Appendix 1
Quality Performance Report

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.)

No changes during this period.

Goals Described in FY 2012-2013 CCDF Plan:

Standardizethe issuance of a provisional license: A child care center is issued either a full or provisional license based on compliance concerns. The licensing unit will develop a decision-tree or indicator system that determines when a provisional license will be issued for a child care center.

Ensure timely and consistent processing of child development home (CDH) registration applications, including data sharing with CCR&R and other key partners):   Within the past year, the Department implemented a Centralized Child Care Assistance Unit (CCAU) that processes CCA eligibility,CCA payment, and CDH registration applications/renewals. As a part of the centralization, strategies are being implemented to ensure consistent processing of applications/renewals and improved timeliness in issuing certificates.   As partners such as CCR&R are no longer points of distribution for CDH applications, communication strategies need to be implemented to ensure they, and other partners such as CACFP are aware of providers inquiring about becoming registered, regulatory status of providers, etc.

Increase in the number of CDH who have completed ChildNet certification: ChildNet certification is achieved by CDH who have completed 25 hours of training and had a certification visit completed by CCR&R staff.   ChildNet certificationassures an increased level of health and safety, quality and monitoring, ascompliance with regulations, participation in CACFP, liability insurance, etc are all required.

Decrease injuries in child care settings by the following strategies: 1) ensure injury reporting/surveillance strategies are developed by HCCI/DHS to provide a method of tracking injuries that occur in regulated child care settings; and 2) determine methods to pull data from HCCI & CCR&R regarding the number of providers completing injury prevention checklists and hazard mitigation plans. Both of these tools are

pointable criteria in the QRS and provide valuable data for targeting consultation, training and resources.

Goal #1:

Is Goal from 2012-2013 CCDF Plan? ☑ Yes ☐ No

 Ensure timely and consistent processing of child development home (CDH) registration applications, including data sharing with CCR&R and other key partners):   Within the past year, the Department implemented a Centralized Child Care Assistance Unit (CCAU) that processes CCA eligibility,CCA payment, and CDH registration applications/renewals. As a part of the centralization, strategies are being implemented to ensure consistent processing of applications/renewals and improved timeliness in issuing certificates.   As partners such as CCR&R are no longer points of distribution for CDH applications, communication strategies need to be implemented to ensure they, and other partners such as CACFP are aware of providers inquiring about becoming registered, regulatory status of providers, etc.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:

 The Lead Agency's Child Care Assistance Unit has held Kaizen events for both the Registration and Eligibility units within the CCAU.   During the events standard processes were put into place to help ensure consistency in processing both CCA recipient and CCA provider applications/renewals. The CCAU unit continues to review these processes for program improvement identified through Quality Control reviews and through coordination with the Lead Agency policy division. Data sharing efforts are being established to ensure that accurate and consistent information regarding the regulatory status of providers is available to both CCR&R and CACFP staff.

Goal #2:

Is Goal from 2012-2013 CCDF Plan? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Increase in the number of CDH who have completed ChildNet certification: ChildNet certification is achieved by CDH who have completed 25 hours of training and had a certification visit completed by CCR&R staff.   ChildNet certificationassures an increased level of health and safety, quality and monitoring, ascompliance with regulations, participation in CACFP, liability insurance, etc are all required.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:

As of 7-1-12, 742 of 4,109 child development home providers were ChildNet certified (18%).

Goal #3:

Is Goal from 2012-2013 CCDF Plan? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Decrease injuries in child care settings by the following strategies: 1) ensure injury reporting/surveillance strategies are developed by HCCI/DHS to provide a method of tracking injuries that occur in regulated child care settings; and 2) determine methods to pull data from HCCI & CCR&R regarding the number of providers completing injury prevention checklists and hazard mitigation plans. Both of these tools are pointable criteria in the QRS and provide valuable data for targeting consultation, training and resources.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:

The Lead Agency has requested our Dept. of Public Health/Healthy Child Care Iowa partner to research and make recommendations regarding injury reporting methodologies that might be implemented for child care providers. Other state's approaches have been researched and compiled and conversations are ongoing to determine an appropriate method for Iowa, including the possibility of a pilot effort.   Input will be solicited from stakeholders, including providers, before implementation. The Lead Agency and DPH currently lack an electronic venue for reporting. In the coming months, the Lead Agency will explore with the CCR&R Regional Directors and the HCCI staff the feasibility of including in the SFY14 CCR&R and HCCI contracts a method to report on the completion of injury prevention checklists and hazard mitigation plans by providers.

