assumed to cut across all of the constructs. The models also articulate factors that may influence family and provider, teacher relationships in column one. And outcomes and effects which are depicted in columns two, columns three and four. Next slide please. So here are the four FPTRQ constructs with the individual elements. You see that there are four attitudes elements. They include respect, commitment sensitivity to the needs of children, parents and families and family an intrinsic motivation for work openness to change, a willingness to alter normal practice in order to be sensitive to an individual children, families or parents and willingness to be flexible in varying practices base on this input and understanding concept. Having an appreciation for the broader context which children's development and family life is situated. Here's acknowledge which is that family specific knowledge that described earlier and now practices, communication responsiveness, which is defined as engaging in sensitive, flexible and responsive support of families identified needs and goals including their work family balance. Collaboration that is joint decision-making and goals setting between provider, teacher and the families. Family focus concern, communication that demonstrate interest in the family as a unit. And there is an additional element connecting to resources which is not depicted here. There are five environmental elements that are incorporated in the director survey and they include welcoming, communication systems, culturally and diverse materials information about resources and peer toper parent activities. Lina. Thank you Toni. So now I am going to be describing some of the measures that we developed. The first is provider, teacher measure, which intended for providers and teachers including center-based programs, family child care, and Head Start or Early Head Start programs. I should note that because of the difficulty entering the school districts, the measures were not tested specifically in public pre-Programs and classrooms. However there is no reason that we have to believe that the measures would not be applicable for pre-K settings. The questions asked

teachers about how they work with the parents of children in their care. And includes about sixty items and takes about ten minutes to complete on average. And just to give you a sense of the type of items that we've included were going to just be providing a sample item for each of the measures. And one other thing that I should note is it that whenever possible we try to have parallel items across providers, teachers and parents. So for example, in the teacher measure we have: Since September how often have you met with or talked to parents about goal parents have for their child? Will have a parallel item that also asks parents how often they what their teacher or provider to talk about the goals they have for their child. Next slide please. So the second is the parent measure which again is intended for parents of children between zero and five years who are in early care and education settings. And they ask parents about how they work with their child's provider or teacher. The parent measure is available in both English and Spanish and Kwang will talk later about the psychometric properties of both the Spanish and English versions. It includes about seventy-five items and it takes roughly about ten minutes again on average to complete. And a sample measure that we have for the parent measure is: How often does your child care provider teacher work with you to develop strategies that you can use at home to support your child's learning and development. And also later on you will see a parallel item of that in the teacher provider survey. The director measure is intended for directors in center-based, family childcare programs serves as the owner or the boss of the family child care provider programs as well as Head Start and Early child care settings. It asks directors general questions about the education and care environment as well as program policy. It really focuses on types of questions that teachers or providers may not have access to or may not be setting policies about. And it really focuses I the conceptual environments features that really either set the tone or set the stage for developing provider teacher relationship quality. It includes a little over fifty items and again takes about ten minutes to complete and you may be wondering by now why does the number of items vary so much but yet the average completion time is the same. For the director survey and it takes a little bit longer because they have to sometime consult records or do math in their head so they have to be a little bit more complicated recall and reporting than the teacher, provider or the families do. So sample item we have for the director measure is: Which of the following methods are used to communicate with families? (websites, emails etc.). And now I'm going to turn it over to Manica who is going be family services staff measure and the work that we did for that.

Manica Ramus: Thank you. As Lina mentioned earlier originally the provider teacher measure was developed to be used with Head Start family service staff. However, we learned early on from focus groups and cognitive interviews that the provider teacher measure items were not applicable to family service staff. Now given the important role that them at back and given the important role that family service staff play within the Head Start mission helping parents to reach their own personal goals, supporting families by advocating for them and connecting family to community services, we decided we needed to develop separate specific measures for family service staff. In addition to, adapting provider teacher measure items and developing new items where gaps existed. We also consulted the literature interview with Kiersten Beigel from the Office of Head Start about the family service staff roles and responsibilities conducted two iterative rounds of cognitive interviews. The family service measure is intended to be used by Head Start and Early Head Staff family services staff. It asks respondent questions about how they work with parents of children in Head Start and Early Head Start program. It includes a hundred and thirteen items, eighteen of which are demographics. It should take about fifteen minutes to complete on average and sample item is: Since September, how often have you been able to follow up with parents about goals they set for themselves. The parent family service staff measure are designed to completed by parents reporting about their Head Start & early Head Start family service staff. Please note that family service staff is used when referring to the role in general, but when

