

**Early Learning Coalition of Broward County, Inc.**  
*Annual Review and Assessment Instrument 2009-2010*

Monitoring Report  
**Contract: SBBC-QIS-10-ELC3 Quality Improvement and Supports**  
*School Board of Broward County*

**Monitors for Early Learning Coalition (ELC)**

Jessica Novak, Early Care and Education Program Specialist  
Andrea Braynon, Chief Financial Officer  
Sandra Martinez, Accounting and HR Manager

**School Board of Broward County (SBBC) Representatives**

Sayra Hughes, Executive Director Early Learning, ESOL and CTACE Departments  
Vicky Saldala, ESOL & Pre-K-2 Director  
Ilene Miller, Ed.D. Coordinator, Pre-kindergarten, Early Intervention Program

The monitoring process reflected in this report began on July 29, 2010, one month after the third and last year of implementing the Early Learning Coalition of Broward County's Early Care and Education System, and was completed on December 3, 2010. The Coalition Monitors completed a comprehensive monitoring review, which included an administrative review of the agencies policies and procedures, a fiscal review of the accounting records and supporting documentation, as well as a review of the programmatic services as reflected in the performance objectives of the **Quality Improvement and Supports** services in contract SBBC-QIS-10-ELC3. **This report includes monitoring results of this contract.**

In addition to examining documentation related to performance objectives, the Coalition Monitor completed two (2) secret shopper phone calls to assess service delivery from the customer's point of view; additional interviews were conducted with the Quality Improvement and Supports Program Coordinator and one (1) mentor, to assess implementation of data collection activities and program operations.

Prior to the monitoring visits, the Coalition staff identified children and providers who participated in the Voluntary Pre-kindergarten (VPK) program, as well as all School Readiness children and the corresponding providers who serve these children contained in the EFS data base for the period July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010. The EFS data was used to randomly select 142 VPK children files, 103 VPK provider files, 142 files representing children receiving financial assistance from School Readiness funds and 109 early care and education provider files where these children received early learning opportunities. Of the 142 clients in receipt of School Readiness funds, 115 children (81%) were between the ages of birth to five and attended 91 of the selected providers (83%), and 27 children (19%) were school-age and attended 25 of the remaining selected providers, with seven (7) of the early care and education providers serving school-age children also served birth to school-age

children; these children and their corresponding providers along with 9 providers receiving a Quality Rating were tracked through the Coalition's early care and education system. **Of the 153 combined early care and education providers (QRS and Providers serving children receiving financial assistance from school readiness funds) selected for review and eligible for ELC 3 services, 23 of the early care and education providers (15%) where these children attended, participated in the Quality Improvement Supports (QIS) system (focused technical assistance [TA] and mentoring services, including inclusion technical assistance and/or training, and accreditation technical assistance), from this ELC 3 service provider during the 2009-2010 contract year and were chosen for review in this monitoring. Additionally, six (6) of the 23 early care and education provider sites, employed 21 teachers, who received college credits (3 teachers), in-service (7 teachers), and/or CDA (11 teachers) scholarships; seven (7) teachers received mentoring from this ELC 3 service provider: six (6) teachers completed their course work and three (3) of these teachers (50%) applied for and received the National CDA credential.**

#### **Administrative Review Summary:**

Agency policies, corporate documents, insurance, document protocols, and incident reporting documents were all *reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications with exception noted below:*

#### **Findings:**

- Page 5, Section 1.H. of the Standard Contract, entitled Sponsorship/Public Announcements, paragraph 3 has not been completely followed:
  - “2. If the sponsorship reference is in any written format, the words “Early Learning Coalition of Broward County, Inc.” and “State of Florida, Agency for Workforce Innovation” shall appear in the same size letters or type as the name of the CONTRACTOR. When issuing statements, press releases, requests for proposals, bid solicitations, and other documents describing projects or programs funded in whole or in part with state or federal funds, all CONTRACTORS receiving state or federal funds, shall clearly state (1) the percentage of the total cost of the program or project which will be financed with federal money, and (2) the dollar amount of federal funds for the project or program. For purposes of complying with this section, the percentage and dollar amount of federal funds are those shown on Exhibit A to this Contract.”

#### **No Action needed at this time:**

*No corrective action is required as the three-year contract cycle year has ended.*

#### **Fiscal Review Summary:**

- **Accounting Policies and Procedures** were reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.
- **General Ledger testing** indicated a 100% compliance rate related to the review of expenses and appropriate classification of transactions.
- **Payroll Records testing** indicated a 100% compliance rate related to the payroll records and personnel files examined. (As a part of the fiscal review the actual salary cost are compared to the approved budget salary amount. In the sampling, there were adjustments for changes in staffing to actual salaries.)

### **Programmatic Review Summary:**

This contract focuses on early care and education quality improvement supports provided by SBBC - ELC 3 Service Provider for early learning providers in the ELC of Broward County, Inc.'s quality initiatives located in Differential Accountability School Neighborhoods. *Coalition staff and Service Providers continue to share a common obstacle with regards to the inability of the multiple and various technologies currently employed by the Broward ECE system to accurately pull aggregate data for the purpose of validating or accounting for performance outcomes within and across services. ELC and Service Provider staff will continue to work collaboratively to address the issues during the 2010-2011 fiscal year.*

### **Results and Highlights:**

- **Contract #SBBC-QIS-10-ELC3 has twenty (20) Performance Outcomes that cover General Performance and Quality Improvement Supports, two (2) deliverables related to clients to be served and schedule/deliverables, and six (6) contract responsibilities connected to mentoring activities and training opportunities.**
- **100% of the twenty (20) performance outcomes were achieved in the 2009-2010 contract year; 50% of the program deliverables were met due to continued difficulty to maintain the number of providers expected to be served on a monthly basis throughout the contract year; and 100% of the contract responsibilities were met in 2009-2010.**
- **89% of the 70 community early care and education providers located in Differential Accountability School neighborhood school zones who received technical assistance showed a measurable increase in each of the pertinent areas identified in their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan (demonstrated by meeting at least 75% of their benchmarks). Seventeen (17) of these providers (24%) have participate in the full Star Rating process; all received both a pre and a post-test assessment using the Environmental Rating Scales; fifteen (15) providers (88%) showed an increase in their ERS scores.**
- **100% of the centers (70) served by this contract sent 437 unduplicated teachers/directors/staff to one or more of the 47 training sessions offered as part of their Quality Improvement Plan to enhance the effectiveness of their work and improve the quality of care.**
- **100% of the 180 teachers sampled reported two (2) or more ways in which the knowledge gained at the trainings enhanced the effectiveness of their work.**
- **Seven (7) CDA scholarship recipient/students from four (4) centers received mentoring to support the student in completing his/her CDA course work and to guide the student in the inclusion of coursework material into practice in the classroom.**
- **86% of the seven (7) students who received a CDA scholarship and mentoring completed CDA components or retained enrollment in the CDA program.**
- **An average of 73 technical assistance hours of training were provided to 62 community early care and education providers, enhancing classroom teachers' abilities to foster positive growth and development in young children.**
- **97% of the 62 community early care and education providers who were surveyed stated that the support provided by the Quality Improvement System was useful in implementing the curricula.**
- **97% of the 62 community early care and education providers who were surveyed stated that the feedback provided by the mentor was useful for improving their programs.**

**Early Learning Coalition of Broward County, Inc.**

***Administrative Specification Annual Review and Assessment Instrument  
2009-2010***

**Contract Annual Review**

**Contract: SBBC-QIS-10-ELC 3 Quality Improvement Supports**

<b>A. FEDERAL LAW REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>ELC REVIEW</b>
1. Does the Agency have a written Drug-Free Workplace Policy?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Are Equal Employment Opportunity, Worker's Compensation, Family Leave Act, and other mandated or relevant posters conspicuously displayed by the agency?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Does the Agency have a written Non- Discrimination and Harassment Free Workplace Policy?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b><u>ELC review comments:</u> Reviewed SBBC policy # 2400 (Drug Free Workplace); #4001.1 (Non-Discrimination Policy) and viewed postings for Equal Employment Opportunity, Worker's Compensation, Family Leave Act, and other mandated or relevant posters conspicuously displayed by the agency in the hallway near copying machine and bathroom area. Agency Policies were reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</b>	
<b>B. CORPORATE DOCUMENTS</b>	<b>ELC REVIEW</b>
1. Does the Agency have an Accounting Policy and Procedures Manual?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Are the Agency's By-laws available for review? N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
3. Are the Agency's Articles of Incorporation available for review? N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
4. Is there an Organizational Chart available that reflects the current organization of the Agency and provides clearly delineated chain-of-command?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Is there an Audit on File?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b><u>ELC review comments:</u> There were no By-Laws or Articles of Incorporation available as BCPS is a public entity/legislative body and not a business entity. Copy of organizational chart reviewed. Reviewed BCPS Financial, Operational, and Federal Single Audit for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2009; available online at: <a href="http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/auditdept">www.broward.k12.fl.us/auditdept</a>. Agency Corporate Documents were all reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</b>	
<b>C. SPONSORSHIP/PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS</b>	<b>ELC REVIEW</b>
1. Does the Agency have sponsorship materials, financed wholly or in part by state funds (including any funds through ELC) that are in accordance with the requirements outlined in the contract?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

