RESEARCH REPORT

Studying the Implementation of DC's Early Childhood Educator Pay Equity Fund

Technical Documentation for Year 1 Early Educator, Home Operator, and Center Director Surveys

Justin B. Doromal, Erica Greenberg, Elli Nikolopoulos, Eve Mefferd, Heather Sandstrom, Rachel Lamb, Victoria Nelson, and Timothy Triplett

July 2024

URBAN INSTITUTE · ELEVATE · THE · DEBATE

ABOUT THE URBAN INSTITUTE

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

Contents

Acknowledgments

This report was supported by the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) of the US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) as part of financial assistance award (Grant #90YE0284) totaling $1.6 million, fully funded by ACF/HHS. Study findings are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of, nor an endorsement by, ACF/HHS, the US government, or the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Please visit the ACF website, Administrative and National Policy Requirements (acf.hhs.gov/administrative-and-national-policy-requirements#chapter-8), for more information. We are grateful to ACF and to all our funders, who make it possible for Urban Institute to advance its mission. Funders do not determine research findings or the insights and recommendations of Urban experts. Further information on the Urban Institute's funding principles is available at urban.org/fundingprinciples.

We thank the District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE), Division of Early Learning (DEL), for engaging in the DC Child Care Policy Research Partnership. We are especially grateful to Kathryn Kigera, director of quality initiatives at DEL; Sara Mead, deputy superintendent of early learning at OSSE; and Hannah Matthews, director of policy, planning, and research at DEL, for their ongoing support and feedback on study products. We thank the early educators and center directors who participated in our surveys for sharing their perspectives and experiences with us. We also thank the RAPID-EC team, whose collaboration and coordination enriched our survey design and approach. Finally, we thank the Child Care Policy Research Partnership Community of Practice, including other grantees (especially the Virginia team), program officers, and technical assistance experts who have enriched our work.

Studying the Implementation of the District of Columbia's Early Childhood Educator Pay Equity Fund

The Urban Institute, in partnership with the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) under a 2022 Child Care Policy Research Partnership cooperative agreement from the federal Administration for Children and Families, sought to document the mission, goals, and early implementation of the Early Childhood Educator Pay Equity Fund ("Pay Equity Fund"), and to raise up the experiences of early educators eligible for and receiving the Pay Equity Fund payments and the experiences and views of their employers. To help address these aims, we developed surveys of early childhood educators eligible for the District of Columbia's Early Childhood Educator Pay Equity Fund and child care program directors in 2023.

This technical report documents the steps we took to design and administer these surveys. We describe the survey development process, survey recruitment and administration procedures, response rates, characteristics of the target population and survey sample, and steps taken to weight, clean, and analyze the data. A companion report (Sandstrom et al. 2024) and accompanying fact sheets (Doromal et al. 2024; Mefferd et al. 2024; Nikolopoulos et al. 2024) presents the survey findings.

The Early Childhood Educator Pay Equity Fund

Early childhood educators play essential roles in providing stable and high-quality child care for young children and supporting their development and growth. As is also true nationwide, historically low wages in the District of Columbia have led to challenges in compensating and retaining qualified early childhood educators, and in turn, building quality child care systems from which families benefit. In 2022, the District of Columbia passed legislation to tax the wealthy, generating revenue to increase compensation for early educators working in OSSE-licensed child care programs. The first of its kind nationwide, the Pay Equity Fund represents an innovative, long-term, and sustainable strategy for addressing early childhood educator compensation.

The Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE), the lead agency in charge of administering the Pay Equity Fund, implemented the fund in three phases:[1]

- In FY 2022, it provided one-time supplemental payments to early educators in licensed centers and home-based programs—$14,000 for full-time lead teachers and $10,000 for assistant teachers and associate caregivers, and half those amounts for part-time early educators.
- In FY 2023, payments were distributed quarterly, totaling the same amount as the previous year.
- In FY 2024, funds were distributed to child care facilities that opted into the Pay Equity Fund, which in turn, must meet minimum salary scales for early educators set by OSSE based on role and education credentials. Facilities could apply during one of four application windows during the fiscal year. Facilities that opt in to the program receive quarterly payments calculated using a payroll funding formula.

Structure of Report

The purpose of this report is to document the steps we took to design and administer a set of surveys to learn more about the opportunities and challenges wage supplements offered child care employers and early educators in the first 1.5 years of implementation (FY 2022 and FY 2023). We begin by describing the survey development process, survey administration procedures, response rates, and characteristics of the target population (i.e., the set of educators we identified as potentially eligible for the Pay Equity Fund, based on administrative data we had access to) and the survey sample (i.e., the set of educators who submitted a valid survey response). We do this once for the Early Educator and Home Operator Surveys, and then once more for the Center Director Survey. We describe these steps separately, given different sampling frames and different constructs of interest across samples. We then describe steps taken to weight, clean, and analyze survey data, and we conclude by summarizing demographic information for each of the survey samples.

Survey Design: Early Educator and Home Operator Surveys

We administered surveys of lead and assistant teachers and home caregivers working in licensed child care facilities[2] to collect information on the experiences of early childhood educators eligible to receive payments from the Pay Equity Fund. Because we were interested in the unique experiences of child care home/expanded home operators, who run a business and employ staff eligible for the Pay Equity Fund while being eligible themselves, we designed two survey questionnaires.

- The **Early Educator Survey** targeted lead and assistant classroom teachers working in licensed centers as well as home caregivers and associate home caregivers working in licensed homes who were not the owners or operators of their facility. The survey asked respondents to indicate whether they were still employed in an OSSE-licensed child care facility or had stopped working in DC child care since being initially eligible for payments. Respondents were routed to different sets of questions based on their current or former employment status.
- The **Home Provider Survey** was designed similarly to the Early Educator Survey, but with several additional questions unique for operators of home-based child care facilities, including questions on staffing and hiring, and perspectives on how well the Pay Equity Fund worked for home-based facilities. As noted above, early educators who were employed in OSSE-licensed child care homes or expanded homes but did *not* operate those facilities received the Early Educator Survey rather than the Home Operator Survey.

Target Population

We define the target population for the Early Educator and Home Operator Surveys as early educators working in OSSE-licensed child care facilities who were eligible to receive at least one of the following payments from the Pay Equity Fund:

- the FY 2022 one-time supplemental payment, and
- the first and/or second FY 2023 quarterly payments.[3]

So long as they were eligible for any of these payments, early educators were a part of the target population, regardless of whether they applied for those payments. This design allowed us to identify and learn from eligible early educators who did not apply for or receive payments, a key group of

interest for OSSE and our study team. Below we describe the data sources and variables used to identify eligible study participants.

DATA SOURCES

Through our data sharing agreement with OSSE, we received information on all early educators in licensed child care facilities who were eligible for and/or received payments from the Pay Equity Fund. Specifically, OSSE provided us with a list of early educators who were working in licensed child care in eligible educator roles, including their names, job titles, and email addresses. The data, which in this report we refer to as data from the Division of Early Learning Licensing Tool (or DELLT data), were pulled in March 2023 and securely transmitted to the Urban Institute research team in April 2023.

