

**New York Quality Indicators Project: Group Child Care Home Key Indicators (Renewal Inspections)****June 2015****Richard Fiene, Ph.D.**

These are the results from the key indicator analyses performed on the full data base of group child care homes (N = 1399) with the 416 Rules for announced Renewal Inspections. Usually these types of analyses are performed using a sample of data, such as 200 – 400 programs. The specific statistics used are most sensitive with a sample size within this range. Therefore, utilizing the full data set with well over 1000 programs is a new use of the Key Indicator methodology. The methodology and the results are still a very efficient way to reduce the full set of rules to a statistically predictive set of rules but there are some cautions which are pointed out throughout this brief report.

Some cautions noted are the following: 1) With the increased number of programs, the number of rules attaining the phi coefficient increases because the p-values decreased very significantly making many more rules statistically significant well below the .25 threshold. This is an expected result; however, the original decision table of maintaining the .25 threshold was used. 2) Whenever substantial compliance is introduced into the high group which was the case in two of the four analytical frameworks, it potentially increases the possibility that a specific key indicator rule could be out of compliance when the key indicators are used.

These analyses were unique in that the full data set was used which provided enhancements to the Key Indicator Methodology. In Table 1 below, the various results are provided demonstrating the differences amongst the various analytical frameworks. Four frameworks were used in constructing the analytical matrix for generating the Key Indicators: 1) (100/99) The high compliance group was defined as 100% in compliance (no violations) while the low compliance group was defined as 1 or more violations, 2) (99/95) The high compliance group was defined as 1 violation while the low compliance group was defined as 5 or more violations, 3) (100/95) The high compliance group was defined as 100% in compliance (no violations) while the low compliance group was defined as 5 or more violations, and 4) (100-99/95) The high compliance group was defined as 0-1 violations while the low compliance group was defined as 5 or more violations.

**Table 1 – Four Frameworks for Generating Key Indicators for Group Child Care Homes (416 Rules)**

| <b>Rule</b>  | <b>100/99</b> | <b>99/95</b> | <b>100/95</b> | <b>100-99/95</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>Content</b>          |
|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| 3H           | -----         | -----        | .33           | .27              | 2            | no peeling paint        |
| 4B1          | -----         | -----        | .31           | .25              | 2            | evacuation drills       |
| 5A           | -----         | -----        | .42           | .33              | 2            | hazard free             |
| 5J           | -----         | -----        | .27           | -----            | 1            | danger items inaccess   |
| 5L2          | -----         | -----        | .30           | .26              | 2            | pets licensed           |
| L3           | -----         | .27          | .32           | .32              | 3            | pet vaccines            |
| 5N5          | -----         | -----        | .25           | -----            | 1            | outdoor surface         |
| 5R           | -----         | -----        | .25           | .25              | 2            | flashlight              |
| 5V           | -----         | -----        | .30           | .29              | 2            | carbon monoxide alarm   |
| 6L           | -----         | -----        | .26           | -----            | 1            | transportation schedule |
| 7L           | .31           | .50          | .61           | .57              | 4            | sleeping arrangements   |
| 8A           | -----         | .32          | .38           | .37              | 3            | supervision             |
| 8E           | -----         | -----        | .27           | .25              | 2            | primary caregiver       |
| 8F           | -----         | .26          | .30           | .30              | 3            | assistant present       |
| 8J2          | -----         | -----        | .26           | -----            | 1            | 2 caregivers present    |
| 8J3          | -----         | .31          | .35           | .36              | 3            | one caregiver           |
| 11B1ii       | -----         | -----        | .27           | -----            | 1            | med statement           |
| 11c1         | -----         | -----        | .26           | -----            | 1            | health care plan        |
| 11c2i        | -----         | -----        | .31           | .28              | 2            | health checks           |
| 11H1i        | -----         | .30          | .43           | .38              | 3            | emergency medical       |
| 12N          | -----         | .30          | .42           | .37              | 3            | parent agree feeding    |
| 12O          | -----         | -----        | .28           | .28              | 2            | parent agree formula    |
| 13C          | -----         | -----        | .34           | .26              | 2            | caregivers & SEL        |
| 14F          | -----         | -----        | .33           | -----            | 1            | 30 hrs training         |
| 14M          | .32           | -----        | .49           | .32              | 3            | cert in FA/CPR          |
| 15A9         | -----         | -----        | .25           | -----            | 1            | licensed capacity       |
| 15B12        | -----         | -----        | .26           | -----            | 1            | notified of any change  |
| 15B22        | -----         | -----        | .28           | .26              | 2            | written policies        |
| 15C3         | -----         | .44          | .54           | .51              | 3            | emergency contact       |
| 15C4         | .27           | .47          | .59           | .55              | 4            | pickup child            |
| 15C5         | -----         | .34          | .43           | .40              | 3            | daily attendance        |
| 15C6         | .41           | .38          | .67           | .52              | 4            | health record           |
| 15C13        | .25           | .29          | .49           | .40              | 4            | arrival departure       |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>5</b>      | <b>12</b>    | <b>33</b>     | <b>24</b>        |              |                         |

These four frameworks provide guidance in determining the best combination of Key Indicators given the various compliance determinations, such as 100% compliance versus substantial but not full compliance with all the group child care home rules. In reviewing the frameworks, clearly the 100/99 option #1 where the high group is 100% in compliance with no violations is too stringent a criteria since so few rules make the cut for the Key Indicator threshold. The second option (99/95) where the high group has only 1 violation is a better option because it introduces additional Key Indicators. This option was completed by both the author and staff at NY/OCFS. The third option (100/95) where the high group is 100% in compliance with no violations but where the low group has 5 or more violations provides a much larger number of Key Indicators. This option really is less efficient (usually key indicator tools represent 10% or less of the full set of rules) by providing over 30 Key Indicators but it could be a good resource to add other Key Indicators randomly. The last option (100-99/95) where the high group has either no violations or 1 violation provides a nice balance with the number of Key Indicators generated. This option gets closer to the 10% ratio of Key Indicators to the full set of rules.

Based upon the results from Table 1, a recommendation could be made to use those Key Indicators that appear the most often in the four options. That would appear to be the best balanced approach. However, one must look at the licensing law to make certain that even this approach is a valid policy to pursue. For example, if the licensing law requires 100% full compliance with all rules, then this approach may not be the best policy decision. Selecting one of the 100% full compliance frameworks may be the better choice. However, if the state has discretion in issuing licenses on the basis of substantial but not full compliance than any of the frameworks will be ok or a combination of any of the four would also be a good policy decision.

Submitted by:  
Richard Fiene, Ph.D.  
Research Institute for Key Indicators (RIKI LLC)  
[RIKI.Institute@gmail.com](mailto:RIKI.Institute@gmail.com)  
<http://RIKInstitute.wikispaces.com>