

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

Monitoring Report
Contract: BCL-09-ELC4-1 Quality Assurance Services/Quality Rating System
Broward County, Child Licensing and Enforcement

Monitors for Early Learning Coalition (ELC)

Lisa Feeney, Senior Early Care and Education Program Specialist

Andrea Braynon, Chief Financial Officer

Leonardo Almanza, Accounting and HR Manager

Broward County, Child Licensing and Enforcement (BCCCLE) Representative

Anita Platt, Supervisor of Quality Rating Services

This monitoring process reflected in this report began on August 3, 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 Assurance Services/Quality Rating System** services in contract BCL-09-ELC4-1. **This report includes monitoring results of this contract.**

In addition to examining documentation related to performance objectives, Coalition Monitors conducted one (1) on-site observation of the Quality Rating Services to access service delivery and technology usage; and conducted interviews with the QRIS Coordinator, one (1) Quality Technician, and eight (8) providers involved in QRIS.

Prior to the monitoring visit, 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 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** (76%), and 25 children (20%) were school-age; four (4) 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) **chosen and eligible for ELC 4-1 services, 101 providers (60%) received a Quality Rating between January 2006 and June 30, 2009; 25 received a 4 star rating in 2006; 29 received a 4 star rating and 3 received a ERS pre-assessment in 2006-2007; six (6) received a 4 star rating and 32 received a ERS pre-assessment in 2007-2008; and 6 received a ERS pre-assessment and 17 received a second 5 star assessment between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2009. Fifty-four (54) of these providers were to receive an ERS pre-assessment or 5 star Quality Rating during this contract year and were chosen 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.*

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 costs are compared to the approved budget salary amount. There were no significant variances. In the sampling, there were estimates for a vacant position and an adjustment for the budgeted amounts for interim staffing to actual salary.)

Programmatic Review Summary:

This contract focuses on the implementation of Broward County's Quality Rating services for early care and education sites delivered by the ELC 4-1 Service Provider. *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 & Highlights Include:

- **Contract # BCL-09-ELC4-1 had fourteen (14) Performance Outcomes and two (2) program deliverables.**
- **93% performance outcomes were achieved; 50% of program deliverables were met and 50% were substantially met; and 80% of contract responsibilities were met for the 2008-2009 contract.**

- **Three hundred seven (307) different providers attended QRIS informational meetings; Ninety two (92) early care and education providers received pre-assessments or 5 star ratings between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2009; Forty (40) centers and five (5) homes received a pre-assessment and forty seven (47) centers received a 5 star rating.**
- **Eighty five (85) early care and education providers (92%) rated in 2008-2009 held Service Agreements to serve children receiving financial assistance from school readiness funds; and 82% serve children participating in VPK.**
- **Since the initial implementation of the QRS protocol in Broward County (Jan 2005), quality baseline data has been obtained for 289 Broward County legally operating early care and education providers serving children birth to school-age; 13 centers closed since their initial rating/pre-assessment, leaving 252 centers and 24 family child care homes currently operating in Quality Counts Broward/QRIS. Of all legally operating child care providers serving children birth to school-age as of June 30, 2009 (553 Centers and 216 Homes), 46% of the centers, and 11% of the Family Child Care Homes participate in Quality Counts Broward/QRIS.**
- **In order to improve the delivery of Quality Rating Services in the 2009-2010 contract year, the Coalition is requiring this Service Provider to:**
 - **Develop and execute a linkage agreement with the ELC 2 Service Provider, to obtain a quarterly report of names, addresses, and executed dates of each Provider's Service Agreement to determine and document which providers are contracted to serve children through school readiness funds.**
- **In order to improve the delivery of Quality Rating System Services in the 2009-2010 contract year, the ELC4-1 Service Provider *has already* put procedures in place to ensure:**
 - **A written QRIS Informational meeting evaluation used to document that each QRIS informational meeting participant can identify at least three (3) benefits of being involved in the Broward QRIS program. ELC 4-1 staff began to use the survey at the September 2009 Informational meetings.**
 - **The ELC 4-1 Service Provider has entered into a contract, beginning August 11, 2009 through August 10, 2010, with the Children's Forum to conduct ERS pre-assessments as necessary, to assist with scheduling anomalies.**

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

Contract Annual Review

Contract: **BCL-09-ELC4-1: Quality Assurance Services/Quality Rating System**

A. FEDERAL LAW REQUIREMENTS	ELC REVIEW
1. Does the Agency have a written Drug-Free Workplace Policy? About Broward County (ABC of Broward County Employment) page 10.	<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? ELC 4-1: The posters are located on the main floor in the employee lunch room displayed on a bulletin board which is accessible to all employees.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Does the Agency have a written Non- Discrimination and Harassment Free Workplace Policy? About Broward County (ABC of Broward County Employment) EEO page 11; Harassment pages 12-13.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
ELC review comments: <i>ELC 4-1: Quality Assurance Services/Quality Rating System is located in the Broward County Human Services Administration Division of Child Care Licensing and Enforcement Section at the Broward County Family Success Center 10077 N.W. 29th Street, Coral Springs, FL 33065. Agency Polices were 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? The Internal Control Handbook on the BC-Net. Internal Control Handbooks Volume 6, reviewed on-line, on-site, contains the county Accounting Policy and Procedures Manual.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Are the Agency's By-laws available for review? The county does not have by-laws since it is county government.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Are the Agency's Articles of Incorporation available for review? The county does not have Articles of Incorporation since it is county government.	<input checked="" 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? Reviewed organizational chart with names and positions listed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Is there an audit on File? Reviewed copy of the Single Audit Report for year ending Sept 30, 2008.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
ELC review comments: <i>Agency Corporation Documents were 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? Yes	<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? Yes	<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? Yes	<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? Yes	<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? Through the use of the general fund.	<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)? Advantage System is the financial system.	<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? Not applicable	<input 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? The financial system eliminates duplications.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