Additionally, we received a list of educators who applied for the Pay Equity Fund. For each applicant, the list indicated whether they were approved to receive payments from the Pay Equity Fund and the method in which the applicant preferred to receive payments. We refer to these data as the AidKit data, since they were maintained by AidKit (the organization disbursing payments). These data were also pulled in March 2023, and we also received these data in April 2023 from OSSE.[4]

AidKit data were our primary source of information on educators who applied for and received payments. With these data, we could identify educators who were and were not determined to be eligible for payments. In contrast, the DELLT data were our primary source of information for the full set of educators who were eligible for payments, including those who did not apply. Moreover, DELLT data include contact information for most early educators represented in the dataset, whereas we did not receive contact information in our AidKit data files.

We endeavored to use information from both datasets—educators who were eligible based on DELLT as well as educators who received payments based on AidKit (regardless of whether they could be identified in DELLT also). We merged the datasets together using unique identifiers so that information included in the AidKit data (e.g., payment dates) could be connected to early educators and their survey responses. We discuss additional issues regarding contact information in the "Recruitment and Data Collection Procedures" subsection later in this report.

SURVEY ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

We aimed to identify all early educators known to be eligible for Pay Equity Fund payments.[5] Eligible educators include teachers and assistant teachers, home providers and expanded home providers, associate caregivers, assistant teachers in Pre-K Enhancement and Expansion Program (PKEEP) classrooms, and Montessori teachers and assistant teachers. In contrast, directors of child care centers,

lead teachers in PKEEP classrooms, Out of School Time program group leaders and assistants, aides and substitutes, and teachers in District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) and public charter schools were not eligible for the Pay Equity Fund and thus were not included in our population of interest for this survey.

We cleaned the DELLT and AidKit data to produce a list of early educators known to be eligible for Pay Equity Fund payments. To identify this population of early educators, we used a combination of staff information (staff role, facility type, employment status) as well as information on employment start and end dates. We used DELLT data to identify educators deemed eligible for payments and AidKit data to identify educators who actually received payments. Note that some educators were listed in AidKit data as receiving funds despite holding positions that were not eligible for the Pay Equity Fund, according to DELLT data at the time of the data pull. We kept these in our sample, deferring to AidKit's eligibility determination AidKit process (as we knew exceptions were possible) and trusting payment records over eligibility rosters given potential data quality issues and the possibility that changes that may have occurred after eligibility was determined by AidKit.

Despite our best efforts to identify the full population of early educators eligible for payments from the Pay Equity Fund, we faced several limitations with the data files we had access to that prevented us from fully reconstructing the full population. First, our DELLT data file was pulled in March 2023, which was several months after educators' eligibility was actually determined for FY 2022 and initial FY 2023 payments. DELLT is a dynamic data system, and our data files thus represent point-in-time snapshots, so there may be educators who are represented in fall 2022 but not spring 2023 (or vice versa). In contrast, AidKit had access to DELLT files that were refreshed daily, allowing for a more dynamic eligibility determination process. Moreover, we did not have access to all variables used to determine eligibility, including hours worked per week as reported in AidKit applications. Finally, some educators who applied and appealed a decision for any reason may still have been engaged in this process, thus appearing in our data as ineligible even if later on they were determined eligible and received payments (which were dispersed on a rolling basis in FY 2024). Thus, in this report we describe the target population of educators we identified for the survey and believed were eligible for Pay Equity Fund payments, acknowledging that the eligible population as identified by OSSE might include some educators we missed or that we include some educators who may not have been eligible.

From this initial survey sampling frame of 4,888, we dropped several groups of educators. These included all ineligible early educators who did not receive payments, educators who changed employment (such as by moving to a new facility) and happened to be listed twice in the DELLT data, and early educators who did not have any contact information we could use for survey recruitment (e.g.,

who were missing email addresses altogether, had unusable email addresses because of an incorrect format, or provided work emails that were shared by other staff and thus could not be used to generate unique survey links or direct communications).

After completing our data cleaning procedures, 3,890 individuals were identified as eligible for our survey.

Survey Questionnaire

RESEARCH CONSTRUCTS

As a first step to developing our instruments, we identified a set of constructs that were relevant toward the overall project goals. The research constructs were used to guide all aspects of survey development, from identifying existing survey questions to drafting new questions, and to determining which questions to prioritize and which to cut for administration length. Table 1 shows a list of research constructs for each of the surveys.

We intended for the Early Educator Survey to be administered to both educators currently in their roles as well as former educators who were eligible at some point for Pay Equity Fund payments but were no longer working in licensed child care in DC at the time of the survey.

- We acknowledged that some research constructs could be asked of both educator groups, whereas others might be interpreted differently depending on whether an educator was currently or formerly employed. In the latter situation, questions were reworded slightly so that they were relevant for former educators but were still tapping into roughly the same constructs as the version of items asked of current educators.
- For the Home Operator Survey, additional research constructs were developed to understand experiences specific to eligible educators working in home-based child care settings who were also the operators of their own facility and employing staff.

TABLE 1

Research Constructs and Measures by Survey Section

Survey Section	Targeted Research Constructs and Measures
About you and your facility *(some constructs only asked in certain surveys)*	▪ Site name ▪ Number of sites *(Home Operator Survey only)* ▪ Facility Type ▪ Position ▪ Hours worked per week *(current and former educators survey only)* ▪ Ages served/worked with ▪ State where respondent works *(former DC Early Educator Survey only)* ▪ Site revenue and share of site revenue taken as income sites *(Home Operator Survey only)* ▪ Number of staff employed, number needed to be fully staffed, and staff turnover *(Home Operator Survey only)* ▪ Pay of highest paid staff member *(Home Operator Survey only)* ▪ Benefits provided to staff *(Home Operator Survey only)* ▪ Highest level of schooling ▪ CDA attainment ▪ Current coursework ▪ Years at site
Perception of employment in the early education field *(some constructs only asked in certain surveys)*	▪ Employment intentions *(current educators and Home Operator Surveys only)* ▪ Job-seeking behavior and reasons for job-seeking *(current educators and Home Operator Surveys only)* ▪ Career efficacy *(current educators and Home Operator Surveys only)* ▪ Perceptions of respect for career *(current educators and Home Operator Surveys only)* ▪ Reasons for leaving the field *(former educators survey only)* ▪ Intentions to return to the field *(former educators survey only)* ▪ Job satisfaction ▪ Job stress
Perceptions of the Early Childhood Educator Pay Equity Fund	▪ Knowledge of Pay Equity Fund ▪ Sources of information on Pay Equity Fund ▪ Receipt of Pay Equity Fund payments ▪ Experiences applying for and receiving Pay Equity Fund payments ▪ Uses for Pay Equity Fund payments ▪ Impact on retention ▪ Other effects of payments ▪ Early educators who were eligible for the Pay Equity Fund payments but chose not to apply
Stability, well-being, and financial security	▪ Depression, measured by Center for Epidemiologic Studies—Depression Scale (CES-D-SF) ▪ Job Content Questionnaire: physical demands ▪ Food insecurity ▪ Financial insecurity ▪ Ability to pay for needs: housing and utilities, child care, medical needs, transportation and car payments, emergency needs, wellness needs, debts ▪ Income ▪ Benefits, benefits satisfaction, and health insurance ▪ Use of government assistance programs
Demographics	▪ Gender ▪ Age ▪ Race/ethnicity ▪ Languages spoken with children as part of job ▪ State of residence

Survey Section	Targeted Research Constructs and Measures
	▪ Household income ▪ Dependent children in household ▪ Household income and proportion of income from early education job

Source: Urban Institute-administered web survey of early educators and home operators in licensed child care facilities in the District of Columbia.

