

Early Learning Coalition of Broward County, Inc.
Annual Review and Assessment Instrument 2008-2009

Monitoring Report
Contract: SBBC-QIS-09-ELC3 Quality Improvement and Supports
School Board of Broward County

Monitors for Early Learning Coalition (ELC)

Janice Carter, Early Care and Education Program Specialist
Andrea Braynon, Chief Financial Officer
Leonardo Almanza, Accounting and HR Manager

School Board of Broward County (SBBC) Representatives

LaQuita D. Lee, Director, Pre-Kindergarten – 2nd Grade Department
Claudia Dean, Head Start Coordinator
Ilene Miller, Coordinator, Pre-kindergarten, Early Intervention Program

This monitoring process reflected in this report began on July 29, 2009, one month after the close of the second year of implementing the revised Early Learning Coalition of Broward County's Early Care and Education System, and was completed on December 7, 2009. The Coalition Monitors completed a comprehensive monitoring review, which included an administrative review of the agencies policies and procedures, a fiscal review of the accounting records and supporting documentation, as well as a review of the programmatic services as reflected in the performance objectives of the **Quality Improvement and Supports** services in contract SBBC-QIS-09-ELC3. **This report includes monitoring results of this contract.**

In addition to examining documentation related to performance objectives, the Coalition Monitor interviewed the directors of 4 facilities that received technical assistance and coaching, 9 staff who received scholarships from SBBC-ELC 3 services, and completed two (2) secret shopper phone calls to assess service delivery from the customer's point of view; additional interviews were conducted with the Quality Improvement and Supports Program Coordinator and one (1) mentor, to assess implementation of data collection activities and program operations.

Prior to the monitoring visits, the Coalition staff identified children and providers who participated in the Voluntary Pre-kindergarten (VPK) program, as well as all school readiness children and the corresponding providers who serve these children contained in the EFS data base for the period July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009. The EFS data was used to randomly select 127 VPK children files, 106 VPK provider files, 127 files representing children receiving financial assistance from school readiness funds and the files for 101 early care and education providers where SBBC-QIS-09-ELC 3 Quality Improvement Supports

these children received early learning opportunities. Of the 127 files, 101 children (80%) were between the ages of birth to five and attended 80 of the selected providers (79%), and 25 children (20%) were school-age; four 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. Of the 167 combined early care and education providers (VPK and Providers serving children receiving financial assistance from school readiness funds) **selected for review and eligible for ELC 3 services, 27 of the early care and education providers (16%) where these children attended, participated in the Quality Improvement Supports system focused technical assistance (TA) and mentoring services from this ELC 3 service provider during the 2008-2009 contract year and were chosen for review in this monitoring: 27 early care and education center-based providers participated in Quality Rating System (QRS) and inclusion technical assistance and/or training, and accreditation technical assistance (18). Additionally, nine (9) of the 27 early care and education provider sites, employed 27 teachers, who received college credits (6 teachers), in-service (7 teachers), and/or CDA (14 teachers) scholarships;** thirteen (13) teachers received mentoring from this ELC 3 service provider, eight (8) completed their course work and five (5) continued their coursework past June 30, 2009.

Administrative Review Summary:

Agency Policies, corporate documents, insurance, document protocols, and incident reporting documents were *all reviewed and found to be in order and meet required specifications.*

Fiscal Review Summary:

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

Programmatic Review Summary:

This contract focuses on early care and education quality improvement supports provided by SBBC - ELC 3 Service Provider for early learning providers in the ELC of Broward County, Inc.'s quality initiatives located in Differential Accountability School Neighborhoods. *Coalition staff and Service Providers 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 2009-2010 fiscal year.*

Results and Highlights:

- **Contract #SBBC-QIS-09-ELC3 has eighteen (18) Performance Outcomes that cover General Performance and Quality Improvement Supports, two (2) deliverables related to clients to be served and schedule/deliverables, and four (4) contract responsibilities connected to mentoring activities and training opportunities.**
- **89% of the eighteen (18) performance outcomes were achieved and 6% require adjustments to improve reporting for accountability in the 2009-2010 contract year; 50% of the program deliverables were met and 50% required adjustments to improve reporting for accountability in the 2009-2010 contract year; and 100% of the contract responsibilities were met in 2008-2009.**
- **91% of the 67 community early care and education providers located in Differential Accountability School neighborhood school zones who received technical assistance showed a measurable increase in each of the pertinent areas identified in their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan (demonstrated by meeting at least 75% of their benchmarks). Twelve (12) of these providers have received a post-test assessment using the Environmental Rating Scales during a 5 Star Rating; seven (7) providers (58%) showed an increase in their ERS scores.**
- **70% of the centers (47) served by this contract sent 171 teachers to one or more of the 62 training sessions offered as part of their Quality Improvement Plan to enhance the effectiveness of their work and improve the quality of care.**
- **85% of the 171 teachers reported two (2) or ways in which the knowledge gained at the trainings enhanced the effectiveness of their work.**
- **Thirteen (13) CDA scholarship recipient/students from six (6) centers received mentoring to support the student in completing his/her CDA course work and to guide the student in the inclusion of coursework material into practice in the classroom.**
- **100% of the thirteen (13) students, who received a CDA scholarship and mentoring, completed CDA components or retained enrollment in the CDA program.**
- **An average of 196 technical assistance hours of training were provided to 67 community early care and education providers, enhancing classroom teachers' abilities to foster positive growth and development in young children.**
- **95% of the 61 community early care and education providers who were surveyed stated that the support provided by the Quality Improvement System was useful in implementing the curricula.**
- **97% of the 61 community early care and education providers who were surveyed stated that the feedback provided by the mentor was useful for improving their programs.**
- **In order to improve the delivery of Quality Improvement Supports in the 2009-2010 contract year, the ELC 3 Service Provider (SBBC) has already put procedures in place to ensure:**
 - **All providers have a Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) in place using provider-specific data from the Quality Assurance (ELC 4) Service Provider as an organizing mechanism to develop the QIP prior to providing ongoing technical assistance, and include each provider's QIP in the provider's file; and**
 - **A waiting list of providers who have participated in Quality Rating Services, located in the Differential Accountability School neighborhood school zones interested in technical assistance exists, is kept to ensure services to 63 center-based providers throughout the contract year, who hold a signed Service Agreement between the provider and the ELC 2**

Service Provider, a completed QRS pre-assessment or Rating, a signed Service Agreement between the provider and this ELC 3 Service Provider, and a completed Quality Improvement Plan.

