>>Alicia Torres: So good afternoon, my name is Alicia Torres, director of communications at Child Trends. And on behalf of the Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality project or FPTRQ, we'd like to welcome you to the webinar. The project offers unique tool for measuring the relationships between families and the providers and teachers who care for their small children. And as you know these relationships are key factors 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 of 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 the right hand side of your screen and you can easily submit questions to our team and we will get back to you. This is the same place where you will submit question for the panelist at any time during the presentation. We will queue them up, the questions, and present them to the different panelists when all the presentations has been completed. So today you're going to be hearing from a few panelists. You'll first hear introductory remarks from Laura Hoard who is a social science researcher and analyst at the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation in the HHS Office of the Administration for Children and Families. She has served as the project manager on this program in this Office. Then you will hear from Kiersten Beigel from the Office of Head Start. After that, after the introductory remarks, you will hear from four of the researchers who have lead and conducted the research and development of these measures for this project. 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 in measurement development among other areas. She is co-PI for this project. You will then hear from Toni Porter from 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 relationships in early areas, as well as evaluation of ECE programs. Thirdly you will hear from Dr. Manica Ramos. She is a research scientist at Child Trends and project manager for this project. Manica has her doctorate in applied developmental psychology and specializes in research on early care and education programs, family engagement, and cultural sensitivity. And finally you will hear from Dr. Kwang Kim who is the project director for this project. Kwang is a senior study director at Westat, his research experience is in survey research, early education research, and implementation of large-scale data collection, and data analysis and reporting. He holds a doctorate in education research. I will now turn it over to Laura for introductory remarks and Lina Guzman will kick of the presentation.

>>Laura Hoard: Hi everyone, as noted my name is Laura Hoard from the Office of Planning Research and Evaluation, and I am just going to provide some opening comments and pass it over to Kiersten Beigel from the Office of Head Start. So, while family engagement has been a corner-stone of Head Start since its inception, a focus on family engagement across early childhood education programs has recently gained prominence, for example, within state QRIS systems, and as a focus for Race to the Top grantees. About five years ago, family engagement was beginning to gain attention in OPRE, where I work. In collaboration with Office of Head Start, in the Office of Child Care, we held a two-day meeting for researchers, policymakers, and program staff to discuss the next step in the area of family engagement. With everyone meeting together, the consensus was that what was really needed 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 needed to have to show family engagement. Serendipitously at that time, the Office of Head Start had some funds that they wanted to put towards building better measures of the quality of early care and education programs and saw the need highlighted by that meeting. OPRE, which is again where I work, and the Office of Head Start used the funds to create the Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality project or FPTRQ. So one thing we're very lucky about OHS, or the Office of Head Start, was really interested in broadly supporting the development of

a measure that could be used across early childhood education programs and not just for Head Start. So FPTRQ measures show here a lot about that, and were developed to be used in center-based and family-based child care centers as well. I will let Kiersten Beigel, who is at the Office of Head Start, she is also the lead and the head on the National Center of Parent Family and Community Engagement, discuss her role on this project. Thanks.

>>Kiersten Beigel: Hi everybody, so glad you could join us and hope you are as excited as we are about this measure, and learning more about it and how we can use it in programs and systems across the country. We do know that regardless of sort of what kind of program you're involved with, how you're thinking about family engagement, or what you're building in your states or program around family engagement and with families, that relationships really are the common denominator for all of us as so this is really exciting work, and while we know that relationships are sort of the foundation for the work around family engagement, it's really easier said than done. So you know at staff or administrators or leaders in programs or policymakers, you know, we all have our own sets of beliefs, and attitudes, and perspectives we bring to the table when working with families. And families likewise have their own sets of perspectives, attitudes, and beliefs. So unpacking some of that, understanding it, and figuring out sort of how we can put our best foot forward, and developing the shared responsibility we have for supporting the learning and development of young children. This measure, I think, it helps us with that and also the National Center that Laura mentioned is also well very well poised. It's kind of nice because we have a lot of great material on relationships rooted in practice as part of our National Center, and we'll have more coming out the next year I think, that can support folks who are interested in using a measure like that and programs who are interested in developing their relationships with families in the works. And without further ado I will pass it on over and I hope you enjoy the webinar.