SURVEY DEVELOPMENT

Once research constructs were finalized, we drafted a survey instrument that was reviewed by both the internal research team and OSSE. We also conducted cognitive testing with several directors of child care expanded homes[6] to further improve the instrument and verify that the survey instructions and questions were clear, relevant, and used terminology commonly understood in the field. Cognitive testing is a technique used to ensure survey questions satisfy their intended purpose. Cognitive testing helped us to identify, for example, whether educators would accurately reflect on the experiences we hoped they would, based on the wording of the survey question. Cognitive testing also helped reveal if some questions were problematic or missing important response options.

Based on languages OSSE identified as commonly spoken among DC educators, the survey instrument was made available in three languages: English, Spanish, and Amharic. We used a translation services company to translate the survey instruments into Spanish and Amharic. The translated survey instruments were reviewed internally by native speakers to ensure accuracy.

Once survey instruments were finalized, we used Qualtrics to program the questions across the two instruments into one web-based survey. The survey was programmed to include skip logic and branching, which was particularly important for directing respondents to different sets of survey questions based on whether they were currently an early educator, formerly an early educator, or an early educator who also operated a home-based child care facility. The survey was also programmed so that an educator could toggle to their preferred language at the start of the survey (or at any point in the survey). We tested the survey internally to check accuracy of text and skip patterns. We also tested the survey for length and confirmed the survey could be taken within 15 minutes, our target time.

Recruitment and Data Collection Procedures

RECRUITMENT AND OUTREACH

Both the Early Educator Survey and the Home Operator Survey were administered from May 26, 2023 through July 12, 2023. We initially intended to close both surveys on June 30, 2023, after five weeks in

the field, but given strong interest from early educators, we ended up extending the survey by an extra 12 days, which included the July 4th holiday, to allow more time for responding. We offered the survey in the three most common languages spoken among early educators in DC: English, Spanish, and Amharic. We offered survey respondents a $20 Amazon e-gift card after submitting a survey response.

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION AND REMINDERS

We distributed surveys by email, using email addresses that were available in the DELLT data. Qualtrics generated unique links for each individual, and we distributed unique survey links via mail merge. After survey launch, we sent biweekly survey reminders up through the last two weeks of the administration period. For these last two weeks, we sent three final reminder emails. We only sent reminder emails to early educators who had not yet completed the survey according to our records.

Response Rates

Of the 3,890 individuals for whom we had contact information, we received survey responses from 1,638 individuals. This constitutes 42 percent of the educators who we attempted to contact, and 35 percent of the eligible educators we identified in the population at large.[7]

We summarize below key patterns in response rates, based on variables available in the DELLT and AidKit data:

- higher response rates for educators working in child care centers;
- slightly lower response rates for Black respondents, and slightly higher response rates for white respondents;
- slightly higher response rates for educators reporting greater years of ECE experience;
- slightly lower response rates for educators that worked in smaller facilities (capacity less than 50) or larger facilities (capacity greater than 100) and a higher response rate for educators in mid-sized facilities (capacity of 50–100);
- higher response rates for lead teachers, home providers, and Montessori lead teachers;
- lower response rates for assistant teachers, associate home caregivers, Montessori assistant teachers, and PKEEP assistant teachers; and
- higher response rates for educators who received Pay Equity Fund payments.

Survey Design: Center Director Surveys

The purpose of the Center Director Survey was to collect information on the experiences of child care directors with the Pay Equity Fund. The survey also asked directors a set of questions about the facilities they owned or operated, including staffing and compensation; for these questions, directors could provide facility-specific information for each of the facilities they operated. The survey concluded by collecting information on directors' views about their jobs as well as a small set of demographic questions.

Target Population

The target population for the Center Director Survey was directors of child care centers employing early educators who were eligible for Pay Equity Fund payments. As with our Early Educator Surveys, this survey asked center directors to reflect on the FY 2022 one-time supplemental payment and the first two FY 2023 quarterly payments.[8] Below we describe the data sources and variables used to identify eligible study participants.

DATA SOURCES

OSSE maintains a listing of all operational child care facilities,[9] updated about monthly. The downloadable public listing includes the full name and email information for each facility's point of contact, which we used to distribute the survey. The listing also includes licensing and capacity information, which we used to create our sampling frame (e.g., we excluded child care centers that only provided before and after-school care to school-age children, as their staff were not eligible for the Pay Equity Fund).

Additionally, as part of our data sharing agreement with OSSE, we received licensing and Capital Quality[10] designation data on all OSSE-licensed child care facilities. We merged these datasets with the listing of all child care facilities to have combined information on center characteristics for the development of analytic weights (described in subsequent sections of the report).

SURVEY ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

We used the July 2023 listing of child care facilities as the starting point for developing our sampling frame. We refined this list by excluding child care homes and expanded homes, as well as child care centers that had restricted licenses or temporary closures. Additionally, with help from key contacts at OSSE, we identified and removed facilities that either were Out-of-School-Time programs for school-

age children or only served children in DC's publicly funded Prekindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Program (PKEEP). Other facilities that did not employ any eligible educators, as identified by OSSE, were also removed from consideration. We wanted to hear from facilities where no eligible educators chose to apply for the Pay Equity Fund, but we did not necessarily want to hear from facilities where no educators were eligible in the first place. Our sample therefore included child care centers with full licenses that served at least some combination of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers; and facilities that employed educators eligible for Pay Equity Fund payments, as identified by our partners at OSSE. In total, 321 facilities were determined to meet these criteria, with 272 unique directors overseeing these facilities.

Survey Questionnaire

RESEARCH CONSTRUCTS

We began by developing a set of constructs that would provide information about each child care center with staff eligible for Pay Equity Fund payments and information on the individual directors operating those centers. Constructs were used to guide all aspects of survey development—for instance, from identifying existing survey questions, to drafting new questions, and to determining which questions to prioritize and which to cut for administration length.

Table 2 shows a list of research constructs for each of the surveys. Note that the first section of survey questions was designed to be repeated for each facility a respondent indicated they operate. All other sections, unless otherwise indicated, were only asked of respondents once.

TABLE 2

Research Constructs and Measures by Survey Section

Survey Section	Targeted Research Constructs
About your facility *(asked for each facility respondent operates)*	▪ Age groups served ▪ Staffing levels ▪ Turnover and vacancies ▪ Compensation ▪ Employee benefits
Perceptions of the Early Childhood Educator Pay Equity Fund	▪ Impact on educator retention and recruitment ▪ Impact on educator morale and well-being ▪ Intention to apply for new payment structure ▪ Overall experiences with Pay Equity Fund
Job plans and perceptions of your work	▪ Intentions to leave field or change jobs ▪ Motivations for leaving field or changing jobs (including eligibility for Pay Equity Fund) ▪ Job satisfaction
Demographics	▪ Gender

Survey Section	Targeted Research Constructs
	▪ Age ▪ Race/ethnicity ▪ Languages spoken ▪ Educational attainment ▪ Years of experience teaching in child care ▪ Salary ▪ Access to health care benefits ▪ Dependent children in household ▪ Household income and proportion of income from early education job ▪ Financial security

Source: Urban Institute-administered web survey of early educators and home providers in the District of Columbia.

