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Funding

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act:

The purpose of ARRA funds has been to help states build or maintain infrastructure to be better prepared for the future and to stimulate the economy at the present.
Administrative Structure

- Virginia Department of Social Services
  Office of Early Childhood Development

- Virginia Early Childhood Foundation

- Local agencies, Smart Beginnings coalitions
Evaluation Charge

- Help VECF evaluate the Star Rating Standards for family child care home-based providers
- Conduct an implementation (process) evaluation
- Develop a plan for ongoing evaluation
Fine Tuning...
Be prepared for the long haul
Main Goal of VSQI

Support provider ability to improve quality of child care for young children
Pilot Service Components

- Training raters, mentors and coordinators
- Recruiting family child care providers
- Observing and providing feedback
- Developing a quality improvement plan
- Working on the plan with a mentor
Virginia Star Quality Standards
Home-Based Child Care

1: Education, Qualification and Training
   *(assessed by documentation)*

2: Environment and Interactions
   *(assessed by observation)*

3: Structure
   *(assessed by observation)*

4: Program Management
   *(assessed by documentation and observation)*
How Do We Look at the Standards & QI Process?

- Raters and Mentors Views (surveys and interviews)
- Provider Views (telephone interviews with participant and nonparticipant providers)
- Weekly telephone calls with VECF
- Local Coordinators VIEWS (group and executive interviews)
- Review Key Documents
What Did We Find?
In general, the family child care home demonstration project pilot was:

✓ Well-delivered

✓ Well-coordinated

✓ Well-received by providers, particularly mentoring and purchasing
Speed Bumps and Potholes

Naturally, challenges occurred

Some parts need lubrication, realignment, or replacement
But Overall...

- Satisfaction by May or June was high
- Challenges help us learn and re-tune
- So, how did we get to these conclusions?
Pilot Regions
- SB Appalachia
- SB Central Virginia
- SB Greater Richmond
- Fairfax Office for Children
- SB Alexandria/Arlington
- SB South Hampton Roads
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Providers</th>
<th>% FCCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appalachia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington/Alexandria</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Virginia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Richmond</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hampton Roads</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Roadmap

- Who were the key players?
- What happened?
- How well did procedures go?
- Lessons learned from challenges
- Stakeholder reactions
- Conclusions
Key Players

- 6 local coordinators
- 12 raters (2 also LCs)
- 20 mentors (1 also LC)
- 75 family child care home providers
Who Are the Providers?

**Education Level**
- High School or equivalent: 43%
- Certificate: 18%
- Associate's degree: 22%
- Bachelor's degree: 15%
- Master's degree: 1%

**Years in Business**
- 1 to 5 yrs: 32%
- 6 to 15 yrs: 51%
- More than 15 yrs: 17%

**Primary Language Spoken**
- English: 74%
- Spanish: 15%
- Other: 11%

**NAFCC Accredited**
- Yes: 16%
- No: 84%
Features of Pilot FCCH

- Hours Open: Average 12 hours a day (range was 9 – 24 hours a day)
- 58% had one or more assistants
- 44% also provide care for their own children or grandchildren
Who Do Providers Serve?

Age of children served, in months

Mostly infants, toddlers, and preschoolers
Who Are the Raters?

- 18 trained, 12 conducted ratings
- 100% early childhood specialists
- 67% BS/BA or higher in relevant field
- 100% had some kind of prior rating experience
- 58% over 20+ years experience in field
Rating Procedures

• Raters each observed between 2 – 9 providers

• Observation visits: 5 hours average (range: 3.5 to 6 hours)

• Total time for raters (n=21 logs): 10.6 hours (range: 8 – 14 hours)

• 75 Summary Reports sent to providers
Who Are the Mentors?

Twenty mentors (one also LC)

- 100% early childhood specialists
- 69% BS/BA or higher in relevant field
- 69% had prior mentoring experience

(Based on survey of 80% of mentors (n=16))
What has been accomplished:

- 75 family child care home providers received detailed feedback on their business
- 74 providers developed QIPs to improve their business
- 74 providers received up to 30 hours of personalized mentoring
- 74 providers received up to $1,000 worth of materials and supplies targeted to specific QIP goals
Relative Strengths

Average FCCERS-R Score, by Subscale

N= 75
Relative Weaknesses

Average FCCERS-R Score, by Subscale

N= 75

- Program Structure: 3.5
- Space and Furnishings: 3.08
- Activities: 2.7
- Personal Care: 2.5
Challenges Occurred

✓ 12 providers dropped out

✓ 30% of original raters could not rate

✓ Scheduling observation visits complicated
Challenges

✓ Language and cultural differences

✓ Many providers were initially unhappy with Summary Reports

✓ QIP development process varied significantly
Stakeholder Satisfaction

Who would continue in the VSQI Program?

- Providers: 94%
- Raters: 92%
- Mentors: 81%
Provider Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Relationship</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship Overall</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIP Planning Process</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Star Quality Program Overall</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“VECF staff was very helpful and offered a lot of guidance.”

“Morgan was a great resource.”

“Betty was great about getting back when I had a question; she did a good job turning around summary reports quickly and she assisted with revising reports but never changed the intent of the content.”
Providers

"it was impressive that we have providers who want to operate business as professionally as possible." (Rater)

"All of these providers are go getters-they want to improve." (Mentor)

"I worked with a provider who is very flexible; I was so impressed- ..... she is so on top of things." (Mentor)

"on quality side, 1/2 of young children come to Kindergarten from HCC care so if we want kids to be ready we really need to support HCC providers." (Rater)
Provider Comments

"[I] liked how it allowed [me] to have more structure and the changes that [I] made changed the behavior if the children in a good way. It helped a lot."

"It's been good for [my] knowledge and [my] children have benefitted from all the new items and technology."

"[My] mentor was very professional and she really helped ...open [my] eyes to new things and new ways to do things."

"If the program continues it would be helpful to have the mentor continue to come and work with [us]. This is a process and continued support would be beneficial."
Conclusions

✓ Data from the implementation study will help make service delivery as smooth as possible within budget constraints

✓ Critical role in the state early childhood system
Conclusions

✓ Family child care home providers often support the development of entire families

✓ “Most of those in [my] care came to [me] at 6 weeks of age and they are still there.”

✓ “[I] enjoy watching children grow from babies onward through school and on to college.”
Keep Up the Good Work!
Thank you and Questions!