6. Number of invoices randomly selected: Eight (8) SR expenditures were reviewed for the months of October 2008 and April 2009	
7. Number of invoices meeting the above criteria (5a. –5f): 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. Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Is the cost allocation methodology in writing and is it representative of the allocation used? Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	
G. BANK	ELC REVIEW
1. Are bank statements reconciled monthly? Yes, by the Broward County Finance 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? Yes (confirmed process verbally)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Select 3 random months and verify above transactions	
6. What three months were randomly selected? Not applicable	
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? Year-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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Did the report contain a detailed explanation of variances from the approved budget? Variances are reviewed monthly	<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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

ELC) that are in accordance with the requirements outlined in the contract? QRS Brochure	
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”? QRS Brochure	<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,” in the same size letters or type as the name as the Contractor? Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
ELC review comments: Agency sponsorship/public announcements were all reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.	
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. Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Does the subcontractor have a contract? Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Are the payments to the subcontractors in line with the contract? Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Does the contract specify a match budget for the subcontractor? Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
ELC review comments:	
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)] ELC 4-1: Maintained seven (7) staff as required by Contract and match organizational chart.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Do names of personnel match positions listed in the budget? Organizational charts match Exhibit B (form B-3)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Did the Contractor ensure that staffing patterns and staff qualifications (see job descriptions) 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? BCCCLE employs multiple individuals who can speak a variety of languages and can be called upon to help with any translation issue and/or turnover issue that might arise. ELC 4-1 has access to the County temporary personnel process to hired for 6 months, to simplify immediate hiring in case of turnover. The ITERS and ECERS tools are available in Spanish; if client comes into QRS office Spanish and Creole interpreters are available. In classrooms, teachers are bi-lingual. (Translation Services are available)	<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? All staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<p>participates in various County continuous quality improvement training. County training calendar lists all trainings available free to county employees on BC-Net. County HR keeps record of all training taken by each employee by employee number. Reviewed evidence of all employees attending quality improvement trainings during contract year. All staff attended the 8 day in depth ECERS training and the annual ERSI reliability training.</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? In the event that the Contractor or its agent employs a person who was referred by the Work Force One office, the Contractor shall notify the Coalition. NA but would if an entry level position opportunity arose.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p><u>ELC review comments:</u> Staffing documentation was reviewed and found to be in order and met required specifications.</p>	
<p>L. 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) submitted to a local and state criminal records check within ten days of employment in accordance with Section 435.03(1), Florida Statutes? County has a risk management department and they do a level 1 screening of potential employees. Criminal Background checks are conducted by the Safety and Occupational Health section of the Risk Management Division for new hires and may be conducted for other employment related matters. Page 9 in ABC’s About Broward County Employment Handbook.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p><u>ELC review comments:</u> Background screenings (submitted in accordance with Section 435.01 (1) Florida Statutes) were reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</p>	
<p>M. KEY PERSONNEL/PERSONNEL POLICIES</p>	<p>ELC REVIEW</p>
<p>1. Does the Agency have written Personnel Policies? On BC-Net Code of Ordinances, Internal Control Handbook, Volume 15 Human Resources.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>2. Where are personnel folders located? ELC 4-1: The HR office downtown keeps all employee records; however duplicate records are located on-site, with the Supervisor, in a locked file cabinet.</p>	
<p>3. Select a random number of personnel files and verify that each file contains the following: Reviewed seven (7) of eight (8) ELC 4-1 personnel files. Personnel files were reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</p>	
<p>a. Job descriptions: All seven files contained signed job descriptions.</p>	
<p>b. Qualification documentation: All seven files contained signed Background Verification Record forms, a Broward County Finance and Administration Services Department Human Resources Division Official Document, signed by supervisor and attesting that original transcripts and diplomas were reviewed.</p>	
<p>c. Evaluations: All seven files contained signed evaluations for 2008-2009.</p>	

d. Individual Non-Disclosure: All seven files contained signed forms for 2008-2009.	
e. Confidentiality Certificate Form (same as above): All seven files contained signed forms for 2008-2009.	
4. Number of randomly selected personnel files: 7/8	
5. Number of said files containing above mentioned criteria: 7/7	
6. Where are the employee records located? ELC 4-1: employee records are located in the Supervisor's office.	
7. Are employee records securely stored? ELC 4-1: employee records are stored within a locked cabinet in the Supervisor's office.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u> Agency Personnel Policies and individual personnel files were reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.	
N. PAYROLL RECORDS	ELC REVIEW
1. Does staff, including management, document their work hours through a time sheet or punch clock?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Are time records signed by both the employee and the supervisor?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Review sample of Payroll journals to ensure that they include: General ledger included payroll. General ledger reviewed also	
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	<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: Four (4) payroll records were reviewed. see payroll test sheets	
5. Number of said journals that included the above criteria: The four 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?	<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?		<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.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Perform a physical inventory of a sample of ELC program assets drawn from the fixed assets register provided by ELC. Do they agree? Note any discrepancies.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. Are program fixed assets being used in accordance with the funding intent?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
7. Do asset additions and/or disposal procedures follow ELC's Fixed Asset policy/procedures?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
8. Were fixed assets purchased within the contract period in which they were approved/funded?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u>		
Q. INSURANCE		ELC REVIEW
1. Review the Agency's Accord Form to determine which policies are in place.		
2. Where are the Agency Insurance Policies located? In the Risk Management Department Governmental Center		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
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. Reviewed Broward County Children's Services Administrative Division (CSAD) 2008 Continuation Of Operations Plan		<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. Per confirmation letter from BC Risk Management Division: "Pursuant to Statute 627.7264, Broward County Board of County Commissioners is fully self insured and self administered for worker's compensation. The Workers' Compensation program operates in compliance with and under the auspices of Chapter 440 of Florida Statutes."	Expiration Date: Self-insured	Amount: \$100,000/ \$200,000

