

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

Monitoring Report
Contract: FCI-09-ELC5 Child Screening and Assessment
Family Central, Inc.

Monitors for Early Learning Coalition (ELC)

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

Family Central, Inc. (FCI) Representatives

Jill Gelman, Developmental Screening Manager
Maria Hernandez, Family Support Services Director
Ainsworth Geddes, Chief Financial Officer
Khalil Zeinieh, Vice President Broward Operations

The monitoring process reflected in this report began on July 28, 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 4, 2009. The Coalition monitors completed a comprehensive monitoring review, which included an administrative review of the agency's policies and procedures, a fiscal review of the accounting records and supporting documentation, and a review of the programmatic services review as reflected in the performance objectives of the **Child Developmental Screening and Assessment** services in contract FCI-09-ELC5. **This report includes monitoring results of this contract.**

In addition to examining documentation related to performance objectives, the Coalition monitors interviewed the directors of eight (8) facilities who were involved in child developmental screening and/or assessment, interviewed the ELC 5 Manager, and completed two (2) phone calls to assess service delivery from the customer's point of view.

Prior to the monitoring visits, the Coalition staff identified all school readiness children and the corresponding providers who serve these children contained in the EFS data base for the period July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009. The EFS data was used to randomly select 127 files representing children receiving financial assistance from school readiness funds and the 101 early care and education provider files 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 (79%), 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; **101 children between the ages of birth and school-age** and the 80 early care and education providers these children attended were **tracked through the Child Screening and Assessment component of the Coalition's early care and education system and were chosen for review in this monitoring.** Additionally, **ten (10) clients who were listed on the unified waiting list**, whose parents consented to screening and who received a developmental screening, were also **selected for review in the ELC 5 Monitoring.**

Administrative Review Summary:

Agency Policies, corporate documents, insurance, document protocols, and incident reporting documents were all *reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications with exception of the following:*

Findings:

- Page 5, Section 1.H. of the Standard Contract, entitled Sponsorship/Public Announcements, paragraphs 1 and 3 have not been completely followed:
 - “1. If CONTRACTOR sponsors a program financed wholly or in part by state funds, including any funds obtained through this Contract, in accordance with Section 286.25, Florida Statutes, it shall in publicizing, advertising, or describing the sponsorship of the program, state: “Sponsored by (CONTRACTOR’s name) and Early Learning Coalition of Broward County, Inc.” and the “State of Florida, Agency for Workforce Innovation.”
 3. If the sponsorship reference is in any written format, the words “Early Learning Coalition of Broward County, Inc.” and “State of Florida, Agency for Workforce Innovation” shall appear in the same size letters or type as the name of the CONTRACTOR. When issuing statements, press releases, requests for proposals, bid solicitations, and other documents describing projects or programs funded in whole or in part with state or federal funds, all CONTRACTORS receiving state or federal funds, shall clearly state (1) the percentage of the total cost of the program or project which will be financed with federal money, and (2) the dollar amount of federal funds for the project or program. For purposes of complying with this section, the percentage and dollar amount of federal funds are those shown on Exhibit A to this Contract.”

Corrective Action:

In order to ensure that this objective is met for 2009-2010 contract year, the ELC 5 Service Provider shall submit to Coalition staff by January 15, 2010, documents used to publicize all programs funded by the Early Learning Coalition of Broward County, Inc. and the State of Florida, Agency for Workforce Innovation; said documents shall include the following clause: “Funded by: Early Learning Coalition of Broward County, Inc. and State of Florida, Agency for Workforce Innovation” and said text shall be the same size letters or type as the name of the ELC 5 Service Provider.

Fiscal Review Summary:

- *Accounting Policies and Procedures* were reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.
- *General Ledger* testing indicated a 100% compliance rate related to the review of expenses and appropriate classification of transactions.
- *Payroll Records* testing indicated a 100% compliance rate related to the payroll records and personnel files examined

Programmatic Review Summary:

This contract focuses on child developmental screening (both cognitive and social-emotional) and child assessment services provided by the ELC 5 Service Provider for the young children of families receiving financial assistance from school readiness funds and the legally operating early care and education programs the children attend. *Coalition staff and Service Providers 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 # FCI-09-ELC5 has (34) Performance Specification Outcomes and two (2) program deliverables (Clients to be Served) and one (1) contract responsibility.
- 97% of the performance outcomes were achieved and 9% require adjustments to improve reporting for accountability in the 2009-2010 contract year; 100% of the program deliverables were met; and 100% of the contract responsibilities were met.
- 89% of clients (7,791) whose children were eligible for a developmental screen gave consent and 77% who were eligible for screening received a screen (5,961).
- 96% of the 5,961 children (birth through school-age) enrolled in early care and education programs and receiving financial assistance for school readiness services or listed on the Unified Waiting List were screened for developmental delays and determined to be developing typically.
- 4% of the 5,961 children (birth through school-age) were identified with possible developmental delays, 53% of these children's parents gave consent (257) for further screening; 72% made their referral appointments (186) and 69% of these children were linked to early intervention services. [128 children]
- 198 children, birth to school age, received pre and post child assessments to determine their growth toward school readiness during the school year.
 - Younger children, from birth through age 3, increased an average of 30% in fine motor skills; 38% in speech and language skills; 28% in general knowledge; and 47% in math readiness skills between pre and post assessments; and
 - Older children, age 36 months to age 5, increased an average of 28% in fine motor skills; 34% in speech and language skills; 31% in general knowledge; and 32% in math readiness skills between pre and post assessments.
- 95% of the teachers, who completed surveys after attending developmental screening training sessions, reported two or more ways they could use the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work with young children.

- **In order to improve the delivery of Child Screening and Assessment in the 2009-2010 contract year, the Coalition is requiring the ELC 5 Service Provider (FCI) to:**
 - **Ensure that children, whose parents provide consent to the developmental screening process, receive developmental screens with 45 days of enrollment or the child's birth date.**
- **In order to improve reporting for accountability in the 2009-2010 contract year, the Coalition requires the Service Provider to:**
 - **Develop a linkage agreement with the ELC 2 Service Provider which outlines a process for providing ELC 5 staff with the number and identity of providers outside of Broward County and the children they serve, who reside in Broward County but use financial assistance from school readiness funds for child care outside of Broward; and create a protocol that indicates ELC 5 staff shall identify on a regular basis:**
 - **All Broward children who receive financial assistance from school readiness funds and use them for care outside of Broward; and**
 - **The children who use care outside of Broward and receive an ASQ and those who do not; and**
 - **All children for whom the ASQ indicates a need for further screening shall be administered the Brigance Screening tool by an FCI Assessment Specialist; and**
 - **Maintain a data base that connects the children in the assessment project to the child's teacher(s) in training; and**
 - **Submit a revised protocol that ensures that the Coalition will be notified of reports made to the Florida Department of Children and Families regarding complaints or observations concerning potential abuse, neglect, or abandonment within the applicable confidentiality regulations.**

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

Contract Annual Review

Contract: FCI-09-ELC5 Child Screening and Assessment

A. FEDERAL LAW REQUIREMENTS	ELC REVIEW
1. Does the Agency have a written Drug-Free Workplace Policy? Policy dated: 07/2006; Employee Handbook.	<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? Five-in-one posters were posted on the fourth floor by the Fiscal department, including laws regarding FMLA, EEOC, Minimum Wage, Child Labor, and Polygraph. Additional information regarding Worker's Compensation, Unemployment Opportunities, Florida Discrimination, and USERRA were seen on the 4th Floor by the Fiscal office. The five-in-one poster was also in the lunch room on the first floor.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Does the Agency have a written Non- Discrimination and Harassment Free Workplace Policy? Policy dated: 03/10/2005; Employee Handbook.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u> Agency Policies were all reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.	
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? Amended and Restated Bylaws reviewed; effective June 17, 2008.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Are the Agency's Articles of Incorporation available for review? Articles of Incorporation available.	<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? Organizational Chart Revised May 2009.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Is there an audit on File? Audit available for June 30, 2008, 2007, and 2006.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u> Agency Corporate Documents were all reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.	
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

reflect all revenues and expenditures of funds provide by the COALITION under this contract?	
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? FCI utilizes Program and Project element codes.	<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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Are payments made to subcontractors within seven (7) working days after receipt of full or partial payments from the Coalition?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Does the Agency maintain an Agency-wide budget by funding source and expenditure category?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Does the Agency have an accounting system to properly account for ELC related transactions (revenues and expenses)? Microsoft Great Plains Accounting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Select a random number of invoices submitted to ELC and test to determine the following:	
a. Does the invoice accurately detail the number of units, description, unit cost, and total?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
b. Do the attendance records and other required documentation flow through to the invoice correctly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
c. Is the invoice approved by authorized staff/management?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
d. Does the invoice reflect third party payments?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
e. Are procedures established and implemented to eliminate duplicate billing?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. Number of invoices randomly selected: Ten (10) SR transactions were selected for the months of October 2008 and April 2009.	
7. Number of invoices meeting the above criteria: 100% of the invoices 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	
G. BANK	ELC REVIEW
1. Are bank statements reconciled monthly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Are the bank statements reconciled by a person other than the person who receipts and disburses funds?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Does the immediate supervisor review the reconciliation? Yes, the statements are prepared by the Accounting Manager and approved by the CFO, demonstrating an appropriate separation of duties.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Are adjustments properly documented and explained? There were adjustments included in the samples which were properly documents.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Select 3 random months and verify above transactions: Three months were selected and reviewed.	
6. What three months were randomly selected: November 2008, February 2009, and May 2009	
7. Number of months meeting above transactions: The three months met the above criteria.	
<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? Actual to date are reviewed monthly.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Did the actual up-to-date and complete revenue/expenditure report submitted follow the same format as the Contractor's approved budget and include all listed line items? Reports are submitted that list the detailed line item information.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Did the report contain a detailed explanation of variances from the approved budget? Yes, variances are reviewed in detail on a monthly basis.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	
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?	
2. In publicizing, advertising, or describing the sponsorship of the program, does Contractor state: “Sponsored by (Contractor’s Name) and The Early Learning Coalition of Broward County, Inc.” and the “State of Florida, Agency for Workforce Innovation”?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Do written materials include “The Early Learning Coalition of Broward County” and “State of Florida, Agency for Workforce Innovation” in the same size letters or type as the name of the Contractor?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
ELC review comments: Reviewed flyers and postcards that notify families and providers of available services from the ELC 5 Service Provider. The Family Central (FCI) brochures, including the ELC 5 flyers, surveys and postcards did not describe sponsorship of the program, nor are the Coalition’s or the AWI name or logo on these documents in the same size letters or type as the name of the ELC 5 Service Provider.	
Corrective Action: <i>In order to ensure that this objective is met for 2009-2010 contract year, this ELC 5 Service Provider shall submit to Coalition staff by January 15, 2010, documents used to publicize all programs funded by the Early Learning Coalition of Broward County, Inc. and the State of Florida, Agency for Workforce Innovation; said documents shall include the following clause: “Funded by: Early Learning Coalition of Broward County, Inc. and State of Florida, Agency for Workforce Innovation” and said text shall be the same size letters or type as the name of the ELC 5 Service Provider.</i>	
Service Provider plan to meet compliance (HOW) Explain: <i>All ELC funded program flyers and related materials will be reviewed and revised to meet this requirement as appropriate going forward. In order to maximize limited resources and because of the expense, it is recommended that existing materials including program flyers be fully utilized before new materials are created with the required letter sizes and text type.</i>	
ELC note: <i>The Coalition accepts the recommendation to fully use existing materials including program flyers before new materials are created and looks forward to receiving revised documents as they are developed during the 2009-2010 contract year.</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. N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Does the subcontractor have a contract? N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Are the payments to the subcontractors in line with the contract? N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Does the contract specify a match budget for the subcontractor? N/A	<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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Contract? [Exhibit B (Form B-3)]	
2. Do names of personnel match positions listed in the budget?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Did the Contractor ensure that staffing patterns and staff qualifications are sufficient to provide the services described within the contract, including backup plans when turnover occurs, with the capacity to provide services in English, Spanish, Portuguese, and Creole?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Did the Contractor provide and/or ensure continuous quality improvement training to 100% of its staff?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Has the Contractor or its agent notified WorkForce One of all entry level employment opportunities associated with this Contract which 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u> Staffing support was reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.	
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
<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.	
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? Personnel Folders are located: on the fourth floor.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
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: Reviewed a total of four (4) personnel files for ELC 5 for Job Description Requirement/Qualifications compared to documented education and experience, etc. Confidentiality and Individual Non-Disclosure and Confidentiality Certificate Forms.	
5. Number of said files containing above mentioned criteria: All four (4) personnel files for ELC 5 contained the required documents	

