

Quality First Update- Statewide and Regionally Funded Programs

Currently **788** QF programs are enrolled (N= 729; 556 C, 173 H) or pending verification to enroll (N =59: 47 C, 12 H) in QF system (Statewide and Regionally funded). Out of 788, **740** providers have had an initial assessment completed (**GF sites = 668; FY 12 sites = 72**) as of February 2012.

Out of **668** grand fathered QF providers with an initial assessment, **514** (77%) have received a progress assessment, which is scheduled based on 12 - 18 months of Quality Improvement Plan implementation after initial assessment. Table below shows estimated star rating for those 514 providers at initial and progress.

INITIAL (514): 387 QF Center and 127 Home Based Care Providers' Rated Using QF Star Rating Scale		
Estimated Star Rating Level	Number of Centers (% against 387)	Number of Homes (% against 127)
RISING STAR 1*	140 (36%)	63 (50%)
PROGRESSING STAR 2*	232 (60%)	59 (46%)
QUALITY 3*	15 (4%)	4 (3.2%)
GOOD QUALITY 4*	0	1 (0.8%)
HIGH QUALITY 5*	0	0
TOTAL	387	127
PROGRESS (514): 387QF Center and 127 Home Based Care Providers' Rated Using QF Star Rating Scale		
Estimated Star Rating Level	Number of Centers (% against 387)	Number of Homes (% against 127)
RISING STAR 1*	39 (10%)	20 (16%)
PROGRESSING STAR 2*	325 (84%)	94 (74%)
QUALITY 3*	20 (5.2%)	11 (8.5%)
GOOD QUALITY 4*	2 (0.5%)	2 (1.5%)
HIGH QUALITY 5*	1 (0.3%)	0
TOTAL	387	127

Preliminary analysis of provider data who received both an initial and progress assessment using 2- tailed paired t-test showed that overall mean of provider estimated quality rating showed a significant increase from a mean of 1.65 to 1.97; $t(513) = 11.96, p = .000$. In other words, results show that from initial to progress assessment QF providers on average are moving from an estimated star rating of 1 to 2 Star, which indicates improvement in the right direction.

Comparing **514** QF Centers and Home based providers on their initial versus progress estimated rating scores showed that:

- 94.4% (485 of 514) of providers either improved or maintained their estimated QF rating level
 - ❖ 187 providers improved their estimated QF star rating from a 1 to 2 (156); 1 to 3 (5); 2 to 3 (21); 2 to 4 (2); 3 to 4 (2); 3 to 5 (1)
 - ❖ 298 providers maintained their estimated QF rating. Specifically, remained at their estimated star rating of 1 (42), 2 (251) and 3 (5).

Quality First Update- Statewide and Regionally Funded Programs

- 5.6% (29 of 514) of providers showed a decline in their estimated QF rating level from 2 to 1 (17); 3 to 2 (11) and 4 to 2 (1).

Preliminary review of ERS and CLASS subscale scores for the centers/homes that showed improvement or decline in estimated rating score showed that most of the changes were related to change in score in the following subscales: **ERS:** Space and Furnishings (e.g. age appropriate child size furniture available), Language-Reasoning (ECCERS; e.g. teachers encouraging the use of language in educational context), Listening and Talking (ITERS and FCCERS; e.g. teachers' responsiveness to children's vocalizations), Activities (e.g., the variety and types of materials and experiences that are accessible to children), Interactions (e.g., quality teacher child interactions), and Program Structure(daily schedule and curriculum). **CLASS:** Instructional Support (teacher's encouragement of higher order thinking skills, concept development and use of language).

Please note that estimated QF rating applied on the assessment scores (initial and progress) above is based on two measures: (1) ERS- Environmental Rating Scales (ECERS, ITERS, and FCCERS); (2) CLASS-Classroom Assessment (Domains: Emotional Support, Instructional Support, and Classroom Organization). QF Point Scale data is currently not available for these providers—*thus please note that QF rating for all providers is labeled estimated QF rating.*

72 SFY 2012 QF programs (Regionally funded) with an Initial Rating assessment (approved status)

Initial Rating (72): 51 QF Center and 21 Home Based Care Providers' Rated Using QF Star Rating Scale								
Star Rating Level	Number of Centers (% against 51)	Large Centers	Medium Centers	Small Centers	Number of Homes (% against 21)	Large Homes	Medium Homes	Small Homes
RISING STAR 1*	6 (12%)	0	3	3	5 (24%)	0	0	5
PROGRESSING STAR 2*	43 (84%)	2	19	22	11 (52%)	0	0	11
QUALITY 3*	2 (4%)	0	1	1	4 (19%)	0	0	4
GOOD QUALITY 4*	0	0	0	0	1 (5%)	0	0	1
HIGH QUALITY 5*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	51	2	23	26	21	0	0	21

Quality First Update- Statewide and Regionally Funded Programs

Preliminary review of providers with 3 assessment points: 19 QF providers (15 centers, 4 homes)

Provider Type	Center Size	Initial Star Rating (T1)	Progress Star Rating (T2)	GF Star Rating (T3)	Initial To Progress (T1 to T2)	Progress to GF Rating (T2 to T3)	CLASS Instructional Support sub score will improve rating
Center	Large	1	2	2	1	0	
Center	Large	2	2	2	0	0	
Center	Medium	2	2	2	0	0	
Center	Medium	1	1	1	0	0	
Center	Medium	2	1	2	-1	1	
Center	Medium	2	2	2	0	0	
Center	Medium	1	2	2	1	0	
Center	Medium	2	2	2	0	0	Yes
Center	Medium	2	1	2	-1	1	
Center	Medium	2	2	2	0	0	Yes
Center	Medium	2	1	2	-1	1	
Center	Medium	2	2	2	0	0	Yes
Center	Small	2	2	2	0	0	Yes
Center	Small	2	2	2	0	0	Yes
Center	Small	1	2	2	1	0	
Home	Small	2	1	2	-1	1	
Home	Small	2	1	3	-1	2	
Home	Small	1	1	2	0	1	Yes
Home	Small	1	2	2	1	0	