- **In order to improve reporting for accountability in the 2009-2010 contract year, Coalition is requiring this Service Provider to ensure:**
 - **Each CDA scholarship candidate is offered mentoring services as indicated by a signed CDA mentorship agreement.**

Early Learning Coalition of Broward County, Inc.
Administrative and Fiscal Specification Annual Review and Assessment Instrument
2008-2009

Contract Annual Review

Contract: SBBC-09-ELC3 Quality Improvement Supports

A. FEDERAL LAW REQUIREMENTS	ELC REVIEW
1. Does the Agency have a written Drug-Free Workplace Policy?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Are Equal Employment Opportunity, Worker's Compensation, Family Leave Act, and other mandated or relevant posters conspicuously displayed by the agency?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Does the Agency have a written Non- Discrimination and Harassment Free Workplace Policy?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
ELC review comments: Reviewed SBBC policy # 2400 (Drug Free Workplace); #4001.1 (Non-discrimination policy) and viewed postings for Equal Employment Opportunity, Worker's Compensation, Family Leave Act, and other mandated or relevant posters conspicuously displayed by the agency in the hallway near copying machine and bathroom area. Agency Policies were <i>reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</i>	
B. CORPORATE DOCUMENTS	ELC REVIEW
1. Does the Agency have an Accounting Policy and Procedures Manual?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Are the Agency's By-laws available for review? N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Are the Agency's Articles of Incorporation available for review? N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Is there an Organizational Chart available that reflects the current organization of the Agency and provides clearly delineated chain-of-command?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Is there an Audit on File?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
ELC review comments: There were no By-Laws or Articles of Incorporation available as BCPS is a public entity/legislative body and not a business entity. Copy of organizational chart reviewed. ELC 2007-2008 monitoring provided as audit on file. Also reviewed documentation certifying audit of annual financial report to the Florida Commissioner of Education and other pertinent financial records. Agency Corporate Documents were all <i>reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</i>	
C. 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>	
D. 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? Fund 101 Location Code 9779 established properly	<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>	
E. INVOICING	ELC REVIEW
1. Are invoices submitted on a timely basis? Yes	<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? Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Does the Agency maintain an Agency-wide budget by funding source and expenditure category? Yes	<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)? Yes	<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? Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
b. Do the attendance records and other required documentation flow through to the invoice correctly? Invoices did flow	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
c. Is the invoice approved by authorized staff/management? Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
d. Does the invoice reflect third party payments? Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
e. Are procedures established and implemented to eliminate duplicate billing? Yes, through the accounting system	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. Number of invoices randomly selected: Eighteen (18) transactions were sampled for the months of October 2008 and April 2009	
7. Number of invoices meeting the above criteria: 100% of the transactions met the criteria.	
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	
F. INDIRECT COSTS	ELC REVIEW
1. Review and document the Agency's Cost Allocation Methodology.	

2. Is the cost allocation methodology in writing and is it representative of the allocation used? Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	
G. BANK	ELC REVIEW
1. Are bank statements reconciled monthly? Yes, bank statements are reconciled by the BCSB Treasury Department	<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? Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Does the immediate supervisor review the reconciliation? Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Are adjustments properly documented and explained? Procedurally yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Select 3 random months and verify above transactions Not applicable	
6. What three months were randomly selected?	
7. Number of months meeting above transactions:	
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	
H. 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Did the actual up-to-date and complete revenue/expenditure report submitted follow the same format as the Contractor's approved budget and include all listed line items?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Did the report contain a detailed explanation of variances from the approved budget?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	
I. SPONSORSHIP/PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS	ELC REVIEW
1. Does the Agency have sponsorship materials, financed wholly or in part by state funds (including any funds through ELC) that are in accordance with the requirements outlined in the contract?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. In publicizing, advertising, or describing the sponsorship of the program, does Contractor state: "Sponsored by (Contractor's Name) and The Early Learning Coalition of Broward County, Inc." and the Agency for Workforce Innovation, Office of Early Learning"?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Do written materials include "The Early Learning Coalition of Broward County" and "Agency for Workforce Innovation, Office of Early Learning" in the same size letters or type as the name as the Contractor?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. When using statements, press releases, requests for proposals, bid solicitations, and other documents describing projects or programs funded in whole or in part with state or federal funds, all awardees receiving state or federal funds, shall clearly state (1) the percentage of the total cost of the program or project which will be financed with federal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

money, and (2) the dollar amount of federal funds for the project or program. Does the Contractor comply?	
ELC review comments: Reviewed QIS brochures and QIS meeting notices. All materials included the proper sponsorship information. Agency sponsorship/public announcements were all <i>reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</i>	
J. ASSIGNMENTS AND SUBCONTRACTS	ELC REVIEW
<i>Perform only if there are sub-contracts in place being paid for direct services with funding covered by this monitoring visit.</i>	
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? Yes; dated 8-5-2008	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Are the payments to the subcontractors in line with the contract?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Does the contract specify a match budget for the subcontractor?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
ELC review comments: Reviewed Subcontract between SBBC and Nova Southeastern University, signed August 5, 2008. Agency documents were <i>reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</i>	
K. STAFFING	ELC REVIEW
1. Did the Contractor maintain sufficient and qualified staff to deliver the agreed upon services required by the Contract? [Exhibit B (Form B-3)] Two staff positions were vacant during the year (in February and May 2009)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Do names of personnel match positions listed in the budget?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Did the Contractor ensure that staffing patterns and staff qualifications are sufficient to provide the services described within the contract, including backup plans when turnover occurs, with the capacity to provide services in English, Spanish, Portuguese, and Creole? During staff vacancies, Mentors are assigned providers to visit until full coverage is obtained.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Did the Contractor provide and/or ensure continuous quality improvement training to 100% of its staff? 4 mentors attended the ECERS training in Miami; NAC Accreditation in Palm Beach Co.; one staff attended So. Fla. Montessori Education Center training.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Has the Contractor or its agent notified WorkForce One of all entry level employment opportunities associated with this Contract which requires a high school education or less? In the event that the Contractor or its agent employs a person who was referred by the WorkForce One office, the Contractor shall notify the Coalition.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
ELC review comments: Matched staff positions with those in the budget. Reviewed personnel list with various languages spoken by each. SBBC also has a Multi-cultural department that provides translation services as well. Also reviewed training authorization request for six (6) QIS staff who attended various trainings. Staffing support was <i>reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</i>	