SURVEY DEVELOPMENT

Once research constructs were finalized, we drafted a survey instrument that was reviewed by both the internal research team and OSSE. Because the Center Director Survey was administered after we closed the Early Educator and Home Operator Surveys, we were able to revise some survey items in the Center Director Survey instrument based on learnings from the other two surveys. For instance, we streamlined the way we asked about educator wages to improve data quality.

After a draft survey was developed, we conducted cognitive testing with individuals who worked closely with center directors and knew their perspectives, to ensure the items had relevance and would be understood by the field. Like the Early Educator Survey, we did not want to conduct cognitive testing with individuals who would later be invited to take the survey, so we tested the survey with two quality coaches who work with center directors in DC's quality rating and improvement system, Capital Quality. We used a translation services company to translate the survey instrument into Spanish. Unlike the Early Educator and Home Operator Surveys, we did not translate the Center Director Survey into Amharic, as very few directors were identified in administrative data as speaking only Amharic and not English. The Spanish survey instrument was reviewed internally by a native speaker to ensure accuracy before administering.

Once survey instruments were finalized, we used Qualtrics to program the web-based survey. The survey was programmed so that an educator could toggle to their preferred language. We tested the survey internally to check accuracy of text and programmed skip logic so that questions would only display for their intended audiences (e.g., a question might be skipped if it is not relevant to the respondent, based on responses to an earlier item). In particular, we tested the loop containing the facility-specific questions to ensure questions were repeated the correct number of times, based on the number of facilities directors reported operating at the start of the survey. Finally, we tested the survey

for length and confirmed the survey could be taken within a base time of 15 minutes, our target length, for directors reporting on one facility.

Recruitment and Data Collection Procedures

RECRUITMENT AND OUTREACH

Prior to launching the survey, we sent an initial outreach email on August 7, 2023, to center directors we identified for the survey sample. We used email addresses for the point of contact identified in the July 2023 OSSE listing of licensed child care facilities. The outreach email served several purposes: (1) it allowed us to identify issues with email addresses in our contact lists; and (2) it allowed us to identify whether we had the appropriate contact person for our survey (and if not, to allow this person to nominate someone else who should take the survey on behalf of their facility instead).

We formally administered the Center Director Survey from August 8, 2023 through September 15, 2023. We initially intended to close the survey on September 1, 2023, but extended the survey by an additional two weeks. This decision was to offer directors additional time to complete the survey given the Labor Day holiday and the back-to-school season.

We distributed surveys via an email invitation that contained a unique link for respondents to complete the survey. When a single point of contact was identified for multiple facilities, we reached out to them with a single survey link, since the survey was designed such that that the respondent could provide information about multiple facilities in the same survey (see table 2). In some cases, the point of contact we had identified for a given facility was no longer at that facility by the time we administered the survey (identified usually via the outreach email, but sometimes during survey administration itself). We used the contact information they identified in their automatic email reply to contact the correct person, in an effort to ensure that all facilities in our sample had a valid contact.

We sent email reminders to participants about once weekly, to account for travel and the back-to-school transition. We also noticed that few directors were opening our email invitations containing the survey link, and thus designed a targeted outreach approach to increase response rates for this group. Specifically, we made targeted phone calls to directors who did not appear to have opened our web invitation after several weeks. In the last week of survey administration, we also sent letters mailed via USPS to remind those who had not started the survey that we would like to hear from them. Finally, we also worked with intermediaries to boost response rates and announced the survey during a District-

wide summer training for child care directors and program staff. We offered survey respondents a $20 Amazon e-gift card after submitting a survey response.

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION AND REMINDERS

We used Qualtrics to generate survey links that were unique to each individual and to distribute the survey invitations via email. Qualtrics has the capacity to track the status of survey invitations distributed by email. In some cases, our emails bounced back, and in other cases we noticed low rates of emails being opened—both potentially due to junk or spam filters. As an alternate approach, we switched to distributing survey links via mail merge (sent directly from our project email address), rather than the Qualtrics integrated mail client; this appeared to be successful, at least as measured by reduced bounced emails. We also sent reminder emails to respondents who had partially completed the survey, asking if they would consider finishing the survey and reminding them of the gift card incentive.

Response Rates

Of the 272 directors (representing 321 facilities) we invited to complete the survey, we received valid survey responses from 137 individuals (representing 157 facilities). This means we were able to hear from 50 percent of the directors we attempted to contact, and we received information on 49 percent of the facilities in our population of interest.

For this survey, we defined a survey response as valid if the respondent completed at least 11 percent of the survey. This completion rate corresponded to the respondent identifying names for all the facilities they reported operating and answering at least the first facility-specific question (i.e., identifying the name of their facility). If a respondent indicated they oversee multiple facilities but did not answer any questions for a facility-specific loop, we did not include their survey response. We defined valid survey responses in this way to address a small handful of situations where multiple respondents who oversaw multiple facilities reported overseeing the same facility, but one of the respondents did not answer any questions about that facility (thus, not contributing meaningful information above and beyond what another respondent had already reported). In some cases, different individuals identified the same facility but offered different and conflicting responses. In such instances, we prioritized the respondent who identified as a "director" or "director and owner;" if more than one respondent held this role, then the more complete survey was used.

Below we summarize key patterns in response rates, based on variables available in DELLT and AidKit data:

- higher response rates for facilities in Wards 1, 3, 4, and 8, and lower response rates for facilities in Wards 5, 6, and 7;
- higher response rates for facilities that serve infants or toddlers;
- lower response rates for facilities that serve preschool or school-age children;
- lower response rates for facilities that have smaller capacity (less than 40) and slightly lower response rate for facilities that have higher capacity (100 or more);
- slightly lower response rates for facilities with educators that worked in both smaller facilities (capacity less than 50) or larger facilities (capacity greater than 100);
- higher response rates for facilities that accept child care subsidy vouchers or participate in the Child and Adult Care Food Program;
- slightly higher response rates for facilities that received Early Head Start funding; and
- higher response rates for facilities that had a higher Capital Quality designation (relative to facilities with lower Capital Quality designations).

Data Cleaning, Weighting, and Analysis

Survey Data Cleaning and Linking

After closing the surveys, we downloaded the data from Qualtrics and used Stata to clean the survey responses. Specifically, we grouped data by the corresponding survey section, harmonized variables across the different surveys and survey sections, constructed new indicator variables where appropriate, checked to ensure continuous variables took on reasonable values, and verified survey skip logic worked as intended. Missingness values were also recoded to better reflect how the data were generated. For instance, we coded the data so we could distinguish between missingness due to skip logic, missingness due to early exit from the survey and therefore not viewing the item, and missingness due to nonresponse, or intentional skipping of items.