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. Per confirmation letter from BC Risk Management Division: "Broward County institutes and maintains a fiscally sound risk management program with regard to its obligations in accordance with the provisions of Section 768.28 Florida Statutes. Pursuant to Statute 627.7264, Broward County Board of County Commissioners is fully self insured and self administered for general liability."	Expiration Date: Self-insured	Amount: \$100,000/ \$200,000
7. Professional Liability: Per confirmation letter from BC Risk Management Division: "Self-Insured as per F.S. 440."	Expiration Date: Self-insured	Amount: \$100,000/ \$200,000
8. Property: Per confirmation letter from BC Risk Management Division: "Broward County is insured for property coverage through FM Global (Factory Mutual Insurance Company)."	Expiration Date: Feb 1, 2010	Amount: \$100,000/ \$200,000
9. Automobile Liability: Per confirmation letter from BC Risk Management Division: "Pursuant to Statute 627.7264, Broward County Board of County Commissioners is fully self insured and self administered for auto insurance."	Expiration Date: Self-insured	Amount: \$100,000/ \$200,000
ELC review comments: Agency Letter of Insurance was <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? Internal Controls Handbook on BC-Net reviewed on-site contains Information Technology Procedures (Volume 12). Reviewed <i>Individual Non-Disclosure and Confidentiality Certification Form</i> and <i>Security Agreement Form with DCF</i>. Broward County follows Florida Statutes 119 relating public and confidential records as most of the County records are public records. Medical records are covered under the HIPPA laws and are referenced in the <i>ABC's of Broward County and Your Benefits & You Booklet</i>. Child Licensing does not maintain medical records. Child care background screening records are covered under Chapter 435 regarding the use of child care personnel records.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Does the Agency have protocols to protect computer based documents and records? Internal Controls Handbook on		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

BC-Net reviewed on-site contains Information Technology Procedures (Volume 12).	
3. Do only the appropriate staff members have access to computerized records? Internal Controls Handbook on BC-Net reviewed on-site contains Information Technology Procedures (Volume 12).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Does the Agency have a system for the maintenance of files? ELC 4-1: Yes; Times 2, Speed Files system is locked in a cabinet where QRS provider files are filed alphabetically and by year of entrance into QRS.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u> Agency Confidential Information and Security Obligations Corporate Documents were all reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.	
S. INCIDENT REPORTING	ELC REVIEW
1. Child Abuse Reports made to the authorities and Coalition? No child abuse reports this year.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Report knowledge of any abuse or alleged abuse or any serious injury or death by a child while in care to the Coalition. None to report.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u> Agency Incident Reporting was reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.	
T. RETURN OF FUNDS / FINAL INVOICE	ELC REVIEW
1. Final Invoice submitted for payment no later than 40 calendar 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: BCL-09-ELC4-1 Quality Assurance Services/Quality Rating System

A. MAJOR PROGRAM GOALS

ELC 4-1 2008-2009 Quality Assurance Services/Quality Rating Services:

- 1. To ensure that quality Early Care and Education Services are provided through the Coalition funded School Readiness and Voluntary Pre-kindergarten programs by monitoring all participating direct service provider programs for the required elements in accordance with laws, statutes, rules, and policies governing Early Care and Education funds and providing timely action and feedback to community partners and the Coalition as to those monitoring results.*
- 2. To ensure that quality Early Care and Education services are available to the community by performing Quality Ratings to those direct service providers volunteering to participate in the approved Quality Rating System.*
- 3. To facilitate community and services planning and action around increasing the quality of services offered by providing data on Quality Assurance results and an analysis of same to the Coalition 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. BRIEF PROVIDER SUMMARY OF ELC 4-1 SERVICES & HIGHLIGHTS

1. Staffing and Training: *There were four full time assessors providing QRS services for ELC 4 during most of the 1st quarter and all of the fourth quarter. One assessor resigned in September to move to Atlanta. A hiring request was made through the appropriate Broward County channels immediately. Due to County hiring policies, it was March by the time a replacement assessor could be hired. During the first quarter, Broward County QRS was contacted by Miami-Dade QRS and asked to conduct reliability ratings with the Miami-Dade assessors. This was done in September. During the second quarter the supervisor and all three assessors attended the 8 day in depth ECERS-R training offered in Miami-Dade County and conducted by the authors and staff from the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute. During the third quarter, one assessor was out on FMLA. She came back part time on light duty in mid-March and helped with portfolio review and onsite visits during that time. At the same time, the newly hired assessor began work. She had done this work previously in Palm Beach County, so the training period was shorter than it would be with an untrained assessor.*

During the fourth quarter, there were four full time assessors providing QRS services for ELC 4-1. The assessor who had been on FMLA returned to full time work. The new assessor continued training during the month of April, attaining reliability by the end of the month. The quarter also included the annual reliability training with ERSI staff. Cathy Riley and Lisa Waller came to us from North Carolina for a full week of reliability. All four assessors attained reliability with the trainers.

List of provider orientation training date and unduplicated attendance numbers of both teachers and provider sites can be found under “clients to be served” #1 below.