referring to a specific person in the measure we use the term family service worker. The parent family service staff measure asks respondents question about how they work with their family service staff. It includes about seventy-six items, ten of which are demographic. It should take about ten minutes and sample item is: Since September how often have you met with or talked with your family service worker how you are progressing towards goals you had set for yourself. We envision that the family service staff measure can be used concurrently with provider teacher and director measure. And in order to gain the full perspective of the family service staff and parent relationship we think it's best to administer both the family service staff and parent - family service staff measures. Because the family service staff measures are not included in the pilot or field studies since we began their development about halfway through the project. These measures are not included in the psychometric testing. So for a future work we think it would be best to test question in the study to establish reliability of the measure. Because the family service staff measures were not included in the field study the items have not undergone psychometric analysis that will confirm constructs defilement. Instead we made recommendation for the family service staff constructs assignment for all items based on conceptual model and parallelism with other measures. On this slides you will see the number of items assigned to the family services staff measure, then the parent-family staff measure within parenthesis. The constructs with asterisks denotes the constructs that were not included in parent family services staff measure. Now I will turn it over to Kwang who will discuss field study recruitments. Thank you Manica.

Kwang Kim: In spring 2014, earlier this year we conducted a field study to collect data to examine psychometric properties of the FPTRQ measure. The first step we took was to send out pre-notice letters to programs informing them of the FPTRQ field study. We selected six cities across the country for the field study and we contacted center-based programs, Headed Start, Early Head Start programs, child care programs, to make sure that we have diverse types of programs in our data. Then we contacted the program directors to get their permission to schedule site visits and we talked to provider teachers and parents while during our visit. Working very closely with the director we were able to recruit providers and parent and we contact them face to face and hand out the measures for them to complete for us. As Lina and Toni mention earlier provider teacher and parent measure we initially made as construct and subscale based on the conceptual model. But we wanted to make sure the conceptual model that we come up with are still strong and strong. So we conduct confirmatory factor analysis and we found that the constructs as well as subscale were also supported your result of the confirmatory factor analysis. Reliability test was the next after we complete the field study. We use Cronbach's alpha to measure internal consistency for each subscale and the reliability estimate for most of the subscale of the FPTRQ measures were very strong. Mostly point seven zero (.70) or higher. The slides you will see provider teacher measure reliability estimate by program type. The first column for the three constructs and next column you will see seven subscales of the provider, teacher measures. And we represent here center-based program, Head Start and early Head Start program and family child care program reliability and most but not most of the reliability for subscale are very strong and some of them are point nine (.) or higher but and as you see there on the last line of attitude the commitment subscale reliability show a little bit the lower than other subscale scores and we look at it to see what’s going on in those commitment the subscale for item subscale scores. And what we found there was that the variation among responses was not much so with and most what happened was that many but not all the providers, teachers answers three over four items that’s the agree and strongly agree so it comes out that lot of teachers providers are very committed to their job but not all of them actually answered the same way. Next slide show reliability measure for parents measures by program type. Again you will see three constructs and eight subscales and reliability estimate was center-based, Head Start, early Head Start and family child care. Here the parent measure subscale shows stronger reliability across each of