Goal #4:
Is Goal from 2012-2013 CCDF Plan?   ☑ Yes ☐ No

Standardizethe issuance of a provisional license: A child care center is issued either a full or provisional license based on compliance concerns. The licensing unit will develop a decision-tree or indicator system that determines when a provisional license will be issued for a child care center.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:

The Child Care Licensing Unit identified an opportunity for greater consistency associated with the issuance of provisional license. To assist staff in making the determination as to when a 'provisional' license should be issued, a decision tree was developed. The tool essentially involves the evaluation of risk in relation to the frequency of identified violations to determine a course of action.   The area of non-compliance is evaluated to assess risk of harm against any patterns of disregard to licensing rules to determine a course of action. The degree of engagement, understanding and planning by the provider assist in determining necessary actions. As an example, high risk of harm may entail violations related to ratio, staff discipline. Medium risk might be related to training, nutrition, etc. Low risk areas may involve file management issues. A Program Improvement Plan (aka "corrective action plan") is developed if a provider is issued a provisional license. The effort has resulted in a more consistent response by providers and a more structured resolution of provisional licenses by means of a program improvement plan and scheduled oversight by licensing staff.   The Lead Agency plans to standardize this as a procedural expectation of licensing staff with providers in calendar year 2013. A second phase of data collection is planned to measure compliance with both process and adherence to improvement plans.

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 30, 2012?   1383
☐ N/A
Describe:

b) How many licensed home-based programs operated in the State/Territory as of September 30, 2012? 4335
☐ N/A
Describe:
Obtained from state KinderTrack system.

c) Does the State/Territory have data on the number or percentage of programs (i.e., paid care provided on a regular basis by an unrelated caregiver outside of the child's own home) operating in the State/Territory that are not subject to licensing regulations?

☐ Yes
If yes, include the number or percentage of programs:

Number:
Percentage: %

Describe:
 Data is available on the number of non-regulated providers that are paid under the state Child Care Assistance (CCA) program but cannot be factored out by relative status.

A purely non-regulated, legally operating provider not paid under the state CCA program could only be extracted from the Child Care Resource and Referral (CCR&R) NACCRRAware database based on those who request to be listed on the referral data base. The total would not be reflective of the total non-registered pool in the state.

☑ No

A1.2.2 What percentage of programs received monitoring visits, and at what frequency, for each provider category during the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)?

a) What percentage of licensed center-based programs were visited as of the end of the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)?
 100%

What was the average number of visits?
 0

☐ N/A
Describe:
 All licensed programs have an annual visit – either their relicensing visit or as their "off year" unannounced visit.

Average number of visits that would comprise both types of visits and complaint visits are not known.

Pending additional resources to support electronic gathering by staff, this data will not be reportable. The Lead Agency's would prefer to report the monitoring expectation by provider type versus an average number of visits across all providers, as it is unclear the value of the latter data.

b) What percentage of licensed family child care programs were visited as of the end of the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)?

47.5%

What was the average number of visits?

0

☐ N/A

Describe:

The percentage reflects the number of homes monitored to meet the state target of 60% during State Fiscal Year 2012 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012).

Average number of visits that would comprise both types of visits and complaint visits are not known.

Pending additional resources to support electronic gathering by staff, this data will not be reportable. The Lead Agency's would prefer to report the monitoring expectation by provider type versus an average number of visits across all providers, as it is unclear the value of the latter data.

c) What percentage of legally exempt providers, receiving CCDF were visited as of the end of the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)?

%

What was the average number of visits?

☑ N/A

Describe:

The state does not routinely monitor legally-exempt providers.

Average number of visits for complaints is not tracked.

A1.2.3 How many programs had their licenses suspended or revoked due to licensing violations as defined in your State/Territory during the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)?

Licensed Centers:

How many were **suspended**?

☑ N/A

Describe:

The state does not invoke a "suspended" status for licensed centers or registered home providers.

How many were **revoked**? 0

☐ N/A

Describe:
 No center licenses were revoked during this time period.

Licensed Homes:

How many were **suspended**?

☑ N/A

Describe:
 The state does not invoke a "suspended" status for licensed centers or registered home providers.

How many were **revoked**?

☑ N/A

Describe:
 The current regulatory data system does not allow for revocation data to be extracted for homes.

A1.2.4 How many programs were terminated from participation in CCDF subsidies due to failure to meet licensing or minimum CCDF health and safety requirements during the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)?

Child Care Centers:
☑ N/A

Group Child Care Homes:
☑ N/A

Family Child Care Homes:
☑ N/A

In-Home Providers:
☑ N/A

Describe:
 Provider agreements can be revoked but such action is not tracked in the current subsidy tracking system.

A1.2.5 How many previously license-exempt providers were brought under the licensing system during the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)?

