Quality Performance Report (QPR)
For

Connecticut
FFY 2015

Appendix 1 **Quality Performance Report**

Ensuring the Health and Safety of Children (Component #1)

In this section, Lead Agencies provide information on the minimum health and safety standards and activities in effect over the past year as of September 30.

A1.1 Progress on Overall Goals

Based on the goals described in the Lead Agency's CCDF Plan at Section 3.1.7, please report your progress using the chart below. You may include any significant areas of progress that were not anticipated in the Plan, as well. For each goal listed, briefly describe the improvement with specific examples or numeric targets where possible (e.g., revised licensing regulation to include elements related to SIDS prevention, lowered caseload of licensing staff to 1:50, or increased monitoring visits to twice annually for child care centers). If applicable, describe any barriers to implementing your planned goals.

Note: If your licensing standards changed during this period, please provide a brief summary of the major changes and submit the updated regulations to the National Resource Center for Health and Safety in Child Care (www.nrckids.org.)
N/A

Goals #1:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:
Perform coordination and planning work on performance benchmarks, in cooperation with the new state Office of Early Childhood, the Connecticut Statewide Advisory Council (SAC), RESCs, Head Start, Early Head Start, Birth to Three Interagency Coordinating Council, Family Providers, and Connecticut After School Network.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
In follow up to NARA's recommendation for the development of a manual of internal policies and procedures, policies pertaining to complaints and inspections were drafted and in May 2014, NARA presented these policies and provided training to all licensing staff. Additional policies have been drafted and are undergoing final review. Licensing staff will then be trained on all portions of the manual. Additionally, the report recommends regular review and updating of child care regulations.

The initial version of the Division's internal Policy and Procedure Manual has been finalized and includes policies and procedures pertaining to general expectations of conduct during inspections, initial licensing, assigning, managing and scheduling inspections, conducting routine inspections, intake, assignment, investigation and tracking of complaints, and investigating suspected illegal operations. All licensing staff have been trained on the manual.

Goals #2:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:

Carry out the activities outlined in a contract executed in April 2013 with the National Association for Regulatory Administration (NARA) to work with the State Departments of Education and Public Health in collaboration with the Office of Early Childhood to conduct a needs assessment of Connecticut's Child Day care Licensing Program to identify strengths and weaknesses of the licensing program and provide recommendations and support activities. Such activities to include a needs assessment including a survey of licensed day care providers and stakeholders, conducting targeted interviews with licensing staff, licensed providers and parents, and holding focus group meetings. Activities will also include a review of existing regulations and administrative policies, and targeted training to licensing staff.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:

Seventeen (17) additional licensing specialists and supervisors have been hired to implement annual inspections of licensed child care facilities. Individual caseloads have been reduced to enable staff to conduct annual inspections of all licensed child care programs.

Goals #3:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:

Establish licensing as a baseline standard of program quality which provides external, reliable statewide monitoring of programs.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:

Goal #3 was deleted in FFY 2014.

A1.2 Key Data

A1.2.1 Number of licensed programs

   a) How many licensed center-based programs operated in the State/Territory as of September 30th of the last federal fiscal year?   1445

☐ N/A

Describe:
As of September 30, 2015, a total of 1,445 child care centers were licensed.

   b) How many licensed home-based programs operated in the State/Territory as of September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? 2294

☐ N/A

Describe:

In total number, there were 2,294 licensed Home-Based, (Family Child Care Home and Group Child Care
Home)   programs that were licensed as of September 30, 2015. This includes 2,265 family child care homes and 29 licensed group child care homes.

 c) Does the State/Territory have data on the number of programs operating in the State/Territory that are legally exempt from licensing? At a minimum, the Lead Agency should provide the number of legally exempt providers serving children receiving CCDF.

☑ Yes
 If yes, include the number of programs as of September 30 of the last federal fiscal year:

Number: 6760

Describe (provide the universe of programs on which the number is based):
In FFY 2015, there were 6,760 providers in the Child Care Subsidy Program, that were legally exempt from licensing (6,316 Family, Friends and Neighbor + 267 Exempt Schools and 177 Summer Camp settings receiving child care assistance vouchers. Please note, there are additional License Exempt providers in the state but not all participate in the Child Care subsidy program. Question A.3.2.4 identifies 584 License-Exempt programs in the state which does not include Family, Friend and Neighbor providers.

There were **267** Exempt Center Based School Settings plus **177** Exempt municipal and Summer Camp programs for a total of **444** Licensed Exempt settings that were not subject to licensing and received Care 4 Kids Certificate in FY 2015.

In total there are **444** License- Exempt and **6316** Family, Friends and Neighbor Settings receiving child care assistance vouchers in FY 2015.

In FY2015, there were **6,316** Family, Friends, and Neighbors (FFN) providers that were not subject to licensing and received Care 4 Kids Certificate and are identified in our Care 4 Kids system as unlicensed home based (Family, Friends, and Neighbor).

Family, Friends, and Neighbors (FFN)- care is provided in the child's home or in the unlicensed home of a relative.

☐ No

Describe:

```

```


A1.2.2 Number and Frequency of Monitoring Visits

a) How many licensed center-based programs received at least one monitoring visit between October 1 and September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? 1328

a-1) Of those programs visited, how many were unannounced? 1328

a-2) Of those programs visited, how many were triggered by a complaint or identified risk? 0

a-3) What percentage of required visits for licensed center-based program were completed? 92

☐ N/A

Describe:
The 1,328 licensed centers received 1,445 monitoring visits (some more than once) but does not include visits triggered by a complaint or identified risk. There were an additional 442 unannounced monitoring visits conducted in child care centers as an initial response to a complaint.

A total of 92% of the **1,445** licensed child care center programs (per CCDF - not including group child care homes) received unannounced monitoring visits in FFY 2015.

b) How many licensed family child care programs received at least one monitoring visit between October 1 and September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? 2018

b-1) Of those programs visited, how many were unannounced? 2018

b-2) Of those programs visited, how many were triggered by a complaint or identified risk? 0

b-3) What percentage of required visits for licensed family child care programs were completed? 87

☐ N/A

Describe:
In question b-2, of those programs visited, how many were triggered by a complaint or identified risk? The answer is: Not known.   The above number does not include complaint visits or identified risk.

A total of **2018** family child care programs (per CCDF - family and group child care homes) received unannounced monitoring visits in FFY 2015.   Of this, 1,994 programs (87%) of licensed family child care homes and 24 (83%) of group child care homes received full unannounced visits in the last federal fiscal year.   In addition, 161 unannounced visits were conducted to family child care homes as an initial response to a complaint.

c) How many legally exempt providers receiving CCDF received at least one monitoring visit between October 1 and September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

c-1) Of those programs visited, how many were unannounced?

c-2) Of those programs visited, how many were triggered by a complaint or identified risk?

c-3) What percentage of required visits for legally exempt providers were completed?

☑ N/A

Describe:
Unknown. License-Exempt programs are not required to be monitored by the licensing staff. However, there is work done with the Connecticut Office of Early Childhood and State Department of Education and well as NAEYC and the CT Accreditation Facilitation Project that includes the opportunity for on-site monitoring and review. The number of license-exempt programs included in monitoring is not collected at this time.

License-Exempt programs in schools or that participate in the Child and Adult Care Food Program, receive monitoring visits as a part of that programs health and safety standards.

A1.2.3 Number of Licensing Suspensions, Licensing Revocations and Terminations from CCDF

Child Care Centers:

How many were **suspended** due to licensing violations as defined in your State/Territory during the last federal fiscal year?   0

☐ N/A

How many were **revoked** due to licensing violations as defined in your State/Territory during the last federal fiscal year?   0

☐ N/A

How many were **terminated** from participation in CCDF due to failure to meet licensing or minimum CCDF health and safety requirements during the last federal fiscal year?

☑ N/A

Describe:
In addition there were 16 Consent Orders and 2 voluntary surrenders.   A Consent Order is a voluntary settlement negotiated between the licensing agency and licensee whereby the licensee agrees to certain conditions/requirements above and beyond those required in the regulations which address the areas of concern. It is a disciplinary action against the license and usually includes a civil penalty.

Child Care Licensing also has a category of voluntary surrender of license. All licensed C4K providers are made ineligible as providers when their licenses are no longer in good standing with child care licensing.

Group Child Care Homes:

How many were **suspended** due to licensing violations as defined in your State/Territory during the last federal fiscal year?   0

☐ N/A

How many were **revoked** due to licensing violations as defined in your State/Territory during the last federal fiscal year?   0

☐ N/A

How many were **terminated** from participation in CCDF due to failure to meet licensing or minimum CCDF health and safety requirements during the last federal fiscal year?

☑ N/A

Describe:

In addition there were 3 Consent Orders and 0 voluntary surrenders.   A Consent Order is a voluntary settlement negotiated between the licensing agency and licensee whereby the licensee agrees to certain conditions/requirements above and beyond those required in the regulations which address the areas of concern.   It is a disciplinary action against the license and usually includes a civil penalty.