mentioned above.	
6. Where are the employee records located? Personnel Folders are located: on the fourth floor.	
7. Are employee records securely stored?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
ELC review comments: ELC 5: Agency Personnel Policies and four (4) 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? Agency policies require non-exempt to utilize a time punch clock and exempt utilize time sheets.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Are time records signed by both the employee and the supervisor? The randomly sampled identified payroll records were both signed by the employee and the supervisor.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Review sample of Payroll journals to ensure that they include:	
a. Staff name	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
b. Position	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
c. Salary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
d. Hours worked	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
e. Payroll period	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
f. Deductions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Number of payroll journals reviewed: There were two payroll records reviewed for ELC 5	
5. Number of said journals that included the above criteria: All files 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? The actual expenditures charged to the program did match the budget within reasonable variance.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
7. For a sample of employees charged to the program, review that recorded time worked matches time paid as reflected in the Payroll journal. Do they match?	<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
ELC review comments:	
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. This test includes fixed price contracts where rates were based on calculations that included capital expenditures.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Perform a physical inventory of a sample of ELC program assets drawn from the fixed assets register provided by ELC. Do they agree? Note any discrepancies.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. Are program fixed assets being used in accordance with the funding intent?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
7. Do asset additions and/or disposal procedures follow ELC's Fixed Asset policy/procedures?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
8. Were fixed assets purchased within the contract period in which they were approved/funded?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	
P. PERFORMANCE BOND	
ELC REVIEW	
1. Has the Performance Bond in the amount of <u>\$539,435.00</u> or an Irrevocable Standby letter of credit been submitted to the Coalition?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<u>ELC review comments:</u>	
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? Agency Policies located: Administrative Office on Fourth Floor.	
3. Did the Contractor submit one Continuation of Operations Plan (COOP) to the Coalition's Contract Manager upon execution of the Contract? The COOP shall include the Contractor's plans to continue operations during unforeseen circumstances whether natural or man-made disasters, local emergencies, or other emergency situations requiring significant changes in operation. The plan shall include pre-disaster planning, including but not limited to record protections, alternative service accommodations, supplies, and a recovery plan that would allow the Contractor to continue functioning as per the executed Contract in the event of an actual disaster.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Workers' Compensation; minimum Liability limits of \$100,000 per accident, \$100,000 per person, and \$500,000 policy aggregate	Expiration Date: <u>04/01/10</u>
	Amount: <u>\$500,000</u>

5. Unemployment Compensation Insurance: reporting and contributions up-to-date payments		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. General Liability: The CONTRACTOR shall maintain adequate liability insurance coverage on a comprehensive basis and hold such liability insurance at all times during the existence of this Contract and any renewal(s) and extension(s) of it. By execution of this Contract, unless it is a state agency or subdivision as defined by subsection 768.28(2), Florida Statutes, and as may be amended from time to time, the CONTRACTOR will provide its self-insurance letter to the COALITION prior to the execution of the Agreement. A self-insurance program established and operating under the laws of the State of Florida may provide such coverage.	Expiration Date: <u>07/01/10</u>	Amount: <u>\$3,000,000</u>
7. Professional Liability:	Expiration Date: <u>07/01/10</u>	Amount: <u>\$1,000,000</u>
8. Property:	Expiration Date: <u>07/01/10</u>	Amount: <u>\$10,349,600</u>
9. Automobile Liability:	Expiration Date: <u>07/01/10</u>	Amount: <u>\$1,000,000</u>
<u>ELC review comments:</u> Agency Insurance Documents were all <i>reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications. Note: Property Liability Insurance coverage amounts have been increased from \$300,000 to \$10 million.</i>		
R. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION AND SECURITY OBLIGATIONS		ELC REVIEW
1. Does the Agency have policies to safeguard client confidentiality? Employee Handbook Confidentiality Policy; department protocol and signed copy in each employee file.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
2. Does the Agency have protocols to protect computer based documents and records? Signed Security Agreement in each employee's File and referenced in Employee Handbook.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
3. Do only the appropriate staff members have access to computerized records? Rights are assigned to specific employees to access specific job related records.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
4. Does the Agency have a system for the maintenance of files? Employee Handbook.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
<u>ELC review comments:</u> Agency Confidential Information and Security Obligations Corporate Documents were all <i>reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</i>		
S. INCIDENT REPORTING		ELC REVIEW
1. Child Abuse Reports made to the authorities and Coalition. Child Abuse and Neglect reporting forms.	<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. Child Abuse and Neglect reporting forms.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

<u>ELC review comments:</u> Agency Incident Reporting Documents were all <i>reviewed and found to be in order and to meet required specifications.</i>	
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: FCI-09-ELC5 Child Screening and Assessment

A. MAJOR PROGRAM GOALS

ELC 5 2008-2009 Child Screening and Assessment:

1. To encourage and provide access to early screening of children for developmental issues by coordinating, supporting, and/or delivering Developmental Screenings for children served by School Readiness child care providers, served by School Readiness funded family support programs, or on the waitlist for School Readiness services, age birth to school-age, by way of a brief process or instrument which is designed to examine a child's development in order to identify whether a child needs formal evaluation to determine if the child's health development or behavior is below the typical range of development for the child's age.
2. To provide information on the progress of children receiving financial assistance for School Readiness services, age birth to school-age, by coordinating and ensuring the implementation and delivery of Child Assessments designed to examine a child's development in greater depth than a developmental screening, by way of ongoing assessment, a pre-test and annual post test, or a combination of methods, which records assessment results of a child's age-appropriate progress according to developmental norms.
3. To provide training and support to providers on how to conduct ongoing assessment, record assessment results of a child's age-appropriate progress according to developmental norms; use the assessment tool as a measure of child on-going progress and modify the curriculum based on assessment results.
4. To enable early care and education providers and parents/guardians to use Developmental Screening and Child Assessment information to tailor and enhance a child's development and learning by providing analysis and assistance to them concerning the findings.
5. To encourage and provide access to early intervention for developmental issues by actively facilitating and tracking linkage to formal evaluation for children whose development or behavior is suspected to be below the typical range of development for the child's age based on initial Developmental Screening and/or Child Assessment information.
6. To facilitate community and services planning by providing aggregate data on Developmental Screening and Child Assessment results and an analysis of same to the Early Learning Coalition of Broward County, Inc. and other Early Care and Education System partners.

Service Provider Directions:

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

B. SERVICE PROVIDER BRIEF SUMMARY OF ELC 5 SERVICES

- 1. Developmental Screening:** *The target population for developmental screening is children, ages birth to school age (not yet enrolled*

in kindergarten), who are receiving school readiness financial assistance, or waiting for school readiness financial assistance who have not been screened elsewhere and whose parent provides consent for the screening to occur.

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

Assessment Specialists (AS) directly administer developmental screening tools to designated children. The developmental screening continuum is categorized into three Levels, I – III. A level I and II’s purpose is to take a “snapshot” of the child’s developmental skills and abilities and ascertain if developmental concerns are present. Qualifying children, whose parent consents, will receive a Level I screening. A Level II screening is completed at the discretion of the AS if the child’s environment, disposition, or other factor on the day of the Level I screening may have impacted the outcome, prior to offering Level III services. Teacher and/or parent feedback is obtained to gather information on a child during the screenings. A Level III service is a full assessment and evaluation completed by a third party assessment agency (Child Find/FDLRS or other assessment agent) for those children whose results indicate a need for a more in depth evaluation. ELC 5 would assist the families in making the referral for Level III services for the child where the parent provides consent for further evaluation.

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

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

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

The Brigance system includes a grid for the Cutoff scores for Detecting Children Likely to Have Developmental Disabilities or Academic Delay by age. For example a child 3.3 years to 3.5 years of age needs a score <55 on the screening tool where a child 3.6 years to 3.8 years would need a score <71 on the same screening tool to meet the cut off score. If a child falls below the cut off score, it does not

necessarily indicate a need for further evaluation. Because we serve a population that meets the criteria for at risk, it is not uncommon that an increased number of children will not meet the cutoff score recommended for their age when using the Brigance screening tools. Brigance has established specific guidelines for at risk children in determining which children falling below the cutoff score should be referred and which children should be offered activities to assist in their academic achievement. In cases where the child falls below the cut off score where a referral is not warranted, the AS will leave various activity sheets based on the child's performance and skill areas during the developmental screening for both the parent and the teacher.

Children who receive school readiness financial assistance in Broward but select a Provider site in either Palm Beach or Dade County are screened utilizing the Ages and Stages Questionnaires for both cognitive and social emotional development as their Level I screen. The AS follows up with the Provider sites to complete the tools which would then be mailed back to the AS for scoring and tracking. If a child falls below expected levels or the Ages and Stages questionnaires are not returned to ELC 5, the AS will then conduct a Level II screening utilizing the Brigance Developmental screening tool.

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

2. Child Assessments:

The target population for Child Assessments is 264 children selected randomly from those children 0-5 (not yet school age) receiving financially assisted care. The breakdown of children by age to receive a child assessment was pre-determined for the 08/09 contract year as:

AGE RANGE	NUMBER OF CHILDREN TO RECEIVE A CHILD ASSESSMENT
<i>Birth-11 months</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>12-23 months</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>24-35 months</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>36-47 months</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>48-59 months</i>	<i>60</i>
<i>60-72 months</i>	<i>42</i>
TOTAL	264

Child assessments are completed based on a random sampling of children from 20 provider sites approved by the ELC. Criteria used to select the provider sites participating in child assessments included utilizing varying size schools (small, medium, and large) based on licensed capacity, geographically located throughout Broward County according to the Innovation Zones established by Broward County Public Schools. The ELC provided the names of the non-school age children at each of the selected provider sites and ELC 5 then randomly selected the children that were offered the service, ensuring the sample would be representative in numbers for each age category. In order to ensure enough time to obtain all required consent forms and complete the pre-assessments for the 264 children, three established offer dates were used (the first offer date to coincide with the first day of Broward County Public School (August 18, 2008); the second offer date was 30 days from that date (September 18, 2008); and the third offer date was 30 days from the second offer date (October 18, 2008). A flyer describing the benefits of the services and the consent form are distributed to the families for children randomly selected. The goal is to have the AS complete the pre-test portion of the assessment within 45 days from the child's pre determined offer date for whom consent has been received, and complete a post test six months from the pre-test date.