We then linked survey responses with select variables from administrative data. For the Early Educator Surveys and the Home Operator Surveys, we linked information from AidKit and DELLT data to supplement survey responses. We also connected survey responses to licensing data (e.g., Capital Quality designation, District ward) so that we could analyze individual responses by the characteristics

of the facilities that employed them. For the Center Director Survey, we had limited information on director demographics but did successfully link survey responses with licensing, Capital Quality designation, and DELTT data. After reshaping the Center Director Survey data to be a facility-level dataset rather than a director-level dataset (to account for directors managing multiple centers), we merged these administrative data using facility name and license number so we could have access to facility characteristics in analysis.

Survey Weights and Response Bias

We developed a unique set of survey weights for each survey we administered. The survey weights can be used in analysis to account for nonresponse that occurred during survey administration. The weights reduce potential nonresponse bias by adjusting the sample so that the respondents and nonrespondents end up with the same characteristics that we have information on for the target population. Previous sections of this report summarize notable patterns in response rates; the variables described in those sections were used to develop the weights for each of the surveys, respectively.

In the following tables, we assess the degree to which sample selection occurred in our data, as well as the degree to which implementing survey weights corrected for potential response bias.

Table 3 compares the demographics of educators who took our survey to those who are in the target population of early educators eligible for Pay Equity Fund payments. Specifically, we use administrative data from DELTT and AidKit to describe the characteristics of the target population (left-most columns). We then compare characteristics of educators who took the survey (middle columns). In the right-most column, we apply analytic weights that adjust for survey nonresponse (see below for additional detail on their construction), to see whether implementing survey weights corrects the sample characteristics to be more representative of the target population. Note that due to differences in data reporting and availability, total counts in target population data may not be consistent across categories.

Comparing the unweighted survey sample characteristics to those of the eligible educator target population reveals that some educators were significantly more likely to complete our survey than others. Because survey weights are designed to adjust for survey nonresponse, we do not expect to see statistically significant differences between the *weighted* sample and the target population on characteristics that were included in the weighting approach. However, we might still expect to see some differences on variables we did not weight the sample for (such as the number of years working at their facility and educators' ages).

Perhaps the most important difference between the eligible educator target population and survey sample is in payment receipt. Based on the administrative data we had access to, which were pulled in March 2023, 80 percent of educators received at least one payment to date (either the FY 2022 one-time supplemental payment or one of the first two FY 2023 quarterly payments), but in our survey this statistic was 93 percent. We expected this type of response bias, yet it remains important to acknowledge in interpretation of findings.

TABLE 3

Comparison of Demographics between Unweighted and Weighted Survey Sample and Target Population of Eligible Educators

	Target Population of Eligible Early Educators (N = 3,890)		Survey Sample, Unweighted (N = 1,638)		Survey Sample, Weighted
	Count	Mean /Percent (%)	Count	Mean /Percent (%)	Mean /Percent (%)
Gender	3,711		1,491		
Woman	3,581	96	1,458	97**	97**
Man	130	3	33	2**	2**
Race and ethnicity					
Hispanic or Latino identity	3,730		1,500		
Hispanic or Latino	1,070	29	432	29	28
Not Hispanic or Latino	2,529	68	1,027	68	69
Prefer not to answer	131	4	41	3+	3
Race (alone or combined with Hispanic or Latino identity)	3,730		1,500		
American Indian/Alaska Native	31	0.8	11	0.7	0.9
Asian	178	5	72	5	5
Black/African American	2,143	57	832	55	57
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	14	0.4	4	0.3	0.3
White	619	17	301	20**	18
Other race or ethnicity	15	0.4	3	0.2+	0.2+
Two or more	338	9	135	9	9
Prefer not to answer	392	11	142	9	10
Languages spoken with children in care					
American Sign Language	3	0.07	2	0.1	0.1
Amharic	84	2	24	2	2
Chinese	5	0.11	2	0.1	0.1
English	3,658	83	1,285	83	83
French	28	0.6	8	0.5	0.5
Spanish	969	22	351	23	23
State of residence	3,382		1,454		

	Target Population of Eligible Early Educators (N = 3,890)		Survey Sample, Unweighted (N = 1,638)		Survey Sample, Weighted
	Count	Mean /Percent (%)	Count	Mean /Percent (%)	Mean /Percent (%)
District of Columbia	1,953	58	837	58	59
Maryland	1,266	37	541	37	36
Virginia	160	5	74	5	5
Other	3	0.1	2	0.1	0.3
Age		41.8		41.2+	40.4**
Position	4,782		1,625		
Early childhood educator I					
Assistant teacher	2,094	44	665	41*	45
PKEEP assistant teacher	19	0.4	6	0.4	0.5
Montessori assistant teacher	11	0.2	6	0.4	0.3
Associate caregiver	177	4	31	2**	4
Early childhood educator II					
Teacher/Lead teacher	2,349	49	892	55**	48
Montessori teacher	14	0.3	5	0.3	0.2
Home/Expanded home provider	118	2	20	1**	2
Full-time/part-time status	3,730		1,500		
Full time	3,531	95	1,411	94	94
Part time	199	5	89	6	6
Experience at site	4,588		1,625		
Years at site		5.16		4.72**	4.27**
Less than 1 year	823	18	309	19	24**
1–5 years	2,259	49	850	52*	51
5–10 years	832	18	245	15**	14**
10+ years	674	15	221	14	12**
Payment receipt, conditional on eligibility					
One-time supplemental payment (FY 2022)	3,170	81	1,275	95**	88**
FY 2023 Q1	3,464	81	1,409	93**	85**
FY 2023 Q2	3,440	81	1,424	93**	84+
FY 2022 one-time payment, FY 2023 Q1, or FY 2023 Q2 payment	3,683	80	1,486	93**	80

Source: Data obtained by Urban research team through a data sharing agreement with OSSE. Target population data come from DELLT and administrative data from AidKit to implement the Pay Equity Fund.

Notes: Administrative data come from AidKit and DELLT data and represents current early educators, former early educators, and home-based owners/operators, unless otherwise specified. Educators could specify gender identities other than Woman or Man, but these values would have to be suppressed for data disclosure reasons, and in suppressing this category, "Man" would also have to be suppressed; thus, we do not report on other categories here. The table depicts statistical testing for the difference between the target population of eligible educators and the unweighted survey sample, and the target population of eligible educators and the weighted sample (see text for which variables were used in weighting). Statistical significance is denoted as follows: + (p-value<.1), * (p-value<.05), ** (p-value<.01).

Table 4 compares the characteristics of all child care centers that employ educators eligible for Pay Equity Fund payments to those facilities whose center directors responded to our survey. We use administrative data from DELTT and licensing data from OSSE to describe the characteristics of the target population and the survey sample, as survey respondents provided the names of the facilities they oversee, which could be linked back to administrative data. Because we do not have administrative data on center directors, we could not compare our survey respondents to the target population of center directors, nor could we design survey weights based on director demographics.

In examining differences between the unweighted survey sample and facilities of directors in the target population, the survey sample was similar to the target population, with statistically significant differences in the number of facilities that serve infants (78 percent in the sample compared to 72 percent in the population) and those that have a "Preliminary" Capital Quality rating (8 percent in the sample compared to 12 percent in the population). However, in examining the weighted survey sample and the target population, we see that the sample weights sufficiently corrected for these differences in response rates, as seen by the lack of statistically significant differences between the weighted sample and target population characteristics.