L. BACKGROUND SCREENING	ELC REVIEW
1. Did the Contractor's personnel and volunteers, who as part of their duties and responsibilities, spend forty hours or more per month in early care and education program(s) submitted to a local and state criminal records check within ten days of employment in accordance with Section 435.03(1), Florida Statutes?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
ELC review comments: Reviewed SBBC policy that requires all prospective candidates for employment to fill out their background check form. Background screenings (submitted in accordance with Section 435.01(1) Florida Statutes) were <i>reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</i>	
M. KEY PERSONNEL/PERSONNEL POLICIES	ELC REVIEW
1. Does the Agency have written Personnel Policies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Where are personnel folders located? Oakland Park Blvd. North Central Area Office.	
3. Select a random number of personnel files and verify that each file contains the following:	
a. Job descriptions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
b. Qualification documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
c. Evaluations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
d. Individual Non-Disclosure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
e. Confidentiality Certificate Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Number of randomly selected personnel files: 3	
5. Number of said files containing above mentioned criteria: 3	
6. Where are the employee records located? Near Office Manager's office and at the SBBC Personnel Department office located on Oakland Park Blvd.	
7. Are employee records securely stored? Yes; In locked file cabinets.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
ELC review comments: Reviewed three (3) employee files. On-site visit to SBBC Personnel Department located on Oakland Park Blvd. for review of qualifications documentation in three (3) files. Agency Personnel Policies and personnel files were <i>reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</i>	
N. PAYROLL RECORDS	ELC REVIEW
1. Does staff, including management, document their work hours through a time sheet or punch clock? Broward County School Board Policy not required except for overtime and other exception.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Are time records signed by both the employee and the supervisor? Not maintained by BCSB	<input 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 (N/A)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
e. Payroll period	<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: Two (2) payroll records were reviewed.	
5. Number of said journals that included the above criteria: The two samples met the criteria	
6. For a sample of employees charged to the program, review that positions match the budget approved by the funding agency, Do they match?	<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?	<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? Request review by Budget Specialist, order approved by Coordinator, requisition approved by Director, verification of receipt approved by Budget Specialist, A/P pays vendors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	
O. NONEXPENDABLE PROPERTY	ELC REVIEW
1. Has the Inventory of Nonexpendable Property been submitted for 2008-2009? Not applicable	<input 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? Not applicable	<input 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? Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Perform the following only if the Agency has been funded by ELC, in current or prior funding cycles, for fixed assets such as computers or equipment. This test includes fixed price contracts where rates were based on calculations that included capital expenditures. Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Perform a physical inventory of a sample of ELC program assets drawn from the fixed assets register provided by ELC. Do they agree? Note any discrepancies. Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. Are program fixed assets being used in accordance with the funding intent? Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
7. Do asset additions and/or disposal procedures follow ELC's Fixed Asset policy/procedures? Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

8. Were fixed assets purchased within the contract period in which they were approved/funded? Not applicable		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
ELC review comments:		
Q. INSURANCE		ELC REVIEW
1. Review the Agency's Accord Form to determine which policies are in place.		
2. Where are the Agency Policies located? Risk Management.		
3. Did the Contractor submit one Continuation of Operations Plan (COOP) to the Coalition's Contract Manager upon execution of the Contract? The COOP shall include the Contractor's plans to continue operations during unforeseen circumstances whether natural or man-made disasters, local emergencies, or other emergency situations requiring significant changes in operation. The plan shall include pre-disaster planning, including but not limited to record protections, alternative service accommodations, supplies, and a recovery plan that would allow the Contractor to continue functioning as per the executed Contract in the event of an actual disaster.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Worker's Compensation; minimum Liability limits of \$100,000 per accident, \$100,000 per person, and \$500,000 policy aggregate.	Expiration Date: 7/1/09	Amount: Self-insured
5. Unemployment Compensation Insurance: reporting and contributions up-to-date payments.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. General Liability	Expiration Date: 7/1/09	Amount: \$700,000
7. Professional Liability	Expiration Date: 7/1/09	Amount: Self-insured
8. Property	Expiration Date: 7/1/09	Amount: Self-insured
9. Automobile Liability	Expiration Date: 7/1/09	Amount: \$700,000
ELC review comments: Reviewed self-insured letter and certificate of liability insurance. Reviewed Superintendent of schools letter to staff regarding emergency response cards. Reviewed emergency phone tree for the School Readiness Department. Agency Insurance Documents were all <i>reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</i>		
R. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION AND SECURITY OBLIGATIONS		ELC REVIEW
1. Does the Agency have policies to safeguard client confidentiality?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Does the Agency have protocols to protect computer based documents and records?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

3. Do only the appropriate staff members have access to computerized records?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Does the Agency have a system for the maintenance of files?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p><u>ELC review comments:</u> Reviewed SBBC policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # 5100.1 (Student Records: Confidentiality and Family Educational Rights). • # 5306 (School and District Technology Usage). • # 4016 (Personnel Records). <p>Reviewed emails with instructions for managing computers on the SBBC Network and information on the SBBC server/computer network standards which include fault tolerant RAID arrays, backup capabilities and onsite warranty. Agency Confidential Information and Security Obligations Corporate Documents were all <i>reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</i></p>	
S. INCIDENT REPORTING	
Child Abuse Reports made to the authorities and Coalition. No reports were made.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Report knowledge of any abuse or alleged abuse or any serious injury or death by a child while in care to the Coalition. No reports were made.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p><u>ELC review comments:</u> There were no reports of child abuse made during the contract year. Agency Incident Reporting Documents were all <i>reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</i></p>	
T. RETURN OF FUNDS / FINAL INVOICE	
1. Final Invoice submitted for payment no later than 40 days after the contract ends:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	

Program Performance Specification Annual Review and Assessment Instrument 2008-2009

Contract: SBBC-QIS-09-ELC 3 Quality Improvement Supports

A. MAJOR PROGRAM GOALS

ELC 3 2008-2009 Quality Improvement Supports:

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

Service Provider Directions:

Please fill in shaded sections using “track changes” tool. Do not write in any other area.