☑ N/A

Describe:
 "Licensed exempt" in this context for Iowa = school-based, school-operated programs currently not required to be licensed by the Lead Agency. This information is not tracked in the child care licensing information system.

We do not track the number of non-registered providers who become registered. The number of new Child Development Home registrations issued were 2,404 during SFY12. However, the system will not allow a query to distinguish between new registrations or renewals.

A1.2.6 How many injuries as defined by the State/Territory occurred in child care during the last year? Please indicate the universe of programs on which the number is based (e.g., licensed providers, CCDF providers, or all providers).

☑ N/A

Describe:
 State does not have an injury surveillance system. Strategies are in development with our Department of Public Health Healthy Child Care Iowa initiative to develop and pilot mechanisms to collect information on child care injuries.

A1.2.7 How many fatalities occurred in child care as of the end of the last year?
Please indicate the universe of programs on which the number is based (e.g., licensed providers, CCDF providers, or all providers).

 2
☐ N/A

Describe:
 1 death occurred in a registered child development home.
 1 death occurred in a non-registered 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 fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)?

☐ Yes

☑ No

☐ N/A

Describe:

No changes were made in the Early Learning Guidelines during this time period.

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 Described in FY 2012-2013 CCDF Plan:
Implement professional development opportunities in using curriculums and developmental assessment tools: A key area of need related to Iowa's Early Learning Guidelines is in improving provider's understanding and use of curriculums and developmental assessments tools. Under the direction of and funding available within the ECI Professional Development component group, training opportunities will be developed regarding appropriate use of curriculums and providers' role in using developmental assessment tools.

Goal #1:
Is Goal from 2012-2013 CCDF Plan? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Implement professional development opportunities in using curriculums and developmental assessment tools: A key area of need related to Iowa's Early Learning Guidelines is in improving provider's understanding and use of curriculums and developmental assessments tools. Under the direction of and funding available within the ECI Professional Development component group, training opportunities will be developed regarding appropriate use of curriculums and providers' role in using developmental assessment tools.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:

 In 2012, the Iowa Legislature charged the Iowa Department of Education with prescribing a kindergarten readiness assessment to be administered to all prekindergarten or four-year-old children enrolled in each school district. The new language required a multi-domain assessment aligned with state early learning standards and encouraged districts to administer the assessment at least at the beginning and end of the preschool program. A task force was convened which included representation from the Lead Agency. The task force was charged with making a recommendation on an assessment. According to the information presented to this task force, their recommendation was that the GOLD online assessment system provided the best fit in meeting the intent of the legislation. Approximately 80 percent of the Iowa school districts providing the preschool program currently use the GOLD online assessment system. This system provides access to data at the local and state level. The GOLD online assessment system assists teachers in individualizing instruction and planning lessons. The system also allows families to view assessment information, and it generates reports for teachers to share with families. Conversations are ongoing as to how an assessment of this magnitude might be implemented throughout the whole of the child care provider community.

Efforts to institute a standardized training effort for providers on the appropriate use of curriculum have been delayed but continue to be an area of focus/interest of the ECI Professional Development component group.

A2.2 Key Data

A2.2.1 How many programs were trained on early learning guidelines (ELGs) or standards over the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)?

Center-based Programs: Early Learning Guidelines (ELGs)	How many center-based programs were trained on ELGs over the past year?	N/A
Birth to Three ELGs		☑
Three-to-Five ELGs		☑
Five and Older ELGs		☑
Describe:	The Lead Agency partnered with the Dept of Education and many stakeholders in the initial development of ELG's for both the birth-3 and 3-5 populations. The ELG's are not viewed as a static curriculum to be delivered as a training. Rather, there is an expectation that training across an allowable array of topics incorporate the ELG's. As such, the Lead Agency is not able to report on the number of providers who received training on the ELG's or the number of children cared for in those programs. In the Fall 2012, the Early Childhood Iowa Professional Development component group facilitated a revision of the ELG's and are pending final format. As a part of that effort, discussion is occurring regarding strategies for implementation.	
Family Child Care Programs: Early Learning Guidelines (ELGs)	How many family child care programs were trained on ELGs over the past year?	N/A
Birth to Three ELGs		☑

