

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

Monitoring Report
Contract: FCI-CSA-10-ELC5 Child Screening and Assessment
Family Central, Inc.

Monitors for Early Learning Coalition (ELC)

Lisa Feeney, Senior Early Care and Education Program Specialist, ELC
Andrea Braynon, Chief Financial Officer
Sandra Martinez, Accounting and HR Manager

Family Central, Inc. (FCI) Representatives

Maria Hernandez, Family Support Services Director
Jill Gelman, Developmental Screening Manager
Ainsworth Geddes, Chief Financial Officer

The monitoring process reflected in this report began on June 28, 2010, the last month of the third year of implementing the revised Early Learning Coalition of Broward County's Early Care and Education System, and was completed on December 10, 2010. The Coalition monitors completed a comprehensive monitoring review, which included an administrative review of the agency's policies and procedures, a fiscal review of the accounting records and supporting documentation, and a review of the programmatic services review as reflected in the performance objectives of the **Child Developmental Screening and Assessment** services in contract FCI-CSA-10-ELC5. **This report includes monitoring results of this contract.**

In addition to examining documentation related to performance objectives, the Coalition monitor interviewed the Developmental Screening Manager, and observed three (3) phone calls to assess service delivery from the customer's point of view.

Prior to the monitoring visits, the Coalition staff identified 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 files representing children receiving financial assistance from school readiness funds and the 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 selected providers, with seven (7) of the early care and education providers serving school-age children also served children birth to school-age children; these children and their corresponding providers were tracked through the Coalition’s early care and education system; **131 children between the ages of birth and school-age and the 91 early care and education providers these children attended were tracked through the Child Screening and Assessment component of the Coalition’s early care and education system and were chosen for review in this monitoring. Additionally, ten (10) clients who were listed on the unified waiting list, whose parents consented to screening and who received a developmental screening, were also selected for review in this monitoring.**

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:
 - “3. 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.”

Corrective Action:

In order to ensure that this objective is met for 2010 – 2011 contract year, the ELC 5 Service Provider shall submit to Coalition staff by January 17, 2011, protocol that directs ELC 5 staff when issuing a statement, press release, request for proposal, bid solicitation, and other documents describing projects or programs funded in whole or in part under this contract, to 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 as indicated in Exhibit A of the contract.

Examples of such statements are as follows:

- “Sponsorship by Early Learning Coalition of _____ and State of Florida, Agency for Workforce Innovation. \$ amount (___%) Federal Funds, \$ amount (___%) State Funds, [if necessary: \$ amount (___%) local funds.”
- "The *Service Provider* announces a special quality initiative for providers to receive books. Ninety percent of this initiative is

funded through CCDF federal dollars in the amount of \$_____ and ten percent of this initiative is funded through *something else* in the amount of \$_____."

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

Programmatic Review Summary:

This contract focuses on child developmental screening (both cognitive and social-emotional) and child assessment services provided by the ELC 5 Service Provider for the young children of families receiving financial assistance from school readiness funds and the legally operating early care and education programs the children attend. *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 # FCI-CSA-10-ELC5** has (35) performance specification outcomes, two (2) program deliverables (clients to be served) and one (1) contract responsibility.
- **97%** of the performance outcomes (34) were achieved with three (3) performance outcomes substantially met due to parents' decisions to not meet with the Service Provider, not bring the child to school consistently, and/or not follow through on appointments with Community assessment organizations and (3%) required adjustments to strengthen customer service; **100%** of the program deliverables (clients to be served) were met; and **100%** of the contract responsibilities were met.
- **92%** of clients (9,042) eligible for a developmental screen gave consent and **71%** who were eligible for screening received a screen (6,202).
- **92%** of the 6,202 children (birth through school-age) enrolled in early care and education programs and receiving financial assistance for school readiness services or listed on the Unified Waiting List were screened for developmental delays and determined to be typically developing children.

- 8% of the 6,202 children (birth through school-age) were identified with possible developmental delays, 53% of these children’s parents gave consent (268) for further screening; 90% of these parents (241) made their referral appointments and 61% of these parents were linked to early intervention services. [148 children]
- 192 children (72%), birth to school age, received pre and post child assessments to determine their growth toward school readiness during a school year; 73 children (27%) were not available to participate in post assessments due to transfer or exit from the program.
- 88% of the teachers, who completed surveys after attending developmental screening training sessions reported two or more ways they could use the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work with young children.
- 97% of School Readiness providers with children in the Assessment program reported two (2) ways in which they modified their program based on assessment results to benefit the children in their care.
- 98% of Providers receiving *Child Screening and Assessment* (ELC 5) services reported overall satisfaction with the service, including cultural competency/sensitivity, customer-friendliness, usefulness of service provided, efficiency of service, and convenience of access to service.
- In order to improve the delivery of Child Screening and Assessment in the 2010 – 2011 contract year, the Coalition is requiring the ELC 5 Service Provider (FCI) to:
 - Work collaboratively with community partners through the Baby SNAC committee of Broward’s Strategic Plan to address the percentage of clients who are referred for a level III screening, but do not make their appointments, in order to look at this phenomenon system wide and develop processes and procedures that will increase linkages to intervention services.

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

Contract Annual Review

Contract: FCI-CSA-10-ELC5 Child Screening and Assessment

A. FEDERAL LAW REQUIREMENTS	ELC REVIEW
1. Does the Agency have a written Drug-Free Workplace Policy? Policy revised June 30, 2008 on “SOP and Policy” compact disk and in Employee Handbook revised 03/2009.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<p>2. Are Equal Employment Opportunity, Worker’s Compensation, Family Leave Act, and other mandated or relevant posters conspicuously displayed by the agency? Five-in-one posters are posted on the fourth floor outside the Human Resource Department, including laws regarding FMLA, EEOC, Minimum Wage, Child Labor, and Polygraph. Additional information regarding Worker’s Compensation, Unemployment Opportunities, Florida Discrimination, and USERRA are posted on the 4th Floor outside the Human Resource Department. The five-in-one poster is also in the lunch room on the first floor.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>3. Does the Agency have a written Non- Discrimination and Harassment Free Workplace Policy? Equal Opportunity Policy revised July 30, 2008; Appropriate Conduct Policy, Policy Against Harassment and Complaint Procedure revised March 10, 2004 on “SOP and Policy” compact disk and in Employee Handbook revised 03/2009.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p><u>ELC review comments:</u> Agency Federal Law Requirements were reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</p>	
<p>B. CORPORATE DOCUMENTS</p>	<p>ELC REVIEW</p>
<p>1. Does the Agency have an Accounting Policy and Procedures Manual? Policies and SOP compact disk, finance subfolder includes finance policies and procedures.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>2. Are the Agency’s By-laws available for review? Amended & Restated Bylaws reviewed; effective January 1, 2010.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>3. Are the Agency’s Articles of Incorporation available for review? Articles of Incorporation reviewed; dated June, 1997.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>4. Is there an Organizational Chart available that reflects the current organization of the Agency and provides clearly delineated chain-of-command? Organizational Chart, revised January 2010.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>5. Is there an audit on File? Audit by Daszkal Bolton LLP dated June 30, 2009 and 2008.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p><u>ELC review comments:</u> Agency Corporate Documents were reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</p>	
<p>C. SPONSORSHIP/PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS</p>	<p>ELC REVIEW</p>
<p>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 contracts?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>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”?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>

<p>4. When using statements, press releases (ALERT is a press release) , 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</p> <p>(1) the percentage of the total cost of the program or project which will be financed with federal money, and</p> <p>(2) the dollar amount of federal funds for the project or program.</p> <p>Does the Contractor comply?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>ELC review comments: Interviewed Community Affairs Coordinator for clarification of sponsorship requirements outlined in contacts, ELC 1, 2, 3, and 5. Reviewed Agency publications and did not find statement of (1) the percentage of the total cost of the program or project which will be financed with federal money, or (2) the dollar amount of federal funds for the project or program on any agency-wide or contract written materials.</p>	
<p><i>Corrective Action:</i> <i>In order to ensure that this objective is met for 2010 – 2011 contract year, the ELC 5 Service Provider shall submit to Coalition staff by January 17, 2011, protocol that directs ELC 5 staff when issuing a statement, press release, request for proposal, bid solicitation, and other documents describing projects or programs funded in whole or in part under this contract, to 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 as indicated in Exhibit A of the contract.</i></p>	
<p>Service Provider plan to meet compliance (HOW) Explain: <i>Please see attached protocol that directs all staff funded by ELC to 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 as indicated in Exhibit A of the contract.</i></p>	
<p>D. STAFFING</p>	<p>ELC REVIEW</p>
<p>1. Did the Contractor maintain sufficient and qualified staff to deliver the agreed upon services required by the Contract and specifically set forth in Exhibit B?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>2. Do names of personnel match positions listed in the budget?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>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? Of 4 files reviewed, 3 employees spoke English; 1 spoke Spanish</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>4. Did the Contractor provide and/or ensure continuous quality improvement training to 100% of its staff? “Performance and Quality Improvement (PQI)” file on “SOP and Policy” compact disk includes all agency continuous quality improvement policies including the requirement for training for all staff. All 4 staff files included documentation of PQI training.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>

<p>5. Has the Contractor or its agent notified WorkForce One of all entry level employment opportunities associated with this Contract which requires a high school education or less? The Contractor or its agent employs a person who was referred by the Work Force One office, the Contractor shall notify the Coalition. Interview with Human Resource Director, stated all entry level positions requiring a high school diploma or less are posted with Workforce One. No one from Workforce One was hired this year.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed Exhibit B, form B; Staffing support was reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</p>	
<p>E. BACKGROUND SCREENING</p>	<p>ELC REVIEW</p>
<p>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? Reviewed “Pre-Employment screening Procedures,” revised May 2009, Human Resources Protocol.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>ELC review comments: Of the 4 personnel files reviewed, employees spend, as part of their duties and responsibilities, forty hours or more per month in early care and education programs. Background screenings (submitted in accordance with Section 435.01(1) Florida Statutes) were found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</p>	
<p>F. KEY PERSONNEL/PERSONNEL POLICIES</p>	<p>ELC REVIEW</p>
<p>1. Does the Agency have written Personnel Policies? Reviewed FCI Employee Handbook, revised March 2009 and the SOP and Policy compact disk including all agency Personnel Policies.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>2. Where are personnel folders located? Human Resources Department, 4th Floor</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>3. Select a random number of personnel files and verify that each file contains the following:</p>	
<p>a. Job descriptions</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>b. Qualification documentation</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>c. Evaluations</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>d. Security Agreement including: Non-Disclosure, data security and confidentiality agreement</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>4. Number of randomly selected personnel files: Four (4) personnel files were randomly selected for review</p>	
<p>5. Number of said files containing above mentioned criteria: Four (4) files were reviewed and contained the above mentioned criteria.</p>	
<p>6. Where are the employee records located? Human Resources Department, 4th Floor</p>	
<p>7. Are employee records securely stored? In a locked room within the Human Resources suite on the 4th floor.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

ELC review comments: Agency Personnel Policies and four (4) personnel files were reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.

G. INSURANCE		ELC REVIEW
1. Review the Agency's ACORD Form to determine which policies are in place. <u>ACORD 25 06/22/10</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Where are the Agency Insurance Policies located? Agency Policies located: Administrative Office on Fourth Floor.		
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. <u>On file at ELC</u>		<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. Each accident \$500,000; each employee \$500,000; policy limit \$500,000	Expiration Date: <u>7/1/11</u>	Amount: <u>\$500,000</u>
5. Unemployment Compensation Insurance: reporting and contributions up-to-date payments		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. General Liability: The CONTRACTOR shall maintain adequate liability insurance coverage on a comprehensive basis and hold such liability insurance at all times during the existence of this Contract and any renewal(s) and extension(s) of it. By execution of this Contract, unless it is a state agency or subdivision as defined by subsection 768.28(2), Florida Statutes, and as may be amended from time to time, the CONTRACTOR will provide its self-insurance letter to the COALITION prior to the execution of the Agreement. A self-insurance program established and operating under the laws of the State of Florida may provide such coverage.	Expiration Date: <u>7/1/11</u>	Amount: <u>\$3,000,000</u> <u>general</u> <u>aggregate</u>
7. Professional Liability:	Expiration Date: <u>7/1/11</u>	Amount: <u>\$1,000,000</u>
8. Property:	Expiration Date: <u>7/1/11</u>	Amount: <u>\$10,359,600</u>
9. Automobile Liability:	Expiration Date: <u>7/1/11</u>	Amount: <u>\$1,000,000</u>
<u>ELC review comments:</u> Agency Insurance documents were reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.		

H. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION AND SECURITY OBLIGATIONS	ELC REVIEW
1. Does the Agency have policies to safeguard client confidentiality? Reviewed “Confidentiality Policy”, revised July 29, 2008 on SOP and Policies compact disk, Human Resource subfolder.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Does the Agency have protocols to protect computer based documents and records? Reviewed “Security of Information” policy dated May 8, 2009 on SOP and Policies compact disk in Information Systems subfolder.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Do only the appropriate staff members have access to computerized records? Reviewed “Use of Communication Systems and Company Equipment” policy revised September 1, 2008 on SOP and Policies compact disk in Information Systems subfolder.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Does the Agency have a system for the maintenance of files? Reviewed “Information Management and Use” policy dated May 28, 2009 on SOP and Policies compact disk in Information Systems subfolder.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u> Agency Confidential Information and Security Obligations documents were reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.	
I. INCIDENT REPORTING	ELC REVIEW
1. Are Child Abuse Reports made to the authorities? “Abuse and Neglect Reporting” policy dated May 16, 2000 on SOP and Policies compact disk, Human Resource subfolder and on Pg 39 in Employee Handbook.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Is knowledge of any abuse or alleged abuse or any serious injury or death by a child while in care reported to the Coalition?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u> “Abuse and Neglect Reporting” policy dated May 16, 2000 on SOP and Policies compact disk, Human Resource subfolder and on Pg 39 in Employee Handbook was revised August, 2010 to include the statement: “knowledge of serious injury or death by a child while in care is reported to the Early Learning Coalition”; the revised policy is found to be in order and to meet required specifications.	
<i>No Action at this time: The ELC 5 Service Provider has already made appropriate adjustments during the Coalition’s monitoring review; the “Abuse and Neglect Reporting” policy was updated and evidence was provided to the Coalition.</i>	
<u>Service Provider response (if desired):</u>	

Fiscal Performance Specification Annual Review and Assessment Instrument 2009-2010

Contract: FCI-CSA-10-ELC5 Child Screening and Assessment

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
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	
B. EFFECTIVE USE OF FUNDS	ELC REVIEW
1. Does the Chart of Accounts support proper allocation by having revenue and expense categories properly identified by program?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Does the Chart of Accounts have an unallowable cost code to properly identify unallowable costs?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	
C. INVOICING	ELC REVIEW
1. Are invoices submitted on a timely basis?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Are payments made to subcontractors within seven (7) working days after receipt of full or partial payments from the Coalition?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Does the Agency maintain an Agency-wide budget by funding source and expenditure category?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Does the Agency have an accounting system to properly account for ELC related transactions (revenues and expenses)? Microsoft Great Plains Accounting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
b. Do the attendance records and other required documentation flow through to the invoice correctly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
c. Is the invoice approved by authorized staff/management?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

d. Does the invoice reflect third party payments?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
f. Are procedures established and implemented to eliminate duplicate billing?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. Number of invoices randomly selected: Ten (10) SR transactions were sampled for the months of October 2009 and April 2010	
7. Number of invoices meeting the above criteria: The ten (10) met the criteria.	
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	
D. INDIRECT COSTS	ELC REVIEW
1. Review and document the Agency's Cost Allocation Methodology. The Cost Allocation Plan was received	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Is the cost allocation methodology in writing and is it representative of the allocation used? The plan is being utilized as presented.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	
E. BANK	ELC REVIEW
1. Are bank statements reconciled monthly? Bank statements are reconciled monthly	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Are the bank statements reconciled by a person other than the person who receipts and disburses funds?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Does the immediate supervisor review the reconciliation? Yes, the statements are prepared by the Accounting Manager and approved the CFO, demonstrating an appropriate separation of duties.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Are adjustments properly documented and explained? Adjustments were not included in the monthly statements selected.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Does the subrecipient receive advances?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. If they received advances, are the funds in an interest bearing account? The funds were in an interest bearing account before February 2009 however because of the uninsured fund balances, the account was changed to a non-interest bearing account for 100% FDIC coverage.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
7. Select 3 random months and verify above transactions: Three months were selected and reviewed.	
8. What three months were randomly selected? The month of August 2009, November 2009 and March 2010	
9. Number of months meeting above transactions: The three months met the above criteria except the funds were transferred into a non-interest bearing account for the 100% FDIC insured coverage February 2009.	
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	

F. DELIVERABLES - REPORTS		ELC REVIEW
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? Actual-to-Date expenditures are reviewed monthly	<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? Reports are submitted in listing the detailed line item information.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
3. Did the report contain a detailed explanation of variances from the approved budget? Yes, variances are reviewed in detail on a monthly basis.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
<u>ELC review comments:</u>		
G. ASSIGNMENTS AND SUBCONTRACTS		ELC REVIEW
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? Some funding sources do not allow the use of sub-contracts to deliver direct services.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
2. Does the subcontractor have a contract?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
3. Are the payments to the subcontractors in line with the contract?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
4. Does the contract specify a match budget for the subcontractor?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
<u>ELC review comments:</u>		
H. STAFFING		ELC REVIEW
1. Does staff, including management, document their work hours through a time sheet or punch clock? Agency policies require non-exempt utilize a time punch clock and exempt utilize a time sheet.	<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	
<u>ELC review comments:</u>		
I. PAYROLL RECORDS		ELC REVIEW
1. Does staff, including management, document their work hours through a time sheet or punch clock? Agency policies require non-exempt utilize a time punch clock and exempt utilize a time sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

2. Are time records signed by both the employee and the supervisor? The randomly sampled identified payroll records were both signed by the employee and supervisor.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
e. Payroll period: October 2, 2009 and April 2, 2010 were the selected pay periods.	<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: There were two (2) selections reviewed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Number of said journals that included the above criteria:	<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? The actual expenditures charged to the program did match the budget within reasonable variance.	<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? The recorded times worked by the selected employees did match the times paid.	<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? Fiscal operations described in the Internal Working Papers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	
J. NONEXPENDABLE PROPERTY	
ELC REVIEW	
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

included capital expenditures.	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	
K. PERFORMANCE BOND	ELC REVIEW
1. Has the Performance Bond in the amount of \$450,000 or an Irrevocable Standby letter of credit been submitted to the Coalition?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	

Program Performance Specification Annual Review Instrument 2009-2010

Contract: FCI-CSA-10-ELC5 Child Screening and Assessment

A. MAJOR PROGRAM GOALS
<p>ELC 5 2009-2010 Child Screening and Assessment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To encourage and provide access to early screening of children for developmental issues by coordinating, supporting, and/or delivering Developmental Screenings for children served by School Readiness child care providers, served by School Readiness funded family support programs, or on the waiting list for School Readiness services, age birth to school-age, by way of a brief process or instrument which is designed to examine a child's development in order to identify whether a child needs formal evaluation to determine if the child's health, development or behavior is below the typical range of development for the child's age. 2. To provide information on the progress of children receiving financial assistance for School Readiness services, age birth to school-age, by coordinating and ensuring the implementation and delivery of Child Assessments designed to examine a child's development in greater depth than a development screening, by way of a pretest and annual posttest.

3. To provide training and support to providers on how to conduct ongoing assessment, record assessment results of a child's age-appropriate progress according to developmental norms; use the assessment tool as a measure of child on-going progress and modify the curriculum based on assessment results.
4. To enable early care and education providers and parents/guardians to use Developmental Screening and Child Assessment information to tailor and enhance a child's development and learning by providing analysis and assistance to them concerning the findings.
5. To encourage and provide access to early intervention for developmental issues by actively facilitating and tracking linkage to formal evaluations for children whose development or behavior is suspected to be below the typical range of development for the child's age based on Developmental Screening and/or Child Assessment information.
6. To facilitate community and services planning by providing aggregate data on Developmental Screening and Child Assessment results, and an analysis of same, to the Early Learning Coalition of Broward County, Inc. and other Early Care and Education System partners.

Service Provider Directions:

Please fill in shaded sections using “track changes” tool.

Do not write in any other area.

B. SERVICE PROVIDER BRIEF SUMMARY OF ELC 5 SERVICES

1. Developmental Screening:

The target population for developmental screenings is children, ages birth to school age (not yet enrolled in kindergarten), who are receiving school readiness financial assistance, or waiting for school readiness financial assistance who have not been screened elsewhere and whose parent provides consent for the screening to occur.

Screenings are offered annually to children receiving school readiness financial assistance based on their initial enrollment date and then annually based on their date of birth with the performance objective to screen within 45 days of their offer date.

Assessment Specialists (AS) directly administer developmental screening tools to designated children. The developmental screening continuum is categorized into three Levels, I – III. Levels I and II's purpose are to take a “snapshot” of the child's developmental skills and abilities and ascertain if developmental concerns are present. Qualifying children, whose parent/guardian consents, will receive a Level I screening. A Level II screening is completed at the discretion of the AS if the child's environment, disposition, or other factor on the day of the Level I screening may have impacted the outcome, prior to offering Level III services. Teacher and/or parent/guardian feedback is obtained to gather information on a child during the screenings. A Level III service is a full assessment and evaluation completed by a third party assessment agency (Child Find/FDLRS or other assessment agent) for those children whose results indicate a need for a more in depth evaluation. ELC5 would assist the families in making the referral for Level III services for the child where the parent provides consent for further evaluation.

The Brigance Developmental Screening tool is utilized to screen children in Broward County, birth to 5 that are not yet school age for cognitive development. There are four screening booklets and seven screening data forms used based on the age of the child being screened. The Temperament and Atypical Behavioral Scale (TABs) is used for the social-emotional component of the developmental screening with the exception for the 0-23 month's age group as social-emotional is included in the Brigance developmental screening tool.

The following chart illustrates which data sheets (by age) are used with each screening booklet:

<i>Brigance Infant and Toddler Screen</i>	<i>Infant assessments (birth-11 months) data sheet Toddler Assessments (12-23 months) data sheet</i>
<i>Brigance Early Preschool Screen II</i>	<i>2-year-old assessments data sheet 2 ½ -year-old assessments data sheet</i>
<i>Brigance Preschool Screen</i>	<i>3-year-old assessments data sheet 4-year-old assessments data sheet</i>
<i>K & 1 Screen</i>	<i>Grade K assessments (5-year-old data sheet)</i>

The Brigance system includes a grid for the Cutoff scores for Detecting Children Likely to Have Developmental Disabilities or Academic Delay by age. For example a child 3.3 years to 3.5 years of age needs a score <55 on the screening tool where a child 3.6 years to 3.8 years would need a score <71 on the same screening tool to meet the cut off score. If a child falls below the cut off score, it does not necessary indicate a need for further evaluation. Because we serve a population that meets the criteria for at risk, it is not uncommon that an increased number of children will not meet the cutoff score recommended for their age when using the Brigance screening tools. Brigance has established specific guidelines for at risk children in determining which children falling below the cutoff score should be referred and which children should be offered activities to assist in their academic achievement. In cases where the child falls below the cut off score where a referral is not warranted, the AS will leave various activity sheets based on the child's performance and skill areas during the developmental screening for both the parent and the teacher.

Children who receive school readiness financial assistance in Broward but select a Provider site in either Palm Beach or Dade copy can be screened utilizing the Ages and Stages Questionnaires for both cognitive and social emotional development as their Level I screen. The AS follows up with the Provider sites to complete the tools which would then be mailed back to the AS for scoring and tracking. If a child falls below expected levels or the Ages and Stages questionnaires are not returned to ELC5, the AS will then conduct a level II screening utilizing the Brigance Developmental screening tool.

All parents receive a copy of their child's developmental screening and are offered the opportunity to contact the AS to review the screening

results, regardless of the child's screening outcome.

2. Child Assessments:

The target population for Child Assessments is 265 children selected randomly from children 0-5 (not yet school age) receiving financially assisted child care and enrolled in one of the 21 Provider sites that are participating in Child Assessments. The breakdown of children by age to receive a child assessment is:

AGE RANGE	NUMBER OF CHILDREN TO RECEIVE A CHILD ASSESSMENT
Birth-11 months	13
12-23 months	40
24-35 months	54
36-47 months	56
48-59 months	60
60-72 months	42
TOTAL	265

The Provider sites participating in child assessments are the same Providers that participated in FY 08/09, with the exception of two new Providers. The ELC provides ELC5 the names of the non-school age children at each of the selected provider sites and ELC 5 then randomly selects the children to be offered our child assessment service, ensuring the sample will be representative in numbers for each age category. In order to ensure enough time to obtain all required consent forms and complete the pre-assessments for the 265 children, three established offer dates are being used (the first offer date coincides with the first day of Broward County Public School (August 24, 2009); the second offer date is 30 days from that date (September 24, 2009); and the third offer date is 30 days from the second offer date (October 24, 2009). The AS is to complete the pre-test portion of the assessment within 45 days from the child's pre determined offer date for whom consent has been received, and complete a post test six months from the pre-test date.