2. Rating: *During the first quarter, recruitment activities were implemented to bring new participants into the program. Six information*

sessions were held in various locations around the county. In addition, plans were made to continue implementation of the 5 star system by offering preparation activities to centers as they reached the six month point before their full rating was due. Each center was assigned a lead liaison from the QRS team as their full rating due date approached. The lead liaison visited the center to review the 5 star criteria and documentation that is needed. Q&A sessions were scheduled to which all programs in this group were invited. In addition, those centers that requested the help were offered the opportunity for informal ERS assessments to help them determine where to concentrate their efforts prior to the full rating. During the second quarter, preparations began for the first full ratings to be conducted, beginning in January 2009. Recruitment activities continued on a smaller scale, as the pending schedule for the second half of the year was already full. During the third quarter, recruitment activities were halted and a waiting list was started, as existing programs began to deliver portfolios and full assessments were scheduled. Q&A sessions were scheduled for programs at the six month point before their due date, to which all programs in this group were invited. The number increased exponentially each month, so that by March, more centers were due than could be completed and some assessments were scheduled for April. This trend continued for the duration of the fiscal year. Approximately 30% of the centers due in a given month requested and were granted postponements for up to 3 months. During the fourth quarter, the waiting list was continued, as existing programs delivered portfolios at a high rate and full assessments were scheduled. Q&A sessions continued for programs at the six month point before their due date, to which all programs in this group were invited. The number of assessments due during fourth quarter was larger than could be readily handled, however overtime for assessors was approved, due to the availability of funds from the previously open position. This allowed staff to complete reports in the evening, giving them the ability to go out into classrooms up to 4 days a week. Due to this overtime option becoming available, the number of ratings completed for the year rose to 92% of those expected.

3. Collaboration Activities: The QRS program was involved in the following collaboration activities during the year:

- Multi-county QRIS Collaboration – continuing participation in conference calls and meetings to move forward on a statewide QRIS model, including the FCC workgroup and the curriculum subcommittee.
- Broward VPK Conference planning and implementation – assisted with planning for the 2008 conference, presented at the conference and took the lead in identifying and researching a possible venue for the 2009 conference. The venue then changed due to financial constraints and the QRIS supervisor took the lead in recruitment of volunteers through Volunteer Broward, as well as continuing to serve on the planning committee.
- ELC System Partners group – took the lead in identifying the priority to work on a comprehensive training and career development plan for Broward; aligned that group work with the CSC strategic plan, (Workforce Development); became co-chair with Charlene Swanson of NSU and invited community stakeholders to participate. The full systems partners group worked on the Core Competencies, which was identified as the first task to be completed by this committee.
- QRIS Broward Joint Provider Group – planned and conducted meetings in August 2008, November 2008, and March 2009.
- Broward Family Child Care work group – took the lead in planning and implementing a mini-conference/retreat for FCC providers.
- School Readiness and Early Learning Committee – continued participation in community based group under the auspices of the CSC.
- One assessor completed and graduated from Broward County’s facilitators training program and has successfully conducted facilitation for the CCLE leadership team who are working on a strategic plan related to COA accreditation.

4. The Quality Rating and Improvement System: As the plan for a statewide QRIS progresses through the work of the multi-county

collaboration, Broward has come to be seen as a leader among many of our peers in other counties. As such, it was requested by the Miami-Dade ELC that the Miami-Dade assessors, a group operated by Devereux, meet with the Broward assessors and participate in joint reliability ratings. This took place in September. Broward QRIS was also contacted by a representative from the Orange County ELC who requested a meeting to learn about our program. This was scheduled for October. In addition, the QRS Supervisor presented a session on QRIS and one of our assessors, Andrea Zabel, presented on the ERS at the ECA of Florida Conference in Orlando in September.

The Multi-County Collaboration formed a subcommittee to work on the Family Child Care protocol. This group met via conference call on a monthly basis. The full collaboration group met quarterly via conference call. A face to face meeting was held in March, and was attended by representatives of the ELC and Family Central. In addition, the tri-County area ELC's met and agreed to a common name and logo, the "Quality Counts" ribbon developed by Miami-Dade.

Broward County is in the process of developing new marketing materials with the Quality Counts logo and working with the QRIS partners to plan a roll-out of the new name. In June, the Child Care Quality Supervisor attended the Quality Rating and Improvement Systems Annual Working Conference in Chapel Hill, NC, where Dr. Thelma Harms and Dr. Richard Clifford continued the theme developed in 2008, of bringing together QRIS practitioners from all over the U.S. and Canada to share successes and challenges and help everyone move forward.

C. CLIENTS TO BE SERVED

General Description	BCCCLE Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review	As verified by
<p>1. The minimum number of legally operating early care and education programs to be informed of the QRIS process in Broward County at informational meetings held at least quarterly is <u>250</u> programs.</p>	<p>1. Number of Meetings held: July 1 –Sept 30: <u>6</u> Oct. 1 – Dec 30: <u>8</u> Jan 1 – March 30: <u>3</u> April 1 – June 30: <u>3</u></p> <p>2. Number of ECE providers informed of QRIS process at informational meetings: <u>193</u> Centers <u>114</u> FCC homes <u>307</u> Total</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Met <input type="checkbox"/>Not Met</p>	<p>Sign-in sheets from 21 meetings and summary sheet tallying provider sites.</p>

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: ELC 4-1 Attendance Sign-in sheets for each informational meeting

ELC review comments: Reviewed sign-in sheets for 20 provider meetings held during the contract year.

- Four (4) Family Child Care Home (FCCH) meetings, three (3) at BCCLE licensing orientation meetings, and one (1) at the FCCH retreat, for a total of 114 different family child care home providers; and
- Sixteen (16) QRS Information meetings for 193 Child Care Center providers, for a total of 307 unduplicated providers.

All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.

2. The minimum number of legally operating early care and education providers to receive a Rating or Pre-assessment is 100 providers.

(a) Rating and/or Pre-assessment of early care and education providers shall include appropriate Environment Rating Scale assessments conducted in Family Child Care Homes and in one half of the classrooms in child care centers.

(b) Up to 25 re-ratings may occur for interested early care and education programs that receive a two (2) star rating or lower on their Environment Rating Scales rating during the previous three contract years and have demonstrated improvement.