Three-to-Five ELGs		☑
Five and Older ELGs		☑
Describe:	The Lead Agency partnered with the Dept of Education and many stakeholders in the initial development of ELG's for both the birth-3 and 3-5 populations. The ELG's are not viewed as a static curriculum to be delivered as a training. Rather, there is an expectation that training across an allowable array of topics incorporate the ELG's. As such, the Lead Agency is not able to report on the number of providers who received training on the ELG's or the number of children cared for in those programs. In the Fall 2012, the Early Childhood Iowa Professional Development component group facilitated a revision of the ELG's and are pending final format. As a part of that effort, discussion is occurring regarding strategies for implementation.	
Legally Exempt Providers: **Early Learning Guidelines (ELGs)**	**How many legally exempt providers were trained on ELGs over the past year?**	**N/A**
Birth to Three ELGs		☑
Three-to-Five ELGs		☑
Five and Older ELGs		☑
Describe:	The Lead Agency partnered with the Dept of Education and many stakeholders in the initial development of ELG's for both the birth-3 and 3-5 populations. The ELG's are not viewed as a static curriculum to be delivered as a training. Rather, there is an expectation that training across an allowable array of topics incorporate the ELG's. As such, the Lead Agency is not able to report on the number of providers who received training on the ELG's or the number of children cared for in those programs. In the Fall 2012, the Early Childhood Iowa Professional Development component group facilitated a revision of the ELG's and are pending final format. As a part of that effort, discussion is occurring regarding strategies for implementation.	

2.2.1(b) How many children are served in programs implementing the ELGs? Separate by age group if possible (e.g., infants and toddlers, preschoolers, school-age children)

Center-based Programs: **Early Learning Guidelines (ELGs)**	**How many children are served in programs implementing the ELGs? Separate by age group if possible (e.g., infants and toddlers, preschoolers, school-age children)**	**N/A**
Infants and toddlers in programs implementing the Birth to Three ELGs		☑
Preschoolers in programs implementing the Three-to-Five ELGs		☑
School-age children in programs implementing the Five and Older ELGs		☑

Describe:	The Lead Agency partnered with the Dept of Education and many stakeholders in the initial development of ELG's for both the birth-3 and 3-5 populations. The ELG's are not viewed as a static curriculum to be delivered as a training. Rather, there is an expectation that training across an allowable array of topics incorporate the ELG's. As such, the Lead Agency is not able to report on the number of providers who received training on the ELG's or the number of children cared for in those programs. In the Fall 2012, the Early Childhood Iowa Professional Development component group facilitated a revision of the ELG's and are pending final format. As a part of that effort, discussion is occurring regarding strategies for implementation.	
Family Child Care Programs: **Early Learning Guidelines (ELGs)**	**How many children are served in programs implementing the ELGs? Separate by age group if possible (e.g., infants and toddlers, preschoolers, school-age children)**	**N/A**
Infants and toddlers in programs implementing the Birth to Three ELGs		☑
Preschoolers in programs implementing the Three-to-Five ELGs		☑
School-age children in programs implementing the Five and Older ELGs		☑
Describe:	The Lead Agency partnered with the Dept of Education and many stakeholders in the initial development of ELG's for both the birth-3 and 3-5 populations. The ELG's are not viewed as a static curriculum to be delivered as a training. Rather, there is an expectation that training across an allowable array of topics incorporate the ELG's. As such, the Lead Agency is not able to report on the number of providers who received training on the ELG's or the number of children cared for in those programs. In the Fall 2012, the Early Childhood Iowa Professional Development component group facilitated a revision of the ELG's and are pending final format. As a part of that effort, discussion is occurring regarding strategies for implementation.	
Legally Exempt Providers: **Early Learning Guidelines (ELGs)**	**How many children are served in programs implementing the ELGs? Separate by age group if possible (e.g., infants and toddlers, preschoolers, school-age children)**	**N/A**
Infants and toddlers in programs implementing the Birth to Three ELGs		☑
Preschoolers in programs implementing the Three-to-Five ELGs		☑
School-age children in programs implementing the Five and Older ELGs		☑

Describe:	The Lead Agency partnered with the Dept of Education and many stakeholders in the initial development of ELG's for both the birth-3 and 3-5 populations. The ELG's are not viewed as a static curriculum to be delivered as a training. Rather, there is an expectation that training across an allowable array of topics incorporate the ELG's. As such, the Lead Agency is not able to report on the number of providers who received training on the ELG's or the number of children cared for in those programs. In the Fall 2012, the Early Childhood Iowa Professional Development component group facilitated a revision of the ELG's and are pending final format. As a part of that effort, discussion is occurring regarding strategies for implementation.

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 Described in FY 2012-2013 CCDF Plan:
Increase QRS participation: Under a voluntary QRS, Iowa has had significant provider participation and continues to support strategies to increase participation. With a recent 'recalibration' of the QRS, and performance measures identified within the CCR&R contracts, Iowa continues to support efforts to increase participation.