The goal for child assessment is to link assessment to classroom curriculum. The Brigance Inventory of Early Development II (IED-II) criterion-referenced assessment booklet is used to assess all children. Each child receives their own record book to document their pre, on-going and post test information. The record book contains various domains and areas of development in which to assess children from birth to school age. Each child is assessed on only those items in the record book that is appropriate for the child, beginning with his/her chronological age. The Assessment Curriculum Coordinator (ACC) standardized which sections of the IED II booklet should be assessed for each age category as a guide for the AS.

To clarify, children are only being compared to themselves to determine growth and development over time. Children are not being compared to other children in their classroom or age bracket. Therefore, no raw data or score is given for a child. The process for criterion-

referenced Brigance Assessment is that the specific items that the child is capable of completing during the assessment are circled. When a specific item is not able to be completed, it is underlined and becomes the starting point for that section during the on-going assessment process. The post-test will indicate the child's gains from the time of the pre-test.

For the 09/10 Fiscal year, all pre-tests and post-test were completed by the AS. The on-going portion of the child assessments were completed by the teachers with technical support and mentoring by the ACC.

The Brigance system includes the Brigance Prescriptive Readiness: Strategies and Practice which provides developmentally appropriate activities and techniques for the teacher (and parent) to use to enhance classroom curriculum. The Brigance Prescriptive Readiness: Strategies and Practice guide is directly correlated to the IED-II thus indicating which activities are selected or recommended based on the child's assessment outcome. Based on information collected during the child assessment, strategies and activities are established as goals for the teacher to implement in the classroom curriculum. The teachers will prepare strategies for use in their classroom based on both the pre-test completed by ELC 5 and their own on-going child assessment. In both situations, strategies are provided to the parent. This allows the parents to work with the child and work cohesively with the teacher.

3. Screening and Assessment Training Services:

ELC 5 offers Developmental Screening and Child Assessment training on a quarterly basis to all school readiness providers serving children birth to school age. Training dates are posted on Family Central's website, sent via group email, and are included in quarterly mailings to Providers. Defining the terms to understand the difference between developmental screening and child assessment, the benefits and expectations of child observation, an overview of the ELC5 model, and the use of and tips in sharing of results are topics covered during trainings. The trainings are taught in English and Spanish, and are held at varying times and days, including Saturdays. Training can also occur at a Provider site based on Provider request.

Teachers of children participating in the child assessment services project receive training and mentoring by the ACC to ensure they are knowledgeable in conducting on-going child assessments and in selecting and applying strategies and goals based on the children results. Teachers are offered a child assessment orientation, introducing them to child assessments and utilizing the Brigance assessment tool; and training on the process of conducting interim assessments. Small group and one on one mentoring also occur in the classrooms to provide additional support as needed to the teachers. The ACC will track the teacher's progress and participation in the program.

4. Collaboration & Coordination of ELC 5 Services:

Coordinating and collaborating with outside systems of support as well as within our own agency is ongoing for ELC 5. During the 09/10 FY, the following took place:

- Manager and/or Director attended the quarterly QRIS meetings;*
- Manager and/or Director attended the quarterly SREL meetings;*
- Manager and/or Director attended the Early Learning Coalition System gatherings;*

- *Manager for ELC 5 attended the Maternal and Child Health committee meetings*
- *Manager for ELC 5 attended the Healthy Families Advisory Committee meetings;*
- *Director participated in the Healthy Start Black Infant Health Practice initiative Committee, and the Community Action Group Committee;*
- *Director participates in the Healthy Start Board of Directors meeting as a board member;*
- *Director participated in the Broward County Child Abuse and Neglect committee meeting*
- *Manager communicated at least monthly with FDLR/ChildFind regarding scheduling of appointments and linkages to services;*
- *ELC 5 referred and communicated as needed with ELC 3 regarding Inclusion services;*
- *Manager communicated monthly with R&R for reporting numbers on children placed on the waiting list;*
- *ELC 5 worked closely with ELC 2 for reconciliation efforts to obtain consents for children offered screening services;*
- *Manager trained all new EDE staff on Developmental Screening and Child Assessment services and how to complete the Terms and Conditions form;*
- *Manager and Director joined and participated in both the Statewide Developmental Screening and Child Assessment workgroup calls;*
- *Manager participated in the “Best Practice” workgroup call for Contracted Services;*
- *Manager and VP attended the CSC Family Support Provider meeting;*
- *Manager attend the “Results Based Training”;*
- *Manager attend the “Get Motivated” seminar;*
- *Manager and Director participated in a two day “Leadership Training”;*
- *ELC 5 staff participated in the “Big 3” training- substance abuse/domestic violence/mental health;*
- *Director and VP participated in the Bay SNAC committee meetings.*
- *ELC 5 staff participated in “Team Building Training”;*
- *ELC 5 staff participated in “Motivation Interviewing Training”;*
- *ELC 5 staff member attended the “Sensory Play for Everyday” conference;*
- *ELC 5 staff attended a two day training on “Child Abuse and Neglect”;*
- *ELC 5 staff participated in a “Starting the New Year Motivated” training”;*
- *ELC 5 staff participated in the Conscious Discipline “Becoming Brain Smart” training;*
- *ELC 5 staffed were informed on the services offered by the Family Central Resource Library*
- *Staff received training on “Infant Mental Health- A Play Therapy Perspective”;*
- *Assessment Curriculum attended training on “Evaluating and Treating Children with Challenging Behaviors”.*
- *Speech/Language Pathologist Bonnie Beck, MS,CCC presented information regarding language expectations and speech delay concerns to ELC5 staff;*

- ELC 5 staff member attended the “Language and Learning” conference;
- ELC 5 staff member attended a training on “Child Abuse and Child Safety”;
- ELC 5 staff member and Director attended the NAEYC conference;
- Manager attended the “One Summer Goal” conference;
- ELC 5 staff participated in the annual Family Support Services retreat;
- ELC 5 staff member attended the “Is My Child Meeting His/Her Developmental Milestones” training’
- ELC 5 Manager attended the Healthy Start/ Infant Mental Health Conference.

C. CLIENTS TO BE SERVED

General Description	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served				ELC Review Results validated?	As verified by																																																														
<p>(1) The target number of children enrolled in early care and education programs and receiving financial assistance for school readiness services or listed on the Unified Waiting List to receive a Level I developmental screen on an annual basis and Level II developmental screen as appropriate is a minimum of 5,700 children.</p>	<p>Total Number Receiving a Developmental Screen: <u>6,202 (49 received a second Level II screen)</u> Level I = <u>revised 6,160</u> Level II = <u>revised 49</u> Waitlist = <u>42</u> Percent Achieved: <u>109%</u></p>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<p>DAISY Served Report (13th month) Level I = 6,160 Level II = 49 Waitlist = 42</p>																																																														
<p>(2) The target number of children enrolled in early care and education programs and receiving financial assistance for school readiness services to be involved in the Child Assessment process is 265 children. All children shall receive a pre-test during the term of this Contract. A post-test shall be administered to the children who maintain enrollment at the time of post testing (at least six months from the date of pre-test).</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>NUMBER IN EACH AGE RANGE</th> <th>GOAL</th> <th>ACTUAL # PRE-</th> <th>ACTUAL # POST-</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Birth-11 months</td> <td>13</td> <td>18</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12-23 months</td> <td>40</td> <td>42</td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>24-35 months</td> <td>54</td> <td>55</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>36-47 months</td> <td>55</td> <td>56</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>48-59 months</td> <td>60</td> <td>62</td> <td>51</td> </tr> <tr> <td>60-72 months</td> <td>42</td> <td>34*</td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>264</td> <td>267</td> <td>192</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	NUMBER IN EACH AGE RANGE	GOAL	ACTUAL # PRE-	ACTUAL # POST-	Birth-11 months	13	18	9	12-23 months	40	42	25	24-35 months	54	55	40	36-47 months	55	56	40	48-59 months	60	62	51	60-72 months	42	34*	27	TOTAL	264	267	192	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>NUMBER IN EACH AGE RANGE</th> <th>GOAL</th> <th>ACTUAL # PRE-</th> <th>ACTUAL # POST-</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Birth-11 months</td> <td>13</td> <td>18</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12-23 months</td> <td>40</td> <td>42</td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>24-35 months</td> <td>54</td> <td>55</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>36-47 months</td> <td>55</td> <td>56</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>48-59 months</td> <td>60</td> <td>62</td> <td>51</td> </tr> <tr> <td>60-72 months</td> <td>42</td> <td>34*</td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>264</td> <td>267</td> <td>192</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	NUMBER IN EACH AGE RANGE	GOAL	ACTUAL # PRE-	ACTUAL # POST-	Birth-11 months	13	18	9	12-23 months	40	42	25	24-35 months	54	55	40	36-47 months	55	56	40	48-59 months	60	62	51	60-72 months	42	34*	27	TOTAL	264	267	192	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<p>Key indicator and quarterly reports.</p>
NUMBER IN EACH AGE RANGE	GOAL	ACTUAL # PRE-	ACTUAL # POST-																																																																	
Birth-11 months	13	18	9																																																																	
12-23 months	40	42	25																																																																	
24-35 months	54	55	40																																																																	
36-47 months	55	56	40																																																																	
48-59 months	60	62	51																																																																	
60-72 months	42	34*	27																																																																	
TOTAL	264	267	192																																																																	
NUMBER IN EACH AGE RANGE	GOAL	ACTUAL # PRE-	ACTUAL # POST-																																																																	
Birth-11 months	13	18	9																																																																	
12-23 months	40	42	25																																																																	
24-35 months	54	55	40																																																																	
36-47 months	55	56	40																																																																	
48-59 months	60	62	51																																																																	
60-72 months	42	34*	27																																																																	
TOTAL	264	267	192																																																																	

Service Provider Annual review: **All children 60-72 months in the participating child assessment provider sites were offered child assessment services. All those eligible with consent did receive a pre-test. The goal number for this age range was unable to be met as the population of children in our sample was not large enough. We were able to reach the benchmark number by serving additional children in*

the other age groups.

ELC review comments: ELC staff had been advised by the Service Provider during the year that they were unable to obtain the sufficient number of consents from parents of children 60-72 months of age due to the small numbers of this age group in the participating centers. All four and five year old children (34) with parental consents participated in a pre-assessment; additional children were selected from other age groups to participate in the Assessment component of the program to meet the expected number of children (265) receiving school readiness funds; 267 children participated in the pre-assessment:

- 192 children (72%) participated in the post- assessment;
- 73 children (27%) were not available to participate in the post assessments due to transfers to a provider not participating in child assessments or termination from care; and
- 2 children (1%) were not available when attempts to complete the post test were conducted during FY 09-10.

D. PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS

CORE COMPONENT OBJECTIVES (OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS) – GENERAL

	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
1. 100% of parents with children, birth to school-age, enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care, Coalition identified family support programs, and/or listed on the Unified Waiting List shall be <u>offered</u> a developmental screen for their child(ren). Said offering shall include information for parents on the importance and advantages of developmental screening.	1.a. Number of eligible children enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care: <u>9,895</u> 1.b. Number of children listed on the Unified Waiting list whose parents requested a screening: <u>7,087</u> <u>children on the waiting list were offered a screening. Of these, 42 parents requested a screening.</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 126/126 N=126 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	1.c. Total number of eligible children offered a developmental screen: <u>16,982</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If yes see row below for details</i>
	1.d. Percent Achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

Service provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used to offer families a developmental screen and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. *When families contact Resource and Referral to complete an intake to determine eligibility to go on the waiting*

list, they are asked if they have any concerns regarding their child's development. Based on their response, they may be provided the number for ChildFind and information regarding developmental screenings provided at Family Central. In addition, developmental screening is part of the packet of information sent to all families on the waiting list. Report from R&R received monthly with list and number of waiting list children. When a family enrolls for their financially assisted childcare, a flyer describing the benefits for developmental screening is part of the enrollment packet along with the Terms and Conditions form which includes consent for the developmental screening. Signing the Terms and Conditions form is part of the enrollment process.

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) Copy of documentation/information given to parents on the importance and advantages of developmental screening; 2) Developmental Screening Offering Protocol; 3) Current *Terms and Conditions* Form in ELC randomly selected child files; 4) Consent form (WL children) in randomly selected client files; and 5) Interview ELC 5 staff.