2. In publicizing, advertising, or describing the sponsorship of the program, does Contractor state: “Sponsored by (Contractor’s Name) and The Early Learning Coalition of Broward County, Inc.” and the “State of Florida, Agency for Workforce Innovation”?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Do written materials include “The Early Learning Coalition of Broward County” and “Agency for Workforce Innovation, Office of Early Learning” in the same size letters or type as the name as the Contractor?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. When using statements, press releases, requests for proposals, bid solicitations, and other documents describing projects or programs funded in whole or in part with state or federal funds, all awardees receiving state or federal funds, shall clearly state (1) the percentage of the total cost of the program or project which will be financed with federal money, and (2) the dollar amount of federal funds for the project or program. Does the Contractor comply?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>ELC review comments: Reviewed one (1) QIS brochure and four (4) QIS meeting notices. All materials included the proper sponsorship titles/descriptions as noted in #2 and #3; however, the requirements identified in #4: (1) the percentage of the total cost of the program or project which will be financed with federal money, and (2) the dollar amount of federal funds for the project or program on any agency-wide or contract written materials were not included in the document.</b>	
<b><i>No Action at this time: No corrective action is required as the three-year contract cycle year has ended.</i></b>	
<b><u>Service Provider response (if desired):</u></b>	
<b>D. STAFFING</b>	<b>ELC REVIEW</b>
1. Did the Contractor maintain sufficient and qualified staff to deliver the agreed upon services required by the Contract? [Exhibit B (B-3)]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Do names of personnel match positions listed in the budget?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Did the Contractor ensure that staffing patterns and staff qualifications are sufficient to provide the services described within the contract, including backup plans when turnover occurs, with the capacity to provide services in English, Spanish, Portuguese, and Creole?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Did the Contractor provide and/or ensure continuous quality improvement training to 100% of its staff?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Has the Contractor or its agent notified WorkForce One of all entry level employment opportunities associated with this Contract which require a high school education or less? In the event that the Contractor or its agent employs a person who was referred by the WorkForce One office, the Contractor shall notify the Coalition. <b>Not applicable because no entry level positions were vacant.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
<b>ELC review comments: Matched staff positions with those in the budget. Reviewed personnel list with various languages spoken by each. SBBC also has a Multicultural Department that provides translation services as well.</b>	
<b>Interviewed Coordinator on 6/21/10: QIS contract was not fully staffed during 2009-2010 contract year. The Coordinator position was vacant from August 2009 until October 2009 and a mentor position at NSU was vacant between December 2009 and March 2010. SBBC provides all employees continuous quality professional development internally. During 2009-2010 all QIS staff</b>	

participated in SBBC-provided OWL and Hanen training. Reviewed training authorization request for three (3) QIS staff who attended ECERS-R training in October 2009. Additionally, all SBBC QIS mentors plus Coordinator (and NSU mentors) were trained locally in Positive Behavior Supports. Reviewed Department TDA (Temporary Duty Assignment) Log for Coordinator who attended various trainings throughout 2009-2010. Staffing support was *reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications*.

E. BACKGROUND SCREENING	ELC REVIEW
-------------------------	------------

1. Did the Contractor’s personnel and volunteers, who as part of their duties and responsibilities, spend forty hours or more per month in early care and education program(s) submit to a local and state criminal records check within ten days of employment in accordance with Section 435.03(1), Florida Statutes?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
---	---

**ELC review comments:** Reviewed SBBC policy that requires all prospective candidates for employment to fill out their background check form. Information can be found online at [www.broward.k12.fl.us/siu/seccl/generalinfo.htm](http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/siu/seccl/generalinfo.htm). Background screenings (submitted in accordance with Section 435.01(1) Florida Statutes) were *reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications*.

F. KEY PERSONNEL/PERSONNEL POLICIES	ELC REVIEW
-------------------------------------	------------

1. Does the Agency have written Personnel Policies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
---	---

2. Where are personnel folders located? **Personnel Department office located at 7720 W. Oakland Park Blvd.**

3. Select a random number of personnel files and verify that each file contains the following:

- |                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| a. Job descriptions                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| b. Qualification documentation      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| c. Evaluations                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| d. Individual Non-Disclosure        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| e. Confidentiality Certificate Form | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

4. Number of randomly selected personnel files: **3**

5. Number of said files containing above mentioned criteria: **3**

6. Where are the employee records located? **Near Office Manager’s office and at the SBBC Personnel Department office located on Oakland Park Blvd.**

7. Are employee records securely stored? <b>Yes; In locked file cabinets.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
---	---

**ELC review comments:** Reviewed three (3) QIS employee files. On-site visit to SBBC Personnel Department located on Oakland Park Blvd. for review of qualifications documentation in three (3) files. Employee Handbook is available online at [www.broward.k12.fl.us/employeehandbook](http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/employeehandbook). Agency Personnel Policies and personnel files were *reviewed and found to be in order*

<i>and to meet required specifications.</i>		
<b>G. INSURANCE</b>		<b>ELC REVIEW</b>
1. Review the Agency's Accord Form to determine which policies are in place.		
2. Where are the Agency Policies located? <b>Risk Management</b>		
3. Did the Contractor submit one Continuation of Operations Plan (COOP) to the Coalition's Contract Manager upon execution of the Contract? The COOP shall include the Contractor's plans to continue operations during unforeseen circumstances whether natural or man-made disasters, local emergencies, or other emergency situations requiring significant changes in operation. The plan shall include pre-disaster planning, including but not limited to record protections, alternative service accommodations, supplies, and a recovery plan that would allow the Contractor to continue functioning as per the executed Contract in the event of an actual disaster.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Worker's Compensation; minimum Liability limits of \$100,000 per accident, \$100,000 per person, and \$500,000 policy aggregate.	Expiration Date: <b>7/1/10</b>	Amount: <b>Self-insured</b>
5. Unemployment Compensation Insurance:		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. General Liability	Expiration Date: <b>7/1/10</b>	Amount: <b>\$700,000</b>
7. Professional Liability	Expiration Date: <b>7/1/10</b>	Amount: <b>Self-insured</b>
8. Property	Expiration Date: <b>7/1/10</b>	Amount: <b>Self-insured</b>
9. Automobile Liability	Expiration Date: <b>7/1/10</b>	Amount: <b>\$700,000</b>
<b><u>ELC review comments:</u> Reviewed self-insured letter dated July 14, 2009 and certificate of liability insurance. Reviewed Superintendent of schools letter to staff regarding emergency response cards. Reviewed COOP Plan for 2009-2010. Reviewed 2009-2010 emergency phone tree for the PreK Department and Emergency Department Plan Checklist for the PreK Department. Agency Insurance Documents were all reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</b>		
<b>H. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION AND SECURITY OBLIGATIONS</b>		<b>ELC REVIEW</b>
1. Does the Agency have policies to safeguard client confidentiality?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Does the Agency have protocols to protect computer based documents and records?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Do only the appropriate staff members have access to computerized records?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Does the Agency have a system for the maintenance of files?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

**ELC review comments: Reviewed SBBC policies:**

- # 5100.1 (Student Records: Confidentiality and Family Educational Rights).
- # 5306 (School and District Technology Usage).
- # 4016 (Personnel Records).
- #1343 (Inspection and Examination of Public Records)
- *Broward County Public Schools Information Security Guidelines* that state “... the following information security guidelines ... serve as a foundation for the protection of Broward County Public Schools data. Use of Broward County Public Schools equipment and/or networks constitutes acceptance of these policies...” (Updated 10/06/2009)

Agency Confidential Information and Security Obligations Corporate Documents were all *reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.*

I. INCIDENT REPORTING	ELC REVIEW
Child Abuse Reports made to the authorities and Coalition.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Report knowledge of any abuse or alleged abuse or any serious injury or death by a child while in care to the Coalition.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b><u>ELC review comments:</u> Reviewed SBBC PreK2 Department Abuse/Neglect/Abandonment Log for 2009-2010. There were no reports of child abuse made during the contract year. Agency Incident Reporting Documents were all <i>reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</i></b>	

*Fiscal Performance Specification Annual Review and Assessment Instrument 2009-2010*