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

To clarify, children are only being compared to themselves to determine growth and development over time. Children are not being compared to other children in their classroom or age bracket. Therefore, no raw data or score is given for a child. The process for criterion-referenced Brigance Assessment is that the specific items that the child is capable of completing during the assessment are circled. When a specific item is not able to be completed, it is underlined and becomes the starting point for that section during the on-going assessment process. The post-test will indicate the child's gains from the time of the pre-test.

For the 08/09 fiscal year, all pre-tests were completed by the AS. For the on-going portion of the child assessments, 25% of the children, one on-going child assessment will be completed by AS. For 75% children, on-going child assessments will be completed by the teachers with technical support and mentoring by the ACC.

The Brigance system includes the Brigance Prescriptive Readiness: Strategies and Practice which provides developmentally appropriate activities and techniques for the teacher (and parent) to use to enhance classroom curriculum. The Brigance Prescriptive Readiness: Strategies and Practice guide is directly correlated to the IED-II thus indicating which activities are selected or recommended based on the child's assessment outcome. Based on information collected during the child assessment strategies and activities are established as goals for the teacher to implement in the classroom curriculum. For those children who receive their on-going assessment by the AS, the strategies and activities are prepared by the ACC and will be hand delivered and reviewed with the teacher to implement in their

classroom. For the children who will receive their on-going assessment by their teacher, the teacher will prepare strategies for use in their classroom based on both the pre-test completed by ELC 5 and their own on-going child assessment. In both situations, strategies are provided to the parent. This allows the parents to work with the child and work cohesively with the teacher.

3. Training Services:

ELC 5 offers Developmental Screening and Child Assessment training to all school readiness providers serving children birth to school age. Training dates are posted on Family Central's website, sent via group email, and are included in quarterly mailings to Providers. Defining the terms to understand the difference between developmental screening and child assessment, the benefits and expectations of child observation, an overview of the ELC 5 model, and the use of and tips in sharing of results are covered during the 2.5 hour training. The trainings are taught in English and Spanish, and are held at varying times and days, including Saturdays. Training can also occur at a Provider site based on Provider request.

Teachers of children participating in the child assessment services project receive training and mentoring by the ACC to ensure they are knowledgeable in conducting child assessments and in selecting and applying strategies and goals based on the children's results. Teachers first participate in a 2 hour child assessment orientation, introducing them to child assessments and utilizing the Brigance assessment tool. Small group and one on one mentoring will occur in the classrooms to ensure that teachers are capable of completing the on-going portion of the child assessment and to establish goals to modify their classroom curriculum. The ACC will track the teacher's progress and participation in the program.

4. Collaboration & Coordination of ELC 5 Services:

Coordinating and collaborating with outside systems of support as well as within our own agency is ongoing for ELC 5. During the 08/09 FY, the following collaboration and coordination activities took place:

- *Manager and/or Director participated in the quarterly QRIS meetings;*
- *Manager and/or Director participated in the quarterly SREL meetings;*
- *Manager and/or Director participated in the Early Learning Coalition System gatherings;*
- *Manager for ELC 5 participated in the Maternal and Child Health meetings as well as the Infant Mental Health meetings as scheduled*
- *Manager communicated at least monthly with FDLR/ChildFind regarding scheduling of appointments and linkages to services;*
- *ELC 5 referred and communicated as needed with ELC 3 regarding Inclusion services;*
- *Manager communicated monthly with R&R for reporting numbers on children placed on the waiting list;*
- *ELC 5 worked closely with ELC 2 for reconciliation efforts to obtain consents for children offered screening services;*
- *Manager trained all new EDE staff on Developmental Screening and Child Assessment services and how to complete the Terms and Conditions form;*
- *Staff (All FCI) participated in a Staff Development Day;*
- *ELC 5 staff received training on Child Abuse Laws and Legal Requirements;*

- *Motivational speaker, Rabbi Mitch Feld, MSW, spoke with staff on how to be positive;*
- *ELC 5 staff participated in COA activities and prepared for the upcoming reaccreditation visit for FCI;*
- *Manager and Director participated in a 6 week Webinar on “Preparing Culturally Responsive Preschool Educators”;*
- *ELC 5 staff received training on various assistance programs offered through DCF;*
- *ELC 5 staff received training on burnout prevention;*
- *ELC 5 staff participated in the Family Support Services retreat which included a motivational speaker and various team building activities;*
- *ELC 5 staff attended the Healthy Start/ Infant Mental Health Conference;*
- *Manager attended the Global Warming Child, Youth & Family Matters Conference;*
- *Director participated in the Healthy Start Black Infant Health Practice Initiative Committee, and the Community Action Group Committee;*
- *Director participated in the Healthy Start Board of Directors meeting as a board member;*
- *Director participated in the Broward County Child Abuse and Neglect committee.*

C. CLIENTS TO BE SERVED

General Description	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served				ELC Review	As verified by
1. The target number of children enrolled in early care and education programs and receiving financial assistance for school readiness services or listed on the Unified Waiting List to receive a Level I developmental screen on an annual basis and Level II developmental screen as appropriate is <u>5,250 children</u> .	Total Number of children Receiving a Developmental Screen: <u>5,961</u> Level I = <u>5,848</u> Level II = <u>65</u> Waitlist = <u>48</u> Percent Achieved: <u>114%</u>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	Key data report 13th month
2. The target number of children enrolled in early care and education programs and receiving financial assistance for school readiness services to receive Child Assessments is <u>264 children</u> during the term of the contract.	NUMBER IN EACH AGE RANGE	GOAL	ACTUAL # PRE-	ACTUAL # POST-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	Key data report 13th month; and Daisy backup
	Birth-11 months	13	13	8		
	12-23 months	40	47	30		
	24-35 months	54	62	44		
	36-47 months	55	59	39		

	48-59 months	60	62	48		
	60-72 months	42	45	29		
	TOTAL	264	288	198		
D. PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS						
CORE COMPONENT OBJECTIVES (OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS)						
SCREENING SERVICES						
1. 100% of parents with children, birth to school-age, enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care, Coalition identified family support programs, and/or listed on the Unified Waiting List shall be offered a developmental screen for their child(ren). Said offering shall include information for parents on the importance and advantages of developmental screening.	FCI Reported Results		ELC Review		Action needed?	
	Actual <u>Number</u> Served		Results validated?			
	<p>1. Number of parents with children, birth to school-age, receiving financial assistance for child care from Coalition funds, Coalition identified family support programs, and/or on the Unified Waiting List:</p> <p>a. Number of eligible children receiving financial assistance for child care from Coalition funds: <u>8,685* new enrollees and birthdates (re-des)</u></p> <p>b. Number of children listed on the Unified Waiting List offered a developmental a screening: <u>8,761 (from ELC IR&R counselors)</u></p> <p>c. Total number of eligible children offered a developmental screening: <u>17,446</u></p>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		<p>100% 111/111 N=111</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><i>If yes see row below for details</i></p>	
1.d. Number of parents offered DS for their child: <u>17,446</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No				

	1.e. Percent Achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
<p>Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used to offer families a developmental screen and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>When families contact Resource and Referral to complete an intake to determine eligibility to go on the waiting list, they are asked if they have any concerns regarding their child's development. Based on their response, they may be provided the number for ChildFind and information regarding developmental screenings provided at Family Central. In addition, a flyer offering developmental screening is part of the packet of information sent to all families on the waiting list. When a family enrolls for their financially assisted childcare, a flyer describing the benefits for developmental screening is part of the enrollment packet (new and redeterminations) along with the Terms and Conditions form which includes consent for the developmental screening. Signing the Terms and Conditions form is part of the enrollment process.</i></p>			
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Documentation of information discussed with parents on the importance and advantages of developmental screening; (2) Developmental Screening Offering Protocol; (3) Current <i>Terms and Conditions</i> Form in selected child files (4) Consent form (WL children) in selected client files</p>			
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed “<i>Benefits of Screening and Assessment</i>” flyer included as part of all ELC 2 enrollment and re-determination packets. Reviewed ELC 5 “<i>Developmental Screening Offering Protocol</i>” which includes training of ELC 2 counselor training with a one page “<i>screening and assessment talking points</i>” which is given to counselors to provide information for parents on the importance and advantages of developmental screening; blank terms and conditions form revised 4/08 with consent and decline for both screening and assessment included; and consent form for waiting list families. Reviewed <i>Terms and Conditions</i> results for each client in the ELC 2 file review. Interviewed ELC 5 Manager.</p> <p>Interview with ELC 5 Manager and back-up training schedules and agendas revealed all ELC 2 Eligibility Counselors were trained on importance and advantages of developmental screening and supplied with talking points. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></p> <p>Reviewed 111 files for evidence of <i>Terms and Conditions</i> consent forms indicating that parents were offered a screening for their child.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One hundred eleven (111) client files (100%) indicated that parents were offered a developmental screen for their child(ren): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 101 client files (91%) represented children birth to school-age whose families received financial assistance from school readiness funds (SR); and • Ten (10) client files (9%) represented children birth to school-age whose families are waiting for financial assistance for child care (WL). 			
<p>2. 85% of parents with children, birth to school-age, enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care, Coalition identified family support programs, and parents listed on the Unified Waiting List who request a developmental</p>	<p>FCI Reported Results</p> <p>Actual <u>Number</u> Served</p>	<p>ELC Review</p> <p><i>Results validated?</i></p>	<p>Action needed?</p>
	<p>2.a. Number of parents offered a screening and Unified Waiting List parents who request a developmental</p>		<p>95%</p> <p>104/109</p>

screening, who have not been screened elsewhere, shall provide <u>consent</u> to the developmental screening process for their children.	screening (1.b.) who have not been screened elsewhere: <u>8,685 (SR)+ 48 (UWL)= 8,733</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	N=109 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
	2.b. Number of said parents (2.a.)who provide consent to the developmental screening process: <u>7,743(SR)+48 (UWL)=7,791</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	2.c. Percent Achieved: <u>89%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed. <i>Data for Q1-Q3 was revised for the annual report to reflect accurate data following reconciliation efforts to obtain consents for children.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Review selected child files for <i>Terms and Conditions</i> (SR children); (2) Consent form of selected children served from waiting list.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed monthly spreadsheets from ELC 5 data system (DAISY), of children offered consent, the status of their consent, and new enrollee or birth date status information, for evidence of parents who provided consent to the developmental screening process. Reviewed ELC 2 child files to verify receipt of consent for developmental screening identified in the signed <i>Terms and Conditions</i> form. All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.			
Reviewed 111 client files (101 SR clients and ten (10) WL clients) for evidence of <i>Terms and Conditions</i> or consent forms indicating that parents with children, birth to school-age, enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care, Coalition identified family support programs, or parents listed on the Unified Waiting List who requested a developmental screening, who have not been screened elsewhere, provided consent for the developmental screening process for their child(ren).			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 111 files revealed: 109 children (99%) were eligible for screenings (2 children was screened elsewhere) and 104 parents (96%), with children birth to school-age, enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care, Coalition identified family support programs, or listed on the Unified Waiting List, who had not received screening elsewhere, provided consent for the developmental screening process for their children. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ninety-four (94) SR parents (96%) provided consent; and • Five (5) SR parents (4%) declined screening for their children. • Ten (10) WL clients (100%) consented to developmental screening. 			
3. 75% of children, birth to school-age, participating in Coalition financially assisted	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?