2. Number of early care and education providers receiving a rating: 92

Pre Assessed	Rated
Centers <u>40</u>	Centers <u>47</u>
FCC home <u>5</u>	Homes
Total <u>45</u>	Total <u>47</u>

(b) Number of early care and education providers receiving a re-rating: 0 Total

Substantially Met
 Not Met

List of 92 early care and education providers to receive Quality Rating

Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges in delivering this service. *In this fiscal year the primary success was reaching a point where the QRIS program is so popular that active recruitment was not needed and a waiting list was started, at the end of the contract year. The primary challenge was at the beginning of the contract year, the fact that the fiscal year began with all participating programs having already been pre-assessed and no program was due for rating until January, at that point ELC4-1 assessors did interim checks on providers with pre-assessments so coaches and mentors could re-evaluate and update improvement plans. There were some pre-assessments as new providers entered the system; however it became a challenge to reach a point of rating 100 providers due to this anomaly in the rating schedule. In the end, 92 centers were rated.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: List of all early care and education providers to receive Quality Rating Services during FY 0809 including date and type of service delivered.

ELC review comments: Reviewed summary data report of 92 providers who were rated in one half of the classrooms in their facility to ensure that the minimum number of licensed early care and education providers to receive Quality Rating Services was 100. Summary data revealed that forty (40) centers and five (5) homes received a pre-assessment and 47 centers received a full star assessment.

This objective is substantially met at 92%. All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.

Reviewed 23 child care provider files to ensure that ratings occurred in one half of the classrooms using the appropriate scale for the age group.

- 23 child care provider files (100%) showed evidence that one half of the total active classrooms, at the time of monitoring, were reviewed; and

- 23 child care provider files (100%) indicated classrooms were rated with the proper age group tool.

D. PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS

CORE COMPONENT OBJECTIVES (OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS) – GENERAL

	BCCCLE Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
1. 75% of the early care and education providers who attend a quarterly QRIS informational meeting shall document at least three (3) benefits of being involved in the Broward QRIS program.	1.a. Number of ECE providers attending meetings: <u>307</u>	a. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	1.b. Number of ECE providers documenting at least three (3) benefits of being involved: <u>0</u>	b. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
		<input type="checkbox"/> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed.			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Attendee evaluations or surveys documenting three or more ways they would benefit from being involved in QRIS.			
ELC review comments: Quarterly reports state that “Participants in informational meetings have all indicated an understanding of the benefits of participation, including such items as: technical assistance, scholarships, matching funds, and improving their performance in regard to child outcomes” and report this objective as being met at 100% each quarter. Interview with QRS Coordinator revealed that the early care and education providers who attend a quarterly QRIS informational meeting report at least three (3) benefits of being involved in the Broward QRIS program orally. <i>No documentation was available at the time of review.</i>			
No Action at this time: <i>The ELC 4-1 Service Provider has already made an adjustment to ensure that this objective is met for the 2009-2010 contract year. The ELC 4-1 Service Provider provided the Coalition with a written QRIS Informational meeting evaluation used to document that each QRIS informational meeting participant can identify at least three (3) benefits of being involved in the Broward QRIS program. ELC 4-1 staff began to use the survey at the September 2009 Informational meetings.</i>			
Service Provider response (if desired): <i>The evaluation tool is now in place and being used at informational meetings.</i>			
	BCCCLE Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
2. 100 early care and education providers shall be rated or pre-assessed during the term of this Contract using the Coalition approved Quality Rating Improvement System Rating Protocol, as may be amended from time to time, including up to 25 re-	2.a. Number of providers pre-assessed homes: <u>5</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	2.b. Number of providers pre-assessed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below</i>

ratings.	centers: <u>40</u>		<i>for details</i>
	2.c. Number of providers Star Rated homes: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	2.d. Number of providers Star Rated centers: <u>47</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	2. e. Number of providers re-rated: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	2.f. Total number rated: <u>92</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Substantially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

Contractor's Responsibility: Use the Coalition's approved Quality Rating System Protocol to rate licensed early care and education programs.

Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed. *In this fiscal year the primary success was reaching a point where the QRIS program is so popular that active recruitment was not needed and a waiting list was started. The primary challenge was the fact that the fiscal year began with all participating programs having already been pre-assessed and no program was due for rating until January. There were some pre-assessments as new providers entered the system; however it became a challenge to reach a point of rating 100 providers due to this anomaly in the rating schedule. In the end 92 centers were rated.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Quarterly Key Indicator Reports spreadsheets of rating results; (2) 2008-2009 protocol and QRS staff manual for description of protocol used in rating; (3) List of providers rated and pre-assessed during the contract term.

ELC review comments: Reviewed summary of collected data and result outcomes for complete Coalition approved Quality Rating Protocol. Reviewed copy of blank QRS assessment that reflects Coalition Approved Quality Rating Protocol.

Annual summary data and Monthly Key Data Indicator reports for 92 providers.

- Five (5) Family Child Care Home providers were pre-assessed with the appropriate ERS tool;
- 40 Child Care Center providers were pre-assessed with the appropriate ERS tool; and
- 47 Child Care Centers received a full rating using the Coalition approved Quality Rating Improvement System Rating Protocol.

All documents and data results were reviewed and indicated that 92 early care and education providers had completed ratings during the term of this Contract using the Coalition approved Quality Rating System and no re-ratings were conducted. **This objective is substantially met at 92%.**

Reviewed 54 files of early care and education providers who had been either rated three (3) years ago or pre-assessed 18 months ago, and were to receive the full 5 star rating according to the approved Quality Rating Improvement System Rating Protocol:

- 23 early care and education providers (43%) received a Quality Rating assessment during the contract year:
 - 13 Child Care Center providers were pre-assessed with the appropriate ERS tool; and
 - 10 Child Care Centers were Star Rated with the appropriate ERS tools.