**Contract: SBBC-QIS-10-ELC 3 Quality Improvement Supports**

A. AUDITS AND RECORDS	ELC REVIEW
1. Does the Contractor maintain books, records and documents including electronic storage media and electronic records, in accordance with generally accepted accounting procedures and practices which sufficiently and properly reflect all revenues and expenditures of funds provide by the Coalition under this contract?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Does the Contractor ensure that accounting records reflect the separation of all programs/activities it administers or for which it receives funding?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Does a clear audit trail exist showing the benefit received from each expenditure as it relates to the applicable program/activity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b><u>ELC review comments:</u></b>	

<b>B. EFFECTIVE USE OF FUNDS</b>		<b>ELC REVIEW</b>
1. Does the Chart of Accounts support proper allocation by having revenue and expense categories properly identified by program? <b>Fund 101 Location Code 9779 established properly</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>	
2. Does the Chart of Accounts have an unallowable cost code to properly identify unallowable costs?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>	
<b><u>ELC review comments:</u></b>		
<b>C. INVOICING</b>		<b>ELC REVIEW</b>
1. Are invoices submitted on a timely basis? <b>Yes</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>	
2. Are payments made to subcontractors within seven (7) working days after receipt of full or partial payments from the Coalition? <b>N/A</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>	
3. Does the Agency maintain an Agency-wide budget by funding source and expenditure category? <b>Yes</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>	
4. Does the Agency have an accounting system to properly account for ELC related transactions (revenues and expenses)? <b>Systems Applications and Products (SAP) business solutions S/W is the fiscal system being utilized since 2007.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>	
5. Select a random number of invoices submitted to ELC and test to determine the following:		
a. Does the invoice accurately detail the number of units, description, unit cost, and total? <b>Yes</b>		
b. Do the attendance records and other required documentation flow through to the invoice correctly? <b>Invoices did flow</b>		
c. Is the invoice approved by authorized staff/management? <b>Yes</b>		
d. Does the invoice reflect third party payments? <b>N/A</b>		
e. Are procedures established and implemented to eliminate duplicate billing? <b>Yes, through the accounting system</b>		
6. Number of invoices randomly selected: <b>Ten (10) SR expenditures were reviewed for the months of October 2009 and April 2010</b>		
7. Number of invoices meeting the above criteria: <b>The ten (10) met the criteria.</b>		
<b><u>ELC review comments:</u></b>		
<b>D. INDIRECT COSTS</b>		<b>ELC REVIEW</b>
1. Review and document the Agency's Cost Allocation Methodology.		
2. Is the cost allocation methodology in writing and is it representative of the allocation used? <b>Yes</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>	
<b><u>ELC review comments:</u></b>		
<b>E. BANK</b>		<b>ELC REVIEW</b>
1. Are bank statements reconciled monthly? <b>Yes, bank statements are reconciled by the SBBC Treasury Department</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>	

2. Are the bank statements reconciled by a person other than the person who receipts and disburses funds? <b>Yes</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Does the immediate supervisor review the reconciliation? <b>Yes</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Are adjustments properly documented and explained? <b>Procedurally yes</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Does the subrecipient receive advances?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
6. If they received advances, are the funds in an interest bearing account? <b>Not applicable</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
7. Select 3 random months and verify above transactions:	
6. What three months were randomly selected?	
7. Number of months meeting above transactions:	
<b>ELC review comments:</b> The School Board of Broward County Controller was interviewed and the bank reconciliation process was discussed. It was established that effective custodial accountability policies and procedures are in place and bank statements were not obtained due to the low level of risk related to the contracts being cost reimbursable without advances, the minimal amounts of non-personnel line item expenses and the single audit provided by the sub-recipient.	
<b>F. DELIVERABLES - REPORTS</b>	<b>ELC REVIEW</b>
1. Did the Contractor submit to the Coalition on a quarterly basis a statement of actual up-to-date and complete revenue/expenditures, by category, within 30 calendar days following the end of the reporting period? <b>Monthly</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Did the actual up-to-date and complete revenue/expenditure report submitted follow the same format as the Contractor's approved budget and include all listed line items?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Did the report contain a detailed explanation of variances from the approved budget? <b>Not applicable</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>ELC review comments:</b> Reviewed copies of expenditure report submission confirmations for July 2009 – June 2010. Agency Reports were reviewed and found to be in order and met required specifications.	
<b>G. ASSIGNMENTS AND SUBCONTRACTS</b>	<b>ELC REVIEW</b>
Perform only if there are sub-contracts in place being paid for direct services with funding covered by this monitoring visit.	
1. Are sub-contracts allowed under this funding? <b>Some funding sources do not allow the use of sub-contracts to deliver direct services.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Does the subcontractor have a contract? <b>There is a contract with NSU</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Are the payments to the subcontractors in line with the contract?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Does the contract specify a match budget for the subcontractor?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>ELC review comments:</b>	
<b>H. STAFFING</b>	<b>ELC REVIEW</b>

1. Does staff, including management, document their work hours through a time sheet or punch clock? <b>No, Time sheets and punch clocks are not utilized. Personal leave time is tracked and documented. This acceptable process is documented appropriately.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
2. Do names of personnel match positions listed in the budget?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b><u>ELC review comments:</u></b>	
<b>I. PAYROLL RECORDS</b>	<b>ELC REVIEW</b>
1. Does staff, including management, document their work hours through a time sheet or punch clock?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
2. Are time records signed by both the employee and the supervisor? <b>School Board has exception reports for leave which are signed and approved which is an acceptable process.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
3. Review sample of Payroll journals to ensure that they include:	
a. Staff name	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
b. Position	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
c. Salary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
d. Hours worked: Each PP only documents exceptions IE vacation. <b>Samples were provided and reviewed in detail.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
e. Payroll period: <b>October 2, 2009 and April 2, 2010 were the selected pay periods.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
f. Deductions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Number of payroll journals reviewed: <b>There were four (4) payroll records selected for review.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Number of said journals that included the above criteria: <b>All four of the payroll records met the criteria.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. For a sample of employees charged to the program, review that positions match the budget approved by the funding agency, Do they match? <b>Yes, all charges reviewed in the random selection process did match with the exception of those salaries that were estimates versus actual.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
7. For a sample of employees charged to the program, review that recorded time worked matches time paid as reflected in the Payroll journal. Do they match? <b>All samples were salaried employees for a 80 hour per payroll cycle.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
8. Review the distribution of fiscal duties (i.e. who approves the expense, who cuts the check, who mails the payment). Is the distribution of duties adequate to safeguard assets? <b>Request review by Budget Specialist, order approved by Coordinator, requisition approve by Director, verification of receipt approved by Budget Specialist, A/P pays vendor.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b><u>ELC review comments:</u></b>	
<b>J. NONEXPENDABLE PROPERTY</b>	<b>ELC REVIEW</b>
1. Has the Inventory of Non-expendable Property been submitted for 2009-2010?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

2. Is a list of property with a useful life greater than one year on file and submitted at the end of the year?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Does the list of property include: property tag identification number, description of item(s); physical location, name, make or manufacturer, year and/or model; manufacturer's serial number(s); date of acquisition and the current condition of the item?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Perform the following only if the Agency has been funded by ELC, in current or prior funding cycles, for fixed assets such as computers or equipment. This test includes fixed price contracts where rates were based on calculations that included capital expenditures.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Perform a physical inventory of a sample of ELC program assets drawn from the fixed assets register provided by ELC. Do they agree? Note any discrepancies.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. Are program fixed assets being used in accordance with the funding intent?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
7. Do asset additions and/or disposal procedures follow ELC's Fixed Asset policy/procedures?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
8. Were fixed assets purchased within the contract period in which they were approved/funded?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
<b><u>ELC review comments:</u></b>	
<b>K. PERFORMANCE BOND</b>	<b>ELC REVIEW</b>
1. Has the Performance Bond in the amount of \$450,000 or an Irrevocable Standby letter of credit been submitted to the Coalition?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
<b><u>ELC review comments:</u></b>	

***Program Performance Specification Annual Review and Assessment Instrument 2009-2010***

**Contract: SBBC-QIS-10-ELC3 Quality Improvement Supports**

**A. MAJOR PROGRAM GOALS**

ELC 3 2009-2010 Quality Improvement Supports:

1. Increase the quality of services delivered by direct child care service providers by being a central and accessible source of information on and providing access to coordinated quality improvement supports, providing targeted technical assistance and training in areas that are linked to positive child outcomes. Targeted areas for technical assistance and/or training shall include: Florida Performance Standards for under school-age children, Florida Voluntary Pre-kindergarten Education Standards, Quality Rating, Infant/Toddler, Inclusion, Family Involvement, Cultural Sensitivity, and Developmentally Appropriate Curricula (inclusive of Character Development). Additional areas may include but are not limited to: Accreditation, General Business related technical assistance, and focused collaborative projects.