<p>care, Coalition identified family support programs, and/or listed/enrolled on the Unified Waiting List, whose parents provide consent to the developmental screening process, shall receive developmental screens according to the following system:</p> <p>(a) All children <u>newly enrolled</u> during the contract period shall be screened within 45 calendar days of enrollment.</p> <p>(b) All children continuing enrollment in school readiness programs shall be screened annually within 45 days of their birth date.</p>	3. a. Number of parents who consent: <u>7,791</u> (should equal 2.b.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>69% 53/77 N=77</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>No</p> <p><i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i></p>
	3. b. Number of children who receive DS: <u>5,896 (65 children had a Level II screen = 5,961; 48 children from WL)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	3.(a)(1) Number of <u>newly enrolled</u> children screened: <u>1,700</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	3.(a)(2) Number of <u>newly enrolled children screened within 45 days of enrollment:</u> <u>511</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	3.(a)(3) Percent (3c/3d) achieved: <u>30%</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
	3.(b)(1) Number of children continuing enrollment screened: <u>4,148</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	3.(b)(2) Number of children continuing enrollment <u>screened within 45 days of their birth date:</u> <u>2,950</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
3.(b)(3) Percent (3g/3f) achieved: <u>71%</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met		
<p>Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used to identify eligible children for a developmental screen and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>A monthly list is generated which identifies the children newly enrolled into care since the prior months list, and for children whose birthday falls within the 45 day time frame. Children on the list with an identified consent form are identified as the eligible children for a developmental screen. Children are assigned to an Assessment Specialist to conduct the Developmental Screening based on their chosen Provider site. Each Assessment Specialist carries a caseload of Provider sites and conducts the Developmental Screening based on eligible children attending sites assigned to them.</i></p> <p><i>Not meeting Outcome #3 has been previously reported as a barrier for ELC 5. ELC 5 continues to look at the data to determine</i></p>			

strategies to implement to improve the timeline for conducting developmental screenings. ELC 5 has seen an increase in the percentage for Q4 and continues to work to make additional improvements.

- 1. A barrier affecting this outcome is not reporting on the attempts ELC 5 makes to screen a child. We make many attempts to screen children within the 45 day timeframe, but if they are not in attendance on a day we are at a site, then we need to reschedule a time to conduct the screening. There are situations that it may take multiple attempts until a child is available to be screened. Many children not screened within the 45 day time frame have documented efforts in the file to show the attempts that were made. Children transferring Provider sites are one good example of a situation where attempts are made only to find out that the child attends a new Provider site.*
- 2. Service Delivery model and timing of reports- we generate a report monthly, therefore children enrolled early in the month will not appear until the following month's list. This can result in 30 of the 45 days passing before a child is identified. We have looked into preparing the list more than once per month but this has not fully resolved the issue.*
- 3. Mass enrollment last year - staff had more children then they could screen which affected case load size. Compared to Q1, caseloads have gone down drastically allowing staff to focus on new children. This barrier has hopefully been eliminated with less children being enrolled and a new pt staff. Q1- % was 23 of new enrollees screened within 45 days- Q4 is up to 46% and I believe this change greater helped the numbers.*
- 4. Automating process to receive consents timely from EDE- significant improvement has been achieved in this process through automation but technology problems and return to manual transfer of documents during the year caused some delay in achieving this outcome. This process will be fully automated in FY 09-10.*

Note: When attempts are made to conduct a developmental screening for children for whom consent is received, there are instances when children are determined to already be receiving services (not identified at the time of consent) (127 children), are school age (167 children), or have been terminated from care (895 children). As a result, these 1,189 children did not receive a developmental screening.

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Review selected child files (SR and Waiting List) for enrollment date (EFS database) and for developmental screening date.

ELC review comments: Reviewed monthly spreadsheets of children offered consent, the status of their consent, and new enrollee or birth date status information, based on data extracted from ELC 5 data base (DAISY), for evidence of newly enrolled parents who provided consent to the developmental screening process. ***All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.***

Reviewed 104 client files (94 SR clients and ten (10) WL clients), where parents **had given consent** for the developmental screen process, for evidence of receipt of a developmental screen according to the following system: (a) All children newly enrolled during the contract period shall be screened within 45 calendar days of enrollment. (b) All children continuing enrollment in school readiness programs shall be screened annually within 45 days of their birth date.

Of the 94 SR client files, 19 children (20%) were newly enrolled during the 2008-2009 contract year and 75 children (80%) were continuing enrollment in school readiness programs; all client files were reviewed for evidence of developmental screening results.

[Thirteen (13) currently enrolled children (17%) had received a screen within the 10 months preceding their FY2008-2009 birth date and were scheduled for their next screening in FY2009-2010.]

A total of 77 files (67 SR and 10 WL) indicated the children were eligible and available to be screened during the 45 day period either after enrollment or around their birth date and 53 files (69%) contained completed screens in 2008-2009; a 1st attempt to screen was made within 45 days for an additional five (5) children (6%).

- **Fourteen (14) newly enrolled SR children were available for screening** during the 45 day period (**four (4) children had left the program before 45 days and one (1) was determined to have been screened elsewhere**):
 - **Seven (7) children (50%) were newly enrolled and received a developmental screen within 45 days of enrollment;** and
 - **Five (5) children (36%) were newly enrolled and received a developmental screen after 45 days of enrollment; one (1) child was eligible for screening; however, the child had left the program before ELC 5 staff screened the child; and one (1) child received a developmental screen in 2009-2010.**
- **Fifty-three (53) SR children continuing enrollment in school readiness programs were available for screening** within 45 days of their birth date.
 - **Thirty six (36) children (68%) received a developmental screen** within 45 days of their birth date; and
 - **A 1st attempt to screen was made within 45 days for five (5) children (9%); and**
 - **Twelve (12) children (23%) received a developmental screen more than 45 days after their birth dates.**
- **Ten (10) WL children (100%) were screened on the day consent was received.**

Corrective Action Required: In order to ensure that this objective is met for the 2009 – 2010 contract year, the ELC 5 Service Provider shall submit to Coalition staff by December 30, 2009, a written operations plan detailing implementation strategies and quality assurance procedures (along with a timeline), that will ensure that children, birth to school-age, participating in Coalition financially assisted care, Coalition identified family support programs, and/or listed/enrolled on the Unified Waiting List, whose parents provide consent to the developmental screening process, shall receive developmental screens according to Coalition policy.

Service Provider plan to meet compliance (HOW) Explain: A protocol (written operations plan detailing implementation strategies and quality assurance procedures, along with a timeline) detailing the quality assurance procedures to ensure children are developmentally screened according to Coalition policy will be developed. An extension until January 15, 2010 is respectfully requested to ensure that this is done thoughtfully and thoroughly to achieve the required results.

ELC note: The ELC agrees to extend the response date to close of business January 4th, 2010. We anticipate that FCI's response by that date will suffice to meet the expectations of monitoring but understand that additional expansion /enhancement of the response may be forthcoming after that due date.

4. 100% of providers, with children who reside in Broward County but use School Readiness financial assistance for child care outside of	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	4. a. Number of providers outside of		

<p>Broward County, will be mailed the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Social Emotional (ASQ: SE) screening tools with directions for tool use and receive a follow up telephone call notifying of the mailing and offering assistance.</p> <p>100% of the children for which the ASQ indicates a need for further screening or the ASQ is not returned shall be administered the Brigance Screening tool by an FCI Assessment Specialist.</p>	<p>Broward County with children who reside in Broward County but use School Readiness financial assistance for child care: <u>54 providers</u></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>100% 1/1 N=1</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><i>If yes see row below for details</i></p>
	<p>4. b. Number mailed the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Social Emotional (ASQ: SE) screening tools with directions for tool use: <u>54 providers were mailed ASQs</u></p> <p>Number of providers who received a follow up telephone call notifying of the mailing and offering assistance: <u>54</u></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<p>4.c. Percent (4b/4a) achieved: <u>100%</u></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
	<p>4. d. Number of children who reside in Broward County but use School Readiness financial assistance for child care outside of Broward County: <u>101.</u></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<p>4. e. Number of children for which the ASQ indicated a need for further screening: <u>3</u></p> <p><u>(ELC 5 had discussion with all 3 parents and determined through parent interviews that there was a need for referral and therefore zero (0) Brigance Screening tools were administered by an FCI Assessment Specialist since referrals were made directly to parent during contact.)</u></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

	<p>4. f. Number of children whose ASQ was not returned: <u>11 (41 ASQ forms were completed and returned, 2 terminated before ASQ and returned and 1 revoked consent)</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
	<p>4. g. Number ASQs administered by an FCI assessment specialist as a result: <u>11</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
	<p>4.h. Percent (4e+4f/4g) achieved: <u>100%</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met</p>	
<p>Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>The number of ASQ's received is different than that in the June 2009 Key Data Report as 4 ASQ forms were received in July. Mailing ASQ's to Providers outside of Broward County saves on travel time to Miami/Dade for screening just a few children. One challenge however, is timely receipt back of the ASQ forms by some of the Providers.</i></p>			
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Copy of ASQ and ASQ: SE sent to PROVIDERS with copy of instructions for tool use as sent to PROVIDERS. (2) Selected client files (3) Documentation indicating follow up phone calls made to providers.</p>			
<p><u>ELC review comments:</u> Reviewed FCI protocol and EFS list of 101 children who reside in Broward County but are recorded to use one of 64 early care and education providers for child care outside of Broward County for evidence that they were mailed the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Social Emotional (ASQ: SE) screening tools with directions for tool use and received a follow up telephone call notifying of the mailing and offering assistance. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></p> <p>Reviewed FCI protocol “<i>Developmental Screening; Time Line for Service Delivery of Level I and II Screens & Referral for Assessment/Evaluation Services</i>” for evidence that children for which the ASQ indicates a need for further screening or the ASQ was not returned, were administered the Brigance Screening tool by an FCI Assessment Specialist.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protocol indicates that “<i>If [after the 23rd of the month] we are unable to ascertain whether or not the child may have concerns, the AS is to schedule a developmental screening using the Brigance Screening tool ...</i>” • The statement in the protocol does not accurately reflect the intent of the objective “<i>100% of the children for which the ASQ indicates a need for further screening ... shall be administered the Brigance Screening tool by an FCI Assessment Specialist.</i>” 			

Reviewed FCI spread sheet with list of **55 children** for evidence that children for which the ASQ indicates a need for further screening or the ASQ was not returned, were administered the Brigance Screening tool by an FCI Assessment Specialist; 46 additional children were not eligible for a screen at the out-of-county site during the 2008-2009 contract year. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

Reviewed 77 files for evidence that providers, with children who reside in Broward County but use School Readiness financial assistance for child care outside of Broward County, will be mailed the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Social Emotional (ASQ: SE) screening tools with directions for tool use and receive a follow up telephone call notifying of the mailing and offering assistance. Reviewed files for evidence that all of the children for which the ASQ indicated a need for further screening or the ASQ was not returned received the Brigance Screening by an FCI Assessment Specialist.

- One (1) file indicated the child resides in Broward County but uses School Readiness financial assistance for child care outside of Broward County; and
- **One (1) provider (100%) was mailed the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Social Emotional (ASQ: SE) screening tools for one (1) child, with directions for tool use and received a follow up telephone call notifying of the mailing and offering assistance; the provider returned the ASQ and the child showed no need for a further screen.**

Adjustment Required: This is a new objective for the 2008-2009 contract year.