>>Lina Guzman: Thank you, Kiersten! And again good afternoon everyone. We are delighted to be here joining you virtually to share with you the new Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality measure. Before I go into what we will be presenting, I just want to take a moment to thank our project Officers Laura Hoard and Nancy Marjeed for the careful oversight they have provided for us throughout the project. As well as Kiersten Beigel, for the guidance that she's given to us, that we hope has made this tool both useful and valuable for Head Start and Early Head Start. And I'd like to acknowledge colleagues at Westat and here at Child Trends, as well as Toni Porter, who has been a true partner to use throughout this project. The measures that you will be hearing about today are culmination of roughly four years' worth of work. They were developed though a multi-step and iterative project which you will hear more about in a minute and which we believe led to greater and more reliable measures. Let me take a moment to walk through what we will be covering today. I will be begin with a brief introduction to the project. We'll then describe the conceptual model that guided the development of the measures. We'll also talk about the survey and how they developed the psychometric analysis that was conducted that resulted in field and pilot studies that were carried out. We'll then also discuss the use of a measure as well as the development of a measure specifically for family services staff in Head Start and Early Head Start programs, as well as the limitations and implications of that measure. As you may have already guessed that project was carried out through a partnership with Westat and Child Trends sponsored by ACF, the Office of Head Start, and OPRE. The purpose of the project was to develop measures that could be used by researchers, policymakers and practitioners to assess the quality of family-provider relationships in early care and education settings for children from birth to five years. More specifically, a goal of the project was to develop measures that were applicable across diverse early care and education settings, including Head Start, and were appropriate for use with racially/ethnically and economically diverse populations. And to this end, we developed five separate measures, depending on the respondent and target relationship, including first the provider and teacher survey which measures their relationships with families that they serve. Second survey measure, of between a parent, that looks at the relationship between themselves and their child's provider or teachers. Third is a measure for directors, about the teachers of centers and fourth is a measure for family services staff about their relationships with the families that they serve. And last is a measure for parents about their about their relationship with a family services staff

member. Next slide please. So why do we need measure of family and provider/teacher relationship quality? Well, as you already know, sixty percent of U.S. children under the age of five spend time regularly at early care and education settings. And we also know from research that children, providers and teachers can lead to positive outcomes like school readiness, positive family engagement, and also strengthen the home program connection which has been an important contributor to child success. Yet there is no currently single measure that incorporates all elements of a provider/teacher relationship such as knowledge, practice, and attitudes which Toni will be talking about in a minute. In addition, while there is a variety of measures currently available there is no measure that assesses all aspects of family and provider/teacher relationship quality. And many of the measures that are available have either not been tested or are not known to be applicable for economically and racially diverse populations. Additionally now many are available in Spanish. In short, there is a need for a new measure of family and provider/teacher relationship qualities that includes all elements that the empirical literature suggests are important and that are applicable to diverse populations. The new and more comprehensive family and provider/teacher relationship quality measure helps to fill a critical gap with a new effective measure for use in Head Start and Early Head Start programs as well as family daycare/child care and center-based programs. It provides on form programmatic and policy directions for measuring the quality of family and provider and teacher relationships, and in family engagement, and contributes to a knowledge base about associations amongst specific elements of effective provider/teacher consultation of strong relationships with the family. So let's talk a lot about the multi-stage process that we undertook to develop these measures. First, as you see, we conducted an extensive literature review that helped to guide the development of our conceptual model that ultimately guided our measurements. We also conducted focus groups with parents, providers, teachers, as well as family services staff. And that was to make sure that the conceptual model matched what our target population thought were critical elements to include in measures of family and provider/teacher relationships. We also consulted experts who provided feedback throughout the life of the project. And we also conducted very extensive item review of existing measures that help either to lead to the identification of items that we could use or items we needed to adapt, tweak a little bit, as well as gaps that existed where we needed to create items from scratch. We also conducted three rounds of cognitive testing with parents, providers and teachers as well as directors, and two rounds of cognitive interviews with family services staff and parents working with family services staff. And those cognitive interviews were designed to help us better understand how well our questions were working and to help improve the wording of the questions. We also conducted a pilot and field study in the cities, in multiple cities across the country, then generated data that we could then use to psychometrically analyze the data so that we can see how well the measures were standing up. Next slide please. So who can the FPTRQ measure be used by? Well first, state and local administrators could use this to inform the development or revision of quality rating and improvement and QRIS family partnership indicators as well as rating systems, and to better align professional development systems competencies. Practitioners and professional development systems can also use it to identify or monitor the quality of relationships to revise and focus or develop training or coursework to address specific areas of weakness or areas where improvement is needed, and also to understand program progress and relationship-building skills over time. Lastly, researchers could also to test the associations between provider/teacher attitudes, knowledge, and practices as well as specific child and family outcomes, and to serve as a reliable and comprehensive measure of family and provider/teacher relationships. And now I would like to pass it over Toni, who will describe our conceptual model and how our measures were developed from the conceptual model.