Child Care Group Home was made ineligible on notification from DPH as they no longer held a valid license from DPH.

Child Care Licensing also has a category of voluntary surrender of license.   All licensed C4K providers are made ineligible as providers when their licenses are no longer in good standing with   child care licensing.

Family Child Care Homes:

How many were **suspended** due to licensing violations as defined in your State/Territory during the last federal fiscal year?   0

☐ N/A

How many were **revoked** due to licensing violations as defined in your State/Territory during the last federal fiscal year?   8

☐ N/A

How many were **terminated** from participation in CCDF due to failure to meet licensing or minimum CCDF health and safety requirements during the last federal fiscal year?

☑ N/A

Describe:

Eight (8) Licensed Family Child (Day) Care Home providers had their license revoked. In addition there were **8** Consent Orders and **6** voluntary surrenders.   A Consent Order is a voluntary settlement negotiated between the licensing agency and licensee whereby the licensee agrees to certain conditions/requirements above and beyond those required in the regulations which address the areas of concern.   It is a disciplinary action against the license and usually includes a civil penalty.

Child Care Licensing also has a category of voluntary surrender of license.   All licensed C4K providers are made ineligible as providers when their licenses are no longer in good standing with   child care licensing.

*In Care4Kids, a total of **13** providers' licenses were revoked due to licensing violations. Out of the **13** providers; **5** were revocations, and **8** were voluntary surrenders. One provider was operating illegally and applied to be an exempt provider from the Office of Early Childhood's Licensing Division. The provider was determined not to be exempt. 17 subsidy providers were terminated: 5 out of the 17 total providers had 2 licensing actions.*

In-Home Providers:

How many were **suspended** due to licensing violations as defined in your State/Territory during the last federal fiscal year?

☑ N/A

How many were **revoked** due to licensing violations as defined in your State/Territory during the last federal fiscal year?

☑ N/A

How many were **terminated** from participation in CCDF due to failure to meet licensing or minimum CCDF health and safety requirements during the last federal fiscal year?

☑ N/A

Describe:
In-Home Providers (known as Family, Friend & Neighbor Care) are not licensed and therefore were not suspended, revoked or terminated.

Background Information
Child Care Providers may be made ineligible based on the results of a criminal background check. Child Care Providers are made ineligible based on a DCF substantiation. (There is duplication between the providers with DCF substantiation and those made ineligible. The estimate is approximately 25% of the criminal background check "made ineligible" are due to the DCF substantiation).   In-Home Providers are Unlicensed Individuals/Providers. The care is provided in the child's home or in the unlicensed home of a relative or friend and are referred to as Family, Friend, and Neighbors (FFN).

If in-home providers did not meet the Health and Safety requirements (which in CT's case include background checks) they would be terminated (made "ineligible").

New providers to C4K are deemed to be ineligible prior to receiving payment from C4K. Existing providers are made ineligible if the crime was committed after they became a provider. These are

uncovered during the annual "recheck" COLLECT process.   Had they applied to be a C4K provider – and never were because of the background and DCF checks?   Same response for CBC.   Never deemed eligible if "hit" exists upon application and made ineligible after the fact if abuse/neglect record is created after care starts and discovered upon annual re-check.

Any subsidy payments made during a period when a provider was in violation of health and safety requirements are recouped from provider since they were not "eligible" to receive payment for that timeframe and it was discovered after the fact.

A1.2.4 How many previously license-exempt providers were brought under the licensing system during the last federal fiscal year (October 1 through September 30)?

☑ N/A

Describe:
Data not available.

A1.2.5 How many injuries as defined by the State/Territory occurred in child care during the last federal fiscal year? Please provide your definition of injuries in the Describe box and indicate the universe of programs on which the number is based (e.g., licensed providers, CCDF providers, or all providers).

☑ N/A

Describe:
Care 4 Kids does not collect anything on injuries.

Not known. "Injuries" is not defined in the licensing regulations. However, licensed programs are required to report a death(s) and to report an admission(s) to a hospital.   The licensing staff works with staff from the Department of Children and Families when appropriate regarding the welfare and safety of children in licensed facilities.

Referrals to the Department of Children and Families are made by the United Way Care4Kids staff, when appropriate regarding the welfare and safety of children in Care4Kid/ CCDF child subsidy facilities.

A1.2.6 How many fatalities occurred in child care or as the result of a child care accident or injury as of the end of the last federal fiscal year? Please indicate the universe of programs on which the number is based (e.g., licensed providers, CCDF providers, or all providers).

1

☐ N/A

Describe:
One fatality occurred in a family child care home. Zero in a Care 4 Kids home.

Establishing Early Learning Guidelines (Component #2)

A2.1 Progress on Overall Goals

A2.1.1 Did the State/Territory make any changes to its voluntary early learning guidelines (including guidelines for school-age children) as reported in 3.2 during the last federal fiscal year?

☑ Yes

☐ No

☐ N/A

Describe:

Connecticut released a Draft Kindergarten through Grade 3 Social, Emotional and Intellectual Habits Framework for Public comment.
Connecticut released Early Learning and Development Standards (CT ELDS) in October 2013.

A2.1.2 Based on the goals described in the Lead Agency's CCDF Plan at Section 3.2.8, please report your progress. You may include any significant areas of progress that were not anticipated in the Plan, as well. For each goal listed, briefly describe the improvement with specific examples or numeric targets where possible (e.g., Expanded the number of programs trained on using the ELGs, Aligned the ELGs with Head Start Outcomes Framework). If applicable, describe any barriers to implementing your planned goals.

Goals #1:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:
Work with State Advisory Council Early Learning Standards Committee to develop evaluation methodology for performance measurement.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
Goal #1 is revised to:
Integrate the Connecticut Early Learning and Development Standards (CT ELDS) into the planned professional development system, thereby ensuring consistency and quality of professional development related to the CT ELDS and data related to training access.

While the professional development system is not yet fully in place, support for the implementation of the CT ELDS has continued. Advanced training on using the CT ELDS to promote an integrated curricular approach was provided to approximately 300 early care and education providers in partnership with our Regional Education Service Centers (RESCs). The RESCs then continue to provide similar trainings on a fee-for-service basis. Further guidance on the implementation of the CT ELDS is also underway, as described under goal #3

Goals #2:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:

Work with State Advisory Council Early Learning Standards Committee to review, update and align Birth- to-Three, Head Start and Early Learning Guidelines (ELGs) to reflect current research and practice: periodic evaluation of ELG trainers' performance; make the Early Learning Guidelines part of the state's professional development system (both Connecticut Charts-A-Course and college based programs); integrate Early Learning Guidelines and Infant and Toddler Modules into Early Care and Education courses at 2- and 4- year colleges.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
Goal #2 is revised as follows:

- Create Core Knowledge Competencies (CKC) for Trainers, Coaches, Mentors, and Consultants.   All training of trainers' content will be integrated with Early Learning Guidelines (ELGs) and aligned with the CKC for all groups i.e. Teachers, Trainers, Coaches, Mentors, and Consultants.
- Re-design Training Approval System based on CKC for Trainers, Coaches, Mentors, and Consultants.
- Provide training and resources to promote widespread and appropriate use of the CT ELDS: crosswalks to relevant sets of standards (e.g. Head Start Framework) and assessment tools; training aimed at various audiences (center-based programs transitioning to the use of new standards, home care providers, librarians, etc.); and integration of CT ELDS into ongoing work across state and local agencies (e.g. State Department of Education work, Department of Children and Families training).
  Describe Progress:

Provide training and resources to promote widespread and appropriate use of the CT ELDS:

A crosswalk to the Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP) was presented to CT Birth to Three providers in December 2014. Advanced training on using the CT ELDS to promote an integrated curricular approach was provided to approximately 300 early care and education providers in partnership with our Regional Education Service Centers (RESCs) in Spring of 2015. The RESCs then continue to provide similar trainings on a fee-for-service basis. Also in the Spring of 2015, two sessions were held for professionals working with home care providers to integrate the CT ELDS into these settings.

The OEC has contracted with the Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC) at Eastern Connecticut State University to develop a series of videos and related training documents on the CT ELDS for providers across all sectors of care.   Link to website housing the videos is: http://www1.easternct.edu/cece/elds/. While other videos are near completion and release, one video has been released widely an integrated into the trainings referenced above. The set of videos will illustrate the standards and learning progressions for children birth to five across eight domains of development. The videos include interviews with teachers in classroom settings. There are also documents to guide the use of these videos in staff meetings, higher education courses, and as a part of other professional development opportunities.

 A process for developing a crosswalk to the new Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework 2015 is currently being planned.

The Core Knowledge and Competency Framework is still under construction and shifting the frame to a multi-disciplinary approach across roles. The result will reference the CT ELDS where appropriate of the roles addressed in the development of the CKCs. Eventual work on Training and Technical Assistance Provider CKCs will serve as the basis for CT's trainer approval system.