- 20 early care and education providers (37%) were scheduled to be rated in 2008-2009 and were not rated:
 - Two (2) centers were rescheduled late in 2008-2009 and did not receive a rating.
 - Nine (9) centers were rescheduled for rating in the first quarter of 09-10:
 - Three (3) centers were rated in the first quarter of 2009-2010;
 - Three (3) more centers are scheduled to be rated late in September, by the end of the first quarter of 2009-2010;
 - Three (3) centers postponed rating and rescheduled for August of the 1st quarter of 2009-2010; the rating did not occur.
 - Seven (7) centers had no postponement letter recorded*; and
 - Two (2) centers postponed rating and rescheduled later in 2009-2010; and
- 11 early care and education providers were scheduled to be rated in 2008-2009 and were listed as "opting out" of QRIS: *
 - Three (3) centers had documentation indicating they were "opting out" of QRIS; and
 - Four (4) centers did not respond to invitations to 5 star rating preparation meetings as their ratings were due; and
 - Four (4) centers had no record of opting out or being invited to orientation meetings to prepare for their 5 star rating.

No Action at this time: The ELC 4-1 Service Provider has already made an adjustment to ensure this objective is met for the 2009-2010 contract year. The ELC 4-1 Service Provider instituted the Broward County's procurement services policies and procedures to enable this contract to hire outside consultants to assess classrooms when scheduling anomalies occur, such as the one described above under "Service provider annual review." The ELC 4-1 Service Provider has entered into a contract, beginning August 11, 2009 through August 10, 2010, with the Children's Forum to conduct ERS pre-assessments as necessary, to assist with scheduling anomalies.

As best practice, ELC 4-1 service provider has crafted a letter to be mailed no later than October 31, 2009, to all early care and education providers that fall within the categories marked with an asterisk* above, as appropriate. It includes the following information:

- Date 1st rated or pre-assessed by ELC 4-1 Service Provider; and
- Date originally due for a quality rating; and
- Number of and dates of invitations to QRIS orientation meetings; and
- Personnel are no longer eligible to receive Quality Counts incentives such as WAGE\$ stipends or have priority to receive professional development scholarships funded through the Coalition, etc.

Service Provider response (if desired): The above referenced letter was sent to providers who opted out, as well as those who didn't respond to reminders that they were due for rating. To date three providers have rejoined the program.

Contractor's Responsibility: Follow the Coalition's approved prioritization and rationale for participation in the Quality Rating System, which can be used to focus available resources. Priorities may include, but are not	BCCCLE Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	a. Number of rated providers who serve children birth to school age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	a. 100%

limited to, the following: (a) Providers who serve children birth to school age, with particular emphasis on providers who serve children birth up to the age of three; (b) Providers who serve children through school readiness funds; and/or (c) Providers who are located in zip codes that can be deemed at-risk from available statistical data.	(ECERS and FCCERS SITES): <u>92: 87</u> <u>ECERS and 5 FCCERS, 40 pre-assessed centers and 5 pre-assessed homes; 47 centers 5star rated.</u>		23/23 b. 0% 0/23
	Number of rated providers who serve children birth up to the age of three (ITERS or FCCERS) <u>76 total: 71</u> <u>ITERS (35 ITERS pre-assessed and 36 ITERS 5star rated) and 5 FCCERS</u> <u>100% serve 0-5; 87% serve 0-3</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	c. 52% 12/23 N=23
	b. Number of rated providers with rate agreements: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	c. Number of rated providers located in zip codes deemed at-risk: (including, but not limited to: 33009, 33020, 33311, 33313) <u>66</u> <u>(66/92 = 60%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If <u>yes</u> see row below for details
Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed: There is a discrepancy below as to which zip codes are considered high risk. Based on census data, the BCCLE has used a list of zip codes with 10% or higher families with children under school age who are deemed at risk. These include 33024, 33060, 33319, 33441, and 33442. Therefore the number of providers in high risk zip codes is higher than was stated below.			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) List of providers rated and pre-assessed during the contract term; (2) Priorities use during contract term to rate or pre-assess providers; (3) Selected Provider files reviewed			
ELC review comments: Reviewed monthly Key Data Spreadsheet and annual YTD summary reports submitted to ELC staff. All interested providers received a rating. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i> Reviewed 23 provider files for evidence that QRS followed the Coalition’s approved prioritization and rationale for participation in the Quality Rating System: (a) 23 provider files (100%) had evidence of ages served: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22 providers (96%) served children birth to 5; and • One (1) provider (4%) served children age two through five. (b) No provider files (0%) displayed evidence that Providers served children through school readiness funds; (c) 23 provider files (100%) had evidence of provider zip code:			

- 12 providers (52%) were located in high risk zip codes (33068,33313,33311,33020); and
- 11 providers (48%) were located outside high risk areas (33325,33024,33060,33328,33322,33027,33319,33441,33442).

Corrective Action Required: *In order to ensure this contract responsibility is met for the 2009-2010 contract year, the ELC 4-1 Service Provider shall submit to the Coalition for approval, by December 30, 2009, a written plan with implementation strategies (including a timeline) to ensure that the prioritization for participation in the Broward County Quality Rating System is followed before services are delivered. Said plan shall include the development of a written, executed linkage agreement with the ELC 2 Service Provider, to receive a quarterly report from the ELC 2 Provider identifying the names, addresses, and executed date of each Provider Service Agreement to determine and document which providers are contracted to serve children through school readiness funds.*

Service Provider plan to meet compliance (HOW) Explain: *Contact has been made between ELC 4-1 and ELC 2 regarding development of a linkage agreement. A form will be developed to go into provider files documenting their prioritization status.*

	BCCCLE Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
3. 100% of provider-specific results from the Environment Rating Scale(s) shall be provided immediately, as agreed upon in the linkage agreement, to the Service Providers providing <i>Quality Improvement Supports</i> (ELC 3) in a mutually agreed upon useable format for that Service Provider’s work, as data becomes available.	3.a. Total number of provider-specific ERS results created: Total: <u>92</u> Classroom ERS results: <u>259</u> Provider ERS results: <u>92</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>
	3.b. Number ERS results provided to the Service Providers providing <i>Quality Improvement Supports</i> (ELC 3): Total: <u>85 (7 not receiving TA)</u> Classroom ERS results: <u>239</u> Provider ERS results: <u>85</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	

Service Provider annual review: Results were provided to the ELC-3 providers for all classrooms in programs receiving technical assistance during the year. Seven (7) programs with 20 classrooms that were rated were not in technical assistance during the year.