>>Toni Porter: Thank you, Lina. Good afternoon everybody. Thank you Lina. As Lina just indicated, the conceptual model was based on extensive review of the theoretical and empirical literature on family and provider/teacher relationships from a variety of fields including early care and education, K-12, social work, mental health and early intervention. In this model, we integrated common and unique elements from three broad perspectives on family provider teacher relationships: family centered care, parent involvement and family engagement, and family sensitive care giving. Common elements to the perspectives included an ecological view of child development, focus on child outcomes 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 families that focuses on families' unique resources and assets, and the centrality of provider/teacher relationships. These three perspectives also included unique elements: the importance of capacity and empowerment, a focus on strong school-family partnership and shared responsibility for children's' learning, and an emphasis on provider/teacher responsiveness and sensitivity. So what you have in front of you is a very elaborate conceptual model and you can see there are two-way arrows that indicates that 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. At the same time, providers/teachers may become more sensitive and more responsive to the needs of families as parents become more involved and engaged in their programs. This model is structured as a logic model in an effort to summarize what is a very complex issue. Each construct has the potential to be dynamic. There is also no temporal assumption. Because the purpose of the measure, as Lina indicated, is to inform assessment and monitoring of ECE programs, the central focus of this conceptual model is column two: effective provider/teacher facilitation of family-provider relationships. The elements here in the second columns are the ones that the empirical literature suggested or associated with positive child, family, and provider outcomes. The elements which I will talk more about in the next slide are grouped into four constructs, which are in the orange bands. One is attitudes, providers' and teachers' perceptions or beliefs related to interactions with families. The second is knowledge, specific information providers/teachers have about the families they are serving. The third is practices, how providers' attitudes and knowledge are translated into their interactions with parents. And the fourth is environmental features: the tone, physical environment, organizational climates, and program-level resources that support and promote family relationships. Cultural responsiveness as you see at the bottom of the column is assumed to cut across all of these constructs. The model also indicates characteristics or factors that may influence the family provider relationship, the first column. Intermediate outcomes and family outcomes as well as provider/teacher outcomes, the third column, and effects on children, families, and providers. Next slide please. So here are the four FPTRQ constructs with their individual elements. There are four attitudes elements. All are captured in subscales. These elements include respect, commitment, sensitivity to the needs of children, parents, and families, an intrinsic motivation for work, openness to change, a willingness to alter normal practice in order to be sensitive to an individual child's, family's, or parent's need, and a willingness to be flexible and understanding context, having an appreciation for the broader context in which children's development and family life is situated. There is only one element in the knowledge construct and as I indicated that is family-specific knowledge. There are four elements in the practices construct: communication, responsiveness - that's flexibility, collaboration - joint goal setting and decision-making between the provider teacher and the parent, and family focus concern, communication that demonstrates interest in the family as a unit. There are five elements in the environmental construct. One is welcoming, and that includes participation in program planning and development. Another is communication systems. A third is culturally diverse materials. A fourth is information about resources and a fifth is peer to peer parent activity. Lina! Lina!

>>Lina Guzman: Sorry about that. We had a little bit of a technical glitch. Sorry about that. We had a little bit of a technical glitch there. So the first of the five surveys is the provider/teacher survey. It's intended to be used by early care and education providers and that includes the wide array of early care and education settings including center-based programs, family child care, Head Start or Early Head Start programs. It can also be used for pre-K settings. However, we did not explicitly test it in public preschool programs, just because of the difficulty of getting into those programs. It asks providers about how they work with parents and the children they serve, and includes about sixty items measuring different aspects of the relationship, and the measure takes about ten minutes to complete. And to give you a sense of the types of question as well as the parallels that we try to maintain across the different surveys, we included a sample question for each of the surveys. The sample question for the provider teacher measure is: "Since September, how often have you met or talked to parents about the goals parents have for their child?" Next slide please. So the parent survey, which is again intended for parents of children ages zero to five in early care and education programs. We focused these questions on how parents work with their child's provide or teacher.