TABLE 4

Comparison of Characteristics between Facilities in Unweighted and Weighted Survey Sample and Facilities of Directors in the Target Population

	Facilities of Directors in Target Population (*N* = 349)		Facilities in Survey Sample, Unweighted (*N* = 157)		Facilities in Survey Sample, Weighted
	Count	Mean/Percent (%)	Count	Mean/Percent (%)	Mean/Percent (%)
DC Ward	348		157		
1	30	9	16	10	10
2	59	17	24	15	16
3	40	11	21	13	11
4	54	16	25	16	14
5	41	12	14	9	13
6	50	14	21	13	16
7	31	9	13	8	8
8	43	12	23	15	12
Age groups served	348		157		
Infants	251	72	123	78+	65
Toddlers	316	91	147	94	84
Preschool children	290	83	124	79	83
School-age children	73	21	30	19	24
Authorized licensed capacity	348	66.2 [7, 500]	157	68.0 range = [8, 300]	65.4
Serves subsidy children	194	56	94	60	58

	Facilities of Directors in Target Population (*N* = 349)		Facilities in Survey Sample, Unweighted (*N* = 157)		Facilities in Survey Sample, Weighted
	Count	Mean/Percent (%)	Count	Mean/Percent (%)	Mean/Percent (%)
Capital Quality designation	349		157		
Preliminary	41	12	12	8+	14
Developing	6	2	2	1	3
Progressing	44	13	23	15	13
Quality	71	20	41	26	20
High Quality	24	7	11	7	5
No Capital Quality designation	163	47	68	43	44

Source: Data obtained by Urban research team through a data sharing agreement with OSSE. Target population data come from DELLT and administrative licensing data from OSSE.

Notes: This table represents characteristics of child care centers for which directors responded to our survey. Because administrative data on center director characteristics was not available, we cannot compare director characteristics in our sample to those in the target population. Data above compare the sample of facilities identified by survey respondents to those that employ educators eligible for Pay Equity Fund payments according to DELTT data.

The table depicts statistical testing for the difference between the population of eligible child care centers (whose directors are in our target population) and the unweighted survey sample of facilities, and the target population and the weighted sample (see text for which variables were used in weighting). Statistical significance is denoted as follows: + (p-value<.1), * (p-value<.05), ** (p-value<.01).

Design Effects

In inferential analyses that use survey data, survey weights can affect variance estimates and, as a result, tests of significance and confidence intervals. Variance estimates derived from standard statistical software packages that assume simple random sampling are generally too low, which can lead to overstated significance levels and overly narrow confidence intervals. When using survey weights, it is important to estimate the survey "design effect" associated with the weighted estimate, in order to assess the impact of the survey weight on estimates. The design effect we used is the "deft," defined as the variance of the weighted sample estimate relative to the variance of an estimate that assumes a simple random sample.

In a wide range of situations, the adjusted standard error of a statistic should be calculated by multiplying the usual formula by the design effect (deft). This process generates a more accurate estimate of the standard errors associated with a weighted estimate. The formula for computing the 95 percent confidence interval around a sample estimate (e.g., a proportion or mean) is:

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

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

- For the Early Educator and Home Operator Surveys, the weights ranged from a low of .73 to a high of 2.39 and the deft value for the survey weight is **1.13**. For example, suppose a researcher was using the weight on a measure from the survey that had an unweighted standard error of 0.0212. The weighted estimate would not change; however, the standard error of the estimate would be 0.0240 (0.0212 x 1.13).
- For the Center Director Survey, the weights ranged from a low of .17 to a high of 4.22 and the deft value for the survey weight is **1.22**. Again, suppose a researcher was using the weight on a measure from the survey that had an unweighted standard error of 0.0212. The weighted estimate would not change; however, the standard error of the estimate would be 0.0259 (0.0212 x 1.14).

Survey Data Analysis

We analyzed the survey data to respond to our research questions and to gain insights into the perspectives of early educators and center directors toward the Pay Equity Fund, job satisfaction, the quality of their workplace experiences, compensation and benefits, and economic well-being.

We used respondent-level survey weights in our analysis of the Early Educator and Home Operator Survey data, and both respondent-level and facility-level survey weights in our analysis of the Center Director Survey data. Although the weights for the Early Educator and Home Operator Surveys account for individual-level characteristics of respondents as well as characteristics of the facilities at which they are/were employed, the weights for the Center Director Survey only account for facility-level characteristics and are averages of the facility-level characteristics of the centers a director oversees.

Sample Characteristics

Demographics of Early Educator and Home Operator Survey Samples

Table 5 presents survey-reported demographic characteristics of respondents to the Early Educator and Home Operator Surveys. Survey respondents represent a group of early educators diverse across their race, age, position, and years of experience in the early care and education field. Most respondents

identified as women (98 percent) and were full-time educators (90 percent). Almost all respondents (96 percent) had received at least one Pay Equity Fund payment by the time of survey administration; implementing survey weights adjusts this estimate down closer to the uptake rate observed in the population of eligible educators. Though a majority of respondents (60 percent) reside in the District of Columbia, some live in Maryland (35 percent) or Virginia (5 percent). Respondents also speak a variety of languages when caring for children, reflecting the District's linguistic diversity. English is the most prevalent language used with children (85 percent) followed by Spanish (29 percent) and American Sign Language (6 percent).

TABLE 5

Demographic Characteristics of Early Educator and Home Operator Survey Sample

	Unweighted Count	Unweighted Percent (%)/Mean	Weighted Percent (%)/Mean
Gender	1,449		
Woman	1,415	98	97
Man	34	2	3
Race and ethnicity			
American Indian/Alaska Native	15	1.0	1.2
Asian	68	4	5
Black/African American	829	56	58
Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin	392	27	26
Middle Eastern/North African	7	0.5	0.4
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	4	0.3	0.3
White	184	12	11
Other race or ethnicity	7	0.5	0.5
Prefer not to answer	36	2	3
Languages spoken with children	1,370		
American Sign Language	86	6	7
Amharic	22	2	2
Arabic	4	0.3	0.3
Chinese	4	0.3	0.3
English	1,168	85	86
French	24	2	2
Portuguese	8	0.6	0.5
Spanish	403	29	29
Other	30	2	2
State of residence	1,480		
District of Columbia	888	60	61
Maryland	513	35	33
Virginia	71	5	5
Other	8	0.5	0.9
Average age	875	42 [19, 80]	42 [19, 80]
Position	1,601		