2. Increase the quality of services delivered by COALITION approved early care and education providers located in the identified Differentiated Accountability School Neighborhoods, by being a central and accessible source of information with access to resources to support learning linked to positive child outcomes.

**Service Provider Directions:**  
**Please fill in shaded sections using “track changes” tool.**  
**Do not write in any other area.**

**B. BRIEF SERVICE PROVIDER SUMMARY OF ELC 3 (SBBC) SERVICES & HIGHLIGHTS**

1. **Technical Assistance:** *Technical Assistance was provided to 70 selected community preschool centers neighboring Differentiated Accountability elementary schools. The results of the pre-assessment, administered by ELC 4, guided the targeted areas for the mentors to closely work with the preschool educators.*
- a. **QRIS:** *The Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) technical assistance (TA) correlated with all aspects of Broward County’s QRIS tool. The seven (7) areas from the environmental tools, as well as curriculum, were recorded under this category. All centers have a written detailed QRIS plan in place to improve educational outcomes and kindergarten readiness. During the 2009-2010 fiscal year, SBBC dedicated 2,408 units to QRIS technical assistance.*
- b. **Inclusion:** *Inclusion focused on TA provided to teachers who serve identified or suspected students with disabilities. Strategies and activities are shared with teachers to implement appropriate practices. During the 2009-2010 fiscal year, 38 units were dedicated to inclusion practices.*
- c. **Accreditation:** *Accreditation TA focused specifically on the requirements of different accrediting entities. 150 hours, or (60) units of technical assistance were provided in 46 centers. One (1) center received accreditation during the 2009-2010 fiscal year.*
- d. **Professional Training:** *The Quality Improvement Services (QIS) mentors facilitated on-site professional development training. A total of 47 unduplicated training events were presented to 68 early child care centers. A total of 437 unduplicated teachers attended the professional development events. All participants received Continuing Education Units (CEUs) for their participation.*
- e. **CDA Mentoring:** *A total of 16 CDA participants indicated interest in receiving direct TA; 7 CDA participants completed the process. Mentors helped the participants understand and implement activities learned in the CDA coursework.*
- f. **Provider Meetings:** *There were 4 provider meetings held during the 2009-2010 contract year. The meetings were scheduled to provide pertinent information regarding the QRIS program. Professional development was added to the meetings. Continuing Education Units (CEUs) were awarded to the center directors attending all scheduled meetings.*
3. **QRIS Blog:** *The QRIS blog was created to facilitate communication between Broward County Child Care Licensing & Enforcement Quality Rating and Improvement System and agencies offering technical assistance. All agencies involved in the QRIS program have been given access to navigate the QRIS blog.*

**4. Computers for Centers:** *None were provided during the fiscal year.*

**C. CLIENTS TO BE SERVED**

General Description	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review	As verified by
<p>1. The number of child care centers located in identified Differentiated Accountability School Neighborhoods to receive Quality Improvement Supports throughout the Contract period shall be <b>63 child care centers</b>.</p>	<p><u>70</u></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Met    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met  <i>Note: SBBC served 70 different providers during the contact year; however, no more than 62 providers were served in any one month. 62 providers were served in each of the months February – June; SBBC did not recruit enough providers throughout the year to meet the deliverable and did not replace facilities when one dropped out.</i></p>	<p><b>Data records identified only 62 centers served in the last five months of the fiscal year.</b></p>

**ELC Review Comments:** Reviewed November 9th, 2009 written operations plan submitted to the Coalition by this ELC 3 Service Provider, with implementation strategies to ensure that recruitment of providers within the neighboring Differentiated Accountability elementary schools would be continuous and that required amount of child care centers would receive Quality Improvement Supports each month throughout the contract period. Reviewed data reports for the program year.

Reviewed list of 70 childcare sites recruited to participate in the QIS program for 2009-2010:

- Seventy (70) sites had signed agreements with the Service Provider:
  - Eight (8) sites withdrew during the course of the contract year: and
  - Sixty-two (62) individual child care centers were served during the last five months of the contract year.

*NOTE: This ELC 3 Service Provider expected each Mentor to recruit providers in their assigned area. An audit of the providers recruited and served indicated that a particular area had been deficient throughout the year due to turnover of a Mentor position in the NSU sub-contract.*

**No Action at this time: Corrective action is not required, as the three-year contract cycle year has ended.**

<b>Service Provider response (if desired):</b>			
<b>D. SCHEDULE AND DESCRIPTION OF DELIVERABLES</b>			
<b>1. Task List - General</b>		<b>ELC Review</b>	<b>As verified by</b>
<b>Did the Contractor provide Quality Improvement Supports for providers to ensure an adequate supply and range of school readiness service sites and to improve the business capacity of providers?</b>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<b>Database records</b>
<p><b>Service provider annual review:</b> Briefly describe how you provided QIS for providers in 2009-2010.  <i>QIS Mentors provided technical assistance to all selected child care providers focusing on all areas of The Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS) and Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scale (ITERS) which are aligned with the Quality Rating Improvement System criteria.</i></p>			
<b>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:</b> ELC randomly selected provider files			
<b>ELC review comments:</b> Reviewed 23 provider files and ELC 3 specially designed database records for evidence of center visits and observations related to quality improvement technical assistance provided on a weekly basis. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
<b>E. PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS</b>			
<b>CORE COMPONENT OBJECTIVES (OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS) - GENERAL</b>			
<b>1. 100% of quality improvement planning and mentoring shall utilize provider-specific data from the Quality Assurance (ELC 4) Service Provider as an organizing mechanism, as demonstrated on each provider's Quality Improvement Plan.</b>	<b>SBBC Reported Results</b> <b>Actual <u>Number</u> Served</b>	<b>ELC Review</b> <i>Results validated?</i>	<b>Action needed?</b>
	1.a. Number of providers (centers) served: <u>70</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>100%</b> <b>23/23</b> <b>N=23</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>
	1.b. Number of Environment Rating Scales (ERS) received from ELC 4 for the above providers: <u>70</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	1.c. Number of Quality Improvement Plans built from ERS for same providers: <u>70</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	1.d. Percent Achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
<b>Contractor Responsibility:</b> In conjunction with the Coalition, determine a prioritization and rationale for technical assistance and training support, which can be used to focus available resources. Priorities may include, but are not limited, to the following: (a) Providers who are			

located in Differentiated Accountability School Neighborhoods; (b) Providers who serve children whose families receive school readiness funds; and (c) Providers who have the greatest demonstrated, measurable need for training, technical assistance, and related supports as indicated by the Environmental Rating Scales.

**Contractor Responsibility:** Provide weekly on-site Technical Assistance for 63 child care centers, located in identified Differentiated Accountability School Neighborhoods throughout the Contract year.

**Service provider annual review:** (1) Briefly describe the process by which focused individual quality improvement planning and coaching/mentoring utilizes provider-specific data from the Quality Assurance (ELC 4) Service Provider as an organizing mechanism, in each provider’s technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan. (2) Briefly describe the process for managing technical assistance by priority. (3) Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges in delivering these services.

*Technical assistance information is entered into the database by the QIS mentors. The data is analyzed by the team and discussed during weekly meetings to ensure that providers are receiving necessary TA.*

**Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:** (1) ELC randomly selected provider files - Quality Improvement Plans; (2) Quality Improvement Plan template; (3) Mentors’ weekly schedules from 2009-2010; (4) A map of superintendent Elementary School Neighborhoods with participating schools highlighted and ECERS scores noted; (5) Technical assistance priority policy; (6) ELC will also review Database for selected providers.

**ELC review comments:** Reviewed sample weekly schedules for mentors and ECERS scores for all 70 centers who received technical assistance through this contract for evidence of provider-specific data from the *Quality Assurance* (ELC 4) Service Provider used as an organizing mechanism in each provider’s technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan. Reviewed twenty-three (23) provider files (33%), who received technical assistance through this contract, for evidence of provider-specific data from the *Quality Assurance* (ELC 4) Service Provider used as an organizing mechanism in each provider’s technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan.

- Twenty-three (23) provider files (100%) showed evidence of provider-specific data from the *Quality Assurance* (ELC 4) Service Provider used as an organizing mechanism in each provider’s technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan.