ELC review comments: Reviewed “*Benefits of Screening and Assessment*” flyer included as part of all ELC 2 enrollment and re-determination packets. Reviewed ELC 5 “*Developmental Screening Offering Protocol*” which includes training of ELC 2 counselor training with a one page “*screening and assessment talking points*” which is given to counselors to provide information for parents on the importance and advantages of developmental screening; blank terms and conditions form revised June 2009 with consent and decline for both screening and assessment included; and consent form for waiting list families. Reviewed *Terms and Conditions* results for each client in the ELC 2 file review. Interviewed ELC 5 Manager.

Interview with ELC 5 Manager and item #3 in “*Developmental Screening; Consent Forms and Authorization for release of information, Distribution and Delivery*” protocol, revised 12/18/08, revealed all new ELC 2 Eligibility Counselors were trained on the importance and advantages of developmental screening and supplied with talking points at time of hire. ***All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.***

Reviewed 125 files for evidence of *Terms and Conditions* consent forms indicating that parents were offered a screening for their child.

- One hundred twenty-five (125) client files (100%) indicated that parents were offered a developmental screen for their child(ren):
 - 115 client files (92%) represented children birth to school-age whose families received financial assistance from school readiness funds (SR); and
 - Ten (10) client files (8%) represented children birth to school-age whose families are waiting for financial assistance for child care (WL).

2. 100% of the consent forms, either consenting to or declining screening services, shall be secured from the ELC 2 Service Provider and matched with the 5,700 children screened by ELC 5. (Coalition monitoring standard shall be 95%, but consent documentation must be corrected to 100%	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	2.a. Number of eligible children enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care: (1.a) <u>9,895</u> 2.b. Number of consent forms	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 125/125 N=125

if errors are discovered at monitoring.)	secured from ELC 2 service provider and matched to number above: <u>9,762</u> 2.c. Number consenting: <u>9,000</u> 2.d. Number declining: <u>762</u> 2.e. Number of eligible children receiving a developmental screen in 2009-2010: <u>6,202 (49 received a second screen)</u>		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes see row below for details</i>
	2. f. Percent Achieved: <u>99%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service provider annual review: Comment if needed. <i>ELC 5 met the monitoring standard for this outcome. Please note that ELC 5 reconciles consents data on a monthly basis. Data from Q1-Q3 was revised to reflect additional consent forms secured from ELC 2.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) ELC randomly selected child files for <i>Terms and Conditions</i> (SR children); and 2) DAISY data system list of children offered consent, the status of their consent, and new enrollee or birth date status information.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed monthly spreadsheets from ELC 5 data system (DAISY), for evidence that consent forms, either consenting to or declining screening services, were secured from the ELC 2 Service Provider and matched with the 6,202 children screened by the Service Provider. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
Reviewed 125 client files (115 SR clients and ten (10) WL clients) for evidence of <i>Terms and Conditions</i> consent forms indicating either consenting or declining screening services for each file: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 115 client files (92%) represented children birth to school-age whose families received financial assistance from school readiness funds (SR) contained <i>Terms and Conditions</i> consent forms indicating either consenting or declining screening services; and • Ten (10) client files (8%) represented children birth to school-age whose families are waiting for financial assistance for child care (WL) contained consent forms indicating consent for screening services. 			
3. 85% of parents with children, birth to school-age, enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care, and/or parents listed on the Unified Waiting List who request developmental screenings, who have not been screened elsewhere, shall provide <u>consent</u> to the developmental screening process for their children.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	3.a. Number of families offered a screening who were <i>not screened elsewhere</i> : <u>9,781 (114 from the total offered reported at time of consent that they were screened elsewhere)</u> 3.b. Number of Unified Waiting List	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	93% 115/123 N=123

	families who request a screening and were <i>not screened elsewhere</i> : <u>42</u> 3.c. Total: <u>9,823</u>		<i>If yes see row below for details</i>
	3.d. Number of (3.a.) who provided consent to the developmental screening process: <u>9,000</u> 3.e. Number of (3.b.) who provided consent to the developmental screening process: <u>42</u> 3.f. Total: <u>9,042</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	3.g. Percent Achieved: <u>92%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service provider annual review: Comment if needed. <i>Data for Q1-Q3 was revised for the annual report to reflect accurate data following reconciliation efforts to obtain consents for children.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) ELC randomly selected child files for <i>Terms and Conditions</i> (SR children); and 2) Consent form of ELC randomly selected children served from waiting list.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed monthly spreadsheets from ELC 5 data system (DAISY), of children offered consent, the status of their consent, and new enrollee or birth date status information, for evidence of parents who provided consent to the developmental screening process. Reviewed ELC 2 child files to verify receipt of consent for developmental screening identified in the signed <i>Terms and Conditions</i> form. All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.			
Reviewed 125 files (115 SR clients and ten (10) WL clients) for evidence of the <i>Terms and Conditions</i> form indicating that parents with children, birth to school-age, enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care, or parents listed on the Unified Waiting List who requested a developmental screening, who have been screened elsewhere, provided consent for the developmental screening process for their children: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 122 children (98%) were eligible for screenings (3 SR children were screened elsewhere); and 115 parents (94%), with children birth to school-age, enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care or listed on the Unified Waiting List, who had not received screening elsewhere, provided consent for the developmental screening process for their children. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One hundred five (105) SR parents (94%) provided consent; and • Seven (7) SR parents (6%) declined screening for their children; • Ten (10) WL clients (100%) consented to developmental screening. 			
4. 75% of children, birth to school-age, participating in Coalition financially assisted care	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?

<p>and/or listed/enrolled on the Unified Waiting List, whose parents provide consent to the developmental screening process, shall receive developmental screens according to the following system:</p> <p>a. All children newly enrolled during the contract period shall be screened within 45 calendar days of enrollment.</p> <p>b. All children continuing enrollment in school readiness programs shall be screened annually within 45 days of their birth date.</p>	4. a. Number of parents who consent: (should equal 3.f) <u>9,042</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>79%</p> <p>83/105</p> <p>N=105</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><i>If yes see row below for details</i></p>
	4.b. Number of children who receive DS: <u>6,202 Level I screens completed</u> (4.c + 4.f. + 4i)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>Level I - 6160</i>	
	4.c. Number of <u>newly enrolled</u> children screened: <u>2,475</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	4.d. Number of newly enrolled children screened <u>within 45 days of enrollment</u> : <u>1,364*</u> see note below	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	4.e. Percent (4c/4d) achieved: <u>55%</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
	4.f. Number of children <u>continuing enrollment</u> screened: <u>3,724</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	4.g. Number of children continuing enrollment <u>screened within 45 days of birth date</u> : <u>3,028</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	4.h. Percent (4e/4f) achieved: <u>81%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
	4.i. Number of children requesting screening from the Waiting List: <u>49</u>		
	4.j. Number of children from the Waiting List receiving screening <u>within 45 days</u> : <u>49</u>		
	4.k. Percent (4i/4j) achieved: <u>100%</u>		
	4.l. Total # children screened (4.b.) <u>6,202</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Substantially Met* <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
	4.m. Total # screened in 45 days (4.d.+4.g.+4j) <u>4,392</u>		

4.n. Percent achieved: 71%

Service provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used to identify eligible children for a developmental screen and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. *ELC 5 was able to enhance our data tracking system, (DAISY) beginning in Q3 data to track the number of new enrollee's in which an attempt to screen the child was made within the 45 day timeframe, but the child was not available on the day of our attempt. ELC 5 has documented attempts made for 463 new enrollee children to be screened within 45 days of their offer date for Q3-Q4. If these attempts would have been successful, the annual percentage for new enrollees would have increased to 74% bringing us just short to meeting this outcome. If data for Q1 and Q2 would have been included, the outcome would have exceeded 75%.*

There are an additional 1,189 children who were unable to be screened due to being terminated from care or were determined to be receiving services at time of screening. The parent did not indicate that the child was receiving services at time of enrollment so attempts to screen the child were made.

A monthly list is generated which identifies the children newly enrolled into care since the prior list, and for children's whose birthday falls within the 45 day time frame. A second list of only newly enrollees is pulled mid month to provide additional time for staff to reach the newly enrolled children. Children on the list with an identified consent form are identified as the eligible children for a developmental screen. Each list specifies whether or not a child is a new enrollee or an annual screen, and includes the 45 day due date for each child so the Specialist assigned can prioritize their provider visits to screen children. Children are assigned to an Assessment Specialist to conduct the Developmental Screening based on their chosen Provider site. Each Assessment Specialist carries a caseload of Provider sites and conducts the Developmental Screening based on eligible children attending sites assigned to them.

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) ELC randomly selected SR child files for enrollment date and developmental screening date; 2) ELC randomly selected WL children files; and 3) DAISY data system list of children offered consent, the status of their consent, new enrollee or birth date status information, and date developmental screen was conducted.

ELC review comments: Reviewed monthly spreadsheets extracted from ELC 5 data base (DAISY), of children offered consent, the status of their consent, and new enrollee or birth date status information, for evidence of receipt of a developmental screen according to the following system: (a) All children newly enrolled during the contract period shall be screened within 45 calendar days of enrollment. (b) All children continuing enrollment in school readiness programs shall be screened annually within 45 days of their birth date. ***All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.***

Reviewed 115 client files (105 SR clients and ten (10) WL clients), where parents **had given consent** for the developmental screen process, for evidence of receipt of a developmental screen according to the following system: (a) All children newly enrolled during the contract period shall be screened within 45 calendar days of enrollment. (b) All children continuing enrollment in school readiness programs shall be screened annually within 45 days of their birth date.

- Of the 105 SR client files, 33 children (31%) were newly enrolled during the 2009-2010 contract year and 72 children (69%) were continuing enrollment in school readiness programs; all client files were reviewed for evidence of developmental screening results.
- Ninety-five (95) SR client files contained consents; seven (7) SR clients declined the screening; and three (3) clients were screened elsewhere.

A total of 105 files (95 SR and 10 WL) indicated that 84% of the children were eligible and available to be screened during the 45 day period either after enrollment or around their birth date and 70 files (67%) contained completed screens in 2009-2010; a first attempt to screen was made within 45 days for an additional thirteen (13) children (12%) for a **total of 79% of the children, birth to school-age, participating in Coalition financially assisted care and/or listed/enrolled on the Unified Waiting List, whose parents provided consent to the developmental screening process, either received a developmental screen or an attempt was made to conduct a developmental screen according to the Coalition’s approved system.**

- **Thirty-one (31) newly enrolled SR children were available for screening** during the 45 day period (**two (2) children had left** the program before 45 days:
 - 58% of the children were either screened (14 children) within 45 days of enrollment or attempted to be screened (4 children) within 45 days of enrollment; and
 - 42% of the children (13) were newly enrolled and did not receive a developmental screen within 45 days of enrollment.
- **Sixty-four (64) SR children continuing enrollment in school readiness programs were available for screening** within 45 days of their birth date:
 - 86% of the children were either screened (46 children) within 45 days of enrollment or attempted to be screened (9 children) within 45 days of enrollment; and
 - 14% of the children (9) did not receive a developmental screen within 45 days of their birth dates.
- **Ten (10) WL children (100%) were screened on the day consent was received.**

***This objective is determined to be Substantially Met at 71% since if children had been in attendance when the first attempts occurred, this objective would have been met.**

5. 100% of providers with children who reside in Broward County but use School Readiness financial assistance for child care outside of Broward County will be mailed the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Social Emotional (ASQ: SE) screening tools with directions for tool use and	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	5. a. Number of providers outside of Broward County with children who reside in Broward County but use School Readiness financial assistance for child care: <u>48 providers</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 1/1 N=1

<p>receive a follow up telephone call notifying of the mailing and offering assistance.</p> <p>100% of the children for which the ASQ indicates a need for further screening or the ASQ is not returned shall be administered the Brigance Screening tool by an FCI Assessment Specialist.</p>	<p>5. b. Number mailed the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Social Emotional (ASQ: SE) screening tools with directions for tool use: <u>69 children</u></p> <p>Number who received a follow up telephone call notifying of the mailing and offering assistance: <u>69 children</u></p>	<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>
	<p>5.c. Percent (5.b./5.a.) achieved: <u>100%</u></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
	<p>5.d. Number of children who reside in Broward County but use School Readiness financial assistance for child care outside of Broward County: <u>129*</u></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<p>5. e. Number of the children for which the ASQ indicated a need for further screening: <u>0</u></p> <p>5.f. Number who did not return ASQ: <u>10</u></p> <p>5.g. Number Brigance administered by an FCI assessment specialist as a result: <u>10</u></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<p>5.c. Percent (5.e+5.f./5g) achieved: <u>100%</u></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
<p>Service provider annual review: Briefly describe any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>*The number of children who received care outside of Broward does not match the number of ASQ's mailed as children are school age receiving aftercare only, declined the screened, terminated from care prior to their offer date, or were screened using the Brigance and was never mailed the ASQ (one Provider is a large school very close to the Broward boarder so the AS screens with the Brigance). Our biggest challenge is timely receipt of the ASQ's. We found that some Providers accidentally returned their Broward County screens with their Miami screens, resulting in</i></p>			

them having to redo the screenings so Broward would receive them.