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

1. Technical Assistance: *Technical Assistance was afforded to 67 selected community preschool centers neighboring Differentiated Accountability elementary schools. The results of the pre-assessment, administered by ELC 4, guided the targeted areas for the mentors to closely work with the preschool educators.*

a. QRIS: *The Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) technical assistance (TA) correlated with all aspects of Broward County’s QRIS tool. The seven areas from the environmental tools, as well as curriculum, were recorded under this category. All centers have a written detailed QRIS plan in place to improve educational outcomes and kindergarten readiness. During the 2008-2009 fiscal year, SBBC dedicated 2,542 units to QRIS technical assistance.*

b. Inclusion: *Inclusion focused on TA provided to teachers who serve identified or suspected students with disabilities. Strategies and activities are shared with teachers to implement appropriate practices. During the 2008-2009 fiscal year, 35 units were dedicated to inclusion practices.*

c. Accreditation: Accreditation TA focused specifically on the requirements of different accrediting entities. One hundred (100) hours or forty (40) units of technical assistance were provided in 11 centers. Three (3) centers received accreditation during the 2008-2009 fiscal year.

d. Professional Training: The QIS mentors facilitated on-site professional development training. A total of 62 training events were presented to early child care centers. 171 teachers attended the professional development events. All participants received CEUS.

e. CDA mentoring: Fourteen (14) CDA participants received ten (10) units of direct TA. Mentors helped the participants understand and implement activities learned in the CDAs coursework.

2. Provider Meetings: Four provider meetings were held during the 2008-2009 contract year. The meetings were scheduled to provide pertinent information regarding the QRIS program. Professional development was added to the meetings. CEUs were awarded to the center directors attending the four scheduled meetings.

3. QRIS Blog: The QRIS blog was created to facilitate communication between Broward County Child Care Licensing & Enforcement Quality Rating and Improvement System and agencies offering technical assistance. All agencies involved in the QRIS program have been given access to navigate the QRIS blog.

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

C. CLIENTS TO BE SERVED

General Description	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review	As verified by
1. The number of child care centers located in identified Superintendent Elementary School Neighborhoods to receive Quality Improvement Supports throughout the Contract period shall be 63 child care centers .	<u>67</u> <i>(for the majority of the fiscal year)</i> <u>61 in the last half of the 4th Quarter</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met	Database records identified 63 centers served only in the Month of December; all other months less than 63 centers were served.

No Action at this time: The ELC 3 Service Provider has already submitted a written operations plan on November 9, 2009, with

implementation strategies that will ensure that recruitment of providers within the neighboring Differentiated Accountability elementary schools is continuous and that 63 child care centers receive Quality Improvement Supports each month throughout the contract period.

Service Provider response (if desired):

Adjustment Required: *In order to ensure the intent of this objective is met for the 2009-2010 contract year, the ELC 3 Service Provider shall count the number of providers served, as those with a signed Service Agreement between the provider and the ELC 2 Service Provider, a completed QRS pre-assessment or Rating, a signed Service Agreement between the provider and this ELC 3 Service Provider, and a completed Quality Improvement Plan.*

Service Provider plan to meet adjustment required (HOW) Explain: *The ELC 3 Service providers will follow procedures as described above.*

D. SCHEDULE AND DESCRIPTION OF DELIVERABLES

1. Task List - General	ELC Review	As verified by
Did the Contractor provide Quality Improvement Supports for providers to ensure an adequate supply and range of school readiness service sites and to improve the business capacity of providers?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	Database records
Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe how you provided QIS for providers in 2008-2009. <i>QIS Mentors provided technical assistance to all selected child care providers focusing on all areas of the ECERS and ITERS, which are aligned with the Quality Rating Improvement System criteria.</i>		
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: ELC randomly selected provider files		
ELC review comments: Reviewed 27 provider files and ELC 3 specially designed database records for evidence of center visits and observations related to quality improvement technical assistance provided on a weekly basis. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>		

E. PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS

CORE COMPONENT OBJECTIVES (OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS)

1. 100% of focused individual quality improvement planning and mentoring shall utilize provider-specific data from the Quality Assurance (ELC 4) Service Provider as an organizing mechanism, as demonstrated in each provider's technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan, to the degree and the extent that the data is available on a quarterly basis.	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	1.a. Number of providers (centers) served: <u>67</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	93% 25/27
	1.b. Number of Environment Rating Scales (ERS) received from ELC 4 for the above providers: <u>67</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	N=27 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