<b>Contractor Responsibility:</b> Provide all identified Technical Assistance services (Accreditation, Inclusion, Curriculum, and other Quality improvements) through each mentor, based on the Environmental Rating Scale and the <i>Child Screening and Assessment</i> (ELC 5) Service Providers’ child assessment results.	<b>SBBC Reported Results</b> <b>Actual <u>Number</u> Served</b>	<b>ELC Review</b> <i>Results validated?</i>	<b>As verified by</b>
	<b>The number of Technical Assistance Units provided for:</b>		
	a. Curriculum: 160	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>Database records, summary print-out and 23 selected provider files</b>
	b. Personal space and furnishing:395	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	c. Personal Care routines: 50	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

	d. Language and Reasoning: 63	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	e. Activities: 192	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	f. Interaction: 116	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	g. Program Structure: 85	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	h. Parents and Staff: 500	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	i. Inclusion: 38	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	j. Accreditation: 54	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	k. Professional Development: 165 hrs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	l. Other Quality Improvements:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

**Service provider annual review:** Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing these services.

*QIS mentors work with each center individually to provide the specific TA that is needed. The challenges for the mentors include those centers that require a great amount of TA in several areas; and often times, include areas that cannot be easily remedied (space and furnishings, teacher/student ratios).*

**Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:** Selected Centers-specific data that reflects services provided.

**ELC review comments:** Reviewed ELC 3 database records for verification of total technical assistance units provided to all centers in each specific area. Reviewed summary print-out for all areas of technical assistance. One discrepancy noted is that the ELC 3 database is very specific with two decimal points and does not round; whereas the key data excel document rounds. All numbers mentioned above were verified in the ELC 3 database and then subsequently adjusted in the key data excel document to be accurate. ***All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.***

Reviewed observation records signed/dated by teachers and mentors in 23 provider files which captured the units of technical assistance/mentoring provided in specific areas to participating child care centers.

**Service provider response:** Comment if desired.

	<b>SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served</b>	<b>ELC Review Results validated?</b>	<b>As verified by</b>
<b>Contractor Responsibility:</b> Provide center specific workshops, linkages to cluster elementary school and CDA recipient mentoring.	a. Number of center specific workshops that were held: <b><u>47 unduplicated workshops were conducted for 68 participating providers</u></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>Database records identified 47 unduplicated</b>

	b. Number of linkages to cluster elementary schools: <u>32</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>specific workshops held, linkage meetings held with 32 elementary schools, and 7 CDA scholarship recipient's mentored</b>
	c. Number of CDA's mentored: <u>7</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
<b>Service Provider annual review:</b> Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing these services. <i>One of the successes in the program is the positive response we have received from the linkages between the early care centers and elementary schools. Both parties have demonstrated willingness and enthusiasm to establishing a connection and a partnership to improve kindergarten readiness in the centers.</i>			
<b>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:</b> (1) ELC randomly selected provider files; (2) Corresponding workshop materials; (3) Documentation of linkages to cluster elementary schools; (4) CDA mentoring documentation for teachers in selected provider sites.			
<b>ELC review comments:</b> Reviewed documentation of center specific workshops held at various centers. Reviewed ELC 3 database documentation of the number of centers linked to 32 cluster elementary schools. Reviewed list of CDA scholarship recipients who received Mentoring. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Forty-seven (47) unduplicated workshops were held at 68 participating ELC 3 childcare centers for a total of 73 sessions;</li> <li>Nine (9) mentors visited each elementary school in their area; a total of 32 elementary schools received visits.</li> <li>Fifty-four (54) early care and education centers each visited one of the 32 elementary schools in the cluster; each of the 32 elementary school received visits (keywords searched by: "transition to kindergarten"; "kindergarten").</li> <li>Seven (7) CDA scholarship recipients receiving mentoring were identified as employed at four (4) centers;</li> </ul> Reviewed twenty-three (23) provider files through the database for evidence of linkage activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Twenty-one (21) provider files (78%) showed evidence of linkage activities with cluster elementary schools.</li> </ul>			
<b>Contractor Responsibility:</b> Provide approximately 10 monthly units of technical assistance/mentoring, support, and training by each mentor, to participating child care centers on subjects directly related to providing quality services and positive child outcomes and organized around Quality Improvement Plans that are built on Environmental Rating Scale Results.	<b>SBBC Reported Results</b> <b>Actual <u>Number</u> Served</b>	<b>ELC Review</b> <i>Results validated?</i>	<b>As verified by</b>
	a. Number of mentors: <u>9</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>Database records and provider files</b>
	b. Number of child care centers per mentor: <u>7</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	c. Number of units per month/per mentor/per center: <u>Varies by month.</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

	<u>approximately 22 per mentor</u>		
<p><b>Service provider annual review:</b> Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing these services. <i>Technical Assistance was provided to 70 selected community preschool centers neighboring Differentiated Accountability elementary schools. The results of the pre-assessment, administered by ELC 4, guided the targeted areas for the mentors to closely work with the preschool educators.</i></p>			
<p><b>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:</b> ELC randomly selected provider files - Center-specific documentation reflecting number of units provided to each center by each mentor.</p>			
<p><b>ELC review comments:</b> Reviewed ELC 3 database observation records as documentation of the total units provided by each mentor. Each mentor averaged a total of 31 units of technical assistance/mentoring per month. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></p> <p>Reviewed 23 provider files for observation records signed/dated by teachers and mentors which captured the number of units of technical assistance/mentoring provided by the mentor to participating child care centers; 100% of the 23 provider files contained such observation records and noted monthly units of technical assistance provided.</p>			
<p><b>Contractor Responsibility:</b> Advertise Quality Improvement matching or mini-grant opportunities as part of Quality Improvement process and award matching or mini-grants to help centers upon reaching Quality Improvement Plan goals and benchmarks, with funding from the Coalition provided under this Contract.</p>	<p><b>SBBC Reported Results</b> <b>Actual <u>Number</u> Served</b></p>	<p><b>ELC Review</b> <i>Results validated?</i></p>	<p><b>As verified by</b></p>
	<p>a. Number of centers receiving matching or mini-grants: <u>62 centers</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><b>Database records, expenditure report and purchase orders.</b></p>
<p><b>Service provider annual review:</b> Please briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing these services. <i>Mentors helped providers identify program materials that would enhance the curriculum and delivery of services. The coordinator worked collaboratively with staff and bookkeepers to ensure accuracy with budget and orders.</i></p>			
<p><b>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:</b> (1) Advertisement material for matching or mini-grants; (2) ELC randomly selected provider file review. (3) Documentation of matching or mini-grant awards for ELC selected providers or documentation of declined opportunity for matching or mini-grants.</p>			
<p><b>ELC review comments:</b> Reviewed advertising material for matching mini-grant in the Provider agreement. Reviewed ELC 3 database records for evidence of expenditure reports and purchase orders identifying participation and receipt of matching mini-grants. A total of \$44,475.01 was awarded to 62 centers. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></p> <p>Reviewed 23 center-based provider files for evidence of expenditure reports and purchase orders identifying participation and receipt of matching mini-grants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twenty-one (21) center-based providers (91%) received a mini-grant ranging up to \$750 to purchase supplies for their centers; and</li> <li>• Two (2) center-based providers had withdrawn from the Quality Improvement program and were not eligible for the grant opportunity.</li> </ul>			

	<b>SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served</b>	<b>ELC Review Results validated?</b>	<b>Action needed?</b>
<b>2. 75% of staff from each provider site who receives quality improvement training, as part of their Quality Improvement Plan, shall demonstrate a measurable increase in their knowledge in each pertinent subject area, on pre and post tests.</b>	2.a. Number of provider sites who received training as part of their QIP: <b><u>68</u></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>100% 180/180 N=180</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>
	2.b. Number of staff from each provider sites who received training as part of their QIP: <b><u>437 unduplicated staff</u></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	2.c. Number of staff who showed a measurable increase in each pertinent area measured by pre and post test: <b><u>437 unduplicated staff</u></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	2.d. Percent of staff from each site that achieved measureable increase: <b><u>100%</u></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
<b>Service provider annual review:</b> Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing these services. <i>The QIS mentors facilitated on-site professional development. A total of 68 provider sites received training; 437 teachers attended the professional development events. All participants received CEUs.</i>			
<b>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:</b> ELC randomly selected provider files - pre and post tests (Database records).			
<b>ELC review comments:</b> Reviewed ELC 3 database records for evidence that providers received training as part of their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) and the pre/post test scores of attendees for increase in knowledge in each of the 24 different pertinent subject areas. There were 47 unduplicated trainings at 68 centers for a total of 73 sessions and 437 unduplicated participants. All participants (100%) showed measurable increase in each pertinent area measured by pre and post test. <b><i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></b>			
Reviewed 23 center-based provider files for evidence that providers who received training as part of their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan, showed a measurable increase in their knowledge in each pertinent subject area, as measured by attendee pre and post-test: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Five (5) center-based provider files (22%) did not require training as part of their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan; and</li> <li>• Two (2) center-based provider files (9%) reflected programs' withdrawal from QIS early in the contract year;</li> <li>• <b>16 providers (69%) received training as part of their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan</b> at one or more of 71 training sessions in 24 pertinent subject areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One hundred eighty (180) teachers, teacher-aids, and/or directors attended training sessions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One hundred eighty (180) teachers, teacher-aids, and/or directors (100 %) showed a measurable increase in their knowledge in each pertinent subject area, as measured by attendee pre/post tests.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>			