the program type with most of the Cronbach's alpha for over point nine zero (.90). The next slide as Lina mentioned earlier we have two language versions of the parent measure English and Spanish. And this slide shows the reliability estimate for both English and Spanish versions of the parent measure and the Cronbach's alpha was over ninety for each of the six of the eight subscales here, as you see them and it turn out to be very strong in their reliability estimate. Next slide you will see director measure and we did not group the items in the director measure into subscales, instead the items were mapped to environmental constructs in the conceptual model as Toni mentioned earlier. It contains an environmental and policy checklist of "yes" and "no" items and that can help to see how they provide some context for the parents and providers, teacher measures. And we did not conduct the reliability test for the director measure because the items are all yes and no and therefore it wasn't appropriate. Next slide, you will see the how we you can access things FPTRQ measures. The printable PDF versions can be downloaded at no cost from the OPRE website and there is the website address. And they will be up posting this slide in the near future so you can get that information you don't have to write that down this moment. And also Excel scoring sheets for the director, provider teacher and parent measure will be available on the same OPRE website. And most importantly I think FPTRQ measures users' manual will be available on the website as well. Next one is before using the FPTRQ measures. I think you want to do a couple of preparation first of all of course download PTRQ measures from OPRE website and make hard copies so that you can hand out to your respondents. And meanwhile or before actually giving out you want to make sure you will develop systematic linked measure ID systems that the director, providers, teachers and parents within the same program same classroom all linked together so that find the findings from the measures and make sense out of it and make use of the information on the parents links. The next one is the administering the FPTRQ measure. FPTRQ measures are develop so that it can be used in diverse programs and it can be administered very easily and conveniently. It is a self-administered measure and we think that respondent name is not needed on the measures. Instead it is good to use the ID system. Numeric ID system and I think it is important so tattoo know the respondents parent in particular as well as teachers providers can really complete that the measures honestly so that because if they put their name sometime they feel uncomfortable sometimes and this It is also a helpful if you give out the parents measure to parent other than their own teachers or providers. And at the same time you can give to parents' in an envelope. So that they can return their measures in a sealed envelope back to appropriate person. Next slide show a scoring the measures of the FPTRQ, as I mentioned earlier Excel scoring sheet for director provider, teacher and parent measure will be available on the OPRE website. In the scoring sheet, you can enter respondents answers into the spreadsheet directly and tenuous will automatically calculate subscale for you. The FPTRQ measures responses can be also analyzed by using statistical package such as SPSS or SAS and there are some reverse score items and those information items included in the users 'manual so you could identify and make appropriate decoding so your data will be accurate. Now I like to mention a few limitations of the FPTRQ measure. The field study was not nationally representative. As I mentioned we selected six cities but they were not nationally representative. And almost all Head Start programs was run by community organizations and small number of all Head Start programs are included in the field study. FPTRQ measure data not yet been examined with any outcome data and so we do not predictive validity analysis data to report. Also no concurrent validity study of the FPTRQ measures been conducted yet. And as Manica reported earlier due to difficulty measuring cultural sensitivity it is measured indirectly across subscales. Next. Lina.

Lina Guzman: Thank you Kwang. Let me just wrap up by giving you sort of the overview of the FPTRQ measures and what we think the new measures provide. First, together they provide, they capture provider teacher perspective across family and parents' perspective and individual teachers. So let me

back up for a moment and just clarify that the teacher measures asked questions about how teachers and provider work with families in their classrooms so across all the families, how do them work with those families in general. So it is not intended to be teacher report on specific family. In contrast the parents' measure is about a specific teacher and in fact the parents are asked to report about the lead teacher. And we had a lot of discussion at the beginning of the project with our expects. And we opted for asking teachers about how they work but all the families because of the burden it would be to report on individual families or multiple families to get sort of a random representation. It was also unclear how many you would really need to get how many we would have to collect in order to get a good estimate. Secondly, the measures are applicable across centers, family child care, Head Start early Head Start programs. So the measures were designed specifically to be applicable across diverse settings. They were not designed only for Head Start or early Head Start programs. They are intended for all early care and education setting. Third, they are appropriate for diverse population including low and high income family, racially and ethnically diverse as well as Spanish-speaking families and they include multiple concepts including attitudes, knowledge practice and environment. The key features the empirical literature suggests are critical to the development of application of family provider relationship quality. And are flexible to facilitate if used either apart of monitoring or evaluation process as well as a research tool. And now here we provide a couple of resources from our project. Some documents have already been released as well as some products that come from the Office of Planning research and Evaluation, that pre dated the project but sort of help to inform it as well. And so you know we going to be releasing not only the measures but the users' manual and other documents including a cross log between our measured or our conceptual model and others. A brief on cultural sensitivity as well as other tools and they will be released later this year. Those who have registered for the webinar will automatically get email when they're ready and the released and they will be available and we will include not only a notice that they are available but also linked to here. And you can find the later this year on both OPRE's website as well as Child Trends and research connections. And now I am going to turn it over to Alicia who is busy taking down all the great questions that we've been getting throughout the webinar. And trying to organize them around that are similar. So hopefully we'll have get through mostly not all of them.