	1.c. Number of Quality Improvement Plans built from ERS for same providers: <u>67</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>
	1.d. Percent Achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
<p>Contractor Responsibility: In conjunction with the Coalition, determine a prioritization and rational for technical assistance and training support, which can be used to focus available resources. Priorities my include, but are not limited, to the following: (a) Providers who are located in Superintendent Elementary School Neighborhoods; (b) Providers who serve children whose families receive school readiness funds; and (c) Providers who have the greatest demonstrated, measurable need for training, technical assistance, and related supports as indicated by the Environmental Rating Scales.</p>			
<p>Contractor Responsibility: Provide weekly on-site Technical Assistance for 63 child care centers, located in identified Superintendent Elementary School Neighborhoods throughout the Contract year.</p>			
<p>Service Provider annual review: (1) Briefly describe the process by which focused individual quality improvement planning and coaching utilizes provider-specific data from the <i>Quality Assurance</i> (ELC 4) Service Provider as an organizing mechanism, in each provider’s technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan. (2) Briefly describe the process for managing technical assistance by priority. (3) Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing these services. <i>Technical assistance information is input into the database by the QIS mentors. The data is analyzed by the team and discussed during weekly meetings to ensure that providers are receiving necessary TA.</i></p>			
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) ELC randomly selected provider files- Quality Improvement Plans; (2) Quality Improvement Plan template; (3) Mentors’ weekly schedules from 2008-2009. (4) A map of Superintendent Elementary School Neighborhoods with participating schools highlighted and ECERS scores noted. (5) ELC will also review Database and selected provider files;</p>			
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed sample weekly schedules for mentors and ECERS scores for all 67 centers who received technical assistance through this contract for evidence of provider-specific data from the <i>Quality Assurance</i> (ELC 4) Service Provider used as an organizing mechanism in each provider’s technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan. Reviewed twenty-seven (27) provider files (40%), who received technical assistance through this contract, for evidence of provider-specific data from the <i>Quality Assurance</i> (ELC 4) Service Provider used as an organizing mechanism in each provider’s technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Twenty-five (25) provider files (93%) showed evidence of provider-specific data from the <i>Quality Assurance</i> (ELC 4) Service Provider used as an organizing mechanism in each provider’s technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan; and • Two (2) provider files (7%) did not contain a Quality Improvement Plan. 			
<p>No Action at this time: <i>The ELC 3 Service Provider has already submitted a written operations plan on November 9, 2009, with implementation strategies that will ensure that each provider has a Quality Improvement Plan in place based on provider-specific data from the Quality Assurance (ELC 4-1) Service Provider as an organizing mechanism prior to providing ongoing technical assistance.</i></p>			
<p>Service Provider response (if desired):</p>			

	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	As verified by	
<p>Contractor Responsibility: Provide all identified Technical Assistance services (Accreditation, Inclusion, Curriculum, and other Quality improvements) through each mentor, based on the Environmental Rating Scale and the <i>Child Screening and Assessment</i> (ELC 5) Service Providers' child assessment results.</p>	The number of Technical Assistance Units provided for:		Database records and 27 selected provider files	
	a. Curriculum: <u>283</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
	b. Personal space and furnishing: <u>438</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
	c. Personal Care routines: <u>58</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
	d. Language and Reasoning: <u>55</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
	e. Activities: <u>246</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
	f. Interaction: <u>70</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
	g. Program Structure: <u>124</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
	h. Parents and Staff: <u>497</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
	i. Inclusion: <u>38</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
	j. Accreditation: <u>38</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
	k. Professional Development: <u>196 hrs.</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
l. Other Quality Improvements: <u>NA</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
<p>Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing these services. <i>QIS mentors work with each center individually to provide the specific TA that is needed. The challenges for the mentors include those centers that require a great amount of TA in several areas; and oftentimes, include areas that cannot be easily remedied (space and furnishings, teacher/student ratios).</i></p>				
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Center-specific data that reflects services provided.</p>				
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 3 database records for verification of total technical assistance units provided to all centers in each specific area. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></p> <p>Reviewed observation records signed/dated by teachers and mentors in 27 provider files which captured the units of technical assistance/mentoring provided in specific areas to participating child care centers.</p>				
<p>Contractor Responsibility: Provide center specific workshops, linkages to cluster elementary school and mentoring to CDA scholarship recipient.</p>	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	As verified by	
	b. Number of center specific workshops that were held: <u>62</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Database records	

	c. Number of linkages to cluster elementary schools: <u>12</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	identified 62 specific workshops held, linkages with 12 elementary schools, and 13 CDA scholarship recipient's mentored
	d. Number of CDAs mentored: <u>14</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing these services. <i>One of the successes in the program is the positive response we have received from the linkages between the early care centers and elementary schools. Both parties have demonstrated willingness and enthusiasm to establishing a connection and a partnership to improve kindergarten readiness in the centers.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Ability to view the video and the corresponding workshop materials; (2) ELC randomly selected provider files - Documentation of linkages to cluster elementary schools; (3) ELC randomly selected provider files - CDA mentoring documentation.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed documentation of center specific workshops held at various centers. Reviewed ELC 3 database documentation of the number of centers linked to 12 cluster elementary schools. Reviewed list of CDA scholarship recipients who received Mentoring. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sixty-two (62) workshops were held at 43 centers; Twenty-five (25) early care and education centers each visited one of the 12 elementary schools in the cluster; each of the 12 elementary school received visits. Fourteen (14) CDA scholarship recipients were identified as employed at six (6) centers; one (1) candidate received a CDA scholarship through another scholarship program. 			
Contractor Responsibility: Provide approximately 20 monthly units of technical assistance/mentoring, support, and training by each mentor, to participating child care centers on subjects directly related to providing quality services and positive child outcomes and organized around Quality Improvement Plans that are built on Environmental Rating Scale Results.	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	As verified by
	a. Number of mentors: <u>9 (until Dec. '08)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Database records and provider files
b. Number of units provided monthly per mentor: <u>over 20</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing these services.			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: ELC randomly selected provider files - Center-specific documentation reflecting			

number of units provided to each center by each mentor.

ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 3 database observation records as documentation of the total units provided by each mentor. Each mentor averaged a total of 28 units of technical assistance/mentoring per month. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

Reviewed 27 provider files for observation records signed/dated by teachers and mentors which captured the number of units of technical assistance/mentoring provided by the mentor to participating child care centers; 100% of the 27 provider files contained such observation records and noted monthly units of technical assistance provided.

Contractor Responsibility: Advertise benchmark matching mini-grant opportunities as part of Quality Improvement Plans and award matching mini-grants with funding from the Coalition provided under this Contract to help centers attain quality improvement plan goals and benchmarks.	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	As verified by
	a. Number of centers receiving matching mini-grants: <u>25 centers</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Database records, expenditure report and purchase orders

Service Provider annual review: Please briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing these services. *Due to budget cuts and district personnel adjustments, maintaining adequate number of staff was a challenge for this contract year.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Advertisement material for matching mini-grants; (2) Documentation of matching mini-grant awards for selected providers or documentation of declined opportunity for matching grant. (3) ELC randomly selected provider file review.