Goal #1:
Is Goal from 2012-2013 CCDF Plan? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Increase QRS participation: Under a voluntary QRS, Iowa has had significant provider participation and continues to support strategies to increase participation. With a recent 'recalibration' of the QRS, and performance measures identified within the CCR&R contracts, Iowa continues to support efforts to increase participation.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:

From 7-1-11 to 7-1-12, QRS participation increased from 1099 to 1137 total programs participating, an increase of 4%.

A3.2 Key Data

A3.2.1 How many programs received targeted technical assistance in the following areas during the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)?

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:

Contractors are expected to deliver technical assistance based on the need of the program, which might include any of the areas listed. Because of this, we are unable to provide data for the technical assistance delivered to this level of detail. Data can be provided for: number of programs receiving TA, the number receiving on-site TA, and total number of on-site visits completed.

A3.2.2 How many programs received financial support to achieve and sustain quality during the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)?

a) One-time, grants, awards or bonuses:

Child Care Centers:
292
Family Child Care Homes:
376
☐ N/A

Describe:

The data reflects only those programs funded by the Lead Agency under the state's Quality Rating System.

b) On-going or Periodic quality stipends:

Child Care Centers:

Family Child Care Homes:

☑ N/A

Describe:

A3.2.3 What is the participation rate (number and percentage) in the State/Territory QRIS or other quality improvement system for programs over the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)? When reporting the percentages, please indicate the universe of programs on which the percentage is based (e.g., licensed providers, CCDF providers, or all providers).

Child Care Centers QRIS:

Number:
 514
Percentage: 37.8 %

or Other Quality Improvement System:

Number:

Percentage: %

☐ N/A

Describe:

 This is data from 7-1-12. The percentage is based on licensed centers and school based and operated programs under the jurisidiction of the Department of Education.

Family Child Care Homes QRIS:

Number:
 623
Percentage: 15 %

or Other Quality Improvement System:

Number:

Percentage: %

☐ N/A

Describe:

This is data from 7-1-12. The percentage is based on the number of registered child development home providers.

License-Exempt Providers QRIS:

Number:

Percentage: %

or Other Quality Improvement System:

Number:

Percentage: %

☑ N/A

Describe:

The only License-Exempt providers eligible for QRS participation are school-based and operated programs under the jurisdicition of the Department of Education. These participants are reported under the "center" data.

A3.2.4 How many programs moved up or down within the QRIS or achieved another quality threshold established by the State/Territory over the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)? If the quality threshold is something other than QRIS, describe the metric used, such as accreditation.

Child Care Centers:

How many moved up within the QRIS:
How many moved down within the QRIS:
☑ N/A

Describe:

Current data tools do not allow an analysis for programs that move up within the QRS or those that may

have had legitimate reasons for achieving a lower rating at reapplication. The Lead Agency believes that if tracking is to occur, it should also legitimize those providers who are able to maintain a rating, for that often requires a tremendous amount of effort and resources by the provider but often goes unacknowledged by the public.

Family Child Care Homes:

How many moved up within the QRIS:
How many moved down within the QRIS:
☑ N/A

Describe:

Current data tools do not allow an analysis for programs that move up within the QRS or those that may have had legitimate reasons for achieving a lower rating at reapplication. The Lead Agency believes that if tracking is to occur, it should also legitimize those providers who are able to maintain a rating, for that often requires a tremendous amount of effort and resources by the provider but often goes unacknowledged by the public.

License-Exempt Providers:

How many moved up within the QRIS: 0
How many moved down within the QRIS: 0
☐ N/A

Describe:

 License-exempt in this context is our school-based, school-operated programs.

Current data tools do not allow an analysis for programs that move up within the QRS or those that may have had legitimate reasons for achieving a lower rating at reapplication. The Lead Agency believes that if tracking is to occur, it should also legitimize those providers who are able to maintain a rating, for that often requires a tremendous amount of effort and resources by the provider but often goes unacknowledged by the public.

A3.2.5 How many programs are at each level of quality? 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
1	6
2	138
3	126
4	194
5	50

Describe:

Child care centers, preschools, school-operated programs, and child development homes are eligible to participate. Programs at Levels 1 and 2 must all complete specific requirements, while programs wishing to earn Levels 3-5 must earn points in each of the following categories:

- Health and Safety
- Environment
- Family and Community Partnerships
- Professional Development
- Leadership and Administration (child care centers only)
  In addition, programs wishing to earn a Level 5 rating must successfully complete an on-site assessment.