One thing is worthy of note, that this measure is available in both English and Spanish. It includes again about seventy-five items and also takes about ten minutes. And the sample question here for the parent measure is: "How often does your child care provider/teacher work with you to develop strategies you can use at home to support your child's learning and development?" The third measure which is the director measure is asked of directors of centers or the owners of family child care programs. It is intended to collect data about the care environment and program policies, things that the teachers or providers don't really set or may not even have the information about, and it really helps to provide contexts about the type of features that can help either promote or serve as a challenge to facilitating the provider/teacher and parent relationship quality. It includes fifty question and also takes ten minutes. And you may be asking why all these with different measures with different numbers of questions still take the same amount. Well, here for the director measure, it takes a little bit longer because they often need records to answer some of the questions, or they may need to do some math in their heads, and a lot more complicated recall than is expected of the parent and the provider. And now I am going to turn it over to Manica who will talk about the family services staff measures.

>>Manica Ramos: Thank you. As Lina mentioned earlier a major goal of the measure is to be across diverse settings including centers, family child care and Head Start and Early Head Start centers. Originally the provider/teacher measure was developed to be used with Head Start family services staff. However, we learned early on from focus groups and cognitive interviews that the provider/teacher measure items weren't applicable to family services staff. Now, given the important role that family services staff play within the Head Start mission, such as helping parents to reach their own goals, supporting families by advocating for them, and connecting family to community services, we decided we needed to develop separate specific measures for family services staff in addition to adapting provider teacher measurement items that work for family services staff and developing new items where gaps existed. We also consulted the literature and interviewed Kiersten Beigel from the Office of Head Start about the family services staff's roles and responsibility. We also conducted two iterative rounds of cognitive interviews. The family services staff measure is intended to be used by Head Start and Early Head Staff family services staff. It asks respondents questions about how they work with parents of children in the Head Start and Early Head Start program. It includes hundred and thirteen items, eighteen of which are demographic items. It should take about fifteen minutes to complete on average and a 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 for parents to complete about their Head Start and Early Head Start family service staff and please note that we use family services staff when referring to the role in general. However when we are referring to a specific person in the measure we use the term Family Service Worker. The parent family services staff measure asks respondents questions about how they work with family service staff. The measure includes about seventy -six items, ten of which are demographic. It should take about ten minutes to complete on average and sample item is: "Since September, how often have you met with or talked with your family service worker about how you are progressing towards goals you had set for yourself?" We envision that the family services staff measure can be used concurrently with the provider/teacher and director measures. And, in order to gain the full perspective of the family services staff and parent relationship, we think it's best to administer both the family services staff and parent family service staff measures concurrently. Because the family services 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 questions in the study to establish reliability of the measure. I'll now turn it over to Kwang who will describe the field study.

>>Kwang Kim: Thank you, Manica. The field study of the FPTRQ was conducted in six cities across the country in the spring earlier this year. We first sent out pre-notice letters to programs informing them that the FPTRQ field study will be conducted in their area and we may be contacting them for participation in the study. Once the project directors agreed to participate in our study, we made