ELC review comments: Reviewed advertising material for matching mini-grant in the Provider agreement. Reviewed ELC 3 database records for evidence of expenditure reports and purchase orders identifying participation and receipt of matching mini-grants. A total of \$12,407 was awarded and matched by 25 centers. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

Reviewed 27 center-based provider files for evidence of expenditure reports and purchase orders identifying participation and receipt of matching mini-grants:

- Eleven (11) center-based providers (41%) received a matching min-grant ranging from \$102 to \$750 to purchase supplies for their centers; and
- Fourteen (14) center-based providers had reached their established Quality Improvement Plan goals and benchmarks and chose not to participate in the matching min-grant opportunity; and
- Two (2) center-based providers had not sufficiently reached Quality Improvement Plan goals and benchmarks to participate in the grant opportunity.

2. 75% of providers who receive training as part of their technical assistance Quality Improvement	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
---	--	--	-----------------------

Plan shall show a measurable increase in their knowledge in each pertinent subject area, as measured by a pre and post-test.	2.a. Number of providers who received training as part of their TA QIP: <u>47</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	84% 116/138 N=116 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	2.b. Number of said providers who show a measurable increase in each pertinent area measured by pre and post test: <u>43</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	2.c. Percent achieved: <u>91%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>

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

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: ELC randomly selected provider files - pre and post tests (Database records).

ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 3 database records for evidence that providers received training as part of their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) and the pre/post test scores of attendees for increase in knowledge in each of the 24 different pertinent subject areas. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

Reviewed 27 center-based provider files for evidence that providers who received training as part of their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan, showed a measurable increase in their knowledge in each pertinent subject area, as measured by attendee pre and post-test:

- 10 center-based provider files did not require training as part of their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan; and
- 17 providers (63%) received training as part of their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan at one or more of 62 training sessions in 24 pertinent subject areas:
 - One hundred thirty-eight (138) teachers, teacher-aids, and/or directors attended training sessions.
 - One hundred sixteen (116) teachers, teacher-aids, and/or directors (84%) showed a measurable increase in their knowledge in each pertinent subject area, as measured by attendee pre/post tests; and
 - Twenty (20) teachers and/or directors (14%) from 5 of the 17 centers, scored consistently high on the pre/post test; and
 - Two (2) teacher-aids did not show measurable increases in their knowledge.

3. 75% of providers who participate in and receive focused technical assistance/mentoring shall show a measurable increase in each of the pertinent areas identified in their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan, as demonstrated by meeting at least 75% of their benchmarks.	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results Validated?	Action needed?
	3.a. Number of providers receiving focused TA: <u>67</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	93% 25/27 N=27 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	3.b. Number of providers who met 75% or more of their benchmarks: <u>61</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	3.c. Percent achieved: <u>91%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>

Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing these services. *Success at recruiting new*

centers and providing them with TA.

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Summary database records and provider files for Quality Improvement Plans and supporting documentation that reflects goals achieved by providers; (2) ELC randomly selected provider files.

ELC review comments: Reviewed summary database record information for 67 participating centers for evidence that providers who participate in and receive focused technical assistance/mentoring show a measurable increase in each of the pertinent areas identified in their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan, as demonstrated by meeting at least 75% of their benchmarks. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

Reviewed 27 center-based provider files for evidence that each provider participated in and received focused technical assistance/mentoring showed a measurable increase in each of the pertinent areas identified in their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan, as demonstrated by meeting at least 75% of their benchmarks:

- Twenty-five (25) center-based provider files (93%) indicated evidence that providers participated in and received focused technical assistance/mentoring and showed a measurable increase in each of the pertinent areas identified in their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan, as demonstrated by meeting at least 75% of their benchmarks (100% met); and
- Two (2) center-based providers did not meet 75% of their benchmarks; (66% met).

	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
4. 75% of providers who receive training as part of their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan shall report two or more ways in which they shall use the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work.	4.a. Number of providers receiving training as part of TA: <u>613 teachers (47 providers)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 138/138 N=138 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes see row below for details.</i>
	4.b. Number of said providers reporting two or more ways they use knowledge: <u>603 teachers (40 providers)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	4.c. Percent achieved: <u>85%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing these services. *The QIS mentors provide trainings as part of TA. The mentors do an excellent job of providing training to staff, directors, and child care personnel.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) List of provider sites with trainings identified as part of their Quality Improvement Plan who attended trainings; (2) List of teachers by provider site that attend each training; (3) Completed surveys of teachers who attended trainings from selected sites indicating how many reported two or more ways in which to use the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work; (4) Summary sheet Knowledge gained; (5) ELC selected provider file review.

ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 3 database records of trainings for evidence of teachers' attendance from 47 providers who received training as part of their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan and reported two or more ways in which they would use the knowledge

provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work. ***All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.***
 Reviewed 17 provider files of providers who received training as part of their technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan for evidence that teachers reported two (2) or more ways in which they used the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work:

- 17 provider files contained training evaluations of 138 early care and education personnel who attended training as part of the technical assistance Quality Improvement Plan:
 - All 138 early care and education personnel (100%) reported two (2) or more ways in which they would use the knowledge provided in the training to enhance the effectiveness of their work.

	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
5. 100% of CDA scholarship recipients, who are employed at centers participating in technical assistance, shall be offered mentoring services during technical assistance at their child care facility, to support their successful completion of the CDA program.	5.a. Number of CDA scholarship recipients at participating centers: <u>34</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	0% 0/14 N=14 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>
	5.b. Number of said recipients offered mentoring services during 0809 Contract period: <u>14</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
	5.c. Percent achieved: <u>41%</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe how mentoring is offered and any successes and/or challenges to providing these services. *All CDA scholarship recipients who are employed at centers participating in TA are offered mentoring services during TA at their child care facility; 100% of the mentors accepted mentoring services.*

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

ELC review comments: Reviewed scholarship data records for evidence of employees working at centers receiving technical assistance from this ELC 3 Service Provider who had been granted CDA scholarships. Reviewed ELC 3 CDA mentorship agreements and database mentor observation records indicating students who were offered and received mentoring services as evidenced by mentor/CDA mentorship agreements and observation records which reflected each mentor’s discussions with CDA scholarship candidates.