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) Protocol outlining identification of and services to children in care outside of Broward County; 2) List of SR children by Provider receiving child care services outside Broward County; 3) Copy of ASQ and ASQ: SE sent to Providers with copy of instructions for tool use as sent to PROVIDERS; 4) ELC randomly selected SR child files; and 5) Evidence of follow up phone calls made to these providers.

ELC review comments: Reviewed FCI protocol and EFS list of 129 children who reside in Broward County but are recorded to use one of 48 early care and education providers for child care outside of Broward County for evidence that they were mailed the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Social Emotional (ASQ: SE) screening tools with directions for tool use and received a follow up telephone call notifying of the mailing and offering assistance. ***All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.***

Reviewed a copy of a linkage agreement with the ELC 2 Service Provider which outlines a process for providing ELC 5 staff with the following information on a regular basis:

- a) the number of providers outside of Broward County serving children who reside in Broward County but use financial assistance from school readiness funds for child care outside of Broward; and
- b) the identity of the children who reside in Broward County and use financial assistance from school readiness funds for child care outside of Broward.

Reviewed an amended Protocol dated December 5, 2009, that indicates ELC 5 staff identify:

- on a regular basis, all Broward children who receive financial assistance from school readiness funds and use them for care outside of Broward; and
- the children who use care outside of Broward and receive an ASQ and those who do not; and
- all children for whom the ASQ indicates a need for further screening shall be administered the Brigance Screening tool by an FCI Assessment Specialist.

Reviewed 95 files for evidence that providers, with children who reside in Broward County but use School Readiness financial assistance for child care outside of Broward County, will be mailed the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Social Emotional (ASQ: SE) screening tools with directions for tool use and receive a follow up telephone call notifying of the mailing and offering assistance. Reviewed files for evidence that all of the children for which the ASQ indicated a need for further screening or the ASQ was not returned, received the Brigance Screening by an FCI Assessment Specialist.

- One (1) file indicated the child resides in Broward County but uses School Readiness financial assistance for child care outside of Broward County; and
- **One (1) provider (100%) was mailed the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Social Emotional (ASQ: SE) screening tools for one (1) child, with directions for tool use and received a follow up telephone call**

notifying of the mailing and offering assistance; the provider returned the ASQ and the child showed no need for a further screen.			
6. 100% of parents who consent to their child’s Developmental Screening will be given the opportunity to meet in-person with their School Readiness provider and/or the ELC 5 Service Provider to discuss the results.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	6. a. Number of parents who consent <u>9,042 consented. Of these, 6,202 had a screening to be able to discuss the results</u> (should equal 3.f.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 115/115 N=115 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes see row below for details</i>
	6. b. Number of parents given opportunity to meet in-person with their School Readiness provider and/or the ELC 5 Service Provider to discuss the results: <u>6,202 (49 received a second screen)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	6. c. Percent Achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service provider annual review: Briefly describe any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>The Terms and Conditions form states that parents will “be informed of the outcome of this screening”, and parents are provided the opportunity to review results once the screening is completed. Every parent receives a letter with their child’s developmental screening providing them the results of the screening and notifying them of the opportunity to meet in-person to discuss said results.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) Process/policy for notifying all parents of opportunity to meet to discuss results; 2) ELC randomly selected SR and WL client files to review evidence of the opportunity to meet in-person with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss screening results; and 3) DAISY data base summary documentation.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed process/policy “ <i>Developmental Screening; Time Line for Service Delivery of Level I and II Screens & Referral for Assessment/Evaluation Services</i> ” revised Dec. 5, 2009 and parent letter used to notify all parents of an opportunity to meet with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss screening results. All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.			
Review 115 eligible client files (105 SR and 10 WL) where parents had given consent for the developmental screening process for evidence of the opportunity to meet in-person with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss screening results.			

- **One hundred fifteen (115) client files (100%) showed evidence of the opportunity to meet in-person with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss screening results.**
 - One hundred five (105) SR client files (100%) had letters to parents providing them the opportunity to meet in-person with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss the results; and
 - Ten (10) WL client files (100%) indicated parents met in person with the Service Provider to discuss screening results.

	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
7. 87% of parents whose child receives a Developmental Screening and scores below expected levels will meet with their School Readiness provider and/or the ELC 5 Service Provider to discuss their child’s results and of those, 100% shall identify two or more ways in which they shall use the information shared in the discussion to further their child’s school readiness.	7.a. Number of children who fell below expected levels: <u>501</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	73% 100% 8/11 8/8 N=11 N= 8
	7.b. Number of parents who discussed results with provider or ELC 5 Service Provider: <u>497</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	7.c. Number of 7.b. who identified 2 or more ways: <u>497</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	7.d. Percent (7b/7a) achieved: <u>99%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Substantially Met* <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
	7.e. Percent (7c/7b) achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

Service provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used to discuss child’s results with parents and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. *A letter is left for the parent at the time of screening notifying them of their child’s screening outcome and requests them to contact their Assessment Specialist to discuss the child’s results. In addition, the Assessment Specialists makes attempts to contact them on the phone to review the results. If the Assessment Specialist is still unsuccessful in contacting the parent, a letter is mailed to the parent and to the Provider site informing them of our attempts to contact them and to please call to discuss their child’s screening results. ELC5 has found it challenging to contact the parent so that the results can be discussed. It often takes numerous attempt and additional letters mailed until contact is made. Once contact is made, the results are reviewed and ways the parent can further their child’s school readiness are discussed. If the parent consents to the referral, the Assessment Specialist will assist the family with the referral process.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: ELC randomly selected SR and WL child files with: 1) Letter notifying parents that child fell below; 2) “Discussion of Results” form noting 2 or more ways in which parents use the information shared in the discussion to further their child’s school readiness; and 3) DAISY data base summary documentation.

ELC review comments: Reviewed letter notifying parents that child fell below expected levels and invites them to meet with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss their child’s results. Reviewed “*Discussion of Results*” form where parents note

two (2) or more ways they shall use the information shared in the discussion to further their child’s school readiness. Reviewed *“Developmental Screening; Time Line for Service Delivery of Level I and II Screens & Referral for Assessment/Evaluation Services”* protocol for evidence that parents who consent to their child’s Developmental Screening and whose child scores below expected levels are expected to meet with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss their child’s results. Reviewed DAISEY UM outcome report of all 501 children who fell below expected levels for evidence that their parents were asked to meet providers to share results. ***All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.***

Reviewed 105 eligible client files for evidence of parents, whose child scored below expected levels, met with their School Readiness provider and/or Service Provider to discuss their child’s results and of those, evidence of the *“Discussion of Results”* form noting two (2) or more ways in which parents use the information shared in the discussion to further their child’s school readiness.

- Eleven (11) SR client files indicated clients had terminated prior to a screen (5), were to be screened in 2010-2011 (5), or received a screen elsewhere (1).
- Seventy-five (75) SR client files had parental consent for the developmental screening process and completed screenings:
 - Twenty-nine (29) new enrollee client files indicated children met expected levels on developmental screens.
 - Thirty-nine (39) SR continuing client files indicated children met expected levels on developmental screens;
 - Three (3) SR continuing client files indicated children fell below expected limits and parents declined discussions or could not be reached (activities were left at the center for these children).
 - **Four (4) SR continuing client files (57%) indicated children fell below expected levels, the parent spoke with their School Readiness Provider and/or Service Provider and the 100% of these parent completed *“Discussion of Results”* form and reported two (2) or more ways they would use the information shared in the discussion to further their child’s school readiness.**
- Ten (10) WL client files had parental consent for the developmental screening process and completed screenings:
 - Six (6) WL client files indicated children met expected levels on developmental screens; and
 - **Four (4) WL children’s score fell below expected levels and 100% of the parents met with the Service Provider and completed *“Discussion of Results”* form and reported two or more ways in which they would use the information shared in the discussion to further their child’s school readiness.**

****NOTE: The sample client file selection indicated a lower percentage achieved this objective than that of the total population; appropriate measures to assist families to further the development of their children were taken in all cases and though the Service Provider should continue to make every effort to communicate the results of screening with families, the Service Provider cannot force parents to have this discussion.***

8. 100% of children, birth to school-age, enrolled in	FCI Reported Results	ELC Review	Action needed?
---	----------------------	------------	----------------

Coalition financially assisted care, and/or listed on the Unified Waiting List, for which the Developmental Screen indicates a need for further screening, shall receive a smart referral to appropriate community assessment services which provide in-depth evaluations and case planning based on the identification of a significant delay or concern, as well as other needed support services.	Actual <u>Number</u> Served	<i>Results validated?</i>	
	8.a. Number of children whose Developmental Screen indicated a need for further screening and whose parents provided consent to the screening process: <u>268</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 4/4 N=4
	8.b. Number of 8.a. who receive a smart referral to appropriate community assessment services: <u>268</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>
8.c. Percent achieved (8b/8a): <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met		
<p>Service provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used to refer families to appropriate community assessment services and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>Families are referred to appropriate community assessment services for further evaluation if the parent provides consent for a referral for their child at the time the Assessment Specialist discusses the results of their screening with the parent. If the parent accepts the referral, the Assessment Specialist makes that referral on behalf of the family. ELC5 distributed learning activities to 732 additional children based on screening results that just fell slightly below the cut off score but did whose overall score did not indicate a need for further evaluation.</i></p>			
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) Appropriate ELC randomly selected SR and WL client files reviewed for evidence of referrals to appropriate community assessment services; and 2) DAISY data base summary documentation.</p>			
<p><u>ELC review comments:</u> Reviewed ELC 5 data base that indicated 268 children were referred to appropriate community assessment services, such as FDLRS and Camelot, which provide in-depth evaluations and case planning based on the identification of a significant delay or concerns, as well as other needed support services. <i>All documentation and data results were reviewed and validated.</i></p> <p>Reviewed 85 eligible client files of children birth to school-age, enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care and/or listed on the Unified Waiting List, who received a screening, for evidence of requiring a Level III assessment and referral to assessment services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eighty five (85) eligible client files revealed ten (10) clients required further screening and four (4) clients, whose parents provided consent to the Level III developmental screening process were referred to assessment services and agreed to the Level III assessment: One (1) SR eligible client file (10%) indicated a need for further screening and the parent was referred to appropriate community assessment services; one (1) child was found to already be receiving services; three (3) parents did not respond to requests for parent discussions; and one (1) declined the level III referral. 			

- **Three (3) WL client files (30%) indicated a need for further screening and the parents were referred to appropriate services;** one (1) WL client declined the level III referral to remain in *Nurturing Parent* program.

	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
9. 65% of children, birth to school-age, enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care and/or listed on the Unified Waiting List, who required further screening and whose parents consent to this screening shall be <u>linked</u> to appropriate community assessment services.	9.a. Number of children who require further screening and whose parents consented to the screening: <u>268</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 4/4/ N=4
	9.b. Total number of children referred who had an appointment: <u>241</u>		
	9.c. Number of 9.a. who were linked to assessment services: <u>148</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	9.d. Percent achieved (9.c/9a): <u>61%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Substantially Met* <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<i>If yes see row below for details</i>

Service provider annual review: Briefly describe any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. **Per the linkage agreement with CDTC, updates are not able to be provided for 90 days post the referral. For Q4 the updates were received after submitted the June Key Data Indicator Report, there for the linkage number reported on the annual report differs than that on the Key Data report. Appointments for children referred during a reporting period can fall into the next reporting period.*

NOTE: *ELC 5 explains the importance and stays in contact with the parent but ultimately has no control over this outcome. It is parental choice for a parent to bring their child to the scheduled appointment.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) Appropriate ELC randomly selected SR and WL client files reviewed for evidence of referrals to appropriate community assessment services; and 2) DAISY data base summary documentation.

ELC review comments: Reviewed data base summary documentation of 241 children referred to FDLRS/CDTC with referral dates, appointments, and outcomes of linkages noted. ***All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.***

Reviewed four (4) files of children, birth to school-age, enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care and/or listed on the Unified Waiting List, who required further screening and whose parents consented to this screening for evidence of linkage to appropriate community assessment services.