	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results Validated?	Action needed?
<b>3. 75% of providers who receive quality improvement assistance mentoring shall show a measurable increase in each of the pertinent areas identified in their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan, as demonstrated by meeting at least 75% of their benchmarks.</b>	3.a. Unduplicated Number of providers who receiving focused TA: <b><u>70 enrolled; 8 centers left during the 2009-2010 year for a total of 62 participants</u></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>91%</b> <b>21/23</b> <b>N=23</b>
	3.b. Number of providers who met 75% or more of their benchmarks: <b><u>62</u></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>
	3.c. Percent achieved: <b><u>100%</u></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
<p><b>Service provider annual review:</b> Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing these services.  <i>A total of 100% of providers showed a measurable increase as demonstrated by the Quality Improvement Plan. 70 provider sites were enrolled and goals were set. However, 8 provider sites withdrew during the year. 62 provider sites were successful in achieving all goals that were set.</i></p>			
<p><b>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:</b> (1) Database report listing each provider, each pertinent area of the improvement plan, how many benchmarks were created in each area at that provider site, how many benchmarks were achieved in each area, and the percentage achieved by each provider. (2) ELC randomly selected provider files.</p>			
<p><b>ELC review comments:</b> Reviewed summary database record information for 62 participating centers for evidence that providers who participate in and receive focused technical assistance/mentoring show a measurable increase in each of the pertinent areas identified in their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan, as demonstrated by meeting at least 75% of their benchmarks. <b><i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></b></p> <p>Reviewed 23 center-based provider files for evidence that each provider that participated in and received focused technical assistance/mentoring showed a measurable increase in each of the pertinent areas identified in their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan, as demonstrated by meeting at least 75% of their benchmarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twenty-one (21) center-based provider files (91%) indicated evidence that providers participated in and received focused technical assistance/mentoring and showed a measurable increase in each of the pertinent areas identified in their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan, as demonstrated by meeting at least 75% of their benchmarks (100% met); and</li> <li>• Two (2) center-based providers (9%) withdrew from the program early in contract year and did not meet any benchmarks.</li> </ul>			
<b>4. 75% of providers who receive quality improvement training as part of their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan shall report two or more ways in which they shall use the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work.</b>	<b>SBBC Reported Results</b> <b>Actual <u>Number</u> Served</b>	<b>ELC Review</b> <i>Results validated?</i>	<b>Action needed?</b>
	4.a. Number of providers receiving training: <b><u>68</u></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>100%</b> <b>180/180</b> <b>N=180</b>
4.b. Number of said providers reporting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		

	two or more ways they use knowledge: <u>68</u>		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.
	4.c. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
<p><b>Service provider annual review:</b> Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing these services.  <i>The QIS mentors provide trainings as part of TA. The mentors effectively provided training to staff, directors, and child care personnel. Child care provider staff demonstrated two or more ways they are using the information. Mentors observed the implementation of each training and provided follow-up as needed.</i></p>			
<p><b>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:</b> (1) List of provider sites with trainings identified as part of their Quality Improvement Plan who attended trainings; (2) List of teachers <b>by provider site</b> that attended each training and identification of those teachers who indicated two or more ways in which they shall use the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work; (3) ELC selected provider file review. (4) Completed surveys of teachers who attended trainings from selected sites indicating how many reported two or more ways in which to use the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work. (5) Summary sheet knowledge gained.</p>			
<p><b>ELC review comments:</b> Reviewed ELC 3 database records of trainings for evidence of teachers' attendance from 16 providers who received training as part of their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan and reported two or more ways in which they would use the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></p> <p>Reviewed 16 provider files of providers who received training as part of their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan for evidence that teachers reported two (2) or more ways in which they used the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>16 provider files contained training evaluations of 180 early care and education personnel who attended training as part of the technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All 180 early care and education personnel (100%) reported two (2) or more ways in which they would use the knowledge provided in the training to enhance the effectiveness of their work.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			
<p><b>5. 100% of employees in sites receiving quality improvement assistance pursuant to this contract (who received scholarships to enroll in coursework to complete the National CDA credential) shall be offered mentoring services during technical assistance visits to support the employee with application of their coursework in their classroom, as measured by offer letters, with declines indicated, signed by each CDA scholarship recipient at each TA site.</b></p>	<p><b>SBBC Reported Results</b> <b>Actual <u>Number</u> Served</b></p>	<p><b>ELC Review</b> <i>Results validated?</i></p>	<p><b>Action needed?</b></p>
	5.a. Number of CDA scholarship recipients at participating centers: <u>66</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.
	5.b. Number of said recipients offered mentoring services during 2009-2010 contract period: <u>66</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	5.c. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
<p><b>Service provider annual review:</b> Briefly describe how mentoring is offered and any successes and/or challenges to providing these services.</p>			

All CDA scholarship recipients who are employed at centers participating in TA are offered mentoring services during TA at their child care facility; 100% of the mentors accepted mentoring services.

**Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:** (1) A spreadsheet listing CDA scholarship recipients by provider site; (2) Documentation that reflects CDA scholarship recipients were offered mentoring services. (3) ELC selected provider/teacher files.

**ELC review comments:** Reviewed scholarship data records for evidence of employees working at centers receiving technical assistance from this ELC 3 Service Provider who had been granted CDA scholarships. Reviewed ELC 3 CDA mentorship agreements and database mentor observation records indicating students who were offered and received mentoring services as evidenced by mentor/CDA mentorship agreements and observation records which reflected each mentor’s discussions with CDA scholarship candidates. Sixty-six (66) individuals at seventeen (17) childcare sites were CDA recipients and evidence of offered mentoring services existed for sixty-six (100%) recipients during 2009-2010 contract period; of these sixty-six individuals, sixteen (16) signed forms expressing interest to be mentored. Of the sixteen (16), seven (7) individuals stayed with their child care site and followed through on all CDA requirements including receipt of mentoring. The seven (7) individuals who accepted CDA mentoring were at four different (4) childcare sites in 2009-2010. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

Reviewed 23 center-based provider files for evidence of employees working at centers receiving technical assistance from this ELC 3 Service Provider who had been granted CDA scholarships:

- Three (3) centers had four (4) employees who received CDA scholarships:
  - All of these employees (100%) had been offered mentorship according to mentorship agreements in said files.

6. 80% of CDA students, who receive mentoring services during technical assistance visits, shall show a measurable increase in their knowledge by reporting two or more ways in which they used the knowledge provided in mentoring to enhance application of their coursework in their classroom.	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
	6a. Number of CDA scholarship recipients mentored: <u>7</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>100%</b> <b>4/4</b>
	6b. Number of CDA scholarship recipient students showing increase in knowledge: <u>7</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>N=4</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	6c. Percent achieved: <b><u>100%</u></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>

**Service provider annual review:** Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing these services.

**Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:** (1) A spreadsheet listing CDA Scholarship recipients mentored who reported two or more ways in which they used the knowledge provided in mentoring to enhance their coursework; (2) ELC selected provider/teacher files

**ELC review comments:** Reviewed ELC 3 database records for evidence of CDA scholarship recipient summary/status and observation records for CDA students, along with corresponding questionnaires that the student reported two (2) or more ways they would use the knowledge provided in the program to enhance the effectiveness of their work. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

Reviewed 23 center-based provider files for evidence of CDA scholarship recipient who received mentoring services during technical assistance visits showed a measurable increase in their knowledge by reporting two or more ways in which they used the knowledge provided in mentoring to enhance application of their coursework in their classroom:

- Three (3) center-based provider files indicated four (4) CDA students participated in mentoring services.
- Review of four (4) CDA student files indicated they all (100%) showed a measurable increase in their knowledge by reporting two (2) or more ways in which they used the knowledge provided in mentoring to enhance application of their coursework in their classroom.

	<b>SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served</b>	<b>ELC Review Results validated?</b>	<b>Action needed?</b>
<b>7. 80% of CDA students, who receive mentoring services during technical assistance visits, shall complete the coursework to obtain the National CDA credential, shall complete the course component in which they are enrolled and/or retain enrollment in the program through National CDA certification.</b>	7.a. Number of CDA scholarship recipient students who receive mentoring: <u>7</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>75%</b> <b>3/4</b> <b>N=4</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>
	7.b. Number of said recipients completing course component in which they enrolled and/or retaining enrollment: <u>6</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	7.c. Number of said recipients who retain enrollment through National CDA certification: <b><u>3 recipients received and 3 recipients continued to pursue</u></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	7.d. Percent achieved: <b><u>86%</u></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

**Service provider annual review:** Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing these services.

*CDA students receiving mentoring chose to complete local CDA prior to enrolling in National CDA courses. There are certain periods for registering for National CDA registration and required paperwork must be submitted within 6 months of registration.*

**Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:** (1) A spreadsheet listing CDA Scholarship recipients who received mentoring, the course component they were enrolled in to obtain the National CDA credential, and the date the course component was completed and/or evidence that continued enrollment exists; (2) ELC selected provider/teacher files.