Goals #3:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:

Work with State Advisory Council Early Learning Standards Committee to crosswalk Connecticut's Early Learning Guidelines (ELG) with the Connecticut Pre-School Assessment Framework (PAF) and the Connecticut Preschool Curriculum Framework (PCF), the community college infant-toddler curriculum, and the Early Head Start performance standards. Crosswalk with NAEYC Accreditation standards.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:

Goal #3 is revised as follows:

- Work with partners to develop guidance related to the implementation of the CT ELDS, including evidence-based practices linked with the standards, use with English Language Learners and children with special needs, and use with assessment tools.

Describe Progress:

The OEC has been working with the UCONN University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD) to develop guidance related to the CT ELDS. Draft documents have been shared during training sessions and the following series of documents is expected to be released in early 2016.These documents are designed to be used as a part of professional learning, through use in higher education courses, professional learning communities, and other professional development opportunities.

Supporting All Children Using the CT ELDS

- **Building Meaningful Curriculum**
- **A Guide to the Domains and Strands**
- **Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners**
- **Meeting the Needs of Dual Language Learners**
- **A Guide for Families**

A2.2 Key Data

A2.2.1a How many individuals were trained on early learning guidelines (ELGs) or standards over the last federal fiscal year?

Responses to this question should be consistent with information provided in question 3.2.3 in the CCDF Plan.

Center-based Programs: Early Learning Guidelines (ELGs)	How many teachers/practitioners in center-based programs were trained on ELGs over the past year? Separate by age group if possible (e.g., infants and toddlers, preschoolers, school-age children)	N/A
Birth to Three ELGs		☑

Three-to-Five ELGs	300	☐
Five and Older ELGs		☑
Describe:	The OEC provided training on using the CT ELDS to promote an integrated curricular approach to approximately 300 early care and education providers, serving ages birth to five, in collaboration with the Regional Education Service Centers (RESCs). In addition, the RESCs were able to use the materials to provide additional trainings on a fee-for-service basis. We do not have data about other trainings provided by the RESCs.	
Family Child Care Programs: **Early Learning Guidelines (ELGs)**	**How many family child care programs providers were trained on ELGs over the past year?** **Separate by age group if possible (e.g., infants and toddlers, preschoolers, school-age children)**	**N/A**
Birth to Three ELGs		☑
Three-to-Five ELGs		☑
Five and Older ELGs		☑
Describe:	The OEC provided professional development to early childhood professionals already supporting family child care program providers in the Spring of 2015 so that they can incorporate the CT ELDS into their work.	
Legally Exempt Providers: **Early Learning Guidelines (ELGs)**	**How many legally exempt providers were trained on ELGs over the past year?** **Separate by age group if possible (e.g., infants and toddlers, preschoolers, school-age children)**	**N/A**
Birth to Three ELGs		☑
Three-to-Five ELGs		☑
Five and Older ELGs		☑
Describe:	CT's provider orientation training, which includes some legally exempt providers, includes a brief introduction to the CT ELDS.	

A2.2.1b How many children are served in programs implementing the ELGs?

Refer to question 3.2.4 in the CCDF Plan for examples of how ELGs can be implemented in programs. Program capacity can be used as an estimate of children served.

Center-based Programs: **Early Learning Guidelines (ELGs)**	**How many children are served in center-based programs implementing the ELGs? Separate by age group if possible (e.g., infants and toddlers, preschoolers, school-age children)**	**N/A**
Birth to Three ELGs		☑
Three-to-Five ELGs		☑
Five and Older ELGs		☑
Describe:	This data is not available; however, on an OEC survey of early care and education providers with 324 respondents, 84% of those responding reported using the CT ELDS as a basis for curriculum and planning. In addition, 45% of respondent were very familiar with the CT ELDS and 50% were somewhat familiar.	

Family Child Care Programs: Early Learning Guidelines (ELGs)	How many children are served in family child care programs implementing the ELGs? Separate by age group if possible (e.g., infants and toddlers, preschoolers, school-age children)	N/A
Birth to Three ELGs		☑
Three-to-Five ELGs		☑
Five and Older ELGs		☑
Describe:	This data is not available.	
Legally Exempt Providers: Early Learning Guidelines (ELGs)	How many children are served in legally exempt programs implementing the ELGs? Separate by age group if possible (e.g., infants and toddlers, preschoolers, school-age children)	N/A
Birth to Three ELGs		☑
Three-to-Five ELGs		☑
Five and Older ELGs		☑
Describe:	This data is not available.	

Pathways to Excellence for Child Care Programs through Program Quality Improvement Activities (Component #3)

A3.1 Progress on Overall Goals

A3.1.1 Based on the goals described in the Lead Agency's CCDF Plan at Section 3.3.9, please report your progress. You may include any significant areas of progress that were not anticipated in the Plan, as well. For each goal listed, briefly describe the improvement with specific examples or numeric targets where possible (e.g., Expanded the number of programs included in the QRIS, Aligned the QRIS standards with Head Start performance standards, or expanded the number of programs with access to an on-site quality consultant). If applicable, describe any barriers to implementing your planned goals.

Goals #1:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:
Connecticut will revisit the plan established by the Early Care and Education State Advisory Council, drafted in 2008 and tabled due to budgetary constraints, to continue review of Quality Improvement opportunities, standards, process, and incentives.
.
1. Program Standards:
Work with State Advisory Council on development of goals, performance measures and evaluation methodologies for program standards to align Birth to Five standards and to maintain a continuum with child development and curriculum standards for school age children Kindergarten to Grade 12.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
Goal #1 - Outreach and Consumer Education - has been revised as follows:

Revised Goal: To implement a statewide public information campaign on the benefits of early care and education.

The OEC continued a statewide, multimedia campaign, "The more you know, the better they grow," that provides family-friendly information on child development, health and safety and the importance of early care and education. The campaign targets all families throughout Connecticut in the following ways:

•Brochures in health centers and health fairs and shared with Early Care and Education professionals, in English and Spanish
•90 second videos available for viewing in hospitals and local Department of Social Services offices.

2-1-1 Child Care is a free, confidential, and statewide service which helps match the requests of parents with child care providers and programs. Parents call 2-1-1 Child Care for information and referrals to: The online site includes the following:

A full list of Parent Resources on this site are listed below:
• Licensing
• What Does Quality Look Like?
• What Are The Most Common Types of Accreditation?
• Quality Checklists
  • Infant & Toddler Quality Checklist
  • Preschool Quality Checklist
  • School Age Quality Checklist

- Health and Safety Checklist For Homes with Young Children
- Selecting a Provider
- Site Visit Checklist
- Phone Pre-Screening Tool
- Preparing Your Child For Child Care
- Tips For a Successful Child Care Arrangement
- Finding a Nanny or a Babysitter
  - Interview Questions for Nanny or Babysitter
  - Hiring a Nanny or Babysitter
  - Reference Check for Nanny or Babysitter
  - Criminal Police Check
  - Department of Motor Vehicles Background Check
  - Becoming the Employer of a Nanny or Babysitter
- Summer Camps
- Out of School Time Care

Goals #2:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:

5. Outreach and Consumer Education:

Continue outreach and consumer education efforts statewide and through 2-1-1- Child Care. Align activities with State Advisory Council family involvement and implementation of fatherhood audit.
.
Consideration for NAEYC provides accredited programs with a window decal of the accreditation logo. Encourage accredited programs to get these up at their programs and provide some kind of document for posting that explains to parents what it is, why it's important.
.
Work with 2-1-1 Child Care to add the NAEYC logo/hyperlink to the program page where it shows that a program is NAEYC Accredited.
.
Work with the Connecticut State Advisory Council (SAC) Committee on Family Involvement and connect with the Connecticut Department of Public Health (DPH) Home Visitation workgroup to determine appropriate strategies.
.
The recommended plan for the CT QRIS includes a public awareness campaign to educate the public about the standards, criteria and indicators of the system.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:

Goal # 4 - Quality Assurance and Monitoring - has been revised as follows:

The Office of Early Childhood (OEC) will continue to work towards a state-wide technical assistance system. A component of the state-wide T/A system will address quality improvement efforts. The OEC will increase the capacity through training raters in the use of program assessment tools such as CLASS, BAS, ERS and PAS. These assessment tools will also be offered to programs in the form of an on-line 'tool kit' to assist in quality improvement efforts

Describe Progress:

CT held CLASS Observation Training for 26 individual in 13 School Readiness and Preschool Development communities during 2 training sessions in the Summer, 2015. CLASS raters began working in the 53 classrooms for the federal Preschool Development Grant sites. Some of which are also state funded School Readiness and Child Day Care contract sites. Some of the classrooms serve children who are not funded by the PDG and may be funded in part by the state subsidy.

One PAS Rater was used for consultative assistance in a Child Day Care contract site.