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
1	87
2	279
3	101
4	109
5	47

Describe:

Child care centers, preschools, school-operated programs, and child development homes are eligible to

participate. Programs at Levels 1 and 2 must all complete specific requirements, while programs wishing to earn Levels 3-5 must earn points in each of the following categories:

- Health and Safety
- Environment
- Family and Community Partnerships
- Professional Development
- Leadership and Administration (child care centers only)
    In addition, programs wishing to earn a Level 5 rating must successfully complete an on-site assessment.

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

Describe:

 Child care centers, preschools, school-operated programs, and child development homes are eligible to participate. Programs at Levels 1 and 2 must all complete specific requirements, while programs wishing to earn Levels 3-5 must earn points in each of the following categories:

- Health and Safety
- Environment
- Family and Community Partnerships
- Professional Development
- Leadership and Administration (child care centers only)
    In addition, programs wishing to earn a Level 5 rating must successfully complete an on-site assessment.

A3.2.6 What percentage of CCDF subsidized children were served in a program participating in the State or Territory's quality improvement system during the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)?   What percentage are in high quality care as defined by the State/Territory?
Note. If the State/Territory does not have a formal QRIS, the State/Territory may define another quality indicator and report it here.

Percentage of CCDF children served in participating programs:
 %

Percentage of CCDF children served in high quality care:
 %

(May define with assessment scores, accreditation, or other metric, if no QRIS.)

☑ N/A

Describe:

 The KinderTrack system does not currently allow the Lead Agency to cross-walk those providers with a QRS rating to the children served under the child care assistance programs by rated providers. The Lead Agency is exploring methods to provide a more robust monthly data extract file that would allow this comparison.

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 Described in FY 2012-2013 CCDF Plan:
Establish under ECI-Professional Development an approval process for training organizations: The Department currently administers a training approval process for any approved training entity not identified in regulations.   The state needs a consistent training organization approval process to assure the quality and integrity of the vast amount of training that is available for child care providers.

Increase participation rate in child care training registry: The Department administers a Child Care Provider Training Registry.   An increase in the number of training organizations listing their training opportunities and the number of providers using the registry to enroll in and track their training would maximize the value of this data system.

Increase in the number of CCR&R consultants who have 1) completed the I-Consult training and 2) achieved the I-Consult credential:
The I-Consult training developed by Iowa State University provides a common framework for developing consistent consultation competencies across the pool of consultants.   Achievement of the I-Consult credential offers a measure of integrity to the work and begins to build a peer-mentor infrastructure.

Goal #1:

Is Goal from 2012-2013 CCDF Plan? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Establish under ECI-Professional Development an approval process for training organizations: The Department currently administers a training approval process for any approved training entity not identified in regulations.   The state needs a consistent training organization approval process to assure the quality and integrity of the vast amount of training that is available for child care providers.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:

Under the guidance of the Early Learning Leadership Team (EL LT) - a work team that exists under the direction of the Early Childhood Iowa Professional Development component group - efforts have begun to establish a more formal structure to guide the professional development received by child care providers.   In an effort to pave the way for a potential state-level, ECI-led training organization approval process, the EL LT has focused its initial effort on drafting adult educator competencies. The draft competencies will be finalized by the EL LT in early 2013 and will be forwarded to the ECI Professional Development Executive Committee for endorsement and considerations for implementation.

Goal #2:

Is Goal from 2012-2013 CCDF Plan? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Increase participation rate in child care training registry: The Department administers a Child Care Provider Training Registry.   An increase in the number of training organizations listing their training opportunities and the number of providers using the registry to enroll in and track their training would maximize the value of this data system.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:

Participation in the training registry increased from 7456 at the end of FFY2011 to 13,200 at the end of FFY 2012. The number of training organizations listing their training opportunities in the training registry increased from 36 (at the end of FFY2011) to 44 (at the end of FFY 2012).

Goal #3:
Is Goal from 2012-2013 CCDF Plan? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Increase in the number of CCR&R consultants who have 1) completed the I-Consult training and 2) achieved the I-Consult credential:
The I-Consult training developed by Iowa State University provides a common framework for developing consistent consultation competencies across the pool of consultants.   Achievement of the I-Consult credential offers a measure of integrity to the work and begins to build a peer-mentor infrastructure.

Describe Progress - Include Examples and Numeric Targets where Possible:

In sfy 11, 41 Child Care Consultants completed Level 1 I-Consult training and 10 Child Care Consultants completed Level 2 I-Consult training and earned their I-Consult Credential.

In sfy 12, 10 Child Care Consultants completed Level 1 I-Consult training and 9 Child Care Consultants completed Level 2 I-Consult training. 7 of the 9 Consultants who completed the Level 2 training earned their I-Consult Credential.