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Provider-specific Results from the Environment Rating Scale(s) provided to the Service Providers providing *Quality Improvement Supports* (ELC 3); (2) Linkage agreement/MOU with ELC 3 Service Providers.

ELC review comments: Reviewed one (1) executed linkage agreement with the ELC 3 Service Provider for provider specific Quality Rating. Reviewed timeline of transfer of information from ELC 4-1 (Quality Rating) Service Provider to ELC 3 (Technical Assistance/Training) Service Providers and quarterly spreadsheet of rating results for evidence that provider-specific Quality Rating results were provided to the

Technical Assistance/Training (ELC 3) Service Provider, as mutually agreed upon in the linkage agreement in a useable format for that Service Provider's work. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

4. One set of aggregate provider data from the Quality Rating System shall be provided quarterly to the Service Providers providing Quality Improvement Supports (ELC 3) in a useable format for that Service Provider's work.	BCCCLE Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served		ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
	<u>Data Report</u>	<u>Date provided to ELC 3</u>		
	4.a. 1 st quarter	<u>10/15/08</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>
	4.b. 2 nd quarter	<u>1/15/09</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	4.c. 3 rd quarter	<u>4/15/09</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
4.d. 4 th quarter	<u>7/15/09</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		

Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges in delivering this service. *The data is tracked in an ongoing manner and provided to the ELC -3 providers on a set schedule.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Quarterly aggregate provider data reports.

ELC review comments: Reviewed eight (8) aggregate reports and dates the four reports were developed and provided to each of the *Quality Improvement Supports* (ELC 3) Service Providers on a quarterly basis and sent via email to ELC. Aggregate data reported included ratings for each of the seven (7) subscales of the ITERS-R, ECERS-R, and FCCERS-R showing the range of subscale scores and the average of these subscale scores. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

5. 100% of staff scoring the Environment Rating Scale(s) shall be reliable raters (85% within one point) at the time of scoring, according to the standards set by the authors of said instrument.	BCCCLE Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served		ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
	5.a. Percent of staff who are reliable raters within one point of 85% at the time of scoring by the Authors' consultants: <u>100%</u>		<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>

Contractor's Responsibility: Achieve and maintain rater reliability on the environment rating scales in accordance with the standards set by the authors for said instrument.

Contractor's Responsibility: The Contractor shall attend training to ensure reliability in using the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scales and the Infant Toddler Environment Rating Scales approved by the Coalition.

Service Provider annual review: (1) Briefly state standards set forth by authors; also provide a list of each QT with name of scale(s)

reliability level.

(1) *The standards set forth by the authors are:*

A) *Each assessor is checked 3 times on each scale used. The training specialist uses this opportunity to help the assessors think through the “whys” so they can use the information to make correct decisions over time.*

B) *The highest scorer on each scale then becomes the “checker” for the others to maintain reliability. Reliability should be checked every 6-10 observations on each scale.*

C) *Annual reliability with FPG is suggested at 1 day per scale for the “checker” as a shape-up, but most communities don’t bring FPG back after establishing initial reliability.*

D) *Training of new assessors should be done by the highest scoring assessors (“checkers”) until reliability is established.*

E) *The standard for reliability is that the average of the last three reliability scores should be equal to or higher than 85%.*

(2) Please provide a list of the following: QT Name, Scale and training date.

B. Pillier: ECERS April 27-30, 86%; B. Lockwood: ECERS/ITERS April 27-29, ECERS 86%, ITERS 78%; L. Becker: ECERS/ITERS April 27-30, ECERS 88%, ITERS 87%; A. Zabel: ECERS/ITERS April 27-30, ECERS 88%, ITERS 92%.

Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges in meeting this objective. The annual ERS reliability training was conducted in the end of April 2009. All assessors, including the newly hired assessor were reliable by the end of the week.

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Documentation of reliability ratings of each ELC 4-1 Child Care Quality Tech employed during the contract term. (2) Notes from author trainers from reliability training.

ELC review comments: Reviewed standards set forth by authors. Reviewed Reliability Check notes from Frank Porter Graham, Environment Rating Scales Institute author trainers. Reviewed reliability-checks chart for four (4) Broward County raters. Reviewed local reliability tracking form of inter-rater reliability for the entire year, including back up documentation.

- All four (4) staff (100%) scoring the Environment Rating Scale(s) were reliable to the standards set by the authors of said instrument;
 - Four (4) Rater staff averaged 87% reliability for the year on the ECERS at 86%, 86%, 88%, and 88% respectively; and
 - Two (2) Rater staff averaged 90% reliability for the year on the ITERS at 87%, and 92% respectively.
- Broward County Child Care Licensing and Enforcement Standard Operating Procedure states that “100% of staff scoring the Environment Rating Scale(s) will be reliable raters (85% within one point) at the time of scoring.”