The OEC continues to maintain our ERS raters, who were used last year as part of Quality Assurance for School Readiness and Child Day Care contracted sites that were not accredited/approved. There are 4 raters trained to reliability, and 2 state anchors who conduct reliability checks with them. We are currently engaged in a process to add at least 2 raters, which will contribute to support the need this spring for ERS in Smart Start sites in addition to School Readiness and Child Day Care.

Goals #3:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:
4. Quality Assurance and Monitoring:
Develop and publish an action planning form for use with any of these tools to help programs plan improvements based on the assessment data gathered from a tool. A form could be finalized, posted on the web, and used with all of our AFP sites. Same document could be used to plan improvements driven by the NAEYC Accreditation Decision Report. Review potential funding to train on PAS or to expand CLASS training done by Head Start.
.
The recommended plan for CT QRIS includes mechanisms to monitor ongoing program quality. The plan builds on the successful Accreditation Facilitation Project and provides a "tool box" that includes valid and reliable environmental rating scales to increase program quality.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
Goal #3A -   Supports to programs to improve quality - has been revised as follows:

Supports to programs to improve quality: Support quality improvement efforts through the training and technical assistance provided by the Accreditation Facilitation Project. We will continue to recruit licensed programs into the NAEYC Accreditation process, with a goal to recruit 15 new non-accredited programs to the pursuit of NAEYC Accreditation in the coming year.

Describe Progress:

The Accreditation Facilitation Project serves approximately 100 programs per year by providing individualized technical assistance on the NAEYC Accreditation process and on quality improvement areas as defined by the NAEYC Standards and Criteria.   The goal of recruiting 15 programs that are seeking accreditation was met.

Revised Goal #3B: To develop an operational framework for QRIS in Connecticut, using existing program learning and workforce standards, and building on existing best practices.   .

Progress:

Starting in 2014 and continuing into 2015, the OEC Quality Improvement System (QIS) work included agency wide staff that researched current quality improvement practices and surveyed center-based,

and home-based providers to determine their needs for technical assistance and preferences for type and delivery mechanisms. Work started with technical assistance from a nationally recognized consultant to develop an operational framework for a statewide QRIS/QIS system. The operational framework has resulted in a commitment to the high-level structure, roles and responsibilities, and activities to be implemented. Work and activities have been delineated between the work of the Connecticut Office of Early Childhood staff and work to be contracted out.

The QIS contract work is expected to commence in 2016.

Goals #4:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:
2. Supports to programs to improve quality:
Support quality improvement efforts through the training and technical assistance provided by the Accreditation Facilitation Project. We will continue to recruit licensed programs into the NAEYC Accreditation process, with a goal to recruit 15 new non-accredited programs to the pursuit of NAEYC Accreditation in the coming year.
.
A workgroup of the State Advisory Council has drafted recommendations for a Quality Rating and Improvement System for Connecticut. The plan was developed with technical assistance from the federal Office of Child Care. There are five standards in the plan: 1. Learning Environment, 2. Workforce Qualifications and Professional Development, 3. Health and Safety, 4. Leadership and Management, 5. Family Engagement and Support.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
Goal #4 - Financial incentives and support - has been revised   as follows:

The OEC will continue to fund tiered subsidies based on setting and/or accreditation of child care providers. The recommendations for CT QRIS include financial incentives for programs that demonstrate higher levels of quality.   Explore opportunities to give a bonus to programs that achieve accreditation for the first time. And, explore opportunity to give a bonus to sites that maintain accreditation through re-accreditation.

Progress:

CT continues to provide tiered subsidies (5% per child/week; and 15% for service to children with identified special needs who require additional support to be in the setting) to programs that achieve accreditation (NAFCC, NAEYC, NEASC, COA and NAA)   An increase in Incentives from 15% to 25% for service to children with identified special needs is anticipated for 2016.

Below are the number of children (by age group) served by Licensed and by accredited facilities in the subsidy program.

	Infant/Toddler	Pre-School	School Age
nsed Facility of Children, SFY 2015	10,093	11,713	5,190
t of Children bsidy, SFY 2015	14,343	15,498	13,043

	Infant/Toddler	Pre-School	School Age
in Licensed Facility	70%	76%	40%
f Children in d SFY 2015	2,488	5,190	1,096
t of Children y SFY 2015	14,343	15,498	13,043
Accredited Facility	17%	33%	8%

licated number of children (w/o age group change)

Goals #5:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:
3. Financial incentives and supports:
Explore opportunities to give a bonus to programs that achieve accreditation for the first time. And, explore opportunity to give a bonus to sites that maintain accreditation through re-accreditation. Continue to fund tired subsidies based on setting and/or accreditation of child care providers.
.
The recommendations for a CT QRIS includes financial incentives for programs that demonstrate higher levels of quality.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
Goal #5 - Program Standards - has been revised as follows:
In 2013 a report was completed by the Early Care and Education State Advisory Council and QRIS workgroup.   The report will provide a baseline for next steps in the creation of a Technical Assistance System.

The QRIS workgroup will reconvene to finish the work regarding standards and criteria to ensure alignment. The group will also make recommendations for next steps to move the QRIS process forward.

Describe Progress:

The Office of Early Childhood coordinated a review of the work already accomplished by the QRIS Workgroup in years past, and moved forward with planning and analysis of a statewide Quality Improvement System for early childhood program in Connecticut.   The workgroup had revisited the 2008 QRIS Plan, and used it as an informant to the 2013 report which served as the impetus for the development of the standards and criteria for the QRIS. This work was considered when developing the QIS system and contractual work to be implemented in 2016.

A3.2 Key Data

A3.2.1 Number of Program Receiving Targeted Technical Assistance

Targeted technical assistance is technical assistance (coaching, mentoring and consultation) that is designed to address a particular domain/area of quality.   Responses in this section should be consistent with responses provided in question 3.3.2 in the CCDF Plan which focuses on targeted technical assistance to programs (rather than practitioners) that is intended for moving programs to higher levels of quality.

a) How many programs received targeted technical assistance during the last federal fiscal year (October 1 through September 30)? 125

☐ N/A

Describe:

The AFP provided targeted technical assistance to 125 programs and over 1000 staff during the year through individualized on-site support and cohort group activities. Additionally, the AFP provided funding to support program-wide Professional Development activities in these sites. The professional development activities addressed the program- wide professional development needs of early care and education sites, including their own staff plus staff from other licensed programs who shared in the activities.

b) If possible, report the number of programs who received targeted technical assistance in the following areas:

Health and safety:
Infant and toddler care:
School-age care:
Inclusion:
Teaching dual language learners:
Understanding developmental screenings and/or observational assessment tools for program improvement purposes:
Mental health:
Business management practices:

☑ N/A

Describe:

This data is not available. AFP services include content support on all of these topics but we do not track visits according to these categories.

A3.2.2 Number of Programs Receiving Financial Supports

Responses to this question should be consistent with responses provided in question 3.3.3 of the CCDF Plan. **Financial supports** must be intended to reward, improve, or sustain quality. They can include grants, cash, reimbursements, gift cards, or purchases made to benefit a program. This includes tiered reimbursements for CCDF subsidies. **One-time grants, awards, or bonuses** include any kind of financial support that a program can receive only once. **On-going or periodic quality stipends** include any kind of financial support intended to reward, improve, or sustain quality that a program can receive more than once.

a) How many programs received one-time, grants, awards or bonuses?

Child Care Centers:

☑ N/A

Describe:

The AFP awarded quality improvement grants to support planful, program-wide professional development in active AFP sites. These grants allow administrators to utilize consultants, trainers, and coaches to address needs identified through the use of accreditation or other assessment tools. The data regarding facility type is not available.

The AFP provided the following support activities to programs in FY 2015. Programs access these services while in AFP, and usually twice, and sometimes three times.   The grants are for the following.

During FY 15, the OEC AFP funded 90 activities:
• Pathways Exams: study groups served 53 individuals from 4 programs;
• Contract courses for Associate Degree credit: 8 courses served 79 staff in AFP sites and 62 additional participants from 22 other programs;
• Trainings to meet NAEYC Professional Development criteria 6A07-6A12 and other specific NAEYC Accreditation criteria: 41 sessions
• Training with coaching: 41 training plus classroom coaching activities.
• Early Learning and Development Standards training
• Creative Curriculum™ Responsive Planning for Infants/Toddlers/ Twos (2 day training)
   These activities served 125 programs and over 1000 staff.

Family Child Care Homes:

☑ N/A

Describe:

Family-based providers (Licensed family child care and Family, Friends and Neighbors) are receiving one time awards or bonuses each month:

The OEC supported:
One-Time Provider Orientation Stipend of $75 (Over 3,000 in FFY 2015)
One-Time License fee reimbursement of $40. (4 providers receive bonus for the move from unlicensed

to licensed status)
One-Time License Bonus is $500, after being licensed for 12 months providing Care 4 Kids care for 12 cumulative months. (Data not available at the time of this report))
One-Time bonuses to family child care providers with CDA credentials of $500 (Data not available at the time of this report)
One-Time bonuses of $750 to the state's sole NAFCC Accredited provider. (Data not available at the time of this report)

b) How many programs received on-going or Periodic quality stipends?