In order to track this objective for the 2009-2010 contract year, the ELC 5 Service Provider shall submit to the ELC Coalition Staff for approval, by December 30, 2009, a copy of a linkage agreement with the ELC 2 Service Provider which outlines a process for providing ELC 5 staff with the following information on a regular basis:

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

Additionally, the ELC 5 Service Provider will submit to Coalition staff for approval, by December 30, 2009, an amended Protocol, that indicates ELC 5 staff shall identify:

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

Service Provider plan to meet adjustment required (HOW) Explain: *ELC2 and ELC5 have initiated discussions to develop a linkage agreement which will outline the process for providing ELC5 a) the number of providers outside of Broward County serving children who reside in Broward County but use financial assistance from school readiness funds for child care outside of Broward; and*

b) the identity of the children who reside in Broward County and use financial assistance from school readiness funds for child care outside of Broward by December 30, 2009. ELC5 will submit an amended protocol by December 30, 2009 which will identify the new process based on the Coalitions required adjustment.

5. 100% of parents who consent to their child’s Developmental Screening will be given the opportunity to meet in-person with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss the results.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	5. a. Number of screenings completed: <u>5,961</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 70/70 N=70
	5. b. Number of parents given opportunity to meet with provider: <u>5,961</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	5.c. Percent Achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>Every parent receives a letter with their child’s developmental screening providing them the results of the screening and notifying them of the opportunity to meet in-person to discuss said results.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Review process/policy for notifying all parents of opportunity to meet with provider; (2) Review appropriate selected client files for evidence of the opportunity to meet in-person with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss screening results.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed process/policy “ <i>Developmental Screening; Time Line for Service Delivery of Level I and II Screens & Referral for Assessment/Evaluation Services</i> ” and parent letter used to notify all parents of an opportunity to meet with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss screening results. All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated. Review 53 eligible client files (43 SR and 10 WL) where parents had given consent for the developmental screening process for evidence of the opportunity to meet in-person with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss screening results. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fifty three (53) client files (100%) showed evidence of the opportunity to meet in-person with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss screening results. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forty-three (43) SR client files (100%) had letters to parents providing them the opportunity to meet in-person with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss the results; and • Ten (10) WL client files (100%) indicated parents meet in person with the Service Provider to discuss screening results. 			
6. 87% of parents who consent to their child’s	FCI Reported Results	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?

Developmental Screening and whose child scores below expected levels will meet with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss their child’s results and of those, 100% shall identify two or more ways in which they shall use the information shared in the discussion to further their child’s school readiness.	Actual <u>Number</u> Served		
	6.a. Number of children who fell below expected levels: <u>488</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	89% 8/9 N=9 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
	6.b. Number of parents who discussed results with provider and/or the Service Provider: <u>472</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	6.c. Number of 6.b. who identified 2 or more ways: <u>472</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	6.d. Percent (6b/6a) achieved: <u>97%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
	6.e. Percent (6c/6b) achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used to discuss child’s results with parents and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>A letter is left for every parent at the time of screening requesting them to contact their Assessment Specialist to discuss the child’s results. In addition, the Assessment Specialist makes attempts to contact them on the phone to review the results. If the Assessment Specialist is still unsuccessful in contacting the parent, a letter is mailed to parent informing them of our attempts to contact them and to please call to discuss their child’s screening results. ELC 5 has found it challenging to contact the parent so that the results can be discussed. It often takes numerous attempts and additional letters mailed until contact is made.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Letter notifying parents that child fell below; (2) “Discussion of Results” form where parents note 2 or more ways they will use the information shared in the discussion to further their child’s school readiness; (3) Appropriate selected client files (SR and WL) for evidence of completed “Discussion of Results” form.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed letter notifying parents that child fell below expected levels and invites them to meet with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss their child’s results. Reviewed “ <i>Discussion of Results</i> ” form where parents note two (2) or more ways they shall use the information shared in the discussion to further their child’s school readiness. Reviewed “ <i>Developmental Screening; Time Line for Service Delivery of Level I and II Screens & Referral for Assessment/Evaluation Services</i> ” protocol for evidence that parents who consent to their child’s Developmental Screening and whose child scores below expected levels are expected to meet with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss their child’s results. Reviewed DAISEY UM outcome report of all 488 children who fell below expected levels for evidence that their parents were asked to meet providers to share results. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i> Reviewed 53 eligible client files for evidence of parents, whose child scored below expected levels, met with their School Readiness provider and/or Service Provider to discuss their child’s results and of those, evidence of the “ <i>Discussion of Results</i> ” form noting two (2) or more ways in which parents use the information shared in the discussion to further their child’s school readiness. Forty-three (43) SR client files had parental consent for the developmental screening process and completed screenings:			

- Seven (7) new enrollee client files indicated children met expected levels on developmental screens.
- Thirty-two (32) SR continuing client files indicated children met expected levels on developmental screens;
- One (1) SR continuing client file indicated the parents could not be reached;
- **Three (3) SR continuing client files indicated children fell below expected levels, the parent spoke with their School Readiness Provider and/or Service Provider and the parent completed “Discussion of Results” form and reported two (2) or more ways they would use the information shared in the discussion to further their child’s school readiness.**

Ten (10) WL client files had parental consent for the developmental screening process and completed screenings:

- Five (5) WL client files indicated children met expected levels on developmental screens; and
- **Five (5) WL children’s score fell below expected levels and the parents met with the Service Provider and completed “Discussion of Results” form and reported two or more ways in which they would use the information shared in the discussion to further their child’s school readiness.**

7. 100% of children, birth to school age, enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care, Coalition identified family support programs, and/or listed on the Unified Waiting List for which the Developmental Screen indicates a need for further screening, and whose parents provide consent to the developmental screening process shall be referred to appropriate community assessment services which provide in-depth evaluations and case planning based on the identification of a significant delay or concerns, as well as other needed support services.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	7.a. Number of children whose Developmental Screen indicated a need for further screening, and whose parents provided consent to the screening process: <u>257</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 7/7 N=7 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
	7.b. Number of 7.a. who were referred to community assessment services: <u>257</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	7.c. Percent (7c/7b) achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used to refer families to appropriate community assessment services and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>Families are referred to appropriate community assessment services for further evaluation if the parent provides consent for a referral for their child at the time the Assessment Specialist discusses the results of their screening with the parent. If the parent accepts the referral, the Assessment Specialist makes that referral on behalf of the family.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Appropriate selected client files (SR and WL) for evidence of referrals to appropriate community assessment services.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 5 data base that indicated 257 children were referred to appropriate community assessment services such as FDLRS which provide in-depth evaluations and case planning based on the identification of a significant delay or			

concerns, as well as other needed support services. *All documentation and data results were reviewed and validated.*

Reviewed 53 eligible client files of children birth to school-age, enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care, Coalition identified family support programs, and/or listed on the Unified Waiting List, for evidence of requiring a Level III assessment and referral to assessment services.

- Fifty-three (53) eligible client files revealed **nine (9) clients required further screening and seven (7) clients, whose parents provided consent to the developmental screening process were referred to assessment services:**
 - **Three (3) SR eligible client files (33%) indicated a need for further screening and the parent was referred to appropriate community assessment services;** one (1) SR eligible client files (11%) could not be reached so did not consent to further screening; and
 - **Four (4) WL client files (44%) indicated a need for further screening and the parent was referred to appropriate services;** one (1) WL client was found to already be receiving services.

8. 65% of children, birth to school-age, enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care, Coalition identified family support programs, and/or listed on the Unified Waiting List, who required further screening and whose parents consent to this screening shall be linked to appropriate community assessment services.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	8.a. Number of children who require further screening and whose parents consent to the screening: <u>257*</u> Total number of children referred <i>who had an appointment</i> : <u>186</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	88% 7/8 N=8
	8.b. Number of 8.a. who were linked to assessment services: <u>128 attended the referral appointment.</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>
	8.c. Percent (8.b/8.a) achieved: <u>69%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe any success/challenges with achieving the outcome.

**There were an additional 7 children whose information was sent to ChildFind as “notification” only as considered K-eligible based on the date of screening and the child’s age. This means that based on the timeframe an appointment was not scheduled for the child. The information was sent so that ChildFind can forward the screening information to the child’s home school in the fall so they are notified of the need for possible further evaluation and need for services. Since no referral for services was actually made, these children are not counted as part of the 257.*

The communication between Early Steps (CDTC) and ELC 5 has greatly improved this FY, which has resulted in success in obtaining

linkage information on the children 0-3 years of age referred to ChildFind. A meeting was also held between ELC 5 and Early Steps to implement changes in how we share information with parents with the goal of improving successful linkage for the families we refer. Due to scheduled appointments for children referred on FY 08/09 falling in FY 09/10, updates for these children are not currently available and will be reported following their appointment; or updates are not yet available as they are not within the 90 days timeframe of the referral date to obtain updates for children referred to Early Steps (CDTC).

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Appropriate selected client files (SR and WL) for evidence of linkage to appropriate community assessment services.

ELC review comments: Reviewed data base summary documentation of 257 children referred to FDLRS/CDTC with referral dates, appointments, and outcomes of linkages noted. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.* Reviewed seven (7) files of children, birth to school-age, enrolled in Coalition financially assisted care, Coalition identified family support programs, and/or listed on the Unified Waiting List, who required further screening and whose parents consented to this screening for evidence of linkage to appropriate community assessment services.

- Four (3) SR children were linked to assessment services:
 - Two (2) made the appointment, were determined eligible for services and are receiving services; and
 - 1 made the appointment, was determined eligible for services, but never followed up to receive services.
- Three (4) WL children were linked to assessment services:
 - 2 made the appointment, were determined eligible for services
 - 1 made the appointment but was found to be ineligible for services
 - 1 parent made the appointment, but did not attend it.

ASSESSMENT SERVICES

9. 100% of parents with children birth to school-age whose families receive financial assistance for a full-time School Readiness program (center-based or home-based providers) that are selected as part of a random sampling, shall be offered involvement in the Child Assessment project. Said offering shall include information for parents on the importance and advantages of assessments.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
	9.a. Total number of parents with children birth to school-age whose families receive financial assistance for a full-time School Readiness program (center-based or home-based providers) selected as part of a random sampling: <u>584</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 29/29 N=29
	9.b. Number of 9. a. parents offered involvement in the Child Assessment project: <u>584</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If yes see row below for details</i>

	9.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) Offering with statement to affect that if child is selected as part of a random sampling, would parent be interested in a Child Assessment; (2) Documentation of number in 9.a.; (3) Evidence of selected client files in documentation of 9.a.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed Child Assessment consent form, revised July 2007, notifying parent that they were <i>selected as part of a random sampling</i> , and are offered involvement in the Child Assessment project. Reviewed consent package delivered to parents including flyers indicating that: if a child was selected as part of a random sampling, parents were offered a Child Assessment; offering included information for parents on the importance and advantages of assessments. Reviewed data spreadsheet lists for evidence of how many packages were delivered. A total of 584 families were randomly selected and offered the opportunity to participate in the Child Assessment Services through three (3) separate offer dates, Aug. 18, 2008: 136 children; Sept 18, 2008: 93 children; and October 17, 2008: 59 children were offered the opportunity to participate in Child Assessment Services. All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated. Reviewed 29 client files for evidence that parents, who were selected as part of a random sampling, were <u>offered</u> involvement in the Child Assessment project and that said offering included information for parents on the importance and advantages of assessments. All 29 files (100%) indicated receipt of an offer to participate and information about the Child Assessment Project. <i>Note: 584 unduplicated consent packages were delivered; 288 families (49%) returned consents and participated in the Assessment process.</i>			
10. 100% of parents who consent to their child's Assessment will be given the opportunity to <u>meet in-person</u> with their School Readiness provider and/or Service Provider to discuss the results.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
	10. a. Number of parents who consent to Assessment <u>288</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 29/29 N=29
	10. b. Number of parents given opportunity to meet in-person with their School Readiness provider and/or the CONTRACTOR to discuss the results <u>288</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