arrangements with the program directors to schedule site visits at their most convenient time, and also we talked to providers/teachers and parents. Working very closely with directors, we contacted the providers/teachers and parents for face-to-face meetings and we handed out measures to them on the spot. After four long months of data collection efforts, we were able to recruit a diverse range of programs and providers and parents from center-based, Head Start, Early Head Start programs, as well as family-based child care centers. Using the data from the field study we were looked the reliability and how the measures are constructed, the way we initially designed based on the conceptual model. Each of the items were grouped under three broad construct of knowledge, practices, and attitudes, and subscales were built under each of those. We conducted confirmatory factor analysis to see how each measure is constructed and to see how subscales are formed within each construct. For reliability tests, we used Cronbach's alpha to measure internal consistency of each subscale. And the rule of thumb for the reliability measures is subscales of point seven zero (.70) or higher are considered to be strong. And we'll show you next few slides that how we were able to do the analysis and find out the reliability measures. This slide is the reliability by program types: center-based program, and Head Start, Early Head Start, and family child care. And here you will see three constructs: knowledge, practices, and attitudes, and you will also see seven subscales in the provider/teacher measures. Most of the subscales' reliability scores are pretty good, some are at point nine zero (.90) or higher or at a point seven zero (.70). But as you see in the last line, the commitment subscale has shown a lower reliability estimate compared to others. And so we looked at it more closely to see what happening in the commitment subscales for the three different program types, and what we found was that most of the providers/teachers answer three or four in the four items included in the commitment. That means agree or strongly agree, but still there are other providers/teachers also rated one or two so it's not always putting the one over two response rate, but at some broad distribution. On the next slide, you will see reliability by program type of the parent measure. Here are the three same constructs, knowledge, practices, and attitude, but we have eight subscales for the parent measure and you will see here that many reliability estimates for subscales for three different types of programs, how very very high, most of them are point nine (.90) or higher, and the family-focused concern subscale has probably the lowest here, but they're still point seven (.70) or higher in the parent measure. As Lina mentioned earlier, for the parent measure there are both English and Spanish versions, and so we looked at the reliability estimated for the Spanish and English versions of the parent measure and that you will see the reliability for both Spanish and English measures or subscales are very, very good. We were very, very happy to see this very good reliability from our measures. Next one is the director measure, that do not group into subscales, the items in the director measure, but we mapped them to environment constructs in the conceptual model and contain environment and policy check list of 'yes or no" items for the director measures. So we do not have a reliability report for information for the director measures. Next one is we will like to present how you can use the FPTRQ measures. Before you want to use the FPTRQ measures, you want to download the measures from the OPRE website and make hard copies. It is very important to develop a systematic and linked measure ID system, because you want to know the providers and teachers are linked to their program and the parents are also linked to the right provider/teacher within the same program. So it will be great to put the ID or put a label on the space on the measure provided in the back of the hard copy. Next one is administering the FPTRQ measure. We were trying to make the measure as easy as possible so that it can be used in a variety of programs for many different purposes. It is self-administered measured and respondents' names not need to be on the measure. We put this so that some confidentiality issues can be honored. And we also thought that someone other than the provider/teacher can collect the measure so that the parents will be able to report their ratings without any fear or concerns. In the same play, the parents can be given an envelope so that they can put their completed measure, sealed, and returned to the program director. Scoring is another important thing I believe you all want to know. We developed an Excel scoring sheet for the director, provider/teacher, and parent measures you can use, and the scoring sheets are available on the OPRE website. Using this scoring sheet, all you need to do is put the correct ID, and then enter the measure's responses in the spreadsheet. It will automatically calculate subscales scores for you. Measure responses in Excel can be analyzed by using statistical packages like at SPSS or SAS. And there are some reverse-scored items in the measures and not only are those automatically scored reversely

in the scoring sheet but using SAS or SPSS or other statistical package you may to do because they're in your syntax file. All this information and more useful information will be found in the user's manual that will be available later in there in the fall. Next, Manica.

>>Manica Ramos: Thank you. I will talk a bit about the family service staff constructs assignments. As you may recall when Kwang discussed constructs assignments earlier, this was based on confirmatory factor analysis of the field data. Because the family services staff measure were not included in the field study, we made our recommendation for family services staff construct assignment for all items based on the conceptual model and parallelism with other measures. However, these construct assignments have not been confirmed through psychometric analysis. On the slides you will see the number of items assigned to the family services staff measure. Then the parent family services staff measure was in parenthesis. The construct was to show, to denote the constructs that were not included in the parent family services staff measure. Now, I will turn it back to Kwang who will discuss the limitations. Study limitations, like most other projects for measurement development or any other purposes, we do have a few limitations in this project. First one is the field studies was not a nationally representative sample. And all of the Head Start and Early Head Start programs were run by community organizations and small number of all Head Start programs were included in the group study. The FPTRQ measures data has not been examined with any outcome data yet, so we have not conducted predictability studies. Also no concurrent validity study of the FPTRQ measure been conducted at the moment. And, due to difficultly measuring cultural sensitivity directly, it is measured indirectly across subscales. Toni, now is your turn.