Child Care Centers: 352

☐ N/A

Describe:

There were 352 Center-based facilities that received the 5% bonus for child care subsidies.

Children Subsidy in Accredited Facility:

	Infant/Toddler	Pre-School	School Age	Totals
Unique Count of Children in I/T Accredited SFY 2015	2,488	5,190	1,096	8,774
Unique Count of Children Receiving Subsidy SFY 2015	14,343	15,498	13,043	42,884
% Children in Accredited Facility	17%	33%	8%	20%

8,051 Unduplicated number of children (w/o age group change)

Family Child Care Homes: 1

☐ N/A

Describe:

1 Family Child Care Home has NAFCC Accreditation.

A3.2.3 Number of Eligible Programs for State/Territory QRIS or Other Quality Improvement System

a) What is the total number of eligible child care centers:

QRIS:
Or

Other Quality Improvement System: 1445

☐ N/A

Describe:

As of September 30, 2015, a total of 1,445 child care centers were licensed.

In Connecticut, there are 393 Licensed Child Care Centers and Nursery Schools with Accreditation from NAEYC (354) and 66 Head Start (72).
  Thirty three (33) of these programs are both NAEYC accredited and Head Start approved.

 LICENSED

Infant/Toddler Pre-School School Age Totals	Infant/Toddler	Pre-School	School Age	Totals
Children in Licensed Facility -				
Unique Count of Children, SFY 2015	10,093	11,713	5,190	
Unique Count of Children Receiving Subsidy, SFY 2015	14,343	15,498	13,043	
% Children in Licensed Facility	70%	76%	40%	

Accredited

Infant/Toddler Pre-School School Age Totals	Infant/Toddler	Pre-School	School Age	Totals
Unique Count of Children in I/T Accredited SFY 2015	2,488	5,190	1,096	
Unique Count of Children Receiving Subsidy SFY 2015	14,343	15,498	13,043	
% Children in Accredited Facility	17%	33%	8%	

8,051 Unduplicated number of children (w/o age group change)

b) What is the total number of eligible family child care homes:

QRIS:
Or
Other Quality Improvement System: 2294

☐ N/A

Describe:

In total number, there were 2,294 licensed Home-Based, (Family Child Care Home and Group Child Care
Home)   programs that were licensed as of September 30, 2015. This includes 2,265 family child care homes and 29 licensed group child care homes. One is NAFCC Accredited and 6 are Head Start approved.

  c) What is the total number of eligible license-exempt providers:

QRIS:
Or
Other Quality Improvement System: 584

☐ N/A

Describe:

There are **584** License-Exempt programs in the state. Of these, **138** License-Exempt Center Based Child Care programs have Accreditation from NAEYC (115) and Head Start approval (36). Thirteen (13) of these programs are both NAEYC accredited and Head Start approved, And, of these, there are 5 Head Start Home Based program, 1 of which is also NAEYC. There are 80 License-Exempt programs with NEASC Accreditation (of which is duplicative with NAEYC accreditation) and 1 with National After School Association (NAA) accreditation.

Please note, there are additional License Exempt providers in the state but not all participate in the Child Care subsidy program. The 584 License-Exempt programs above does include the 444 License-Exempt programs that participate in Care 4 Kids (CCDF) Child Care Subsidy program and includes an additional 140 License-Exempt programs that provide child care but, do not participate in the Child Care Subsidy program. The 594 does not include unlicensed Family, Friend and Neighbor providers.

A3.2.4 Number and Percentage of Programs Participating in State/Territory QRIS or Other Quality Improvement System

a) Of total number eligible as reported in A3.2.3, what is the total number and percentage of child care center programs in the State/Territory that participate in the State/Territory QRIS or other quality improvement system for programs over the last federal fiscal year?

Child Care Centers:

QRIS:

Number:
Percentage:

Or

Other Quality Improvement System:

Number: 1445
Percentage: 100

☐ N/A

Describe:

Quality Improvement levels are Licensing and NAEYC Accreditation. These levels have a subsidy rate differential.

As of September 30, 2015 there were 1,445 Center-based programs that met the minimum / initial level of CT's Quality Improvement System, which is Licensing. The highest level is NAEYC Accreditation and/or approval by Head Start. The NAEYC website identifies 492 NAEYC Accredited programs in Connecticut (as of 02/11/16). There are 84 Head Start and Early Head Start program delegate sites in Connecticut.** In a report for 2015*, in Connecticut, there are **393** Licensed Child Care Centers and Nursery Schools with Accreditation from NAEYC (354) and Head Start approval (72). Thirty three (33) of these programs have both NAEYC accreditation (w/ 5% Bonus) and Head Start approval. One (1) additional program has NEASC, only and three (3) are duplicative of above with both NAEYC and NEASC.

Unmet Needs 2015 Data Phase1V6
http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/data/center-data As of 1:30 02/03/16

b) Of total number eligible as reported in A3.2.3, what is the total number and percentage of family child care programs in the State/Territory that participate in the State/Territory QRIS or other quality improvement system for programs over the last federal fiscal year?

Family Child Care Homes:

QRIS:

Number:
Percentage:

Or

Other Quality Improvement System:

Number: 2294
Percentage: 100

☐ N/A

Describe:

Connecticut does not have a public QRIS system. Quality Improvement levels are Licensing and NAEYC Accreditation. These levels have a subsidy rate differential.

As of September 30, 2015 there were 2,294 Licensed Family Child Care Homes that met the minimum / initial level of CT's Quality Improvement System, which is licensing. One (1) Family Day Care Home has NAFCC Accreditation.

c) Of total number eligible as reported in A3.2.3, what is the total number and percentage of license-exempt programs in the State/Territory that participate in the State/Territory QRIS or other quality improvement system for programs over the last federal fiscal year?

<u>License-Exempt Providers:</u>

QRIS:

Number:
Percentage:

Or

Other Quality Improvement System:

Number: 138
Percentage: 24

☐ N/A

Describe:

Of the 584 License-Exempt programs in the state (446 do not necessarily participate in QIS - but are shown above so that the 24% is representative of a total), Of the 584, there are **138** License-Exempt Child Care Centers and Nursery Schools with Accreditation from NAEYC (115) and Head Start approval (36). Of these, 13 of the programs are duplicative and have both NAEYC accreditation and Head Start approval. And, of these, there are 5 Head Start Home Based program, 1 of which is also NAEYC. There are 80 License-Exempt programs with NEASC Accreditation (on of which is duplicative with NAEYC accreditation) and 1 with National After School Association (NAA) accreditation.

Connecticut does not have a public QRIS system. Quality Improvement levels are Licensing and NAEYC Accreditation or Head Start approved. The highest level is Head Start approved or NAEYC Accreditation (w/ a 5% Bonus).

Please note, there are additional License Exempt providers in the state but not all participate in the Child Care subsidy program. The 584 License-Exempt programs above <u>does</u> include the 444 License-Exempt programs that participate in Care 4 Kids (CCDF) subsidy and includes an additional 140 License-Exempt programs that provide child care but do not participate in the Child Care Subsidy program. The 594 does

not include unlicensed Family, Friend and Neighbor providers.

138 out of 584 = 24%

A3.2.5 Number of programs at Each Level of Quality?

For each type of care, provide the total number of quality levels and the number of programs at that level of the total number of participating as reported in A3.2.4. Describe metric if other than QRIS, such as accreditation.

Child Care Centers:

Please provide the total number of Child Care Center quality levels (if available):

☐ N/A

Quality Level	Number of Programs at this level
Head Start Approved	72
NAEYC*	354
Licensed	1019

Describe:

CT recognizes program quality at two levels: 1. Licensing and 2. NAEYC Accreditation and Head Start Approved

Quality Improvement levels are Licensing and NAEYC Accreditation. These levels have a subsidy rate differential.

As of September 30, 2015 there were **1,445** Center-based programs that met the minimum / initial level of CT's Quality Improvement System, which is Licensing. The highest level is NAEYC Accreditation and/or approval by Head Start. The NAEYC website identifies 492 NAEYC Accredited (licensed and unlicensed programs in Connecticut (as of 02/11/16). There are 84 Head Start and Early Head Start program delegate (Licensed, License-Exempt and Family) programs in Connecticut.   In a report for unmet needs in 2015, in Connecticut, the dataset showed **393** Licensed Child Care Centers with Accreditation from NAEYC (354 =321+33) and Head Start approval (72). Thirty three (33) of these programs have both NAEYC accreditation (w/ 5% Bonus) and Head Start approval. One (1) additional program has NEASC, only and three (3) are duplicative of above with both NAEYC and NEASC.

 Unmet Needs 2015 Data Phase1V6
http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/data/center-data As of 1:30 02/03/16

Family Child Care Homes:

Please provide the total number of Family Child Care Home quality levels (if available):

☐ N/A

Quality Level	Number of Programs at this level
Head Start	6
NAFCC	1
Licensed	2287

Describe:

Connecticut does not have a public QRIS system. Connecticut recognizes program quality at two levels: 1. Licensing and 2. NAEYC Accreditation, NAFCC Accreditation, and Head Start Approval.