- **One (1) child (25%)** was documented as being linked to services.
 - No (0) SR children were documented as linked to assessment services: The (1) referred client said she would follow through on her own since she had another child in the PLACE program.
- **Three (3) WL children (75%) were linked to assessment services:**

- One (1) parent made an appointment with CDTC Early Steps program and was determined eligible for services;
- One (1) parent made the appointment with CDTC Easy Steps program and did not attend the appointment; and
- CDTC Easy Steps was unable to coordinate services with one (1) family; the child turned 3 years old, and was referred to FDLRS.

***This objective is determined to be Substantially Met at 61% with action required to analyze coordinated efforts with ECE System partners and parents.**

Action Required: *The Coalition recognizes that this objective is maximized by working closely with community system partners. In order to increase the percentage of families who follow through with appointments when referred to appropriate community resources, the Service Provider shall contact families via telephone calls to remind families of the importance of making the appointment and the benefits of an assessment. Additionally, the Service Provider shall work closely with the Baby SNAC Committee to develop a business plan outlining a timeline of activities to address the percentage of clients who are referred for a level III screening, but do not make their appointments. The community level plan must develop processes and procedures that will increase linkages to intervention services addressing this phenomenon system wide and coordinate the collection of reasons families do not follow through on appointments.*

Service Provider plan to meet adjustment required (HOW) Explain: *ELC 5 has been participating in the Baby SNAC meeting since July 2010. A sub-committee consisting of ELC 5, FDLRS, Early Steps and the CSC has been formed and meets following the scheduled Baby SNAC meeting to discuss our Turn the Curve report regarding ELC 5 children referred for Level III services and how to increase the percentage.*

ELC note: *The Coalition appreciates the involvement of the ELC 5 staff in the community collaboration of the Baby SNAC subcommittee to explore ways to increase the percentage of children receiving services who are referred to Level III services and looks forward to reviewing the business plan that outlines a timeline of activities to address this community challenge.*

Recommendation: *The Coalition staff recommends implementing use of the FCI automated phone call system to remind clients of scheduled appointments at FDLRS or CDTC during the third quarter of the contract year.*

Service Provider response (if desired): *In order to maintain FCI's high quality customer service standards, ELC 5 staff does not agree with the recommendation to use automated calls to remind clients of scheduled appointments. This practice has proven effective and useful when there are hundreds of calls to make simultaneously. ELC 5 implemented personally calling families prior to their scheduled appointment (for children 3-5) and calling families to follow up on the status of the referral made for children 0-3 years old. The Referral Specialist position that was created with the FY 10-11 service model makes and tracks the status of these calls. She emphasizes the importance of the attending and following through with their appointment.*

Assessment Services

1. 100% of parents with children birth to school age whose families receive financial assistance for a full-time School Readiness program (center-based	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
--	---	--	-----------------------

<p>or home-based providers) who are selected as a part of a random sampling shall be offered involvement in the Child Assessment project. Said offering shall include information for parents on the importance and advantages of assessment.</p>	<p>1.a. Total number of parents with children birth to school-age whose families receive financial assistance for a full-time School Readiness program (center-based or home-based providers) selected as part of a random sampling: <u>463</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i></p>
	<p>1. b. Number of 1.a. parents offered Child Assessment: <u>463</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
	<p>1.c. Percent Achieved: <u>100%</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met</p>	
<p>Service provider annual review: Comment if needed.</p>			
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) Offering with statement to affect that if child is selected as part of a random sampling, would parent be interested in a Child Assessment; 2) Documentation of number in 10.a.; and 3) Appropriate ELC randomly selected SR child files; and 3) DAISY data base summary documentation.</p>			
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed <i>Terms and Conditions</i> form, revised 6/23/09, which includes Child Assessment consent, and information for parents on the importance and advantages of assessments. Reviewed binder with fliers and <i>Terms and Conditions</i> forms, by age and data spreadsheet lists for evidence of parents offered child assessment, offering included information for parents on the importance and advantages of assessments. Reviewed data spreadsheet lists for evidence of how many packages were delivered. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></p> <p>A total of 267 families were randomly selected and offered the opportunity to participate in the Child Assessment Services through three (3) separate offer dates (Aug. 24, 2009: 73 children; Sept 24, 2009: 73 children; and October 24, 2009: 121 children) children were offered the opportunity to participate in Child Assessment Services. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></p> <p>Reviewed 16 client files for evidence that parents, who were selected as part of a random sampling, were <u>offered</u> involvement in the Child Assessment project and that said offering included information for parents on the importance and advantages of assessments.</p> <p>All 16 files (100%) indicated receipt of an offer to participate and information about the Child Assessment Project.</p> <p><i>Note: 463 unduplicated Terms and Conditions forms were gathered from 2008-2009 sample population; 324 families (70%) had terms and condition consents and 267 families (82%) were found available and eligible to participate in 2009-2010 Assessment process.</i></p>			

	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
2. 100% of parents who consent to their child's Assessment will be given the opportunity to meet in-person with their School Readiness provider and/or ELC 5 Service Provider to discuss the results.	2. a. Number of parents who consent to Assessment whose children received a pre-test: <u>267</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>
	2. b. Number of parents given opportunity to meet in-person with their School Readiness provider and/or the ELC 5 Service Provider to discuss the results: <u>267</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	2. c. Percent Achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used to inform parents of opportunity to meet and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>The families of all children who received a pre-test received a post card informing them of the opportunity to meet in person to discuss the results of their child's assessment results. In addition, families for children who completed a post test received a packet which included a letter providing them a second opportunity to meet to review their child's assessment results.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) Appropriate ELC randomly selected SR child files; and 2) Evidence of notification to parents of opportunity to meet with School Readiness provider and/or Service Provider to discuss results in-person.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed parent notification post card, letters to parents inviting them to discuss the results of their child's pre-assessment and post assessment, for evidence of opportunities for parents to meet with the School Readiness provider and/or Service Provider to discuss their child's results in-person. Reviewed packet of materials that included information on the benefits of assessment, activities for supporting development and milestones for specific ages, resource library summer schedule flyer, and growth milestone chart. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
Reviewed 16 randomly selected client files (6%) of parents, who consented to their child's Assessment, for evidence that all parents were given the opportunity to <u>meet in-person</u> with their School Readiness provider and/or Service Provider to discuss the results. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sixteen (16) client files (100%) contained postcards to parents providing them the opportunity to meet in-person with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss the results. 			
3. 100% of children, for which the Child Assessment process indicates a need for further	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?

evaluation, shall receive a smart referral to appropriate community assessment services which provide in-depth evaluations and case planning based on the identification of a significant delay or concern, as well as other needed support services.	3.a. Number of children whose Child Assessment indicated a need for further screening: <u>2</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 2/2 N=2
	3.b. Number of 3.a. who receive a smart referral to appropriate community assessment services: <u>2</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	3. c. Percent Achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
<p>Service provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used to refer families to appropriate community assessment services and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>Families of children whose child assessment results indicate a need for further evaluation are contacted by phone to review the results and offer assistance in making a referral if the parent consents. Due to the low number of referrals resulting from the child assessment process, no barriers are identified.</i></p> <p><i>Note: There were three additional children participating in both the Child Assessment program and who received a developmental screening that were referred for further evaluation. They are reported in Outcome #8 under Screening Services.</i></p>			
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) Appropriate ELC randomly selected SR client files for evidence of referrals to appropriate community assessment services; and 2) FDLRS and CDTC Referral List of children.</p>			
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 5 FDLRS and CDTC referral list identifying the names of two (2) children who needed further evaluation and were referred as a result of the Assessment process and related outcome information. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></p> <p>Reviewed 16 randomly selected client files for evidence that children involved in the Child Assessment process and needing further evaluation were referred to appropriate community services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two (2) client files indicated a need for further evaluation during the assessment process and both of the children (100%) were referred to appropriate community services. 			
4. 65% of children who, as determined by the results of Assessment, require further screening and whose parents consent to this screening shall be linked to appropriate community assessment services.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	4. a. Number of children who require further screening and whose parents consented to the screening: <u>2</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	50% 1 / 2

	4. b. Number of 4.a. who were linked to assessment services: <u>1</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	N=2
	4. c. Percent Achieved: <u>50%</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes see row below for details</i>
Service provider annual review: Briefly describe any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>FCI has no control over this outcome as it is parental choice on whether or not to follow through with their referral for further evaluation. In addition, the small number of children in the sample significantly affected this outcome.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) Appropriate ELC randomly selected SR client files for evidence of linkage to appropriate community assessment services; and 2) FDLRS and CDTC Referral List of children.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 5 FDLRS and CDTC referral list identifying the names of two (2) children who needed further evaluation and were referred through the Assessment process. Reviewed other related outcome information. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
Reviewed two (2) client files that indicated a need for further evaluation during the assessment process and referral to appropriate community assessment services:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One (1) child (50%) was linked to assessment services and determined eligible for speech interventions; • One (1) child's parent (50%) denied the need for a referral after an appointment was made. 			
<i>No Action needed at this time: The Agency for WorkForce Innovation is in the process of redesigning the system of Child Assessment and no further action than that described in Developmental Screening Objective #9 above is necessary at this time.</i>			
Service Provider response (if desired):			
5. 100% of children birth to school age whose families receive financial assistance for full-time School Readiness services participating in assessments must have written parental consent for their child's pre, post and on-going child assessments before initiation of assessments. Said consent must be available for review by AWI/OEL and/or Coalition during routine monitoring of	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
	5. a. Number of children participating in Assessments: <u>324</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 16/16 N=16
	5. b. Number of children with parental consents: <u>324</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

center-based or home-based provider.	5. c. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
<p>Service provider annual review: Comment if needed. <i>Although ELC 5 has received 324 consents year to date for children offered participation in child assessment services, we identified 57 children ineligible to receive services. This is due to children transferring to non participating provider sites, terminating from care, and/or children who do not attend the Provider site on a full time basis.</i></p>			
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) ELC randomly selected SR client files for evidence of written parental consent to participate in the child assessment project; and 2) DAISY data base summary documentation.</p>			
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed data base summary document and files with 324 children in the Assessment project indicating written parental consent for their child’s pre, post and on-going child assessment given with date before initiation of assessment. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></p> <p>Reviewed 16 client files of children birth to school-age whose families receive financial assistance for full-time School Readiness services who were selected as part of a random sample and whose parents consented for their child’s pre, post and on-going child assessment before initiation of assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sixteen (16) files (100%) had written parental consent for pre, post and on-going assessment and 100% of the files were available during coalition monitoring. 			
<p>6. 100% of pretests must be administered to the selected population of children birth to school-age, whose families receive financial assistance for full-time School Readiness services, within 45 days of one of 3 staggered offering dates: August 24, September 24, and October 20, 2009.</p>	<p>FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number Served</u></p>	<p>ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i></p>	<p>Action needed?</p>
	<p>6.a. Number of pre-tests: <u>267</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>100% 16/16 N=16</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i></p>
	<p>6.b. Number pre-tests completed within 45 days of selection into Assessment project: <u>August 24: 73</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
	<p>6.c. Number pre-tests completed within 45 days of selection into Assessment project: <u>September 24: 73</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
	<p>6.d. Number pre-tests completed within 45 days of selection into Assessment project: <u>October 20: 121</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	

	6.e. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u> [(6b+6c+6d)/6a.]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
<p>Service provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used to administer pretests to selected population and any success/ challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>ELC 5 had nine full time and one part time Assessment Specialists, and one Curriculum Coordinator, each of whom carried a caseload of 1-3 of the 21 participating Providers in the Child Assessment Program. Children for whom consent has been received in each of the participating sites are assessed by the assigned Assessment Specialist within 45 days of their offer date. The Assessment Specialist was provided a due date just prior to the 45 day mark to ensure timely completion. There were no challenges with achieving this outcome.</i></p>			
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) ELC randomly selected client files for evidence of pre-tests administered within 45 days of one of 3 staggered offering dates: August 24, September 24, and October 20; and 2) DAISY data base documentation.</p>			
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 5 excel spreadsheets of child assessment participation for pre test, on going, and post test dates for evidence that pretests were administered to the selected population of children between birth and school-age, whose families received financial assistance for full-time School Readiness services, within 45 days of one of 3 staggered offering dates: August 24, September 24 and October 20. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></p> <p>Reviewed 16 client files of the selected children birth to school-age, whose families received financial assistance for full-time School Readiness services, for supporting documentation that pre-tests were conducted within 45 days of one of 3 staggered offering dates: August 24, September 24 and October 20, 2009:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sixteen (16) client files (100%) contained Child Development Record Books with pretests dates within 45 days of one of three (3) staggered offering dates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 2009: 2; • September 2009: 6; and • October 2009: 8. 			
<p>7. 100% of post tests must be administered to the selected population of children birth to school-age whose families receive financial assistance for full-time School Readiness services and maintain enrollment at the time of post testing, at least six (6) months, but not more than one (1) year, after the child's pretest.</p>	<p>FCI Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served</p>	<p>ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i></p>	<p>Action needed?</p>
	<p>7. a. Number of children who received post tests: <u>192</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>100% 12/12 N=12</p>
	<p>7.b. Number of children (7.a.) who maintain enrollment at least 6 months after child's pretest: <u>192</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	