	Unweighted Count	Unweighted Percent (%)/Mean	Weighted Percent (%)/Mean
Home/Expanded home provider	24	2	3
Teacher/Lead teacher	934	59	55
Assistant teacher	577	37	41
Montessori teacher	16	0.9	0.8
Montessori assistant teacher	31	2	2
Lead caregiver	8	0.5	0.9
Associate caregiver	11	0.7	1.2
Full-time/Part-time status (educators)	1,587		
Full time	1,421	90	89
Part time	166	11	11
Average years of ECE experience	1,435	6 [<1, 45]	5 [<1, 45]
Highest level of schooling	1,618		
No CDA and no degree	254	16	18
CDA but no degree	891	55	53
Associates degree	108	7	6
Bachelor's degree	255	16	16
Master's degree or higher	110	7	7
Received FY 2022 One-Time Payment, FY 2023 Q1 and/or Q2 Payment (conditional on eligibility)	1,549		
Yes	1,486	96	91
No	63	4	9
Type of pay	1,493		
Hourly	1,324	89	90
Annual	119	8	7
Other	50	3	3
Median compensation	1,901		
Hourly wages		$19 [$9, $100]	$19 [$9, $100]
Annual salary		$35,000 [$25, $300,000]	$35,000 [$25, $300,000]
Has at least one dependent 5 years of age or younger	1,336		
Yes	269	20	21
No	1,067	80	79
Has at least one dependent between ages 6 to 13	1,336		
Yes	276	21	21
No	1,060	79	79
Has at least one dependent between ages 13 to 17	1,336		
Yes	241	18	17
No	1,095	82	83
Total household income from all sources	1,368		
Less than $50,000	825	60	62
$50,000 to $74,999	224	16	15

	Unweighted Count	Unweighted Percent (%)/Mean	Weighted Percent (%)/Mean
$75,000 to $99,999	72	5	5
$100,000 to $149,999	43	3	3
$150,000 and greater	21	2	1
Prefer not to answer	183	13	14
Amount of 2022 household income from work in early care and education	1,345		
All	535	40	40
Almost all	240	18	18
More than half	90	7	7
About half	155	12	11
Less than half	151	11	11
Very little	97	7	7
None	77	6	6
Income earned from another job	825		
No	732	89	88
Yes	93	11	12
Other household members contributing to income	821		
No	440	54	56
Yes	381	46	44

Source: Urban Institute-administered web survey of early educators and home providers in the District of Columbia.
Notes: For select continuous variables, ranges are provided in square brackets. Educators could specify gender identities other than Woman or Man, but we do not report these categories here due to small sample sizes and data privacy reasons. Race and ethnicity are nonexclusive, respondents could select all that applied.

Demographics of Center Director Survey Sample

In table 6, we present survey-reported demographic information of center directors who took the survey on behalf of their facility. Most directors were women (90 percent) and either Black or African American (55 percent), white (16 percent), or Hispanic or Latino (13 percent). Most also held at least a bachelor's degree (88 percent).[11] Directors brought in a range of prior experience as a classroom teacher, with almost half having spent 10 to 20 years in a teaching role (45 percent). The number of years they served as a child care facility director varied widely. Few respondents were new to the role of director, with less than one year on the job (4 percent). The largest share of educators spent between 5 and 10 years as a director (28 percent), followed by 20 or more years (26 percent), between 10 and 20 years (25 percent), and between 1 and 5 years (17 percent).

TABLE 6

Demographics of Center Directors in Center Director Survey Sample

	Unweighted Count	Unweighted Percent (%)/Mean/Median	Weighted Percent (%)/Mean/Median[a]
Gender	114		
Woman	103	90	
Man	7	6	
Prefer not to answer	4	4	
Race and ethnicity	113		
Asian	6	5	
Black or African American	62	55	
Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin	15	13	
White	18	16	
Other	2	2	
Prefer not to answer	9	8	
Average age	104	50 [29, 77]	
Languages spoken with children	112		
American Sign Language	5	4	
English	108	96	
Portuguese	2	2	
Spanish	23	21	
Other	3	3	
Highest level of schooling	113		
Some college but no degree	3	3	2
Associate degree	10	9	10
Bachelor's degree	51	45	46
Master's degree	44	39	37
Doctorate or professional degree	5	4	5
Degree major	112		
Early childhood education	41	37	38
Elementary education	9	8	9
Special education	4	4	3
Child development, human development, or psychology	17	15	16
Child or family studies, or family sciences	3	3	3
Other	38	34	30
Years worked as a classroom teacher in child care	110		
Less than a year	3	3	2
Between 1 and 4 years	14	13	13
Between 5 and 9 years	23	21	19
Between 10 and 19 years	50	45	52
20 or more years	20	18	15
Years worked as a director in a child care facility	137		

	Unweighted Count	Unweighted Percent (%)/Mean/Median	Weighted Percent (%)/Mean/Median[a]
Less than a year	5	4	5
Between 1 and 4 years	23	17	19
Between 5 and 9 years	39	28	26
Between 10 and 19 years	34	25	22
20 or more years	36	26	28
Average number of centers overseen	157	1.4 [1, 5][b]	1.3 [1, 5]
Median center director salary	94	$72,900 [$37,440, $194,000]	$76,000 [$37,440, $194,000]
Has at least one dependent 5 years of age or younger	95		
Yes	17	18	15
No	78	82	85
Has at least one dependent between ages 6 to 13	100		
Yes	31	31	30
No	69	69	70
Has at least one dependent between ages 13 to 17	97		
Yes	21	22	22
No	76	78	78
Total household income from all sources	112		
Less than $50,000	8	7	7
$50,000 to $74,999	29	26	25
$75,000 to $99,999	17	15	15
$100,000 to $149,999	18	16	15
$150,000 and greater	22	20	19
Prefer not to answer	18	16	19
Amount of 2022 household income from work in early care and education	110		
All	54	49	53
Almost all	13	12	11
More than half	13	12	11
About half	13	12	11
Less than half	13	12	11
Very little	4	4	4
Income earned from another job	109		
No	95		88
Yes	14	13	12
Other household members contributing to income	111		
No	55	59	48
Yes	56	50	52

Source: Urban Institute-administered web survey of child care center directors in the District of Columbia.

Notes: [a] We did not apply facility-level survey weights to director-level demographic variables, and as such, empty cells under the Weighted Statistics column indicate "not applicable."
[b] For selected continuous variables, ranges are presented in square brackets. Data presented represent director-level characteristics. Select responses for "Race and Ethnicity" and "Languages Spoken with Children" not displayed in this table for disclosure reasons. Some respondents reported compensation in hourly wages, in these cases, we calculated the equivalent annual salary assuming 40-hour work weeks for 52 weeks a year. Due to variables available in administrative data, we were not able to develop director-level survey weights; we could only weight the sample based on facility characteristics. We apply facility-level weights when computing these descriptive statistics, but because of this limitation, we do not provide weighted estimates of director demographics.

Table 7 presents survey-reported characteristics of child care centers represented in our Center Director Survey. Respondents to the Center Director Survey oversee child care centers with varying characteristics. Most centers represented in the survey are licensed to serve toddlers (97 percent), with slightly fewer licensed to serve infants (78 percent) and preschool children (78 percent), and far fewer licensed to serve school-age children (23 percent). Among centers licensed to serve a given age group, centers tended to report serving that age group, though only 70 percent of centers with licenses covering school-age children do serve school-age children. Several facilities do not participate in Capital Quality, but among those that do participate, the most common ratings were Quality (26 percent of sample) and Progressing (15 percent).