As of September 30, 2015 there were 2,294 Licensed Family Child Care Homes that met the minimum / first level of CT's Quality Improvement system - Licensing.   One (1) Family Day Care Home has NAFCC Accreditation and 6 are Head Start approved.

License-Exempt Providers:

Please provide the total number of License-Exempt Provider quality levels (if available):

☐ N/A

Quality Level	Number of Programs at this level
Head Start	36
NAEYC	102

Describe:

Connecticut does not have a public QRIS system. Connecticut recognizes program quality at two levels: 1. Licensing and 2. NAEYC Accreditation, NAFCC Accreditation, and Head Start Approval.

In a report for unmet needs in 2015, in Connecticut, the dataset showed that there are **138** License-Exempt Child Care Centers and Nursery Schools with Accreditation from NAEYC (115) and Head Start approval (36). Thirteen (13) of these programs have both NAEYC accreditation and Head Start approval. There are 79 additional License-Exempt Programs with NEASC Accreditation, plus 4 with both NEASC and NAEYC, duplicative of above. And, one (1) with National After School Association (NAA) accreditation.

There are 23 additional NAEYC accredited programs which are not identified as licensed or licensed exempt, as the data from NAEYC and the unmet needs data report was not matched at the time of this publication.The NAEYC website identifies 492 NAEYC Accredited (licensed and unlicensed programs) in Connecticut (as of 02/11/16). There are 84 Head Start and Early Head Start program delegate sites in

A3.2.6 Number of Programs Who Moved Up or Down within QRIS

 If the quality threshold is something other than QRIS, describe the metric used, such as accreditation.   These numbers ARE NOT expected to total the number of participating programs in the QRIS as reported in A3.2.4.

Child Care Centers:

How many moved up within the QRIS: 1
How many moved down within the QRIS: 8

☐ N/A

Describe:

In FFY 2014, Connecticut reported 353 NAEYC Accredited Child Care Centers, which represents an increase from 2014 for NAEYC Accreditation. And, this represents the programs that are not both NAEYC accredited and have Head Start approval. Licensed Centers decreased by 8 from 1,453 to 1,445 from September 30, 2014 to 2015. Head Start appears to have decreased but two different data sources were used for the two years.

 Some NAEYC sites may have consolidated their accreditation under NAEYC 's rules for Primary and satellite sites.
.
The NAEYC website identifies 492 NAEYC Accredited (licensed and unlicensed programs in Connecticut (as of 02/11/16). There are 84 Head Start and Early Head Start program delegate (Licensed, License-Exempt and Family) programs in Connecticut.** In a report for unmet needs in 2015*, in Connecticut, the dataset showed **393** Licensed Child Care Centers with Accreditation from NAEYC (354 =321+33) and Head Start approval (72). Thirty three (33) of these programs have both NAEYC accreditation (w/ 5% Bonus) and Head Start approval. One (1) additional program has NEASC, only and three (3) are duplicative of above with both NAEYC and NEASC.

Family Child Care Homes:

How many moved up within the QRIS: 0
How many moved down within the QRIS: 123

☐ N/A

Describe:

In FFY 2014, Connecticut reported 8 NAFCC Accredited or Head Start Family Child Care Homes, which represents a decrease of 1 in 2015 with NAFCC Accreditation from 2 to 1. Head Start approval continued for 6 programs. Licensed Family Day Care Homes decreased by 122 from 2,416 to 2,294 from September 30, 2014 to 2015.

 License-Exempt Providers:

How many moved up within the QRIS: 46
How many moved down within the QRIS: 0

☐ N/A

Describe:

In FFY 2014, Connecticut reported 87 = 75 NAEYC Accredited + 12 both NAEYC Accredited and Head Start approved - License Exempt Child Care Centers, which represents an increase of 40 from 75 to 102 and 1 from 12 to 13 for both Head Start Approved and NAEYC Accreditation. Plus 5 from 31 to 36 Head Start Approved.

   A3.2.7 Number of CCDF Subsidized Children Served in Programs Participating in the State/Territory Quality Improvement System
Note. If the State/Territory does not have a formal QRIS, the State/Territory may define another quality indicator and report it here.

a) What percentage of CCDF children were served in participating programs during the last federal fiscal year? 63 %

b) What percentage of CCDF children were served in high quality care as defined by the State/Territory? 20 %

Provide the definition of high quality care in the Describe box. This may include assessment scores, accreditation, or other metric, if no QRIS.

☐ N/A

Describe:

| **Infant/Toddler** | **Pre-School** | **School Age** | **Totals** |

nsed e Count of 015	**10,093**	**11,713**	**5,190**	**26**
f Children idy, SFY	**14,343**	**15,498**	**13,043**	**42**
censed	**70%**	**76%**	**40%**	**63%**
	Infant/Toddler	Pre-School	School Age	Totals
Children in FY 2015	2,488	5,190	1,096	8,774*
Children ly SFY 2015	14,343	15,498	13,043	42
ccredited	**17%**	**33%**	**8%**	**20%**

Data on the number of children receiving Care 4 Kids CCDF assistance in Head Start approved facilities is not available.

Pathways to Excellence for the Child Care Workforce: Professional Development Systems and Workforce Initiatives (Component #4)

A4.1 Progress on Overall Goals

A4.1.1 Based on the goals described in the Lead Agency's CCDF Plan at Section 3.4.7, please report your progress. You may include any significant areas of progress that were not anticipated in the Plan, as well. For each goal listed, briefly describe the improvement with specific examples or numeric targets where possible (e.g., Implement a wage supplement program, Develop articulation agreements). If applicable, describe any barriers to implementing your planned goals.

Goals #1:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:
GOAL 2) Career Pathways (or Career lattice):

•Align the credentials that are offered in CT with their respective roles and levels on the CCAC career ladder,
•Work on a bi-regional model (OCC Region 1 and II) model of reciprocity and portability of credentials that would allow the child care workforce to work beyond their state borders and meet qualifications in similar roles, sectors and settings tied to 3.4.1 and 3.4.2. Build on other cross state cross sector resources and create the scale necessary to make meaningful progress. Other states don't focus on the workforce in such a limited way.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
Goal #1 is revised as follows:

Career Pathways (or Career lattice):
Re-align Charts-A-Course Career Ladder to reflect educational qualification only.

Describe Progress:
The OEC is no longer offering non-credit module training reflected in the lower levels of the career ladder. Scholarship assistance funds are targeted toward degree attainment.

Progress for 2015:
Due to the development of the new Early Childhood Information System (ECIS), of which the Registry will eventually be a part, and work toward a unified state-funded program system that will streamline policy references to career ladder levels (among other efficiencies), the career ladder will have a timed in revision. The lower levels that reflected the non-credit module training have been paused. The ECIS development will move into phases of Registry development a year from now and spanning several years. The net to the career ladder is a revision that also rewrites the logic for reports in the Registry.

REVISED GOAL: Finalize Core Knowledge Competencies (CKC) for Teachers to include a self-assessment to be used to develop professional development goals.   Create CKC for Trainers, Coaches, Mentors, and Consultants, with a self-assessment, to be used for approvals of trainers and TA providers.

• Work on a bi-regional model (OCC Region 1 and II)   of reciprocity and portability of credentials that would allow the child care workforce to work beyond their state borders and meet qualifications in similar roles, sectors and settings tied to 3.4.1 and 3.4.2. Build on other cross state cross sector resources and create the scale necessary to make meaningful progress.

Describe Progress:

Progress for 2015:
The Core Knowledge and Competency Framework development has shifted to take an integrated approach at developing a shared core that is multi-disciplinary in nature to be used across multiple early childhood roles. This is in response to latest literature from the Institute of Medicine regarding their publication "Transforming the Workforce for Children Birth through Age Eight." A review of the current CKC draft is underway with expected revisions to broaden the lens of the framework to be completed in February 2016.

Goals #2:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:
GOAL 4) Compensation, Benefits and Workforce Conditions:

•Study the outcomes of the START Education Bonus System to establish its effectiveness in persistence toward CDA Credentials and if there is mechanism to expand its use.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
REVISED GOAL: Incentives for providers (area for TA support)

Progress for 2015: Scholarship funds continue to incentivize credential and degree work. The OEC was successful in having legislation changed that allows up to $1,000,000 (up from $500,000) in unspent School Readiness funds targeted to scholarship specifically for Teachers in state-funded programs pursuing bachelor degree work at in-state institutions. These scholarship dollars combined with an additional $640,000 in quality enhancement scholarship funding for eligible staff, and $200,000 toward family child care providers actively receiving Care4Kids.

The OEC supported 42 one-time bonuses to family child care providers with CDA credentials ($500.00 bonus), and one $750.00 bonus to the state's sole NAFCC Accredited provider. A total of 6 providers who moved from unlicensed to licensed status were reimbursed their $40 licensing fees.