All four (4) rater staff (100%) scored within one point of authors at the time of scoring on the particular scale they will execute. ***All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.***

6. 100% of complaints or observations concerning potential abuse, neglect, or abandonment shall be reported to the Department of Children and Families and the Coalition shall be notified of said reports.	BCCCLE Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
	6. 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
	6. b. Number of complaints reported	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below</i>

	to FLDCF: <u>0</u>		<i>for details</i>
	6. c. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed. <i>There were no complaints or observations concerning potential abuse, neglect or abandonment this year.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Department of Children and Families Child Abuse Complaint Log.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed Service Provider Department of Children and Families 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 to the Coalition. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
7. 100% of complaints received or observations concerning potential child care licensing violations shall be tracked and reported to the appropriate department at Broward County Child Care Licensing and Enforcement and feedback on the outcome from said department shall be documented.	BCCCLE Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	7.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
	7.b. Number of complaints reported to BCCCL: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
	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>There were no complaints received or observations of potential licensing violations this year.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Broward County Child Care Licensing Complaint Log			
ELC review comments: Reviewed Service Provider Broward County Child Care Licensing Complaint Log and any documentation of feedback on outcomes. No potential child care licensing violation complaints were filed through ELC 4-1 services for 2008-2009. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
8. 100% of other complaints concerning early care and education providers shall be referred to the Service Provider(s) providing <i>Eligibility Determination, Application Processing, Slot Management, and Provider Payment (ELC 2) and/or Quality Improvement Supports (ELC 3 and ELC 6), and/or Quality Assurance (ELC 4)</i> as appropriate, and feedback on the outcomes shall be documented.	BCCCLE Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	8.a. Number of provider complaints received: <u>1</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	8. b. Number of said complaints referred to appropriate Service Provider and/or addressed through training and TA: <u>1</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
	8. c. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed. *There was one complaint of a VPK classroom being out of VPK ratio. It was reported and investigated.*

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 Service Provider complaint log and supporting documentation for referral and feedback on outcomes. One (1) provider complaint was identified and referred to the *Eligibility Determination, Application Processing, Slot Management, and Provider Payment* ELC 2 Service Provider on 11/24/08 on a QRIS Report of Provider Issue Form via email; feedback was received on 12/2/08 from the ELC 2 Service Provider, VPK out-of-ratio issue was founded and resolved. ***All documents and QRS data results reported were reviewed and validated.***

	BCCCLE Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
9. 75% of providers participating in the Quality Rating System shall report being treated with professionalism and respect by the rater, as measured by a Provider survey.*	9.a. Number of providers participating in QRS: <u>92</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
	9.b. Number of said providers surveyed: <u>92</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	9.c. Percent who report being treated with professionalism and respect by the rater: <u>23/24 returned = 96%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed. *Some providers were sent surveys twice due to lack of response. The total surveys sent were 122; 24 were returned. 23 reported being treated with professionalism for 96% satisfaction rate.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Provider surveys with summary report.

ELC review comments: Reviewed blank provider survey and summary documentation of 24 completed provider survey responses for documentation of **Quality Rating System (QRS)** rater's ability to treat early care and education providers with professionalism and respect. A total of 122 surveys were distributed to 92 providers participating in the Quality Rating System and 24 providers (26%) returned the survey; 23 providers (96%) reported being treated with professionalism and respect by the rater. ***All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.***

	ELC Review	Action needed?
10. 100% of required data shall be collected, entered and tracked in accordance with State of Florida and Coalition 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 as mutually agreed.	<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. <i>All required reports and ad hoc data requests were completed and delivered on time.</i>		
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: ELC will review its own Contract Obligations Checklist.		
ELC review comments: Reviewed Coalition’s ELC 4-1 Contract Obligations Checklist. Reviewed emails of reports due and sent to the ELC. ELC 4-1 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, one (1) annual report, and one ad hoc data report for a total of 17 reports. Reviewed the contract due dates for various monthly, quarterly, annual, and ad hoc reports. Seventeen (17) 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.		
11. 100% participation in monthly Early Care and Education system coordination team meetings shall occur by a representative of the Contractor 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 4-1 participated in 2008-2009. <i>ELC 4-1 staff participated in the following groups/associations: ELC System Partners; SREL and its subcommittees - Workforce Development, Transition, and Finance/Advocacy; Multi-County Collaboration and it’s subcommittees – Family Child Care, Professional Development, Curriculum; ad hoc Family Child Care work group; BAEYC/ECA of Florida.</i>		
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 4-1 Service Provider attended all monthly system coordinator team meetings and/or had a representative in attendance; eleven (11) meetings (100%) were attended by ELC 4-1 staff.		
12. 100% of formal service linkage agreements and procedures, that are approved by the Coalition, with any and all early care and education system providers and pertinent	ELC Review	Action needed?

<p>community partners in order to coordinate services and prevent duplication shall have been developed within thirty (30) days from the date of execution of this Contract and shall be implemented, followed, and revised, as needed. Linkage agreements shall be actively implemented and maintained throughout the service year.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Met <input type="checkbox"/>Not Met</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i></p>
<p>Service Provider annual review: Note the organization with whom linkage agreements were executed and any successes/challenges with achieving the outcome.</p>		
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Copies of all signed and dated linkage agreements/Memorandums of Understanding (MOU).</p>		
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed two (2) Memorandums of Understanding (MOU). The MOU with BCPS-ELC 3 was signed on July 1, 2008, the MOU with FCI-ELC 3 was signed on October 24, 2008; both documents were developed on July 1, 2008, within thirty (30) days from the date of execution of this Contract (7/1/2008).</p>		
<p>13. 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.</p>	<p>ELC Review <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Met <input type="checkbox"/>Not Met</p>	<p>Action needed? <input type="checkbox"/>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i></p>
<p>Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed.</p>		
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: ELC Fiscal department will review invoices submitted for timely submission.</p>		
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC fiscal department invoice submission log. All invoices were submitted on time and accurately met the requirements of the approved cost allocation plan.</p>		
<p>14. The Contractor’s forecasts, trend analysis 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.</p>	<p>ELC Review <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Met <input type="checkbox"/>Not Met</p>	<p>Action needed? <input type="checkbox"/>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i></p>
<p>Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed. <i>There was a surplus at the end of the year for salary and fringe due a vacancy during the year and also for overtime that was agreed to during the mid-year budget modification. By the time the approved modification was received there was not enough time to complete the project for which funds had been allocated.</i></p>		

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: ELC Fiscal department 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 2008-2009. The contract ended with a 9.2% surplus (\$48,471) for the fiscal year.