>>Toni Porter: Thank you Manica. And we are going to try to sum up the potential uses that the FPTRQ measures in the real world. Next slide please. Okay, so there are a variety of ways in which Head Start and Early Head Start administrators and directors could use these measures. For one, they could conduct self-assessments of teachers' and family services staff's attitudes, knowledge, and practices, and they could also use the director survey to conduct self-assessments of the program and environment. Another way to use the survey would be to assess parents' perceptions of their relationships with providers and teachers and family services staff, and to use those parent surveys in conjunction with teacher surveys and or the family services staff surveys to assess the fit between the perspective of staff members in the program and the parent of their relationship with each other. These measures could also be used to identify areas that are can be addressed to continue with improvement efforts and in family relationships over time, and the measures can be used to supplement the existing Head Start parent, family, and community engagement framework self-assessment. Next slide, please. For policymakers, as Lina indicated at the outset, the measures can be useful for refining or revitalizing quality rating and improvement systems standards and indicators especially because some research suggests that those indicators lacked variation and lack specificity. They can also be used in Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge grant for efforts to assess family engagement alongside existing instrument such as the Strengthening Family Self-Assessment, or in addition to the instruments, to capture aspects of quality in family-provider relationships that may not be included in other instruments. And finally, the FPTRQ measures could be used to improve alignments across professional development systems which identify those areas' expectations for what providers/teachers need to know and do course offerings and trainings that are intended to help the providers and teachers obtain those skills. And the QRIS indicators that are intended to rate providers on those skills. Lina.

>>Lina Guzman: Thank you Toni. And so I'd just like to briefly sum up what the FPTRQ measures provide and just really briefly so that we have some time for questions and answers. I hope that you come across, that you walk away with a perception that or the belief that the FPTRQ measure provides a really strong and reliable tool. And it's a measure used or done across diverse settings, including Head Start and Early Head Start, but also center-based family child care. And again as I mentioned earlier pre-K although we did not explicitly test this in pre-K it can also be for diverse settings, as in some of the psychometrics that Kwang presented to you. Which showed really strong properties in both English and Spanish but also cross-diverse and multiple features for the sample, multiple

characters for the sample. And it is also a very flexible tool, so it can have measure multiple constructs separately or together. And it is flexible for use either as a standalone measure, or also a part of an existing monitoring or valuation process. And with that we also wanted to provide in the next slide some of the resources that are currently available on family-provider relationship quality that came out of this project, including our literature review and measures review, as well as other measures and other tools that are currently available. And then in the next slide we also have the links to where to where you will the able to find all the products that come out of the project and we'll be releasing the measures as well as the user's manual later this fall, and those will be available on these websites. And we also plan to, when they become available - so that you don't have to be checking the website - we will send an e-newsletter or email to all those who have signed onto the webinar to let them know that the measures and documents have been released and where they could find them. Alicia?

>>Alicia Torres: Great. Thanks to all the panelists. So now we'll start to ask some of the questions that you have sent in. I just wanted to, several of you have asked whether these slides will be available and we've answered you privately, those of you who have been asking this. But just so that everyone knows, the slides will be available on the Child Trends' website under Our Research, then Early Childhood Development, and then FPTRQ. So you will be able to see those, and those will probably be posted sometime later this evening today, or tomorrow, in the next day or so. So, now in addition to that, several of you have sent in questions. I'd like to begin with one that was sent in regarding whether or not providers from public pre-K programs were also involved in the focus groups. And so, this is Lina.

>>Lina Guzman: Providers specifically in pre-K programs were not included in the focus groups, again, just because of the difficulty of getting permission from school districts and state and local government agencies to do research in public pre-K programs. So private pre-K programs were definitely included, and center-based programs were included, but if it was part of a school district it was really difficult for them to get included.

>>Alicia Torres: Okay, thank you Lina.

>>Lina Torres: One thing I would add, though, is there is no reason, theoretical or based on other research, that we would have to suspect that these measures will hold up less well in a pre-K setting.

>>Alicia Torres: Okay, so for Toni: What aspects of Family Partnership do the FPTRQ survey capture that are not already measured another survey?

>>Toni Porter: Well I think as Lina said and alluded to and as I said it earlier, the FPTRQ measures capture all the elements that the empirical research suggests are associated with effective provider facilitation of relationships with families. So, some of the distinctive features that are not often captured in other assessment tools are openness to change, in the attitudes construct, and responsiveness, which specifically relates to providers' and teachers' flexibility with families. In the practices construct, peer-to-peer parent activities, which relates to social support for parents, which is in the director survey. So those three, and also I would say there is a family-focused concern which not necessarily captured in other measures. And it's based, just to sort strengthen my response here, it's based on a review of two commonly used assessments for family-provider relationships, as well as the analysis we conducted in our measures review, and finally a comparison between the FPTRQ constructs and elements and national professional standards.