CT legislation requires a workforce report due January 1, 2016 creating a plan for building education qualifications and supporting compensation and retention strategies. A work group is actively writing the plan.

Goals #3:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:
GOAL 5) Data & Performance Measures of the Child Care Workforce:

•Work toward participation in the Registry for staff in all child care programs that are licensed by DPH and require annual updating of staff and their qualifications.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
Goal #3 - Data & Performance Measures of the Child Care Workforce - has been revised as follows:
Data & Performance Measures of the Child Care Workforce:

REVISED GOAL: Work toward participation in the Registry for staff in all child care programs in all settings that   are licensed by OEC and unlicensed. Require annual updating of staff and their qualifications.

Progress 2015:
Registry participation has continued to increase due to various requirements: all staff of state-funded programs must hold up to date Registry accounts; the following applications are electronically processed via Registry account: scholarship assistance, licensing head teacher certificate, Early Childhood Teacher Credential, and medication administration trainers. Total number of Registry accounts: 19,409 (11/2015). Unlicensed family child care providers receiving Care4Kids were eligible for scholarship.

The new CCDF draft plan for 2016-2018 requires all administrative and teaching staff in programs receiving Care4Kids to hold up to date Registry accounts. CCDF professional development requirements will be loaded into the Registry and a compliance report by program will be available.

Taking the Registry to full implementation of all providers is planned for the new version in the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS).

Goals #4:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:
 The following goalswill be coordinated with the work of the State's Advisory Council (SAC) Workforce Committee.

GOAL 1) Core Areas of knowledge and Knowledge:

•Align Core Knowledge and Skills to professional development requirements and DPH licensing regulations.
•Goal to conduct needs assessment.
•Work on a bi-regional model (OCC Region I and II) model of reciprocity and portability of credentials that would allow the child care workforce to work beyond their state borders and meet qualifications in similar roles, sectors and settings tied to 3.4.1 and 3.4.2. This credential work will include those who provide consulting services to the child care workforce and service providers.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
Goal #4 is revised as follows:
The following goals will be coordinated with the work of the State's Advisory Council (SAC) Workforce Committee.

Core Areas of Knowledge and Competencies:
* Finalize Core Knowledge Competencies (CKC) for Teachers to include a self-assessment to be used to develop professional development goals.   Create CKC for Trainers, Coaches, Mentors, and Consultants.
* Work on a bi-regional model (OCC Region I and II) model of reciprocity and portability of credentials that would allow the child care workforce to work beyond their state borders and meet qualifications in similar roles, sectors and settings tied to 3.4.1 and 3.4.2. This credential work will include those who provide consulting services to the child care workforce and service providers.
  2015 Progress:
The Core Knowledge and Competency Framework development has shifted to take an integrated approach at developing a shared core that is multi-disciplinary in nature to be used across multiple early childhood roles. This is in response to latest literature from the Institute of Medicine regarding their publication "Transforming the Workforce for Children Birth through Age Eight." A review of the current CKC draft is underway with expected revisions to broaden the lens of the framework to be completed in February 2016. CT is engaged with Massachusetts regarding potential alignment to a few Massachusetts colleges early childhood programs that would pass approval in CT for the CT Early

Childhood Teacher Credential. One Massachusetts college has been sent the materials for alignment.

Goals #5:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:

GOAL 3) Professional Development & Access to Professional Development:

•Assess the availability of early childhood and school-age training including web-based/on-line opportunities.
•Using the pilot for the ECTC to assess the quality assurances of the two and four year early childhood degree programs
•Assess the clearinghouses for professional development and consultants available for interdisciplinary technical assistance opportunities to better align the dissemination of this information across sectors
•Build on cross state cross sector resources for professional development and consultant services and create the scale necessary to make meaningful progress.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
Goal #5 - Professional Development & Access to Professional Development - has been revised as follows:

Professional Development & Access to Professional Development:
• Assess the availability of early childhood and school-age training including web-based/on-line opportunities.
• Using information collected on from a survey of state professional development provider will create a basis for designing a collaborative technical assistance system.
• Create one standard definition for all TA providers based on NAEYC glossary for training and technical assistance. Align DPH licensing definition of "consultant" with standard definition.
  2015 Progress:
The Technical Assistance Provider CKC remains in draft as the lens has shifted for completing the CKC work to reflect multiple disciplines. Drafting of licensing regulation language pertaining to the role of the education consultant and the use of other consultants is ongoing.

A4.2.1a Number of Teachers/Caregivers and Qualification Levels

a) What is the total number of child care center teachers in the State/Territory as September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

☑ N/A

Describe:

2015 Progress:
The table below represents the known population of staff in publicly funded programs for young children. All staff of said programs must be members of the Connecticut Early Childhood Professional Registry. Connecticut does not yet require all non-publicly funded staff to join the Registry.

Registry Report of Administrators and Teaching Staff in State-Funded Programs - (11/13/15)

Education and Training	Career Ladder Level	Program Administrators: Number (Percent)	Teachers: Number (Percent)	Assistant Teachers Number (Percent)
BA or more plus 12 credits	11-15	260 (76%)	1,123 (57%)	214 (11%)
AS plus 12 ECE credits	9-10	20 (6%)	435 (22%)	265 (13%)
CDA plus 12 ECE credits or 30 credit credential	7-8	7 (2%)	148 (8%)	218 (11%)
CDA or 12 ECE credits	6	3 (1%)	83 (4%)	364 (18%)
Less than a CDA or 12 ECE credits (or no reported or triggering Early Childhood degree/credit work)	1-5	54 (16%)	179 (9%)	926 (47%)
		344	1,968	1,987

A. Education and Training   B. Career Ladder Level   C. Program Administrators: Number (Percent)
D. Teachers: Number (Percent) E. Assistant Teachers Number (Percent)

A1. **BA or more plus 12 credits** B1. **11-15**   C1. **260 (76%)** D1. **1,123 (57%)** E1. **214 (11%)**
A2. **AS plus 12 ECE credits** B2. **9-10**   C2. **20 (6%)** D2. **435 (22%)** E2. **265 (13%)**
A3. **CDA plus 12 ECE credits or 30 credit credential** B3. **7-8**   C3. **7 (2%)** D3. **148 (8%)** E3. **218 (11%)**
A4. **CDA or 12 ECE credits** B4. **6**   C4. **3 (1%)** D4. **83 (4%)** E4. **364 (18%)**
A5. **Less than a CDA or 12 ECE credits (or no reported or triggering Early Childhood degree/credit**

work) B5. 1-5 C5. 54 (16%) D5. 179 (9%) E5. 926 (47%)

Total
C. Program Administrators = 344
D. Teachers = 1,968
E. Assistant Teachers = 1,987

A4.2.1b Number of Teachers/Caregivers and Qualification Levels

b) What is the total number of family child care providers in the State/Territory as September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

☑ N/A

Describe:

2015: There are 2,294 licensed family child care providers.

See A4.2.1a for the number of staff by education level known population in publicly-funded programs for each data point in this section.

A4.2.1c Number of Teachers/Caregivers and Qualification Levels

c) What is the number of center teachers and family child care providers by qualification level as of the end of the last fiscal year? Count only the highest level of education attained.

Child Care Center Teachers:

How many had a Child Development Associate (CDA)?

☑ N/A

Describe:

See A4.2.1a for the number of staff by education level known population in publicly-funded programs for each data point in this section.

How many had State/Territory Credentials?

☑ N/A

Describe:

See A4.2.1a for the number of staff by education level known population in publicly-funded programs for each data point in this section.

How many had an Associate's degree?

☑ N/A

Describe:

See A4.2.1a for the number of staff by education level known population in publicly-funded programs for each data point in this section.

How many had a Bachelor's degree?

☑ N/A

Describe:

See A4.2.1a for the number of staff by education level known population in publicly-funded programs for each data point in this section.

How many had a Graduate/Advanced degree?

☑ N/A

Describe:

See A4.2.1a for the number of staff by education level known population in publicly-funded programs for each data point in this section.

Family Child Care Providers:

How many had a Child Development Associate (CDA)?

☑ N/A

Describe:

See A4.2.1a for the number of staff by education level known population in publicly-funded programs for each data point in this section.

How many had <u>State/Territory Credentials</u>?

☑ N/A

Describe:

See A4.2.1a for the number of staff by education level known population in publicly-funded programs for each data point in this section.

How many had an <u>Associate's degree</u>?

☑ N/A

Describe:

See A4.2.1a for the number of staff by education level known population in publicly-funded programs for each data point in this section.

How many had a <u>Bachelor's degree</u>?

☑ N/A

Describe:

See A4.2.1a for the number of staff by education level known population in publicly-funded programs for each data point in this section.

How many had a <u>Graduate/Advanced degree</u>?

☑ N/A

Describe:

See A4.2.1a for the number of staff by education level known population in publicly-funded programs for each data point in this section.