Thirteen (13) files indicated evidence of mentorship activity; seven (7) had mentorship agreements and observation records and six (6) additional CDA candidates had observation records.

Of the 27 center-based provider files reviewed, six (6) centers had 14 employees who received CDA scholarships:

- None of these employees had been offered mentorship according to mentorship agreements or observation records.

No Action at this time: *The ELC 3 Service Provider has already submitted a written operations plan on November 9, 2009, detailing implementation strategies, effective dates, and quality assurance procedures that will ensure that each CDA scholarship recipient is offered mentoring services as indicated by signed CDA mentorship agreements.*

Service Provider response (if desired):			
	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
6. 85% of providers served shall report overall satisfaction with services delivered through this Contract, including cultural competency/sensitivity, customer-friendliness, usefulness of services provided, efficiency of service, and convenience of hours and location of services.	6.a. Number of providers served: <u>67</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>
	6.b. Number of providers surveyed: <u>61</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	6.c. Number of surveys returned: <u>38</u> 6.d. Number of providers reporting satisfaction with:		
	<input type="radio"/> Cultural competency/sensitivity: <u>36/38 (95%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="radio"/> Customer-friendliness <u>38/38 (100%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="radio"/> Usefulness of services provided: <u>37/38 (97%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="radio"/> Efficiency of service: <u>36/38 (95%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="radio"/> Convenience of hours and location of services: <u>37/38 (97%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	6.d. Percent achieved: <u>97%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe method for gathering satisfaction data and any successes/challenges in delivering this survey. <i>The total number of surveys delivered and received was less than 61 due to staff reduction in the summer. The surveys completed and returned did report a 97% satisfaction rate for services provided.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Satisfaction surveys with summary.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed satisfaction survey summary analysis and back-up documentation for quality improvement supports, cultural competency/sensitivity, customer-friendliness, usefulness of services provided, efficiency of service, convenience of hours and location of services.			

A total of 61 providers who used the Quality Improvement Support services during the contract year were delivered to each participating provider in the last quarter of the contract year and 38 providers (62%) responded to the survey; on average, over 97% indicated that providers receiving coaching and technical assistance services reported overall satisfaction with services, including cultural competency/sensitivity, customer-friendliness, usefulness of services provided, efficiency of service, and convenience of access of services. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
7. 80% of students who receive CDA scholarships and mentoring shall complete the CDA component in which they are enrolled and/or retain enrollment in the program through certification and shall report five or more ways in which they will use the knowledge provided in the program to enhance the effectiveness of their work.	7.a. Number of CDA scholarship recipients with mentoring: <u>13</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 8/8 N=8 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>
	7.b. Number of said recipients completing CDA component in which they enrolled and/or retain enrollment: <u>13 (8 completed/5 newly enrolled)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	7.c. Number of said recipients reporting five or more ways they use knowledge: <u>8</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	7.d. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges to providing this service.

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Database records, CDA scholarship recipient summary/status; (2) Documentation that supports CDA students' knowledge.

ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 3 database records for evidence of CDA scholarship recipient summary/status and observation records for CDA students, along with corresponding questionnaires that the student reported five (5) or more ways they would use the knowledge provided in the program to enhance the effectiveness of their work. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

Reviewed thirteen (13) files of CDA scholarship recipients for indication that those who received mentoring, completed or remained in the CDA program:

- Eight (8) students (62%) completed the CDA component in which they were enrolled and five (5) students (38%) received scholarships in May 2009 and retained enrollment in the program; and
- Eight (8) students (100%) completed documentation listing five (5) or more ways they would use the knowledge gained from the program to enhance the effectiveness of their work.

8. 100% of the policies and procedures shall ensure the protection and confidentiality of	ELC Review	Action needed?
--	-------------------	-----------------------

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.	<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. *Personnel are trained to abide by the Florida Statutes including Standard Levels of Service, Chapter 411 and Chapter 1002, to ensure that all individual child records and early learning provider records remain protected and confidential.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Copy of Policies and Procedures; (2) Confidentiality Policy.

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

9. 100% of child care provider telephone calls shall be answered by the fourth ring and 100% of customer telephone calls which are placed on hold shall hold for no more than two (2) minutes before caller being given the option to continue to hold or to request a call-back within 48 business hours and 90% of customers who leave messages will receive follow-up within two (2), 48-hour (business) days of initial contact.	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review	Action needed?
	9.a. Percent of telephone calls answered by fourth ring: <u>6</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	9.b. Percent of customer phone calls placed on hold holding for no more than 2 minutes: <u>6</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	9.c. Percent of customers receiving call-back within 48 hour business days: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<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: (1) Provider call log; (2) ELC staff will conduct Secret Shopper Calls.

ELC review comments: Reviewed SBBC-ELC 3 Service Provider’s call log which contained six (6) phone message. ***All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.***

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

Conducted two (2) Secret Shopper calls where messages were left:

- 10/10/08 – Call made at 11:00 AM, left message for Program Supervisor to call back; Call-back received same day, 10/10/08.
- 5/5/09 – Call made at 10:32 PM, left message for Program Supervisor; Call back received same day, 5/5/09.