	7.c. Number of post tests competed at least six (6) months, but not more than one (1) year after the child's pretest: <p style="text-align: center;"><u>192</u></p>	<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>
	7. d. Percent achieved (7.c/7.b): <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
<p>Service provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used to administer post tests to selected population and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>The Curriculum Coordinator maintains a spreadsheet which formulates the due date for each child's post test based on their pre-test date. The Curriculum Coordinator tracks these due dates and distributes the assessment record book back to the assigned Assessment Specialist to complete to the post-test in the designated time frame. ELC 5 has two pending post tests for children who have maintained enrollment for at least six (6) months from the date of pre-test and are still within the one (1) year timeframe to complete. These children were unavailable during attempts to complete in FY 09/10 and will be completed on FY 10/11.</i></p>			
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: ELC randomly selected Child Developmental Record Books with pretest and post test dates.</p>			
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed Child Developmental Record Books summary data spreadsheet listing 192 names and dates with pretest and post test dates. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></p> <p>Reviewed 16 files of selected children birth to school-age whose families receive financial assistance for full-time School Readiness services, for supporting documentation that posttests were administrated at least six (6) months, but not more than one (1) year after the child's pretest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four (4) files indicated that children (25%) had withdrawn from the School Readiness program before post tests were administered; and • Twelve (12) remaining files (75%) contained Child Developmental Record Books; all files (100%) contained post test dates at least six (6) months, but not more than one (1) year, after the child's pretest. 			
<p>8. 100% of teachers with children in the Assessment program will receive training on how to use the assessment tool to conduct informal on-going assessments throughout the school year, how to record a child's progress in attaining developmental milestones, how to modify their program based on assessment results, and share results and strategies with parents.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">FCI Results Actual <u>Number Served</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Action needed?</p>
	8. a. Number of classrooms with children in the Assessment program: <p style="text-align: center;"><u>106</u></p> 8.b. Number of teachers in those classrooms: <u>131</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>

<p>90% shall identify two or more ways in which they shall use the information in the training to further children's school readiness.</p>	<p>8. c. Number of 8.b. teachers who received training on how to use the assessment tool to conduct informal on-going assessments throughout the school year, how to record a child's progress in attaining developmental milestones, how to modify their program based on assessment results, and share results and strategies with parents. <u>182 (more than 131 due to additional assistants, etc in 106 classrooms)</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
	<p>8. d. Percent of 8.c. who received training (8.c/8.b.): <u>100%</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met</p>	
	<p>8.e. Number of teachers (8.c) who identified two or more ways in which they shall use the information in the training to further children's school readiness: <u>131 of 8.b. and 172 of 8.c</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
	<p>8. f. Percent of 8.c. who identified two or more ways in which they shall use the information in the training to further children's school readiness (8.e./8.b.): <u>95%</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met</p>	
<p>Service provider annual review: Comment if needed. <i>In addition to the 100% of teachers participating in the Child Assessment program receiving training, Directors of the participating Provider sites had additional teachers participate (as well as them) in the training which is why the number of teachers trained is greater than the number of participating teachers.</i></p>			
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) List of teachers by provider, and the children they served, identifying which ones took training and of those, which ones identified 2 or more ways in which they used the information in the training to further children's school readiness; 2) Training outline, contents, objectives, goals; 3) ELC randomly selected Provider sites; 4) Provider surveys/other documentation listing 2 or more ways in which they use the information in the training to further children's school readiness; and 5)</p>			

Summary data from training results.

ELC review comments: Reviewed list of teachers by provider, identifying who took training with evaluations and sign in sheets and which identified 2 or more ways in which they use the information to further children’s school readiness. Reviewed training outline, contents, objectives, goals, and summary data from training results. Reviewed ELC 5 Service Provider maintained data base reports that identified children in the project and the child’s teacher(s) who attended training. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

	FCI Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
9. 90% of School Readiness providers with children in the Assessment program will report two (2) ways in which they modified their program based on assessment results to benefit the children in their care.	9.a. Number of providers/teachers who received follow-up training surveys on how to modify their program based on assessment results: <u>131 teachers participated in program, 122 were surveyed, 102 were completed and returned*</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>f <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
	9.b. Number who reported 2 or more ways in which they modified their program based on assessment results to benefit the children in their care: <u>99</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	9.c. Percent Achieved: <u>97%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

Service provider annual review: Comment if needed. **7 additional surveys were returned with a note indicated that the teacher was no longer employed at the site so unable to be completed.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) List of teachers, by provider, identifying who took training and who identified 2 or more ways in which they modified their program based on assessment results to benefit the children in their care; 2) Copy of blank Provider survey; 3) Summary of survey results; and 4) ELC randomly selected Provider sites.

ELC review comments: Reviewed a blank survey asking teachers for two (2) or more ways in which they modified their program based on assessment results to benefit the children in their care; a list of 131 teachers, by provider, identifying 131 teachers with children in their class completing the post test as a part of the Child Assessment program and the 102 teachers who had completed and returned surveys. (Thirteen (13) teachers did not complete the survey and did not receive certificates for CEUs or in-service credit). Reviewed copies of provider

surveys documenting that indicated 99 teachers identified two (2) or more ways in which they modified their program based on assessment results to benefit the children in their care. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

	FCI Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
10. 100% of selected children participating in child assessment services who maintain enrollment in the program at the time that they are due for an ongoing child assessment (and at least 3 months from the pre-test) will receive an ongoing assessment from their early care and education provider with training and mentoring from the Assessment Curriculum Coordinator.	10. a. Number of children maintaining enrollment at 3 months after pre-test: <u>210</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 14/14 N=14
	10. b. Number of those (10.a) who received at least one ongoing/interim assessment(s) from their provider: <u>210</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>
	10. c. Percent Achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

Service provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used for training and mentoring for ongoing assessment activities and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. *Assessment Curriculum Coordinator (ACC) met individually with each teacher to review pre test results, identifying children’s areas of strength and challenges. Teachers determined which developmental areas to create as goals for child. The ACC and the teacher created a ‘Goal Strategy Report’ to document the learning objective and the child’s mastery of the goal.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) ELC randomly selected child files; 2) List of children in Assessment project identifying those with ongoing assessments by provider and those receiving training and mentoring from the Assessment Curriculum Coordinator.

ELC review comments: Reviewed list of children in Assessment project identifying those with ongoing assessments conducted by provider. List revealed 267 children received pre assessments; 210 of the pre-assessed children (79%) were still enrolled and 100% of the children received on-going assessments. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

Reviewed 16 files of children in the assessment program, two (2) children withdrew from care before ongoing assessment was completed:

- 14 children retained enrollment at time of on-going assessment and **100% of the children received on-going assessments.**

	FCI Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
11. 100% of child assessment pretests and annual posttests aggregate results shall be submitted monthly by the ELC 5 Service Provider to the Coalition and one quarterly analysis of same shall	11.a. Number of monthly pre/post test aggregate results submitted: <u>12</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes see row</i>

be submitted by the ELC 5 Service Provider to the Coalition and shared with the Early Care and Education Systems group for planning purposes.	11.b. Number of quarterly analysis submitted and shared with Systems: <u>4</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<i>below for details</i>
	11.c. Percent Achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service provider annual review: Comment if needed.			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Monthly and quarterly pre/post test aggregate results.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed monthly and quarterly pre/post test aggregate results submitted to ELC. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
12. 100% of assessment results shall be kept by the ELC 5 Service Provider and child's early care and education provider during the child's enrollment in the program and for three (3) years after the child is no longer enrolled. Said results must be available for routine monitoring by AWI/OEL and/or the Coalition.	FCI Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	12.a. Number of children in the assessment program: <u>267</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 assessment results kept at ELC 5 Service Provider: <u>267</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	12.c. Number of providers with signed Memorandum of Agreement agreeing to keep assessment results during the child's enrollment in the program and for three (3) years after the child is no longer enrolled: <u>21</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	12.d. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service provider annual review: Comment if needed.			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) Protocol and MOU for providers; 2) Review of child files with assessment results; 3) Evidence of policy that files are kept for 3 years by school readiness provider; 4) ECE Selected provider site visit to review selected child files for assessment results.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed Protocol and a Memorandum of Agreement and an Acknowledgement Regarding Record Maintenance developed for 2009-2010, and signed by each of the 21 providers participating in the child assessment program detailing their responsibility to maintain copies of the child assessment results for the children who received the services. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			

<u>Screening and Assessment Training</u>			
1. 100% of School Readiness providers serving birth to school-age children shall be offered training and technical assistance on the screening and assessment tools and on the analysis and use of results.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	1.a. Number of SR providers paid for caring for children (from ELC 2- July 1, 2009-June 30, 2010): <u>702</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>
	1.b. Number offered training and technical assistance on the screening and assessment tools and on the analysis and use of results. <u>702</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	1.c. Percent Achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
<p>Service provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology for SR providers to be offered training and technical assistance on the screening and assessment tools and on the analysis and use of the results and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>ELC 5 trainings have been posted on the FCI website, CSC training calendar, sent via group e-mail and included in quarterly mailings to offer all School Readiness providers serving birth to school-age children training and technical assistance on the screening and assessment tools and on the analysis and use of results. Training was also offered at the 2009 VPK/Preschool conference.</i></p>			
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Documentation of Training offering to SR providers; (2) Copies of materials; and 3) Evidence of delivery to all providers.</p>			
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed “Developmental Screening Training Calendar Distribution” Protocol; Annual Summary of “Training Offerings,” e-mail offerings, website offerings, and interviewed the manager of the Child Screening and Assessment program for evidence that training and technical assistance on screening and assessment tools and on the analysis and use of results was offered to 100% of School Readiness providers serving birth to school-age children. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></p> <p>Training and technical assistance on the screening and assessment tools and on the analysis and use of results occurred multiple times in various ways throughout the year and targeted all School Readiness serving birth to school-age children in Broward County:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2009-2010 VPK Conference program verified that ELC 5 staff gave three (3) workshops to a total of 38 teachers, titled “Linking Assessment Results to the VPK Classroom;” • ELC 5 Protocol “Developmental Screening Training Calendar Distribution,” revised October 18, 2007, ensured this objective is policy; • E-mails dated 10/9/09; 10/20/09; and 2/9/10 from the ELC 5 Manager to the training calendar input staff, verified developmental screening training information was mailed with quarterly FCI mailings to all legally operating child care facilities with Service 			

Agreement (734); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FCI & CSC website screen-shots verified that training dates, times, and registrations were offered; and • Broward County Training Collaborative website screen-shots verified that training dates, times, and registrations were offered. 			
2. 75% of School Readiness providers who receive training directly from the ELC 5 Service Provider on screening and assessment shall report two or more ways in which they shall use the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work with young children.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	2.a. Number of SR providers sites whose staff received training: <u>87</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>
	2.b. Number of practitioners attending training from SR provider sites: <u>254-216 completed survey* see note</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	2.c. Number of practitioners who report 2 or more ways in which they shall use the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work with young children: <u>189</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	2.d. Percent Achieved (2.c/2.b): <u>88%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology for providing screening and assessment tool training to SR providers and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>Trainings are provided quarterly and are offered in both English and Spanish both on site and at FCI. The training is 2.5 hours. Note: These numbers only apply to those that took Screening and Assessment training. Teachers who participated in the child assessment orientation are reported in Outcome B#8.</i> <i>*NOTE: The 38 people that completed a satisfaction survey in Q1 attended our training as part of the VPK conference. The survey distributed for the conference did not include a section for participants to report ways in which they would use the knowledge to enhance their work with children; therefore, these participants cannot be measured in this outcome.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: List of providers who took training; Training contents; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) List of teachers by SR provider identifying which ones took training and which ones identified 2 or more ways in which they used the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work with young children; 2) Training outline, contents, objectives, goals; 3) Copy of blank provider surveys/training evaluations; 4) Completed Practitioner surveys for ELC randomly selected Provider sites, listing 2 or more ways in which they modified their program based on assessment results to benefit the children in their care; and 5) Summary data - Survey results/other documentation identifying providers ability to report 2 or more ways in which they used the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work with young children. 			

