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All Licensing Rules – Full Compliance Reviews

Differential Monitoring

How Often to Visit?  What is Reviewed?

Frequency

More Often  Less Often

Abbreviated Tool

Risk Assessment Weights  Key Indicators Predictors
DIFFERENTIAL MONITORING LOGIC MODEL & ALGORITHM (DMLMA©) (Fiene, 2014): A 4th Generation ECPQIM – Early Childhood Program Quality Indicator Model

CI x PQ(PD) => RA + KI => DM => CO

Definitions of Key Elements:

CI = Comprehensive Licensing Tool (Health and Safety) *(Caring for Our Children)* (Structural Quality)
PQ = Program Quality Initiatives *(ECERS-R, FDCRS-R, CLASS, CDPEs, QRIS, Accreditation)* (Process Quality)
PD = Program Quality Initiatives (cont) - Professional Development/Technical Assistance/Training
RA = Risk Assessment, (High Risk Rules/Standards) *(Stepping Stones)*
KI = Key Indicators (Predictor Rules/Standards) *(13 Key Indicators of Quality Child Care)*
DM = Differential Monitoring, (How often to visit and what to review)
CO = Child Outcomes (Developmental, Health, & Safety Outcomes)
Program Compliance (PC)
- Full Licensing Visit
- Comprehensive Instrument (CI)
- Health & Safety
- Structural Quality
  - Eg: Caring for Our Children (CFOC)

Program Quality (PQ) Initiatives:
- Quality Rating & Improvement (QRIS)
- Professional Development (PD)
- Early Learning System (ELS)
- Process Quality
  - Eg: CLASS/ERS’s (ECERS, FDCRS)

Key Indicators (KI) – Abbreviated Visit
- Statistical predictor rules/standards that predict overall compliance with rules or standards.
  - Eg: 13 Indicators of Quality Child Care

Risk Assessment (RA) – Abbreviated Visit
- Weighting of Rules or Standards
- Places children at greatest risk of mortality or morbidity if non-compliance found.
  - Eg: Stepping Stones to CFOC

Differential Monitoring (DM): How often to visit – More or Less? And what is reviewed – More or Less? Time saved on the compliant programs can be used with the non-compliant programs. This should create a more cost effective and efficient program monitoring system with targeted reviews which should ultimately lead to better outcomes (CO) for the children and their families served in the programs.
## Differential Monitoring Scoring Protocol (DMSP)©

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Systems Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No systems in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>KI or RA in place and not linked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(KI &amp; RA in place but not linked) or (PC + PQ are linked).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(KI &amp; RA in place) &amp; (KI + RA are linked).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(KI &amp; RA in place but not linked) &amp; ((PC + PQ) are linked).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>All systems in place and linked.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differential Monitoring Scoring Protocol (DMSP)©
Point Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Systems Present and Point Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No systems in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(KI (1)) &amp; (KI -&gt; DM (1)) or ((RA (1)) &amp; (RA -&gt; DM (1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(PC + PQ (4)) or (KI (1) &amp; (KI -&gt; DM (1)) &amp; (RA (1) &amp; (RA -&gt; DM (1)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(KI + RA -&gt; DM (4)) &amp; (KI (1)) &amp; (RA (1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(KI (2) &amp; RA (2)) &amp; (PC + PQ (4)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(KI + RA -&gt; DM (4)) &amp; (KI (1)) &amp; (RA (1)) &amp; (PC + PQ (4))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KI (Key Indicators); RA (Risk Assessment); PC (Program Compliance/Licensing); PQ (Program Quality Initiatives; DM (Differential Monitoring).
10 POINTS
ALL SYSTEMS IN PLACE AND LINKED.
Example
HEAD START

8 POINTS
KI & RA IN PLACE BUT NOT LINKED; AND PC & PQ LINKED.
Example
Georgia

6 POINTS
KI & RA IN PLACE & LINKED.
Examples
Illinois
New York

4 POINTS
KI & RA IN PLACE BUT NOT LINKED OR PC & PQ LINKED.
Example
None

2 POINTS
KI OR RA IN PLACE.
Examples
Colorado
Kansas

0 POINTS
NO SYSTEMS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYSTEMS (pts)</th>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>NY</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>IL</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>CO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KI (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI + RA -&gt; DM (4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI + RA (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC + PQ (4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI -&gt; DM (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA -&gt; DM (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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