	10. c. Percent Achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
<p>Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used to inform parents of opportunity to meet and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>Parents are informed of their opportunity to discuss the results of their child's assessment following the pre-test by receiving a post card; and by letter for on-going assessments completed by Family Central and the post-test. In addition, the letter sent at time of post-test included information about developmental benchmarks, activities that could be conducted at home and a flyer on our Resource Library. No identified challenges as all families receive valuable information via the assessment process.</i></p>			
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Selected client files; (2) Evidence to document opportunity for parents to meet with School Readiness provider and/or Service Provider to discuss results in-person.</p>			
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed parent notification post card, letters to parents inviting them to discuss the results of their child's pre-assessment and post assessment, for evidence of opportunities for parents to meet with the School Readiness provider and/or Service Provider to discuss their child's results in-person. Reviewed packet of materials that included information on the benefits of assessment, activities for supporting development and milestones for specific ages, resource library summer schedule flyer, and growth milestone chart. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></p> <p>Reviewed 29 randomly selected client files (10%) of parents, who consented to their child's Assessment, for evidence that all parents were given the opportunity to <u>meet in-person</u> with their School Readiness provider and/or Service Provider to discuss the results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Twenty-nine (29) client files (100%) contained letters to parents providing them the opportunity to meet in-person with their School Readiness provider and/or the Service Provider to discuss the results. 			
<p>11. 100% of children, for which the Child Assessment process indicates a need for further evaluation, shall be referred to appropriate community assessment services which provide in-depth evaluations and case planning based on the identification of a significant delay or concern, as well as other needed support services.</p>	<p>FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served</p>	<p>ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i></p>	<p>Action needed?</p>
	<p>11.a. Number of children whose Child Assessment indicated a need for further screening whose parent consented: <u>5</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>No</p>	<p>100% 1/1 N=1</p>
	<p>11.b. Number of 11.a. who receive a referral to appropriate community assessment services: <u>5</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>No</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>No</p>
	<p>11. c. Percent Achieved: <u>100%</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Met <input type="checkbox"/>Not Met</p>	<p><i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i></p>

Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used to refer families to appropriate community assessment services and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. *Families of children whose child assessment results indicate a need for further evaluation are contacted by phone to review the results and offer assistance in making a referral if the parent consents. Due to the low number of referrals resulting from the child assessment process, no barriers are identified.*
Note: There were two additional children participating in both the Child Assessment program and who received a developmental screening that were referred for further evaluation. They are reported in Outcome 7.

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Appropriate selected client files (SR) for evidence of referrals to appropriate community assessment services.

ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 5 FDLRS and CDTC referral list identifying the names of five (5) children who needed further evaluation and were referred as a result of the Assessment process and related outcome information. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*
 Reviewed 29 randomly selected client files for evidence that children involved in the Child Assessment process and needing further evaluation were referred to appropriate community services: (two (2) clients had received a developmental screen and were referred during screening).
 • **One (1) client file indicated a need for further evaluation during the assessment process and the child was referred.**

12. 65% of children who, as determined by the results of Assessment, require further screening and whose parents consent to this screening shall be <u>linked</u> to appropriate community assessment services.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	12. a. Number of children who require further screening and whose parents consented to the screening: <u>5</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 1/1 N=1
	12. b. Number of 12.a. who were linked to assessment services: <u>4</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	12. c. Percent Achieved: <u>80%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<i>If yes see row below for details</i>

Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. *One of the five (5) referrals that were made during Q4 was for a 5 year old child scheduled to attend Kindergarten in the fall. Based on the ChildFind schedule, there were no available appointments prior to the start of the school year so the referral is sent as informational only and is to be forwarded to the child's home school so that they may follow up in the fall. The outcome for the last appointment is still pending as CDTC requires at least 90 days post referral to be able to provide any updates.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Appropriate selected client files (SR) for evidence of linkage to appropriate community assessment services.

ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 5 FDLRS and CDTC referral list identifying the names of five (5) children who needed further evaluation and were referred through the Assessment process. Reviewed other related outcome information. Four (4) clients were linked to appropriate community assessment services and one (1) client declined the appointment when contacted by assessment service. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

Reviewed the one (1) client file that indicated a need for further evaluation during the assessment process and referral to appropriate community assessment services:

- **One (1) child (100%) was linked to CDTC for speech services and has an Individual Family Support Plan (IFSP).**

Note: One (1) child linked to appropriate assessment services was scheduled to enter K in Fall of 09. Due to the backlog in the ChildFind schedule, there were no available appointments prior to the start of the 2009 school year; thus, the referral was sent as “informational only” to be forwarded to the child’s home school so follow up would occur when the child entered Kindergarten.

13. 100% of children birth to school-age whose families receive financial assistance for full-time School Readiness services participating in assessments must have written parental consent for their child’s pre, post and on-going child assessment before initiation of assessments. Said consent must be available for review by AWI/OEL and/or Coalition during routine monitoring of center-based or home-based provider.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
	13.a. Number of children participating in Assessments: <u>288</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 29/29 N=29
	13.b. Number of consents: <u>288</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	13.c. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<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: (1) Selected client files for evidence of written parental consent to participate in the child assessment project.

ELC review comments: Reviewed data base summary document and files with 288 children in the Assessment project indicating written parental consent for their child’s pre, post and on-going child assessment given with date before initiation of assessment. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

Reviewed 29 client files of children birth to school-age whose families receive financial assistance for full-time School Readiness services who were selected as part of a random sample and whose parents consented for their child’s pre, post and on-going child assessment before initiation of assessments:

- **Twenty nine (29) files (100%)** had written parental consent for pre, post and on-going assessment and 100% of the files were available during coalition monitoring.

14. 100% of pretests must be administered to the selected population of children birth to school-age, whose families receive financial assistance for full-time School Readiness services, within 45 days of one of 3 staggered offering dates: August 18, September 18 and October 18.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	14.a. Number of children to receive pretests: <u>288</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 29/29
	14.b. Number pre-tests completed within 45 days of selection into Assessment project: August 18: <u>136*</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	N=29
	14.c. Number pre-tests completed within 45 days of selection into Assessment project: September 18: <u>93</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	14.d. Number pre-tests completed within 45 days of selection into Assessment project: October 17: <u>59</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
	14.e. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u> [(14b+14c+14d)/14a.]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used to administer pretests to selected population and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. * For one child, attempts to conduct the pre-test were done within the 45 day time frame but child was unavailable due to extended illness. Pre-test was completed upon his return.

ELC 5 has nine (9) Assessment Specialists and one (1) Curriculum Coordinator, each of whom carries a caseload of 1-3 of the 20 participating Providers in the Child Assessment Program. Children for whom consent has been received in each of the participating sites are assessed by the assigned Assessment Specialist within 45 days of their offer date. ELC 5 believes the change in 08/09 of having a select group of participating Providers contributed to our success in meeting the timeframes due to the relationships built with these Providers and the decreased travel time. No challenges were identified as all pre tests were completed within the 45 day time frame.

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Selected client files for evidence of pre-tests administered within 45 days of one of 3 staggered offering dates: August 18, September 18, and October 18.

ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 5 excel spreadsheets of child assessment participation for pre test, on going, and post test dates for evidence that pretests were administered to the selected population of children between birth and school-age, whose families received financial assistance for full-time School Readiness services, within 45 days of one of 3 staggered offering dates: August 18, September 18 and October 18. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

Reviewed 29 client files of the selected children birth to school-age, whose families received financial assistance for full-time School Readiness services, for supporting documentation that pre-tests were conducted within 45 days of one of 3 staggered offering dates: August 18, September 18 and October 17, 2009:

- **Twenty-nine (29) client files (100%) contained Child Development Record Books with pretests dates within 45 days of one of three (3) staggered offering dates: August 18, September 18 and October 17, 2009.**

15. 100% of post tests must be administrated to the selected population of children birth to school-age whose families receive financial assistance for full-time School Readiness services and maintain enrollment at the time of post testing, at least six (6) months, but not more than one (1) year, after the child's pretest.	FCI Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	15.a. Number of children to receive post tests: <u>288</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 18/18
	15.b. Number of children (15.a.) who maintain enrollment at least 6 months after child's pretest: <u>198</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	N=18
	15.c. Number of post tests completed at least six (6) months, but not more than one (1) year after the child's pretest: <u>198</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	15.d. Percent achieved (15.c./15.b): <u>100%</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 methodology used to administer post tests to selected population and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. *The Curriculum Coordinator maintains a spreadsheet which formulates the due date for each child's post-test based on their pre-test date. The Curriculum Coordinator tracks these due dates and distributes the assessment record book back to the assigned Assessment Specialist to complete the post-test in the designated time frame. No challenges identified as all post tests for children who maintained enrollment were completed.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Selected client Child Developmental Record Books with pretest and post test dates.

ELC review comments: Reviewed Child Developmental Record Books summary data listing 288 names and dates with pretest and post test dates. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

Reviewed 29 files of selected children birth to school-age whose families receive financial assistance for full-time School Readiness services, for supporting documentation that posttests were administrated at least six (6) months, but not more than one (1) year after the child's pretest.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eleven (11) files indicated that children (38%) had withdrawn from the School Readiness program before post tests were administered; and • Eighteen (18) remaining files (62%) contained Child Developmental Record Books; all files (100%) contained post test dates at least six (6) months, but not more than one (1) year, after the child’s pretest. 			
<p>16. 100% of teachers with children in the Assessment program will receive training on how to use the assessment tool to conduct informal on-going assessments throughout the school year, how to record a child’s progress in attaining developmental milestones, how to modify their program based on assessment results, and share results and strategies with parents. 90% shall identify two or more ways in which they shall use the information in the training to further children’s school readiness.</p>	FCI Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	16. a. Number of teachers with children in assessment project: <u>134 for 288 (pretest) children</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	16. b. Number of teachers who received training on how to use the assessment tool to conduct informal on-going assessments throughout the school year, how to record a child’s progress in attaining developmental milestones, how to modify their program based on assessment results, and share results and strategies with parents: <u>134+ (*323 received training- 305 submitted a training survey)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Reviewed teacher training log.	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
	16. c. Percent of 16. b. who received training (16.a/6.b.): <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
	16. e. Number of teachers (16. b.) who identified two or more ways in which they shall use the information in the training to further children’s school readiness. <u>276 (including 134 teachers)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	16. f. Percent of 16. e. who identified two or more ways in which they shall use the information in the training to further children’s school readiness: (16.e/16.b.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