**ELC review comments:** Reviewed ELC 3 database records for evidence of CDA scholarship recipient summary/status and observation records for CDA students, along with corresponding questionnaires that the student reported two (2) or more ways they would use the knowledge provided in the program to enhance the effectiveness of their work. Seven (7) participants accepted CDA mentoring at four (4) participating childcare centers. Of these seven (7) individuals, six(6) completed their course work, three (3) enrolled in National CDA course, and one (1) dropped out of the course component in which they were enrolled. ***All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.***

Reviewed four (4) CDA scholarship recipient files for indication that those who received mentoring, completed or remained in the CDA program:

- **Three (3) students completed the CDA component** in which they were enrolled:
  - **Three (3) students completed the CDA component** applied for *and* **received the National CDA credential**; and
- One (1) student dropped out of the course component prior to completion.

	<b>SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served</b>	<b>ELC Review Results validated?</b>	<b>Action needed?</b>
<b>8. 100% of matching or mini-grant opportunities shall be advertised as incentives and granted as part of Quality Improvement Plans to help centers attain quality improvement plan goals and benchmarks.</b>	<b>8.a. Number of mini grants advertised:</b> <u>62 centers</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>100%</b> <b>21/21</b> <b>N=21</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>
	<b>8.b. Number of mini grants granted:</b> <u>62</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<b>8.c. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

**Service provider annual review:** Briefly describe any successes/challenges in advertising mini-grant incentives.

*Mentors worked collaboratively to achieve goals and helped centers identify appropriate program materials. Mini grants were successfully advertised by provider agreements, word of mouth, and separate advertisements. 70 sites signed service agreements were made aware of the mini grant opportunities. 62 provider sites remained in the program.*

**Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:** (1) Mini-grant advertisements (flyers, provider agreement, etc.); (2) List of providers and those identified who were granted mini-grants as part of Quality Improvement Plans.

**ELC review comments:** Reviewed advertising material for matching mini-grant in the Provider agreement. Reviewed 70 signed Provider Agreements. Reviewed ELC 3 database records for evidence of expenditure reports and purchase orders identifying participation and receipt of matching mini-grants. A total of \$44,475.01 was awarded to 62 centers. ***All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.***

Reviewed 23 center-based provider files for evidence of expenditure reports and purchase orders identifying participation and receipt of matching mini-grants:

- Twenty-one (21) center-based providers (91%) received a mini-grant up to \$750 to purchase supplies for their centers; and
- Two (2) center-based providers had withdrawn from the Quality Improvement program and were not eligible for the grant opportunity.

<b>9. 85% of providers served shall report overall satisfaction with services delivered through this</b>	<b>SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served</b>	<b>ELC Review Results validated?</b>	<b>Action needed?</b>

<b>Contract, including cultural competency/sensitivity, customer-friendliness, usefulness of services provided, efficiency of service, and convenience of hours and location of services.</b>	9.a. Number of providers served: <u>62</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>
	9.b. Number of providers surveyed: <u>62</u>		
	9.c. Number of surveys returned: <u>62</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	9.d. Number of providers reporting satisfaction with:		
	○ Cultural competency/sensitivity: <u>61/62 (98%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	○ Customer-friendliness: <u>62/62 (100%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	○ Usefulness of services provided: <u>60/62 (97%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	○ Efficiency of service: <u>60/62 (97%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	○ Convenience of hours and location of services: <u>61/62 (98%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
9.e. Percent achieved: <u>98%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met		
<b>Service Provider annual review:</b> Briefly describe method for gathering satisfaction data and any successes and/or challenges in delivering this service. <i>Surveys were disseminated at the end of the year and returned in a timely manner.</i>			
<b>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:</b> (1) Copy of Satisfaction survey; (2) Summary of survey results; (3) Copies of completed surveys.			
<b>ELC review comments:</b> Reviewed blank 2009-2010 satisfaction survey. Reviewed satisfaction survey summary analysis and back-up documentation for quality improvement supports, cultural competency/sensitivity, customer-friendliness, usefulness of services provided, efficiency of service, convenience of hours and location of services. A total of 62 providers who used the Quality Improvement Support services during the contract year were delivered surveys in the last quarter of the contract year and 62 providers (100%) responded to the survey; on average, 98% indicated that providers receiving coaching and technical assistance services reported overall satisfaction with services, including cultural competency/sensitivity, customer-friendliness, usefulness of services provided, efficiency of service, and convenience of access of services.			

Reviewed 23 center-based provider files for evidence of satisfaction surveys:

- Twenty-one (21) center-based providers (91%) files contained completed satisfaction surveys and indicated overall satisfaction with services delivered through this Contract, including cultural competency/sensitivity, customer-friendliness, usefulness of services provided, efficiency of service, and convenience of hours and location of services.
- Two (2) centers dropped out of the program early in contract year and did not complete a satisfaction survey.

*All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

<b>10. 100% of the policies and procedures shall ensure the protection and confidentiality of individual child records and early learning provider records from unlawful disclosure as identified in the Standard Levels of Service (Exhibit D), Chapter 411, Chapter 402 and Chapter 1002, Florida Statutes.</b>	<b>ELC Review</b>	<b>Action needed?</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>

**Service Provider annual review:** Briefly describe the process by which confidentiality is ensured and any successes/challenges with achieving the outcome. *The database is password protected and student files are located in a file cabinet in the locked administrative office.*

**Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:** (1) Review copy of SBBC policies and procedures; (2) Obtain copy of Confidentiality Policy.

**ELC review comments:** Reviewed Broward County School Board Policy # 5100.1 (Student Records: Confidentiality and Family Education Rights) referencing the protection of confidential documents by Florida Statute 1002.22 and ensures the protection and confidentiality of individual child records and early learning provider records from unlawful disclosure. Policies are sufficient. *All documents were reviewed and validated.*

<b>11. 100% of child care provider telephone calls shall be answered by the fourth ring and 100% of customer telephone calls which are placed on hold shall hold for no more than two (2) minutes before caller being given the option to continue to hold or to request a call-back within 48 business hours and 90% of customers who leave messages will receive follow-up within two (2), 48-hour (business) days of initial contact.</b>	<b>SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served</b>	<b>ELC Review Results validated?</b>	<b>Action needed?</b>
		11. Total number of ELC 3 phone calls: <u>5</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	11.a. Percent of telephone calls answered by fourth ring: <u>5</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	11.b. Percent of customer phone calls placed on hold holding for no more than 2 minutes: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	11.c. Percent of customers receiving call-back within 48 hour business days: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

**Service provider annual review:** Briefly describe any successes or challenges in delivering this service.  
*All calls are answered in a timely manner. Clerical staff are trained to answer calls efficiently and successfully communicate with the public.*

**Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:** (1) Provider call log; (2) ELC staff will conduct Secret Shopper Calls.

**ELC review comments:** Reviewed SBBC-ELC 3 Service Provider’s call report log which contained five (5) phone messages. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

Telephone calls made to SBBC-ELC 3 Service Provider by Coalition staff occurred many times during the fiscal year where the call was answered within one or two rings and requests for call-back were received within 48 business hours.

- Conducted two (2) Secret Shopper calls where messages were left:
- 4/13/10 – Call made at 10:15 AM, left message for Program Supervisor to call back; Call-back received same day, 4/13/10; and
  - 5/17/10 – Call made at 2:00 PM, left message for Program Supervisor; Call back received same day, 5/17/10.