>>Alicia Torres: Yes, thank you Toni. Okay, for Kwang: What is the time commitment that you anticipate it will take to complete the survey and assess the results?

>>Kwang Kim: It takes, we estimate, about ten minutes on average per respondent to complete each measure, as Lina mentioned earlier, it could be faster, but that is the time on average. I think entering the responses in the Excel scoring sheet will take maybe five to ten minutes, it depends on how

efficient you are in entering such data into an Excel spreadsheet, but once they are entered it will be calculated in no time. So I think it will be, it won't take too long actually in most cases.

>>Alicia Torres: Okay, great! The other question Kwang that came in I think for you would be: How can the survey questions be incorporated into other types of surveys?

>>Kwang Kim: That's a good question. I think if you are conducting large-scale research, you may want to take only a few subscales from the FPTRQ measures. I think that is very good way to kind of get the information you'd like to use from the FPTRQ, but also you can also use multiple, or add the FPTRQ survey to a large-enough battery you are already developing, so it may take not long, actually, but it may, it is good actually, to take, we suggest that it good to use both - not both, actually, all three, director, provider/teacher, and parent surveys so that you'll be able to reach and get comprehensive information on family and provider/teacher relationship quality.

>>Alicia Torres: Thank you, Kwang. We got a really interesting question that may be beyond the scope of this project but that you think we might have some thoughts on. Basically, somebody wrote in saying: With all the cuts in education funding in Michigan, will the information being gathered possibly help secure more funding for schools in the future? I think that's an interesting question and I think it's beyond the scope but maybe, Toni, you might have some thoughts on this?

>>Toni Porter: I do. I am not sure whether this will help the questioner obtain additional funding, but I think certainly there's a great deal of interest and growing interest in family engagement in early childhood programs, and in school as well. You may know or may not know that there was a White House meeting on this this summer. There is a strong interest across several departments, and within the federal government, in terms of family engagement, and also there is a real value in understanding the quality of relationships between families and providers and teachers, and teachers specifically in the public schools. So to the extent that you could use these measures, is they collect data that indicate that there are strong aspects of these relationships, or weak aspects of these relationships, you could demonstrate that this is an essential, really a crucial, element in supporting children's development, which is what we're all about, so it might be useful in that way. In addition, I think that you could probably use these measures to inform your QRIS, which I know is not related to your school funding but would also strengthen this cross-system effort I think we are all engaged in to enhance outcomes for children and families.

>>Alicia Torres: Great, thank you, Toni. One more question for you: Will time to administer these programs affect time for learning and instruction?

>>Toni Porter: I think that we've said this repeatedly, and I think one of the strengths of these measures, is that it takes about ten minutes for the respondents to complete them. I mean, Kwang keeps saying about it is about how fast you read, so even if you administered the measure to a teacher or a provider for ten minutes, is it not going to take significantly away from her time with the children. For parents, it could be something where they can take it home and bring it back in a sealed envelope. Maybe they would do it when a child was asleep or something like that. And directors, it's only ten minutes of their time - they could do it while they're having their coffee in the morning. So, no, I think that the short answer to that one is no, this really shouldn't take away time. And besides, the benefits of understanding the quality of the relationships in a particular setting, and the effort that you might want to conduct to improve those areas that warrant attention will more than outweigh the ten minutes of time per respondent.

>>Alicia Torres: Great and I think we have time for just one more. A question came in: Were the surveys tested with the Head Start population? Kwang?

>>Kwang Kim: Yes, absolutely, and that is one piece of information I reported earlier. We contacted Head Start programs and Early Head Start programs, and we got a very good response from them, so

Head Start teachers and parents participated in providing their responses to help us develop and finalize the surveys, these measures. However, we were unable to have as many Head Start programs as we wished, but we still have a few Head Start and Early Head Start programs in the field studies.

>>Alicia Torres: Great, and well this is Alicia Torres, I wanted to thank all the panelists that have participated and all of the people who have logged on and asked questions. On behalf of the Family and Provider/Teacher Relationship Quality project or FPTRQ, we thank you and we look forward to next webinar with you.