	<u>276/305= 90%</u>		
<p>Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed. * <i>Note: The number of teachers receiving training is greater than the number of teachers with children in the assessment program due to the fact that many Providers had additional staff participate in the training. *13 training participants marked their survey as all 5's (strongly agreed) in their satisfaction with the training but did not complete the question that corresponded to the outcome therefore affecting the percentage. Teachers that did not participate in the formal training received individual mentoring and/or assistance by trained co-workers.</i></p>			
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) List of teachers by provider identifying which ones took training and which ones identified 2 or more ways in which they use the information in the training to further children's school readiness; (2) Training outline, contents, objectives, goals; (3) Provider surveys/other documentation listing 2 or more ways in which they use the information in the training to further children's school readiness; (4) Summary data from training results.</p>			
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed list of teachers by provider, identifying who took training with evaluations and sign in sheets and which identified 2 or more ways in which they use the information to further children's school readiness; Reviewed training outline, contents, objectives, goals and summary data from training results. All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</p>			
<p>Adjustment Required: <i>In order to ensure the intent of this objective is met for the 2009-2010 contract year, the ELC 5 Service Provider shall maintain a data base that connects the children in the project to the child's teacher(s) in training.</i></p>			
<p>Service Provider plan to meet adjustment required (HOW) Explain: <i>The ELC 5 current spreadsheet that tracks all children in the assessment project includes a column for the teacher. This spreadsheet can be sorted by teacher to extract this data. In addition, a log is maintained to track participation in training. Teachers are listed by provider site and this log includes a column which tracks the children. Both of these methods are able to track this data. Our intent continues to be to enhance the current FCI program that is used to manage this data (DAISY) but the project has been delayed because of conflicting priorities and limited resources. Upgrading DAISY to assist with this process will be a priority in 2010-11.</i></p>			
<p>17. 90% of School Readiness providers in the Assessment program will report two (2) ways in which they modified their program based on assessment results to benefit the children in their care.</p>	<p>FCI Results Actual <u>Number Served</u></p>	<p>ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i></p>	<p>Action needed?</p>
	<p>17.a. Number of providers who received follow-up training surveys on how to modify their program based on assessment results: <u>111 surveys were</u></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>No</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>No</p>

	<u>distributed and 105 were returned to ELC5 (for the 198 children)</u>		<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
	17.b. Number who reported 2 or more ways in which they modified their program based on assessment results to benefit the children in their care: <u>95</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	17.c. Percent Achieved: <u>90%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed. <i>23 teachers were unable to be surveyed at follow-up, as either the children transitioned out of their classroom prior to any mentoring services or were no longer employed with the Provider. These 23 teachers did participate in the initial Assessment Orientation training.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) List of teachers, by provider, identifying who took training and who identified 2 or more ways in which they modified their program based on assessment results to benefit the children in their care; (2) Copy of Provider surveys. (3) Summary of survey results.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed a blank survey asking teachers for two (2) or more ways in which they modified their program based on assessment results to benefit the children in their care; a list of 134 teachers, by provider, identifying 134 teachers took training and 105 identified two (2) or more ways in which they modified their program based on assessment results to benefit the children in their care; and copies of provider surveys. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
18. 75% of selected children will receive ongoing assessment through their provider, with training and mentoring from the Assessment Curriculum Coordinator; 25% of such children will receive one formal ongoing assessment from an Assessment Specialist.	FCI Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	18. a. Number of children who received ongoing assessment through their provider, with training and mentoring from the Assessment Curriculum Coordinator: <u>145 children remained eligible and received ongoing child assessment from their teachers. (216 pretested children would have been eligible to receive their ongoing assessment by their teacher, 71 children terminated from the program prior to their ongoing</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	100% 21/21 N=21

	<u>assessment).</u>		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes see row below for details</i>
	18. b. Percent of selected children, maintaining enrollment, who received ongoing assessment: <u>74% of original 288 pretest.</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
	18.c. Number of children who received one formal ongoing assessment from an Assessment Specialist: <u>74</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	18. d. Percent of children who received ongoing assessment from an Assessment Specialist: <u>26% of original 288 pretests.</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
<p>Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology used for training and mentoring for ongoing assessment activities and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>The Curriculum Coordinator had scheduled trainings exclusive to Providers participating in the Child Assessment Program entitled “The Process of Interim Assessments” for teachers to attend. In addition, every teacher participated in individual and /or small group mentoring and training sessions with the Curriculum Coordinator focusing on ongoing assessment activities. All on site mentoring and training sessions for each teacher are documented. In an effort to ensure all children received an on-going assessment, ELC 5 conducted the on-going assessment for 2 additional children which changed the percentage by 1%. However, 100% of eligible children received an on-going child assessment.</i></p>			
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Selected child files (2) List of children in Assessment project identifying those with ongoing assessments by provider and those by Assessment Specialist.</p>			
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed list of children in Assessment project identifying those with ongoing assessments conducted by provider and those conducted by Assessment Specialist. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i> List revealed 288 children received pre assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 219 of the pre-assessed children (76%) were still enrolled and 100% of the children received on-going assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 145 children (66%) received on-going assessments conducted by their teachers; and • 74 children (34%) received on-going assessments conducted by Assessment Specialists. <p><i>Note: 198 children (69%) received both pre-assessments, on-going assessments, and post assessments during the contract year; since</i></p>			

100% of the children available for on-going assessment received on-going assessments, this objective is met.

Reviewed 29 files of children in the assessment program, eight (8) children withdrew from care before ongoing assessment was completed:

- 21 children retained enrollment at time of on-going assessment:
 - 14 children (67%) received on-going assessments conducted by their teachers, and
 - 7 children (33%) received on-going assessments conducted by the Assessment Specialist.

Note: This objective has changed in 2009-2010 and all on-going assessments are now conducted by the classroom teacher.

19. 100% of child assessment pretests and annual post tests aggregate results shall be submitted monthly by the Service Provider to the Coalition and one quarterly analysis of same shall be submitted by the Service Provider to the Coalition and shared with the Early Care Systems group for planning purposes.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
	19.a. Number of monthly pre/post test aggregate results submitted: <u>12</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes see row below for details</i>
	19.b. Number of quarterly analysis submitted and shared with Systems: <u>4</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	19.c. Percent Achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed. *ELC5 completes all data fields pertaining to developmental screening and assessment on the ELC Monthly Data Report and reports on contractual outcomes quarterly.*

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Monthly and quarterly pre/post test aggregate results.

ELC review comments: Reviewed monthly and quarterly pre/post test aggregate results submitted to ELC. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

20. 100% of assessment results must be kept by the school readiness provider during the child's enrollment in the program and for three (3) years after the child is no longer enrolled. Said results must be available for routine monitoring by AWI/OEL and/or the Coalition.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
	20.a. Number of children in the assessment program: <u>288</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>
	20.b. Number of assessment results kept at ELC 5 Service Provider: <u>288</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	20.c. Number of providers with signed Memorandum of Agreement agreeing to keep assessment results during the	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

	child's enrollment in the program and for three (3) years after the child is no longer enrolled: <u>20</u>		
	20.c. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed. <i>A Protocol and a Memorandum of Agreement was developed for each of the 20 providers participating in the child assessment program detailing their responsibility to maintain copies of the child assessment results for the children who received the services. All Providers have signed their Memorandum of Agreement.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Review of child files with assessment results; (2) Evidence of policy that files are kept for 3 years by school readiness provider. (3) ECE Selected provider site visit to review selected child files for assessment results.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed Protocol and a Memorandum of Agreement developed for and signed by each of the 20 providers participating in the child assessment program detailing their responsibility to maintain copies of the child assessment results for the children who received the services. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
SCREENING AND ASSESSMENT TRAINING			
21. 100% of School Readiness providers serving birth to school-age children shall be offered training and technical assistance on the screening and assessment tools and on the analysis and use of results.	FCI Reported Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
	21.a. Number of SR providers paid for caring for children (from ELC 2- July 1, 2008-June 30, 2009): <u>734</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	21.b. Number offered training and technical assistance on the screening and assessment tools and on the analysis and use of results. <u>734</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
	21.c. Percent Achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology for SR providers to be offered training and technical assistance on the screening and assessment tools and on the analysis and use of the results and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>ELC5 offers Developmental Screening and Child Assessment training to all school readiness providers serving children birth to school age. Training dates are posted on Family Central's website, sent via group email, and are included in quarterly mailings to Providers. The trainings are taught in English and Spanish, and are held at varying times and days, including Saturdays. Developmental Screening and Child Assessment training was scheduled 3 times as breakout sessions at the 2008 VPK Conference to accommodate many Providers who attended the event. Trainings can also occur at a Provider site based on Provider request.</i>			

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Documentation of Training offering to SR providers; (2) Copies of materials; (3) evidence of delivery to all providers; (3) Provider specific information.

ELC review comments: Reviewed “Developmental Screening Training Calendar Distribution” Protocol; Annual Summary of “Training Offerings,” e-mail offerings, website offerings, and interviewed the manager of the Child Screening and Assessment program for evidence that training and technical assistance on screening and assessment tools and on the analysis and use of results was offered to 100% of School Readiness providers serving birth to school-age children. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

Training and technical assistance on the screening and assessment tools and on the analysis and use of results occurred multiple times throughout the year and targeted all providers and various ways to all School Readiness providers serving birth to school-age children in Broward County:

- 0809 VPK Conference program verified that ELC 5 gave three (3) workshops to a total of 98 teachers, titled “Assessment in the VPK Classroom;”
- ELC 5 Protocol “Developmental Screening Training Calendar Distribution,” revised October 18, 2007, ensured this objective is policy;
- An e-mail dated 12/24/08 from the ELC 5 Manager to the training calendar input staff, verified developmental screening training information was mailed with quarterly FCI mailings to all legally operating child care facilities with Service Agreement (734);
- A group email sent on 7/8/08, to the 734 Providers recorded as holding Service Agreements and an email address with ELC 2, ELC provider board member distribution list, and ELC 3 coaches and mentors verified that developmental screening training information was offered to these providers with internet service;
- FCI website screen-shots verified that training dates, times, and registrations were offered; and
- Broward County Training Collaborative website screen-shots verified that training dates, times, and registrations were offered.

22. 75% of School Readiness providers who receive training directly from the Service Provider on screening and assessment shall report two or more ways in which they shall use the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work with young children.	FCI Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	22.a. Number of SR providers sites whose staff received training: <u>70</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
	22.b. Number of practitioners attending training from SR provider sites <u>156 - 153 completed a survey</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	22.c. Number of practitioners (22.b.) who report 2 or more ways in which they shall use the knowledge provided	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

	in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work with young children: <u>145</u>		
	22.d. Percent (22.c./22.b) Achieved: <u>95%= 145/153</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe methodology for providing screening and assessment tool training to SR providers and any success/challenges with achieving the outcome. <i>ELC5 offers Developmental Screening and Child Assessment Training for SR Providers on a quarterly basis. Trainings are offered in both English and Spanish. In addition, ELC5 conducted on site training at Provider sites by request. Developmental Screening and Child Assessment training was also a highlight at the 2008 Conference.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) List of teachers by SR provider identifying which ones took training and which ones identified 2 or more ways in which they used the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work with young children; (2) Training outline, contents, objectives, goals; (3) Copy of blank provider surveys/training evaluations; (4) Summary data - Survey results/other documentation identifying providers ability to report 2 or more ways in which they used the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work with young children.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed a list of 156 teachers employed by 70 School Readiness provider sites who attended Developmental Screening and Assessment Training. Reviewed blank survey and summary data of 153 participant's surveys. One hundred and forty-five (145) participants (93%) indicated two (2) or more ways in which they shall use the knowledge provided in training to enhance the effectiveness of their work with young children. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
GENERAL			
23. 100% of the policies and procedures shall ensure the protection and confidentiality of individual child records and early learning provider records from unlawful disclosure as identified in the Standard Levels of Service (Exhibit C), Chapter 411 and Chapter 1002, Florida Statutes.	ELC Review	Action needed?	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes see row below for details</i>	
Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed. <i>Family Central has Standard Operating Procedures written and in place to ensure compliance with this outcome available for review.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Confidentiality Policies and Procedures.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed FCI Confidentiality Policies and Procedures. Reviewed departmental protocol "Confidentiality of Records" revised September 27, 2004, for evidence that ensures the protection and confidentiality of individual child records and early learning provider records from unlawful disclosure. <i>All documents were reviewed and validated.</i>			