A4.2.2 Number of Individuals Included in State/Territory's Professional Development Registry during Last Federal Fiscal Year (October 1 through September 30)

Teachers in child care centers:

Family child care home providers:

License-exempt providers:

☑ N/A

Describe:

19,409 [Workforce] Registry accounts.

A4.2.3 Number of Individuals Receiving credit-based training and/or education as defined by the State/Territory during the last federal fiscal year (October 1 through September 30)?

Teachers in child care centers:

Family child care home providers:

License-exempt providers:

☑ N/A

Describe:

2015 Progress: Data not available by setting.

A4.2.4 Number of credentials and degrees awarded during the last federal fiscal year If possible, list the type of credential or degree and in what type of setting the practitioner worked

Type of Credential:

How many credentials were awarded to teachers in child care centers?

Please list and provide number:

Child Development Associate (CDA):

State/Territory Credentials:
Other:

☑ N/A

Describe:
271 CT Early Childhood Teacher Credentials have been awarded. Setting is not tracked over time. 175 of these credentials are the Associate degree level and 96 are at the bachelor degree level.

How many credentials were awarded to family child care home providers?

Please list and provide number:

Child Development Associate (CDA):
State/Territory Credentials:
Other:

☑ N/A

Describe:
Data is not available. All providers are not yet required to be in the Registry and report this information.

 How many credentials were awarded to license-exempt providers?

Please list and provide number:

Child Development Associate (CDA):
State/Territory Credentials:
Other:

☑ N/A

Describe:
Data is not available. All providers are not yet required to be in the Registry and report this information.

Type of Degree:

 How many **degrees** were awarded to teachers **in child care centers**?

Please list and provide number:

Associates:
Bachelors:
Graduate/Advanced Degree:
Other:

☑ N/A

Describe:
Data is not available. All providers are not yet required to be in the Registry and report this information.

How many **degrees** were awarded to **family child care home providers**?

Please list and provide number:

Associates:
Bachelors:
Graduate/Advanced Degree:
Other:

☑ N/A

Describe:
Data is not available. All providers are not yet required to be in the Registry and report this information.

 How many **degrees** were awarded to **license-exempt providers**?

Please list and provide number:

Associates:
Bachelors:
Graduate/Advanced Degree:
Other:

☑ N/A

Describe:
Data is not available. All providers are not yet required to be in the Registry and report this information.

A4.2.5 Number of Individulas receiving technical assistance during the last federal fiscal year Describe any data you track on coaching, mentoring, or specialist consultation. If possible, include in what type of setting the practitioner worked. Responses to this question should be consistent with information provided in question 3.4.4e of the CCDF Plan.

Type of Technical Assistance:

How many teachers in child care centers received technical assistance?

☑ N/A

Please list type of technical assistance and provide number:

Data is not available.

How many family child care home providers received technical assistance?

☑ N/A

Please list type of technical assistance and provide number:

Data is not available.

How many license-exempt providers received technical assistance?

☑ N/A   Please list type of technical assistance and provide number:

Data is not available.

A4.2.6 Type of Financial Supports Provided and Number of Teachers/Providers Receiving as of End of Last Federal Fiscal Year?

☑ Scholarships. How many teachers/providers received? 1253

☐ Reimbursement for Training Expenses. How many teachers/providers received?

☐ Loans. How many teachers/providers received?

☐ Wage supplements. How many teachers/providers received?

☐ Other.

Describe:

Scholarship data for FFY15: Scholarship Assistance Fund As of 11/03/14 - 6 month period Credit Course Tuition: 1,253 Awards [500 Recipients] & Textbooks: 1,060

☐ N/A

Describe:

Building Subsidy Systems that Increase Access to High Quality Care

In this section, Lead Agencies provide progress on their subsidy administration goals over the past year as of September 30.

A5.1 Progress on Overall Goals

Based on the goals described in the Lead Agency's CCDF Plan at Section 2.8, please report your progress using the chart below. You may include any significant areas of progress that were not anticipated in the Plan, as well. For each goal listed, briefly describe the improvement with specific examples or numeric targets where possible (e.g., established copayment policies that sustain income and sustain quality, or established eligibility policies that promote continuity of care). If applicable, describe any barriers to implementing your planned goals.

Goals #1:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:
Implement transition of CCDF and the Care4Kids Subsidy program from the Department of Social Services to the anticipated new Office of Early Childhood, which would become the CCDF lead agency (SFY 2014-2015).

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
Connecticut's Child Care Subsidy program served an average of 6,488 School Age Children each month in 2015. This equates to 31% of the monthly average of total active children. The distribution of services is fairly equally distributed across age groups with 36% Preschool Age (7,633) and 34% Infants/Toddlers (7,129) per the 2015 monthly average of total active children in SFY 2015. Of the 6,488, over half - 3,423 are in care in licensed and school-based settings. Provider training includes Family, Friends and Neighbors. Orientation Trainings in FFY 2015* included 2882 English speaking participants and 574 Spanish Speaking participants. The Office of Early Childhood has developed a comprehensive early childhood system to reach all children and families. By including Early Care and Education Services, School and Center-based programs and Family Childcare, Licensing, Quality Enhancement and Workforce Development, Early Intervention and Home Visiting and Parent Information and Family Support Services this will better meet the needs of young children and families.

*9 months of FFY 2015 data available at the time of this report October 2014- June of 2015

Goals #2:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:
Report on the proportion of federal child care quality funding that is spent on school-age providers. CCDF quality set-aside funding is an essential source for systems-level improvements. Programs serving school-age children are an important target for this funding. Data exists on exactly how this funding is spent, but a concerted effort to collect and analyze it is needed to assess its effectiveness at reaching its target audience.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
In 2015, the Connecticut Early Childhood Cabinet (State Advisory Council) created Subcommittee on Families with Young Children Without Homes, with representatives from multiple state agencies and community service providers.

The subcommittee reviewed policy changes identified by the subcommittee and ranked them in importance for discussion and inclusion in a plan of action. The plan discussion relating to subsidy included items such as priority access for homeless families across state-funded early care and education programs; eligibility for homeless families for Care4Kids subsidies without requiring them to

be working, in an approved training or education program, or enrolled in TANF; provision for child care vouchers in shelters, increase the Care4Kids reimbursement rate for homeless children adequate to access a high-quality early care and education program, create an expedited path to enroll children experiencing homelessness in early childhood programs (change in licensing requirements to allow additional time for immunization documentation; early childhood providers professional development about the needs of children experiencing homelessness and specific training in the use of the RAFT and Q-RAFT; and use of 12-month redetermination in the Care4Kids program to help promote stability of care.

Goals #3:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:
Analyze Continuum of Care for homeless children – planning, policies, and best practices in communities.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
The Office of Early Childhood is developing an Early Childhood Information System (ECIS). Data on children, programs and staff will be housed in this system. Data relating to Connecticut's Child Care Assistance Program -   Care 4 Kids, School Readiness, Child Day Care Contracts, state Head Start, Smart Start and the Federal Preschool Development grant will be stored in this system. The ECIS is a secure online data system. With the ECIS, the Office of Early Childhood is able to collect data and information so we can best make informed program and policy decisions affecting
young children and families. From the data provided by the ECIS, the Office of Early Childhood, other early learning policy makers, families, educators, service providers, and communities will be able to make data-informed, outcome-driven decisions on policy, practice and funding. ECIS will provide improved efficiencies and accountability for a coordinated and comprehensive system of early care and education.

In addition the State of Connecticut has an open data portal to provide easy access to agency aggregate data for other agencies and the public at https://**data.ct**.gov.

Goals #4:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:
Align and improve data sharing opportunities across agencies with early childhood responsibilities.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
The Connecticut General Assembly and the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Bargaining Unit ratified an agreement to approve a general rate increase to all licensed and license-exempt Child Care Providers serving Infants/Toddlers, Preschool, and School Age children. The rate increase was approved in May 2014. The rate increases were retroactive to January 1, 2014 for Family Child Care Homes and unlicensed in-home (Family, Friends, and Neighbor (FFN)) care providers. Rate increases for licensed Child Care Centers, Group Child Care Homes and Recreational providers were first effective July 1, 2014. There was a 3% rate increase to all providers in years 2014 and 2015. There was an additional rate increase of 8.25% for licensed family child care providers caring for infants and toddlers for calendar year 2014 and again in 2015. The rate for unlicensed providers is one-third (1/3) of the State's minimum wage for 2015. There are also incentive payments to support providers to become licensed. The 2014 rates increased from the January 1, 2002 Care 4 Kids providers Reimbursement Rates.

Goals #5:as described in FY 2014-2015 CCDF Plan:

Review current payment rates and implications for parents and providers.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
The transition occurred in 2015. The Office of Early Childhood is the Lead Agency for CCDF.

Review current payment rates and implications for parents and providers.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:
The transition occurred in 2015. The Office of Early Childhood is the Lead Agency for CCDF.