ELC review comments: Reviewed a list of 254 teachers employed by 87 School Readiness provider sites who attended Developmental Screening and Assessment Training. Reviewed blank survey and summary data of 216 participant’s surveys. One hundred and eighty nine (189) participants (88%) indicated two (2) or more ways in which they shall use the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work with young children. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
<u>General</u>			
1. 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 C), Chapter 411 and Chapter 1002, Florida Statutes.	ELC Review		Action needed?
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes 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. <i>Family Central has Standard Operating Procedures written and in place to ensure compliance with this outcome available for review.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: FCI Confidentiality Policies and Procedures.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed FCI Confidentiality Policies and Procedures. Reviewed departmental protocol “Confidentiality” (Human Resources-Broward) revised 7/29/08, for evidence that ensures the protection and confidentiality of individual child records and early learning provider records from unlawful disclosure as identified in Chapter 411 and Chapter 1002, Florida Statutes. Policies are sufficient. <i>All documents were reviewed and validated.</i>			
2. 100% of parent/guardian and 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 as demonstrated by mystery shoppers.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	2.a. Percent of telephone calls received by ELC 5 answered by the fourth ring: <u>100%</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>
	2.b. Percent of customer phone calls received by ELC 5 placed on hold holding for no more than 2 minutes: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	2.c. Percent of ELC 5 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: Comment if needed. *FCI phone system is programmed to ensure compliance with this outcome.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) Copy of customer message logs and/or call back logs; 2) Parent/Provider Survey Results if applicable; and 3) ELC Secret Shopper Call.

ELC review comments: Observed operation of FCI phone system while on-site and from remote location. FCI phone system is programmed to ensure compliance with the phone being answered by the fourth ring and 100% of customer telephone calls which are placed on hold are on hold for no more than two (2) minutes before caller is given the option to continue to hold or to request a call-back within 48 business hours. *All data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

Conducted three (3) telephone observations for evidence that customers who leave messages will receive follow-up within two (2), 48-hour (business) days of initial contact:

- 9/16/10 phone call: – 1st call – observed incoming phone call from CDTC to Developmental Screening Manager directly; was picked up on first ring.
- 9/20/10 phone call: - 2nd call – observed incoming call from parent who message regarding financial assistance for child care. Message was left at 01:17 p.m. and was forwarded to R&R 1:38;
- 9/20/10 phone call: - a 3rd parent call was answered on the first ring, woman inquiring about her child’s developmental screen and was transferred to screener immediately.

	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
3. 100% of child care providers shall be proactively informed of complaint procedures, leading to formal, established grievance procedures.	3.a. Number of child care providers Served by ELC 5: <u>702 providers</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	3.b. Number of said providers receiving complaint procedures: <u>702</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
	3.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. *Family Central revised their grievance policy for the 2009-2010FY. All providers have been mailed Family Central’s grievance procedures to ensure they are proactively informed. All parents/guardians receive client’s rights information during their enrollment process.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: A blank copy of documentation that providers receive that proactively informs them of complaint procedures leading to formal, established grievance procedures.

ELC review comments: Reviewed Family Central, Inc’s *Grievance and Appeals Process* Protocol (revised 9/3/09) for evidence that

parents/guardians and child care providers are proactively informed of Family Central’s complaint procedures. Reviewed “Grievance and Appeals Process Overview” mailed to all provider 9/21/09. Reviewed page 6 of the 2009-2010 Provider Service Agreement for grievance procedure information. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

4. 100% of complaints received, or observations made, concerning potential child care licensing violations shall be tracked and reported to Broward County Child Care Licensing and Enforcement and feedback on the outcome shall be documented.	FCI Results	ELC Review	Action needed?
	Actual <u>Number Served</u>	Results validated?	
	4.a. Number of complaints received: <u>2</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	4.b. Number of complaints reported to BCCCL: <u>2</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
4.c. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<i>If yes see row below for details</i>	

Service provider annual review: Briefly describe any successes or challenges in achieving this outcome. *No challenges to report in this outcome.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) Protocol for tracking/recording complaints/observations; and 2) ELC 5 Complaint Log with copies of complaints/observations received and documented licensing violations have been reported to BCCCLE and feedback recorded.

ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 5 Compliant Log for evidence of complaint or observations concerning potential child care licensing violations tracked and reported to Broward County Child Care Licensing and any supporting documentation of feedback received on the outcome of the complaints. A total of two (2) complaints were reviewed and feedback received from Broward County Child Care Licensing (BCCCLE) was noted:

- 7/22/09 licensing violation report made; outcome was received 8/18/09 as unfounded.
- 2/8/10 licensing violation report made; 9/14/10 email indicated that FCI is still awaiting outcome report from BCCCLE.

All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.

5. 85% of Providers receiving <i>Child Screening and Assessment</i> (ELC 5) services shall report overall satisfaction with the service, including cultural competency/sensitivity, customer-friendliness, usefulness of service provided, efficiency of service, and convenience of access to service.*	FCI Results	ELC Review	Action needed?
	Actual <u>Number Served</u>	Results validated?	
	5. a. Number of provider Assessment sites served: <u>21</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	b. Number of providers served with DS: <u>702</u>		
c. Number of providers receiving DS			

	<p>and Assessment service: <u>702</u></p> <p>Survey's distributed <u>122 surveys were distributed for assessment services; 212 surveys were distributed for developmental screening = 334</u></p> <p>Surveys returned: <u>102 surveys were returned for child assessments and 141 were returned for developmental screening = 241</u></p>		
	Number satisfied with:		
	Cultural competency/sensitivity: <u>237 (98%)</u>		
	Customer-friendliness: <u>238 (98%)</u>		
	Usefulness of services provided: <u>237 (98%)</u>		
	Efficiency of service: <u>236 (98%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
	Convenience of access: <u>235 (98%)</u>		
	5. b. Percent Achieved: <u>98%</u>		
<p>Service provider annual review: Briefly describe method for gathering satisfaction data and any successes and/or challenges in delivering this service. <i>For Child Assessment- all teachers participating in the program are provided a survey to complete. Once their survey is completed, the teacher receives their certification for participating in the program. For Developmental Screening, each Assessment Specialist is to deliver satisfaction surveys to the first 15 providers they visit during Q2 and Q4 of the FY.</i></p>			
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) Blank Satisfaction Surveys; 2) Satisfaction Surveys from parents/providers; and 3) Summary of analyzed results tallied for individual categories.</p>			
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 5 protocol: "Distribution of Satisfaction Survey" stating that every Assessment Specialist will survey 15 providers they visit during Q2 and Q4 of the FY for satisfaction of services rendered. Reviewed returned surveys and summary data for 241 surveys. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></p>			
6. 100% of complaints or observations concerning potential abuse, neglect, or abandonment shall be	FCI Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?

reported to the Florida Department of Children and Families and the Coalition shall be notified of said reports, within the applicable confidentiality regulations.	6.a. Number of complaints or observations: <u>6</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>
	6.b. Number of complaints reported to FLDCF and ELC: <u>6</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	6.c. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service provider annual review: Comment if desired. <i>One of the Q4 reports was not accepted by the hotline. Notification to the ELC on the abuse reports were sent via e-mail.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) Protocol for tracking/recording complaints/observations; and 2) Copies of complaints/observations received by ELC 5 staff and documentation showing each have been reported to DCF.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 5 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. A total of six (6) reports were recorded in the Child Abuse Complaint Log indicating complaints or observations concerning potential abuse, neglect, or abandonment were reported to the Florida Department of Children and Families. All reports dates 7/22/09; 7/27/09; 7/29/09; 4/20/10; 5/27/10; 6/16/10 were reported (within the applicable confidentiality regulations), via e mail, to the Coalition. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
7. 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), and/or Quality Assurance Services (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.	FCI Results		Action needed? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes see row below for details</i>
	Actual <u>Number</u> Served		
	7.a. Number of provider complaints received: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	7.b. Number of said complaints referred to appropriate Service Provider and/or addressed through training and TA: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
7.c. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met		
Service provider annual review: Comment if needed. <i>No Provider complaints were received</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 1) Provider concerns/complaint log; 2) Supporting documentation for referral and feedback on outcomes; and 3) Policy and Procedures for tracking/recording concerns/complaints.			

ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 5 complaint log and supporting documentation for referral and feedback on outcomes. There were no other concerns about early care and education providers referred to the ELC 1, ELC 2, ELC 3, or ELC 4 Service Provider during the fiscal year. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated*

8. 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.	ELC Review	Action needed?
	<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. *ELC 5 has submitted all Monthly Key Data Reports and Quarterly Reports timely.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Note: ELC will review its own 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.

ELC review comments: Reviewed Coalition’s ELC 5 Contract Obligations Checklist. Reviewed the contract due dates for various monthly quarterly and annual reports. Reviewed emails of required reports sent to the ELC. ELC 5 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 and 100% of ad hoc data made by the Coalition were provided in a timely manner: twelve (12) monthly Key Data Indicator reports, three (3) quarterly reports, and one (1) annual report for a total of 16 reports. Sixteen (16) reports were due to the Coalition; 100% of the required monthly, quarterly, annual, and ad hoc data reports were submitted complete and on time in accordance with state and local standards and requirements.

9. 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.	ELC Review	Action needed?
	<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. *All invoices were submitted timely.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: 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.

10. 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 in order to coordinate services and prevent duplication shall have been	ELC Review	Action needed?
--	-------------------	-----------------------

developed within thirty (30) days from the date of execution of a contract and shall be implemented, followed, and revised as needed. This paragraph shall be inclusive of the links to ELC 2 data for the enrollment of school readiness children and Broward County Child Care Licensing and Enforcement, regarding communication about the change in status of, or critical incident with, any child care provider. Linkage agreements shall be actively implemented and maintained throughout the service year.

Met Not Met

Yes No

If yes see row below for details

Service Provider annual review: Note the organization with whom linkage agreements were executed and any successes and/or challenges with achieving this outcome. *ELC5 has positive working relations in regards to the executed linkage agreement.*

ELC5 LINKAGE AGREEMENTS:	DATE LINKAGE AGREEMENT DEVELOPED	DATE LINKAGE AGREEMENT SIGNED
School Board of Broward County/FDLRS	6/15/09	6/16/09
Family Central- ELC3	7/1/09	7/28/09
Children's Diagnostic & Treatment Center, Early Steps Program	6/15/09	7/28/09
Camelot Community Care, Inc.	6/16/09	9/10/09
Family Central-ELC2	12/18/09	2/10/10

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

ELC review comments: Reviewed five (5) signed linkage agreements. Reviewed one (1) linkage agreement with *FDLRS*, signed on 6/16/09; one (1) linkage agreement with *CDTC*, signed on **7/28/09**; one (1) linkage agreement with Camelot, signed on **9/10/09**; one (1) linkage agreement with ELC 3-FCI, signed on **7/28/09**, and one (1) linkage agreement with Family Central – ELC 2, signed on **2/10/10**. Four (4) of the linkage agreements (80%) were developed and reduced to writing within thirty (30) days after the date of execution of this Contract and one (1) was developed and reduced to writing upon request of the Coalition in December 2009; all were implemented, followed, and revised as needed. The FCI-CSA-10-ELC5 Contract was fully executed on June 30, 2009.

11. 100% participation in monthly Early Care and Education system coordination team meetings shall occur by a representative of the Service Provider and all services shall be actively and successfully coordinated with system partners and with the Coalition.	ELC Review	Action needed?
	<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 ELC 5 participated in 2009-2010. *Associations and community collaborative groups that ELC 5 participated in during the 2009-2010 Fiscal Year:*

- *Manager and/or Director attended the quarterly QRIS meetings;*
- *Manager and/or Director attended the quarterly SREL meetings;*
- *Manager and/or Director attended the Early Learning Coalition System gatherings;*
- *Manager for ELC5 attended the Maternal and Child Health committee meetings*
- *Manager for ELC5 attended the Healthy Families Advisory Committee meetings;*
- *Director participated in the Healthy Start Black Infant Health Practice initiative Committee, and the Community Action Group Committee;*
- *Director participates in the Healthy Start Board of Directors meeting as a board member;*
- *Director participated in the Broward County Child Abuse and Neglect committee meeting*
- *Manager and Director joined and participated in both the Statewide Developmental Screening and Child Assessment workgroup calls;*
- *Manager participated in the "Best Practice" workgroup call for Contracted Services;*
- *Director and VP participated in Baby SNAC committee meetings; and*
- *Manager and VP attended the CSC Family Support Provider meeting.*

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 5 Service Provider attended all monthly system coordinator team meetings and/or had a representative in attendance; eleven (11) meetings (100%) were attended by ELC 5 staff.

12. 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.	ELC Review	Action needed?
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes 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 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.