<p>24. 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.</p>	FCI Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review	Action needed?
	24.a. Percent of telephone calls received by ELC 5 answered by fourth ring: <u>100%</u>	<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>
	24.b. Percent of customer phone calls received by ELC 5 placed on hold holding for no more than 2 minutes: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
	24.c. Percent of ELC 5 customers who left messages, receive call-back within 48 hour business days: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
<p>Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed. <i>FCI phone system is programmed to ensure compliance with this outcome. Telephone system performance reports are reviewed regularly to ensure compliance.</i></p>			
<p>Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) ELC will conduct Secret Shopper Call(s).</p>			
<p><u>ELC review comments:</u> Observed operation of FCI phone system while on-site and from remote location. FCI phone system is programmed to ensure compliance with the phone being answered by the fourth ring and 100% of customer telephone calls which are placed on hold are on hold for no more than two (2) minutes before caller is given the option to continue to hold or to request a call-back within 48 business hours. <i>All data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i></p> <p>Conducted two (2) Secret Shopper Observation for evidence that customers who leave messages will receive follow-up within two (2), 48-hour (business) days of initial contact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9/2/08 phone call: – 1st call - the system automatically answered after the first ring; tracking inbound calls in seconds instead of rings; the phone system gave the option to hold, request a call-back or dial 0 for the operator within minutes. 9/12/08 phone call: 2nd call - contacted Developmental Screening Manager directly; a message was left and the phone call was returned by the end of the day. 			
<p>25. 100% of child care providers shall be proactively informed of complaint procedures, leading to formal, established grievance procedures.</p>	FCI Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	25. a. Number of child care providers Served by ELC 5: <u>734</u> providers	<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</i>
	25. b. Number of said providers receiving complaint procedures: <u>734</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

	25. c. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<i>below for details</i>
Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed. <i>Both clients and Providers are verbally informed about Family Central's grievance procedures, and clients have been receiving this information in writing. The current policy was reviewed by our senior management team to ensure parents/guardians and child care providers are proactively informed of Family Central's complaint procedures in writing. The revised process to ensure continued compliance has been implemented for FY 09/10.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) A copy of documentation that providers receive from ELC 5 Service Provider that proactively informs them of complaint procedures leading to formal, established grievance procedures.			
ELC review comments: The 2008-2009 draft grievance policy was under review by Senior Management during the second half of the contract year and approved on September 3, 2009. Providers and clients were <i>verbally</i> informed about Family Central's grievance procedures during the 2008-2009 contract year. <i>Note: The revised protocol "the Grievance and Appeals Process" that ensures parents/guardians and child care providers are proactively informed of Family Central's complaint procedures in writing went into effect September 3, 2009, and to ensure continued compliance has been implemented for FY09-10 and the "Grievance and Appeals Process Overview" was mailed to all provider 9/21/09.</i>			
26. 100% of complaints received, or observations, concerning potential child care licensing violations shall be tracked and reported to Broward County Child Care Licensing and Enforcement and feedback on the outcome from Broward County Child Care Licensing and Enforcement shall be documented.	FCI Results Actual <u>Number</u> Served	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	26.a. Number of complaints received: <u>2</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u>, see row below for details</i>
	26.b. Number of complaints reported to BCCCL: <u>2</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	26.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: Broward County Child Care Licensing complaint log with feedback from BCCCLE.			
ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 5 Compliant Log for evidence of complaint or observations concerning potential child care licensing violations reported to Broward County Child Care Licensing and documented feedback on the outcome. Two (2) complaints were received or observations concerning potential child care violations were made during the fiscal year. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			

27. 85% of Providers receiving <i>Child Screening and Assessment (ELC 5)</i> services shall report overall satisfaction with the service, including cultural competency/sensitivity, customer-friendliness, usefulness of service provided, efficiency of service, and convenience of access to service.*	FCI Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	27. a. Number of provider Assessment sites served: <u>20</u> b. Number of providers served with DS: <u>734 eligible providers</u> c. Number of providers receiving DS and Assessment service: <u>734 eligible providers</u> Survey's distributed: <u>111 for Child Assessment and 274 for Developmental Screening = 385</u> Surveys returned: <u>105 for Child Assessment and 123 for Developmental Screening = 228</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Number satisfied with:		
	Cultural competency/sensitivity: <u>217 (95%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If yes, see row below for details</i>
	Customer-friendliness: <u>222 (97%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	Usefulness of services provided: <u>218 (96%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	Efficiency of service: <u>220 (96%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	Convenience of access: <u>212 (93%)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	27. b. Percent Achieved: <u>96%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service Provider annual review: Briefly describe any successes and/or challenges in delivering this survey. <i>One success ELC5 had this year was obtaining a successful return rate for satisfaction surveys distributed to teachers participating in the Child Assessment program. Certificates were distributed to teachers following the receipt of their survey. ELC5 also implemented the distribution of surveys to our Providers with very positive feedback as to our services. No challenges were identified.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Provider Satisfaction surveys of the survey sample of providers who received Screening and Assessment services, including summary results tallied for each individual category.			

ELC review comments: Reviewed new ELC 5 protocol: “Distribution of Satisfaction Survey” developed 12-11-08 stating that every Assessment Specialist will survey 15 providers for satisfaction of services rendered. Reviewed returned surveys and summary data for 228 surveys. *All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.*

28. 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.	FCI Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review Results validated?	Action needed?
	28.a. Number of complaints received: <u>3</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	28.b. Number of complaints reported to FLDCF and ELC: <u>3</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	28.c. Number of complaints reported to ELC: <u>0</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<i>If yes, see row below for details</i>
	28.d. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Substantially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	

Service Provider annual review: Comment if desired. One of the three reports was not accepted by the hotline.

Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Copies of complaints/observations received and documentation showing each have been reported to DCF.

ELC review comments: Reviewed ELC 5 Child Abuse Complaint Log for evidence of complaints or observations concerning potential abuse, neglect, or abandonment reported to the Florida Department of Children and Families, including notification of said reports (within the applicable confidentiality regulations) to the Coalition.

A total of three (3) reports were recorded in the Child Abuse Complaint Log indicating complaints or observations concerning potential abuse, neglect, or abandonment were reported to the Florida Department of Children and Families:

- Two (2) in November 2008 and one (1) in May 2009.
- While the number of reports made was recorded on quarterly reports, none (0) of the actual complaints or observations were reported to the Coalition within the applicable confidentiality regulations.

Adjustment Required: *In order to meet the intent of this outcome in 2009-2010 contract year, the ELC 5 Service Provider shall submit a copy of the revised protocol by December 30, 2009, to Coalition staff, that ensures that the Coalition will be notified, by email, each time a report is made to the Florida Department of Children and Families regarding complaints or observations concerning potential abuse, neglect, or abandonment within the applicable confidentiality regulations.*

Service Provider plan to meet adjustment required (HOW) Explain: *While reporting the number of complaints or observations concerning potential abuse, neglect, or abandonment on ELC quarterly reports has been acceptable in the past, we will adjust the process to ensure that the ELC is notified when such reports are made within the applicable confidentiality regulations. A revised*

<i>Protocol to ensure the notification of reports concerning potential abuse, neglect or abandonment to the Coalition will be sent by December 30, 2009.</i>			
29. 100% of other complaints concerning 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)</i> as appropriate, and/or shall be addressed through the provision of training and technical assistance through the Service Provider, and feedback on the outcomes shall be documented.	FCI Results Actual <u>Number Served</u>	ELC Review <i>Results validated?</i>	Action needed?
	29.a. Number of provider complaints received: <u>0</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, see row below for details</i>
	29.b. Number of said complaints referred to appropriate Service Provider and/or addressed through training and TA: <u>N/A</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	29.c. Percent achieved: <u>100%</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	
Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed. <i>No Provider complaints were received.</i>			
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: (1) Provider 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. No other complaints concerning providers were referred to the ELC 2, ELC 3 or ELC 4 Service Providers during the fiscal year. <i>All documents and data results reported were reviewed and validated.</i>			
30. 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. <i>All ELC5 reports were submitted timely.</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 5 Contract Obligations Checklist to confirm reports were delivered by contractual commitment dates; including the receipt dates for twelve (12) monthly Key Data reports, three (3) quarterly and one (1) annual report; 16 total reports. Reviewed the contract due dates for various monthly quarterly and annual reports. Sixteen (16) reports were due to the Coalition; all of the required data and reports (100%) were submitted on time.			

31. 100% of invoices submitted to the Coalition for processing shall be submitted on time and shall accurately meet the requirements of the approved cost allocation plan and contractual budget.	ELC Review	Action needed?
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u>, see row below for details</i>
Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed. <i>All invoices were submitted timely.</i>		
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 to fiscal on time and accurately met the requirements of the approved cost allocation plan.		
32. 100% of formal service linkage agreements and procedures, that are approved by the Coalition, with all Early Care and Education System Providers and pertinent community partners in order to coordinate services and prevent duplication shall have been developed within thirty (30) days from the date of execution of a contract and shall be implemented, followed, and revised as needed. This is inclusive of the link to the Broward County Child Care Licensing and Enforcement, as to communication about the change in status of, or critical incident with, any child care provider. Linkage agreements shall be actively implemented and maintained throughout the service year.	ELC Review	Action needed?
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>
Service Provider annual review: Comment if needed. <i>Linkage agreements will be available for review during the upcoming monitoring.</i>		
Documents to be ready for ELC on-site annual review: Copies of all signed and dated linkage agreements.		
ELC review comments: Reviewed six (6) signed linkage agreements. The linkage agreement with FDLRS was signed on 6-30-08, the linkage agreement with CDTC was signed on 7/31/08, the linkage agreement with Mothers Overcoming Maternal Stress (M.O.M.S.) was signed on 7/1/08, the linkage agreement with Camelot was signed on 7/1/08, the linkage agreement with ELC 3-FCI was signed on 8-5-08 and the linkage agreement with ELC 3-BCPS was signed on 4-21-09, all linkage agreements (100%) were developed within thirty (30) days of the execution of a contract with ELC (6/30/08).		
33. 100% participation in monthly Early Care and Education system coordination team meetings shall occur by a representative of the Service Provider and all services shall be actively and successfully coordinated with system partners and with the Coalition.	ELC Review	Action needed?
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If <u>yes</u> see row below for details</i>

<p>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.</p>		
<p>Service Provider annual review: Please submit a list of associations and community collaborate groups that ELC 5 participated in 2008-2009.</p> <p>Associations and Community collaborate groups that ELC5 participated in 2008-2009 are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Manager and/or Director participated in the quarterly QRIS meetings;</i> • <i>Manager and/or Director participated in the quarterly SREL meetings;</i> • <i>Manager and/or Director participated in the Early Learning Coalition System gatherings;</i> • <i>Manager for ELC5 participated in the Maternal and Child Health meetings as well as the Infant Mental Health meetings as scheduled;</i> • <i>Director participated in the Healthy Start Black Infant Health Practice initiative Committee, and the Community Action Group Committee;</i> • <i>Director participates in the Healthy Start Board of Directors meeting as a board member;</i> • <i>Director participated in the Broward County Child Abuse and Neglect committee.</i> 		
<p>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.</p>		
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed contract obligation log and system coordination team meeting attendance records. The ELC 5 Service Provider attended all monthly system coordinator team meetings and/or had a representative in attendance; eleven (11) meetings (100%) were attended by ELC 5 staff.</p>		
<p>34. 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.</p>	<p>ELC Review</p>	<p>Action needed?</p>
	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><i>If yes 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: Fiscal department will review budgets for deficit spending and significant surplus of funds.</p>		
<p>ELC review comments: Reviewed contract budget and amendments in comparison to the actual expenditures for fiscal year 2008-2009. Budget management objectives were met.</p>		