In sfy11, the majority of consultants completed Level 1 training; in sfy12, there were only 10 consultants who needed the training. The Lead Agency intends to offer Level 1 annually for new consultants.

A4.2 Key Data

A4.2.1 How many teachers/caregivers had the following qualifications as of the end of the last fiscal year (as of September 30, 2012)?

Child Care Center Teachers:

How many had a Child Development Associate (CDA)?
☑ N/A

Describe:

This information requires a state system response and is not information solely maintained by the Lead Agency. While the Lead Agency does operate a Child Care Provider Training Registry (TR), the use of the TR is not mandatory across all provider types (including Head Start and programs under the jurisdiction of the Dept. of Education). While some of the requested information is collected in the TR, it is currently unverified and is entered as "self-report." The TR also does not allow the Lead Agency to filter education level by job category.

How many had <u>State/Territory Credentials</u>?
☑ N/A

Describe:

This information requires a state system response and is not information solely maintained by the Lead Agency. While the Lead Agency does operate a Child Care Provider Training Registry (TR), the use of the TR is not mandatory across all provider types (including Head Start and programs under the jurisdiction of the Dept. of Education). While some of the requested information is collected in the TR, it is currently unverified and is entered as "self-report." The TR also does not allow the Lead Agency to filter education level by job category.

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

Describe:

This information requires a state system response and is not information solely maintained by the Lead Agency. While the Lead Agency does operate a Child Care Provider Training Registry (TR), the use of the TR is not mandatory across all provider types (including Head Start and programs under the jurisdiction of the Dept. of Education). While some of the requested information is collected in the TR, it is currently unverified and is entered as "self-report." The TR also does not allow the Lead Agency to filter education level by job category.

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

Describe:

This information requires a state system response and is not information solely maintained by the Lead Agency. While the Lead Agency does operate a Child Care Provider Training Registry (TR), the use of the TR is not mandatory across all provider types (including Head Start and programs under the jurisdiction of the Dept. of Education). While some of the requested information is collected in the TR, it is currently unverified and is entered as "self-report." The TR also does not allow the Lead Agency to filter education level by job category.

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

Describe:

This information requires a state system response and is not information solely maintained by the Lead Agency. While the Lead Agency does operate a Child Care Provider Training Registry (TR), the use of the TR is not mandatory across all provider types (including Head Start and programs under the jurisdiction of the Dept. of Education). While some of the requested information is collected in the TR, it is currently unverified and is entered as "self-report." The TR also does not allow the Lead Agency to filter education level by job category.

Family Child Care Providers:

How many had a Child Development Associate (CDA)?
☑ N/A

Describe:

This information requires a state system response and is not information solely maintained by the Lead Agency. While the Lead Agency does operate a Child Care Provider Training Registry (TR), the use of the TR is not mandatory across all provider types (including Head Start and programs under the jurisdiction of the Dept. of Education). While some of the requested information is collected in the TR, it is currently unverified and is entered as "self-report." The TR also does not allow the Lead Agency to filter education level by job category.

How many had State/Territory Credentials?
☑ N/A

Describe:

This information requires a state system response and is not information solely maintained by the Lead Agency. While the Lead Agency does operate a Child Care Provider Training Registry (TR), the use of the TR is not mandatory across all provider types (including Head Start and programs under the jurisdiction of the Dept. of Education). While some of the requested information is collected in the TR, it is currently unverified and is entered as "self-report." The TR also does not allow the Lead Agency to filter education level by job category.

How many had an Associate's degree?
☑ N/A

Describe:

This information requires a state system response and is not information solely maintained by the Lead Agency. While the Lead Agency does operate a Child Care Provider Training Registry (TR), the use of the TR is not mandatory across all provider types (including Head Start and programs under the jurisdiction of the Dept. of Education). While some of the requested information is collected in the TR, it is currently unverified and is entered as "self-report." The TR also does not allow the Lead Agency to

filter education level by job category.

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

Describe:

This information requires a state system response and is not information solely maintained by the Lead Agency. While the Lead Agency does operate a Child Care Provider Training Registry (TR), the use of the TR is not mandatory across all provider types (including Head Start and programs under the jurisdiction of the Dept. of Education). While some of the requested information is collected in the TR, it is currently unverified and is entered as "self-report." The TR also does not allow the Lead Agency to filter education level by job category.

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

Describe:

This information requires a state system response and is not information solely maintained by the Lead Agency. While the Lead Agency does operate a Child Care Provider Training Registry (TR), the use of the TR is not mandatory across all provider types (including Head Start and programs under the jurisdiction of the Dept. of Education). While some of the requested information is collected in the TR, it is currently unverified and is entered as "self-report." The TR also does not allow the Lead Agency to filter education level by job category.