Alicia Torres: We have about fifteen minutes and we do have a lot of questions. That are coming in. one question is that came a while ago. Are parents asked to identify, well you've mentioned that already or are they asked to answer generally. That one has been answered. Are there any plans for Spanish version of provider teacher measure for family care home you primarily speak Spanish? Manica?

Lina Guzman: So we specifically did not translated into Spanish because in our sort of earlier work when we were doing the focus groups and the cognitive interviews. We found that for the most part we went by me Spanish dominate family child care providers. They were me knowledgeable or fluent enough in English to be able to answer the measured and English. If we had found more Spanish dominant or Spanish only family child care providers. I think that we would have gone ahead and do the translation. This is not to say that this doesn't occurring a certain segment of the country but this wasn't sort of, it didn't rise to the top. In terms of priority for translating and testing in Spanish.

Alicia Torres: Great. Thank you Lina. The next question, is did you conduct focus groups or interviewed with parents or providers about how they filed out that the measure how they've responded to see they interpreted items the way you expected?

Lina Guzman: So the cognitive interview were specifically design to assess how parents interpreted the question. So for example we ask them a question and then we would say something like walk me through how you went about answering that question. Or what is it that phrase mean to you. And we will also take notes if we were doing it in person. We tried to do, we did the cognitive interviews both in person and over the phone. And the reason we did the cognitive interviews over the phone was that we could get and much more diverse geographic sample. Geographically diverse sample. The one that we did in person we did take notes to make sure that we took verbal notes, non-verbal cues as well. Whether people where pausing or seemed hesitant. We'd picked up on anything that suggested that they were having trouble. Kwang?

Kwang Kim: In addition these FPTRQ measures don't have any issues at all in the whole measures. So there wasn't any necessary any reason with know how the respondent complete it or make any mistakes or any concerns like that at all. We didn't do that type of testing at all, In terms of the responding and fill it out. It is a very sort of straight forward simple tool.

Alicia Torres: Okay, our next question are there any differences in psychometric based upon child age, child age controlled for.

Kwang Kim: We did look at the variety of but we have most of the most of the parents of children aged three to five and there are few young age and we did not see any differences among different age groups, parents of different age groups actually to make those thing but I do not have that information in front of me but that is what we have learned and so it work on parents with all ranger of children.

Alicia Torres: Next question: What was sample size that you piloted for the provider teacher measure parent and director measure?

Kwang Kim: In the field study we have on thousand one hundred and eighty-four parents. And four hundred and twenty-three provided teachers and two hundred and fifty-three directors from three different types of program center-based, Head Start, early Head Start and family child care.

Alicia Torres: Have you looked at the congruence between parent and teacher response within a given file?

Kwang Kim: During the field, I think Lina mentioned very briefly that there was some items that are common or on same parallels between the parents and provider, teacher measures and initially while we are developing the measures we are hoping that there will be a hundred percent congruence between it then two in their responses but when we run the that the data we found that they don't actually always agree between two. It was actually, we realized was that the measure was developed for parents and provider, teacher separately to get the full and comprehensive information for the quality

relationship between them so I think that perhaps we show that they don't always agree so that it is very important to ask two parents as well as provider/teacher separately and that was what we kind of what we learned.

Alicia Torres: The next question: Do you have a list of the family engagement models used to develop the logic model?

Toni Porter: We looked across a variety of fields for that we looked at family centered care model we looked at parent family and community, parent engagement model and we look at ask family sensitive caregiving model. We look specifically at those different approaches and in the forthcoming brief on the crosswalk we've looked at the Head Start parent family and community engagement framework, the strengthening family framework and the FPTRQ framework.

Alicia Torres: Great, Toni.so then, I think there is another one here that you maybe you would be the best person to respond to. How are teachers desires of partnership with family included in focus group measures?

Lina Guzman: Including the focus group measures. In the focus group we ask both providers and teachers and there separate focus groups for both types of respondents, about their perceptions of what constitutes quality in relationships between family and provider teachers so we listed that first then we asked them to rank what they thought were the most important aspect of those relationships and then we showed them the elements for the early conceptual model and asked them whether the, extent to which they agreed or disagreed those elements, the research based elements. And for the most part we found strong spontaneous responses to the elements that we had identified in conceptual model even before we showed folks the conceptual model and there were very few elements after shown them the conceptual model with which there were some concern. Folks didn't really understand for example an original element that was defined as empowerment they felt that it was sort of more disempowering than empowerment and they also identified trust as a factor in those relationships which we've incorporated in the element. The other thing I would add is that both the parents and providers and the teachers that we focused in the focus groups as well as in the cognitive interview, really saw family, teacher, provider relationships sort of defined through or centered around the child. That it was really in there, it was about the child it was for the child this is very much a relationship that wouldn't be existing without the child. So that our items really needed to reflect that.