TABLE 7

Characteristics of Facilities Represented in Center Director Survey Sample

	Unweighted Count	Unweighted Percent (%)/Mean/Median	Weighted Percent (%)/Mean/median
Age groups covered by license	155		
Infants	121	78	67
Toddlers	151	97	94
Preschool children	121	78	80
School-age children	36	23	27
Age groups served (if age group covered by license)			
Infants	120	98	99
Toddlers	147	97	97
Preschool children	110	90	92
School-age children	26	70	77
Average number of lead teachers employed	147	6.5 [0, 23]	6.1
Average number of assistant teachers employed	147	6.2 [0, 37]	5.6
Average number of total teachers employed	147	12.6 [2, 60]	11.8
Median starting pay for lead teachers	126	$41,600 [$29,120, $83,200]	$44,548
Median starting pay for assistant teachers	123	$36,500 [$24,960, $76,960]	$38,743 [$24,960, $76,960]
Capital Quality designation**	157		
Preliminary	12	8	14
Developing	2	1	3
Progressing	23	15	13
Quality	41	26	20
High-Quality	11	7	5
No Capital Quality designation	68	43	44
Subsidy participation**	157		
Participates in subsidy program	94	60	58
Does not participate in subsidy program	63	40	42
Average authorized capacity**	157	68 [8, 300]	65

Source: Survey data come from Urban Institute-administered web survey of child care center directors in the District of Columbia. Select data obtained from administrative licensing data from OSSE by the Urban research team through a data sharing agreement and denoted with (**).

Notes: For selected continuous variables, ranges are presented in square brackets. Data presented represent facility-level characteristics. Survey respondents could provide information for multiple facilities. Some respondents reported the starting pay for teachers as an hourly wage, in these cases, we calculated the equivalent annual salary assuming 40-hour work weeks for 52 weeks a year.

Notes

[1] "Early Childhood Educator Pay Equity Fund," District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education, https://osse.dc.gov/ecepayequity.

[2] OSSE licenses child care facilities in DC and uses the term "child development facilities." There are three types of facilities: child development centers, child development homes, and child development expanded homes. We use the term licensed child care facilities in this report, however, since the term may be more familiar with audiences outside of DC.

[3] Although the third FY 2023 quarterly payment was disbursed shortly after surveys entered the field in May 2023, we did not consider eligibility for the third payment in defining the survey sample, and we did not ask survey respondents to reflect on the third quarterly payment.

[4] In our case study of the Pay Equity Fund (Greenberg et al. 2023) we describe in greater detail AidKit's role in implementing the Pay Equity Fund: https://www.urban.org/research/publication/toward-pay-equity-case-study-washington-dc-wage-boost-early-childhood-educators.

[5] More information on child care staff eligibility and payment amounts can be found on OSSE's website: https://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/page_content/attachments/Child%20Care%20Staff%20Eligibility%20and%20Payment%20Amounts%20for%20Early%20Childhood%20Educator%20Pay%20Equity%20Fund%20Policy%20%281%29.pdf.

[6] Although most ideal would be to test the instrument with early educators, we did not want to ask educators to participate in cognitive testing if they would qualify for our survey and later receive our invitations through the census administration. Recruiting early educators in neighboring states would not work either, given the state-specific nature of Pay Equity Fund questions. As such, we conducted cognitive testing with individuals who knew best the perspectives and experiences that early educators might offer if taking the survey.

[7] We received inquiries from several early educators who were not identified in our target sample (roughly 25 educators in all). In nearly all cases, these were early educators whose contact information was missing in DELLT. Because they were eligible for Pay Equity Fund payments, we allowed them to take the survey. In the response rates reported here, they are not reflected in the denominator, since they were not identified in our initial outreach list, but they are included in the numerator.

[8] Three of four FY 2023 quarterly payments had been disbursed by the time the Center Director Survey administration launched in August 2023, but like the Early Educator Survey, we did not ask survey respondents to reflect on the third quarterly payment.

[9] This listing of child care facilities can be found on OSSE's website: https://osse.dc.gov/publication/child-development-facilities-listing.

[10] Capital Quality is the District of Columbia's quality rating and improvement system, which launched in its current form in 2018. More information on Capital Quality can be found on OSSE's website: https://osse.dc.gov/page/capital-quality-qris.

[11] DC introduced a licensing requirement which required directors to have at least a bachelor's degree. A waiver (general or continuous service) was available to directors at the time of the survey, which is why this estimate is not 100 percent of directors despite the licensing requirement. More information on waivers can be found on OSSE's website: https://osse.dc.gov/page/center-director.

References

Doromal, Justin B., Eve Mefferd, Heather Sandstrom, Erica Greenberg, Laura Jimenez Parra, Victoria Nelson, and Elli Nikolopoulos. 2024. *Wage Supplements Strengthen the Child Care Workforce: Reflections on the DC Early Childhood Educator Pay Equity Fund*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Greenberg, Erica, Victoria Nelson, Justin B. Doromal, Heather Sandstrom, Soumita Bose, and Eleanor Lauderback. 2023. *Toward Pay Equity: A Case Study of Washington DC's Wage Boost for Early Childhood Educators*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Mefferd, Eve, Justin B. Doromal, Heather Sandstrom, Erica Greenberg, Laura Jimenez Parra, Victoria Nelson, and Elli Nikolopoulos. 2024. *Wage Supplements Improve Early Educators' Financial Well-Being: Reflections on the DC Early Childhood Educator Pay Equity Fund*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Nikolopoulos, Elli, Justin B. Doromal, Erica Greenberg, Heather Sandstrom, Victoria Nelson, and Eve Mefferd. 2024. *Center Directors View Teacher Wage Supplements as Benefiting the Child Care Field*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Sandstrom, Heather, Eve Mefferd, Laura Jimenez Parra, Victoria Nelson, Justin B. Doromal, Erica Greenberg, Elli Nikolopoulos, Rachel Lamb, and Alicia Gonzalez. 2024. *Early Educators' Reflections on the DC Early Childhood Educator Pay Equity Fund*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

About the Authors

Justin B. Doromal is a senior research associate in the Center on Labor, Human Services, and Population at the Urban Institute. His research examines policy initiatives aiming to stabilize, build, and strengthen the availability of high-quality early care and education.

Erica Greenberg is a senior fellow and PK–12 team lead in the Center on Education Data and Policy at the Urban Institute. She is coprincipal investigator of the DC Child Care Policy Research Partnership. Her research spans early childhood and K–12 education with a focus on the District of Columbia.

Elli Nikolopoulos is a research analyst in the Center on Labor, Human Services, and Population. Her research focuses on efforts to increase access to high-quality and affordable child care and early education, especially for low-income families.

Eve Mefferd is a research analyst in the Center on Labor, Human Services, and Population. She works on a variety of child care and early education projects, focusing on economic security, labor rights, the well-being of the child care and early education workforce, and the role of child care as both social service and workforce support.

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

Rachel Lamb is a research analyst in the Center on Education Data and Policy at the Urban Institute. She focuses on Pre-K2–12 education policy issues.

Victoria Nelson is a policy analyst in the Center on Education Data and Policy at the Urban Institute, focusing on K–12 education policy issues. Her current research focuses on child care and early education, the relationship between education and economic mobility, school funding formulas, and access to free and reduced-priced meals in schools.

Timothy Triplett is a principal research associate and senior survey methodologist with the Statistical Methods Group at the Urban Institute. He advises on survey methods and complex sample designs.

Statement of Independence

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

500 L'Enfant Plaza SW
Washington, DC 20024

www.urban.org