10. 100% of complaints received, or observations, concerning potential child care licensing violations shall be tracked and reported to	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
	10.a. Number of complaints received: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

Broward County Child Care Licensing and feedback on the outcome shall be documented.			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	10.b. Number of complaints reported to BCCCL: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 any successes/challenges with achieving this outcome. No challenges to report.			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Broward County Child Care Licensing complaint log.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed log of complaints or observations concerning potential child care licensing violations tracked and reported to Broward County Child Care Licensing and feedback on the outcome documented. No complaints were received or observations concerning potential child care licensing violations were made during the fiscal year. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
11. 100% of complaints or observations concerning potential abuse, neglect, or abandonment shall be reported to the Florida Department of Children and Families and the Coalition shall be notified of said reports, within the applicable confidentiality regulations.	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	11.a. Number of complaints received: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	11.b. Number of complaints reported to FLDCF: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If yes see row 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: Child Abuse Complaint Log.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 3 Child Abuse Complaint Log for evidence of complaints or observations concerning potential abuse, neglect, or abandonment reported to the Florida Department of Children and Families, including notification of said reports (within the applicable confidentiality regulations) to the Coalition. No complaints or observations concerning potential child abuse, neglect, or abandonment were received during the fiscal year. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
12. 100% of other complaints concerning 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) and/or Quality Assurance (ELC 4) as appropriate,	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	12.a. Number of provider complaints received: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	12.b. Number of said complaints referred to appropriate Service Provider:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If yes see row below</i>

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.	<u>0</u>		<i>for details.</i>
	12.c. Number of said complaints addressed through training and TA: <u>0</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) Provider Complaint Log; (2) Supporting documentation for referral and feedback on outcomes.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 3 Service Provider Complaint Log and supporting documentation for referral and feedback on outcomes. No other complaints concerning providers were referred to the ELC 1, ELC 2, ELC 3, or ELC 4 Service Provider during the fiscal year. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
13. 100% of required data shall be collected, input, and tracked in accordance with state and local standards and requirements and reports shall be delivered complete and on time and 100% of ad hoc data and report requests made by the Coalition shall be provided in a timely manner.	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 will review its own Contract Obligations Checklist.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed Coalition's SBBC-ELC 3 Contract Obligation Checklist to confirm reports were delivered by contractual commitment dates. Reviewed emails for report arrival dates. The SBBC-ELC 3 Contract Obligations Checklist revealed that 100% of required data was collected, input, and tracked in accordance with state and local standards and requirements and reports were delivered complete and on time. 100% of reports were provided in a timely manner. Sixteen (16) reports were due to the Coalition; 100% of the required monthly, quarterly, annual, and ad hoc data and reports were submitted complete and on time in accordance with state and local standards and requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Twelve (12) monthly Key Data reports; three (3) quarterly; and one (1) annual report; for a total of 16 reports submitted on time to the Coalition. 			
14. 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 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 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.			
15. 100% of child care providers shall be proactively informed of complaint procedures, leading to formal, established grievance procedures.	SBBC Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	15.a. Number of child care providers served: <u>67</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>
	15.b. Number of said provider receiving complaint procedures: <u>67</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	15.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: (1) Provider agreements/A copy of documentation that providers receive; (2) Review select number of provider files.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 3-SBBC QRIS provider agreement between providers and the School Board of Broward County. Section 2.07, Interagency Dispute Process, is a formal established grievance procedure included in each provider agreement. Reviewed a copy of welcome letter from Program Supervisor sent to all providers after enrolling into the program. The letter includes a paragraph informing providers that for any concerns regarding eligibility determination or quality of service received, they could call the Program Supervisor. The phone number is included. According to the Program Coordinator, all facilities received a welcome letter once they signed the agreement for technical assistance. Reviewed selected provider files.			
Reviewed 27 center-based provider files for provider agreements and inclusion of welcome letter; 100% of the provider files contained a provider agreement and the letter.			
16. In order to coordinate services and prevent duplication, 100% of formal service linkage agreements and procedures that are approved by the Coalition, with all Early Care and Education System Providers and pertinent community partners, shall be developed and reduced to writing within thirty (30) days after the date of execution of this Contract and shall be implemented, followed, and revised as needed. This paragraph shall be inclusive of the links to the Broward County Child Care Licensing and Enforcement Division regarding communication about a change in status of or critical incident with any child care provider. Linkage agreements shall be actively implemented and maintained throughout the service year.	ELC Review		Action needed?
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details.</i>

Service Provider annual review: Note the organization with whom linkage agreements were executed and any successes/challenges with achieving the outcome.		
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Copies of all signed and dated linkage agreements.		
ELC review comments: Reviewed two (2) signed and dated linkage agreements; one (1) Memorandum of Agreement (MOU) with ELC 4-1: Broward County Quality Assurance Services - Quality Rating System a service of the Broward County Licensing and Enforcement Section, dated July 1, 2008 and one (1) letter of agreement with ELC 5: Child Screening and Assessment. The MOU was developed within the thirty (30) days after the date of execution of the Contract; the letter of agreement with ELC 5 was developed and executed in April 2009. The SBBC-QIS-09-ELC3 contract was fully executed June 30, 2008.		
Action required: <i>In order to ensure the intent of this objective is met for the 2009-2010 contract year, the ELC 3 Service Provider shall amend the 2009-2010 linkage agreement with the FCI-ELC 3 Service Provider for the purpose of obtaining CDA Scholarship Recipient information. The linkage agreement shall include the sharing of information on the following:</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Names of CDA scholarship recipients at all provider sites receiving technical assistance from the SBBC-ELC 3 Service Provider; Updates on the CDA recipients who withdraw from a provider site receiving technical assistance from the SBBC-ELC 3 Service Provider and move to another site within the ECE system. 		
Service Provider plan to meet action required (HOW) Explain: <i>A linkage agreement has been amended to reflect the language above. This is in the process of being signed and will be sent to the Coalition and maintained on file.</i>		
17. 100% participation in monthly Early Care and Education system coordination team meetings shall occur by a representative of the Contractor for all services and shall be actively and successfully coordinated with system partners and with the Coalition.	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 SBBC ELC 3 participated in 2008-2009.		
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: ELC will review its monthly sign-in sheets for attendance at system coordination team meetings along with meeting agendas and any other attendance documentation.		
ELC review comments: Reviewed contract obligation log and system coordination team meeting attendance records. The ELC 3 Service Provider attended all monthly system coordinator team meetings and/or had a representative in attendance; eleven (11) meetings (100%) were attended by SBBC-ELC 3 staff.		

18. 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 <u>ye s</u> see row below for details.</i>
Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed.		
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: ELC Fiscal department review budgets for deficit spending and significant surplus of funds.		
<u>ELC review comments:</u> Reviewed contract budget and amendments in comparison to the actual expenditures for fiscal year 2008-2009. The contract ended with an 18.7% surplus (\$162,007) for the fiscal year.		