Alicia Torres: Great. Manica, a question here for you. Do the surveys measure cultural sensitivity?

Manica Ramus: Given that culture sensitivity can be conceptualized in various ways we look at what cultural sensitivity looks like specifically between the provider teacher and the parent relationship. We found that cultural sensitivity can measured as attitude, knowledge and practices which are the same elements that characterize the quality relationship between provider teachers and parents. Ultimately we concluded that cultural sensitivity is best measured in various elements and constructs rather than directly to through items on its own subscale.

Alicia Torres: Okay great thank you Manica. For Kwang: Have you look at correlations between scales on the measure?

Kwang Kim: I'm glad that you asked that question. We did look at correlationamong subscales within parent measure as well as within provider teacher measures. The correlations was higher within each construct and not and that they are notes high across the subscales different subscales and constructs. And the correlations are not always alike point four, point five within same construct and the point zero point two, two, three (.223) across the constructs. And it actually, the one that actually we realized from the correlation analysis was that, if there are a lot of correlation interaction among the subscales and if you are making some changes in one subscale aspect of a relationship then I think it will then have also effect on others though I think the in the information that you will be gathering from the FPTRQ will be really helpful and useful tool to improve the family relationship quality in your program. And in the research that you will be planning to conduct.

Alicia Torres: Great. There a lot of questions here we only have a couple more minutes. So I just wanted way that we're not going to get to all the questions and so what we will do is to send emails to the people who have asked them with the questions later on. So we apologize that maybe we should have scheduled this for a little bit longer. There has been a lot of questions coming in. There is one question here I would like to address: Can the FPTRQ be adapted for electronic delivery or data collection? And who would I contact for discussions about permissions to make such annotation?

Kwang Kim: It's not currently in that form that you probably is trying to use. So I think that person to contact is Laura I think. Laura?

Laura Hoard: I'm here. So I would it think you could probably do it yourself. And just taking the measure as it is and transposing it into whatever system that you are using. But currently that not one of our goals to do that.

Alicia Torres: Right on okay and for Toni: What aspect of family partnership do the FPTRQ surveys capture that is not already in other surveys?

Toni Porter: Now because we are using the four main constructs, we 'recapturing all the elements that as I indicated earlier that the empirical literature suggests they are associated with positive outcomes for children, parents and provider and in particular we have, there is three different element that are incorporated in this survey, that are not necessarily captured in other .measures. In these measures that not captured in other measures. One is this notion of openness to change, which is no often captured in other measures, because we think that there may an assumption that other that professional development falls outside of the family provider relation, the directory family provider relationship. Another is this notion of a specific information that the provider teacher have about individual families. The measures are very comprehensive about the kinds of information that providers and teachers are expected to have about families. And it goes much further than any other measures. In addition there is a, in the environmental elements there is a peer to peer parent networking which is supported by evidence that social support for parents that may emanate some of the relationship between the provider or the teacher and parent it important for parental outcomes that often not included in other measures as well. And I don't also, like to add that in terms of the practices elements the FPTRQ measures are really comprehensive. The elements include collaboration which may appear in other measures but may not be measured as extensively in SAR and FPTRQ measures. And the same thing goes for communication which is far broader than what is often included in other measures. And we have a minute left for an additional question.

Alicia Torres: Thank you, Toni. And this is regarding whether there is a shorter version of the instruments to be made available, if so will others identify for these versions.

Kwang Kim: Shorter versions of the parents and provider teacher survey are currently under developed and then we will be making them available but think in this fall or when other measures and materials are available. And so that is where we are right now and I think we are still working on it right now I think I probably wouldn't want to say much about it at this moment.

Alicia Torres: Great. Well, we've run just about a minute over. I want really thank all of you for participating and all of the panelist. I know there's a lot of questions that have come in that have not been answered but we will work on sending you responses to those, Thank you all and until the next webinar then,