12. 100% of complaints received, or observations, concerning potential child care licensing violations shall be tracked and reported to Broward County Child Care Licensing and feedback on the outcome shall be documented.	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
	12.a. Number of complaints received: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  <i>If yes see row below for details.</i>
	12.b. Number of complaints reported to BCCCL: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	12.c. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

**Service provider annual review:** Briefly describe any successes/challenges with achieving this outcome. *N/A*

**Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:** Broward County Child Care Licensing complaint log.

**ELC review comments:** Reviewed log of complaints or observations concerning potential child care licensing violations tracked and reported to Broward County Child Care Licensing and feedback on the outcome documented. No complaints were received or observations concerning potential child care licensing violations were made during the fiscal year. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

13. 100% of complaints or observations concerning potential abuse, neglect, or abandonment shall be reported to the Florida Department of Children and Families and the Coalition shall be notified of said reports, within the applicable confidentiality regulations.	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
	13.a. Number of complaints received: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  <i>If yes see row below for details.</i>
	13.b. Number of complaints reported to FLDCF: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	13.c. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

**Service provider annual review:** Comment if needed.

<b>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:</b> Child Abuse Complaint Log.			
<b>ELC review comments:</b> Reviewed ELC 3 Child Abuse Complaint Log for evidence of complaints or observations concerning potential abuse, neglect, or abandonment reported to the Florida Department of Children and Families, including notification of said reports (within the applicable confidentiality regulations) to the Coalition. No complaints or observations concerning potential child abuse, neglect, or abandonment were received during the fiscal year. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
<b>14. 100% of other concerns about early care and education providers shall be referred to the Service Provider(s) providing Resource and Referral and Family Education and Supports (ELC 1), Eligibility Determination, Application Processing, Slot Management and Provider Payment (ELC 2), Quality Improvement Supports (ELC 3-FCI), and/or Quality Assurance (ELC 4) as appropriate, and/or shall be addressed through the provision of training and technical assistance through the Service Provider, and feedback on the outcomes shall be documented.</b>	<b>SBBC Reported Results</b> <b>Actual <u>Number</u> Served</b>	<b>ELC Review</b> <i>Results validated?</i>	<b>Action needed?</b>
	14.a. Number of provider complaints received: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>
	14.b. Number of said complaints referred to appropriate Service Provider: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	14.c. Number of said complaints addressed through training and TA: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
14.d. Percent achieved: <u>N/A</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met		
<b>Service provider annual review:</b> Comment if needed.			
<b>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:</b> (1) Provider Complaint Log; (2) Supporting documentation for referral and feedback on outcomes.			
<b>ELC review comments:</b> Reviewed ELC 3 Service Provider Complaint Log and supporting documentation for referral and feedback on outcomes. No other complaints concerning providers were referred to the ELC 1, ELC 2, ELC 3, or ELC 4 Service Provider during the fiscal year. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
<b>15. 100% of required data shall be collected, input, and tracked in accordance with State of Florida and Coalition standards and requirements and reports, including any ad hoc data and report requests made by the Coalition, shall be delivered complete and on time, as mutually agreed.</b>	<b>ELC Review</b>		<b>Action needed?</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>
<b>Service Provider annual review:</b> Comment if needed.			
<b>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:</b> ELC will review its Contract Obligations Checklist for evidence of monthly, quarterly, and annual reports, as well as any requested ad hoc data/reports delivered complete and on time.			
<b>ELC review comments:</b> Reviewed Coalition's SBBC-ELC 3 Contract Obligation Checklist to confirm reports were delivered by contractual commitment dates. Reviewed emails for report arrival dates.			

The SBBC-ELC 3 Contract Obligations Checklist revealed that 100% of required data was collected, input, and tracked in accordance with state and local standards and requirements and reports were delivered complete and on time. 100% of reports were provided in a timely manner. Sixteen (16) reports were due to the Coalition; 100% of the required monthly, quarterly, annual, and ad hoc data and reports were submitted complete and on time in accordance with state and local standards and requirements:

Twelve (12) monthly Key Data reports; three (3) quarterly; and one (1) annual report; for a total of 16 reports submitted on time to the Coalition.

<b>16. 100% of invoices submitted to the Coalition for processing shall be submitted on time and shall accurately meet the requirements of the approved cost allocation plan and contractual budget.</b>	<b>ELC Review</b>	<b>Action needed?</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>

**Service provider annual review:** Comment if needed.

**Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:** ELC fiscal department will review invoices submitted for timely submission.

**ELC review comments:** Reviewed invoice submission log from the ELC fiscal department. All invoices were submitted on time and accurately met the requirements of the approved cost allocation plan.

<b>17. 100% of child care providers shall be proactively informed of complaint procedures, leading to formal, established grievance procedures.</b>	<b>SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served</b>	<b>ELC Review Results validated?</b>	<b>Action needed?</b>
	17.a. Number of child care providers served: <u>70</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>
	17.b. Number of said provider receiving complaint procedures: <u>70</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	17.c. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

**Service provider annual review:** Briefly describe any successes or challenges in delivering this service.  
*All providers are informed of complaint procedures during registration. This is an effective practice as all providers receive consistent information from the beginning.*

**Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:** (1) Provider agreements/A copy of documentation that providers receive; (2) Review select number of provider files for evidence of notification of complaint procedures, leading to formal, established grievance procedures.

**ELC review comments:** Reviewed ELC 3-SBBC QRIS provider agreement between providers and the School Board of Broward County. Section 2.07, Interagency Dispute Process, is a formal established grievance procedure included in each provider agreement. Reviewed a copy of welcome letter from Program Supervisor sent to all providers after enrolling into the program. The letter includes a paragraph informing providers that for any concerns regarding eligibility determination or quality of service received, they could call the Program Supervisor. The

phone number is included. According to the Program Coordinator, all facilities received a welcome letter once they signed the agreement for technical assistance. Reviewed selected provider files.

Reviewed 23 center-based provider files for provider agreements and inclusion of welcome letter:

- 100% of the provider files contained a provider agreement and the letter.

<b>18. 100% of formal service linkage agreements and procedures that are approved by the Coalition, with all Early Care and Education System Providers and pertinent community partners, shall be developed and reduced to writing within thirty (30) days after the date of execution of this Contract, in order to coordinate services and prevent duplication, and shall be implemented, followed, and revised as needed. This paragraph shall be inclusive of the links to the Broward County Child Care Licensing and Enforcement Division regarding communication about any change in status of, or critical incident with, any child care provider. Linkage agreements shall be actively implemented and maintained throughout the service year.</b>	<b>ELC Review</b>	<b>Action needed?</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>

**Service provider annual review:** Note the organization with whom linkage agreements were executed and any successes/challenges with achieving the outcome. *An MOU was received from BCCCLE and did not have an area for signatures or dates. A Family Central Agreement regarding CDA scholarships was signed, dated, and on file.*

**Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:** Copies of all signed and dated linkage agreements.

**ELC review comments:** Reviewed two (2) signed and dated linkage agreements; one (1) Memorandum of Agreement (MOU) with ELC 4-1: Broward County Quality Assurance Services - Quality Rating System a service of the Broward County Licensing and Enforcement Section (BCLE), with subject line “Contract Year 2009-2010” and one (1) linkage agreement initiated from Family Central, Inc. ELC 3: Quality Improvement Supports. The MOU with BCCCLE was developed within the thirty (30) days after the date of execution of the Contract; the letter of agreement with ELC 3 was developed and executed in December 2009. The SBBC-QIS-10-ELC3 contract was fully executed June 30, 2009. *Conclusion:* No corrective action is required as linkage agreement was initiated from FCI and not SBBC.

<b>19. 100% participation in monthly Early Care and Education system coordination team meetings shall occur by a representative of the Contractor for all services and shall be actively and successfully coordinated with system partners and with the Coalition.</b>	<b>ELC Review</b>	<b>Action needed?</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>

**Contractor Responsibility:** The Contractor shall participate in associations; attend the Coalition’s annual meetings; participate in community collaborative groups; and attend Coalitions’ in-service training sessions to the greatest extent possible and consistent with funding, program description and design.

**Service provider annual review:** Please submit a list of associations and community collaborate groups that SBBC ELC 3 participated in 2009-2010. *SBBC ELC 3 participated in the following committees during the 2009-2010 school year: ELC Systems Committee, VPK conference*

committee, Positive Behavior Supports Implementation, Transition Sub-Committee, Special Needs Advisory Committee, School Readiness Leadership Committee, Broward Training Collaborative Committee, Positive Behavior Supports Leadership Team, Technical Assistance and Training System (TATS) Regional Steering Committee.

**Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:** ELC will review its monthly sign-in sheets for attendance at system coordination team meetings along with meeting agendas and any other attendance documentation.

**ELC review comments:** Reviewed contract obligation log and system coordination team meeting attendance records. The ELC 3 Service Provider attended all monthly system coordinator team meetings and/or had a representative in attendance; eleven (11) meetings (100%) were attended by SBBC-ELC 3 staff.

<p><b>20. The Contractor’s forecasts, trend analyses, and budget management shall result in fiscal year budgets that are balanced, with no deficit spending and with no significant surplus of funds that have been contracted for services.</b></p>	<p><b>ELC Review</b></p>	<p><b>Action needed?</b></p>
	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Met      <input type="checkbox"/>Not Met</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Yes   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes see row below for details.</i></p>

**Service provider annual review:** Comment if needed.

**Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review:** ELC fiscal department will review budgets for deficit spending and significant surplus of funds.

**ELC review comments:** Reviewed contract budget and amendments in comparison to the actual expenditures for fiscal year 2009-2010. Budget Management Objectives were met within a reasonable range of 10%.