A4.2.2 How many teachers/caregivers were included in the State/Territory's professional development registry during the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)?

Staff in child care centers: 3974
Family child care home providers: 3246
License-exempt practitioners: 22
☐ N/A

Describe:

Inclusion within the training registry requires that a person enters the application and creates a unique account within the state's Information Technology Enterprise. The data reported was obtained by counting people (users) who created an account (unique ID and password) in the Iowa Child Care Provider Training Registry and requested a specific job category (e.g. staff in center, staff in family child care, etc.), which is then verified by an entity authorized to make that determination (e.g., center director, DHS staff, etc. The data reflects users as of September 30, 2012.

A4.2.3 How many teachers/caregivers received credit-based training and/or education as defined by the State/Territory during the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)?

Staff in child care centers:
Family child care home providers:
License-exempt practitioners:
☑ N/A

Describe:

 The Iowa Child Care Provider Training Registry does not track credit based training.
The Child Care Resource and Referral agencies do not track credit-based training

A4.2.4 How many credentials and degrees were awarded during the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)? 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 staff in child care centers?

Please list and provide number:

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

Describe:
The requested information is not tracked in a formalized data system by the Lead Agency. Collection of this information would require a systemic response across the early childhood system. Collection of this information would require a systemic response across the early childhood system including not only the Lead Agency, but other entities such as community and 4-year colleges.
  Collection of this information would require a systemic response across the early childhood system including not only the Lead Agency, but other entities such as community and 4-year colleges.
  Collection of this information would require a systemic response across the early childhood system including not only the Lead Agency, but other entities such as community and 4-year colleges.
  Collection of this information would require a systemic response across the early childhood system including not only the Lead Agency, but other entities such as community and 4-year colleges.

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 from the Lead Agency. Collection of this information would require a systemic response across the early childhood system.

How many <u>credentials</u> were awarded to <u>license-exempt practitioners</u>?

Please list and provide number:

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

Describe:
Data is not available from the Lead Agency. Collection of this information would require a systemic response across the early childhood system.

<u>Type of Degree:</u>

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

Please list and provide number:

Associates:
Bachelors:
Graduate/Advanced Degree:
Other:
☑ N/A

Describe:
Data is not available from the Lead Agency. Collection of this information would require a systemic response across the early childhood system including not only the Lead Agency, but other entities such as community and 4-year colleges.

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 from the Lead Agency. Collection of this information would require a systemic response across the early childhood system including not only the Lead Agency, but other entities such as community and 4-year colleges.

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

Please list and provide number:

Associates:
Bachelors:
Graduate/Advanced Degree:
Other:
☑ N/A

Describe:
 Data is not available from the Lead Agency. Collection of this information would require a systemic response across the early childhood system including not only the Lead Agency, but other entities such as community and 4-year colleges.

A4.2.5 How many teachers or other professionals received technical assistance such as coaching, mentoring or consultation during the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)? Describe any data you track on coaching, mentoring, or specialist consultation. If possible, include in what type of setting the practitioner worked.

Type of Technical Assistance:

How many teachers or other professional staff in child care centers received technical assistance?

☑ N/A

Please list type of technical assistance and provide number:

 The Lead Agency does not collect the number of staff who received TA. The Lead Agency can only report on the number of programs receiving TA.

How many family child care home providers received technical assistance?

☑ N/A

Please list type of technical assistance and provide number:

The Lead Agency does not collect the number of staff who received TA. The Lead Agency can only report on the number of programs receiving TA.

How many <u>license-exempt practitioners</u> received technical assistance?

☑ N/A

Please list <u>type of technical assistance</u> and provide number:

The Lead Agency does not collect the number of staff who received TA. The Lead Agency can only report on the number of programs receiving TA.

A4.2.6 What financial supports were funded over the past fiscal year to support teachers and caregivers in meeting and maintaining standards and qualifications as of the end of the last fiscal year (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012)?

☐ Scholarships.
How many teachers received?
☐ Reimbursement for Training Expenses.
How many teachers received?
☐ Loans.
How many teachers received?
☐ Wage supplements.
How many teachers received?
☐ Other.
☑ N/A
Describe:
The requested information is not tracked in a formalized data system by the Lead Agency. Data collection effort is larger than the Lead Agency, and would require a systemic response across the early childhood system. Support may be available to providers through the Dept. of Education or Early Childhood Iowa, but varies from area to area.

While the state plan for Iowa indicates scholarships and reimbursement for training are offered to providers, that response is in the context of the other elements of the state early childhood system that support providers in this regard and not direct funding/support from the Lead Agency.