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Methods for Achieving Quality Child Care

GOALS

NONREGULATORY METHODS
- Public Education
- Training of Caregivers & Directors
- Association Membership
- Newsletters., Journals & Books
- Resource & Referral Centers

REGULATORY METHODS
- Accreditation/CFOC
  - Credentialing
- Rate Setting
  - Fiscal Regulation
- Quality Rating & Improvement Systems
- Stepping Stones
- Environmental Health
- Licensing or Registration
- Building & Fire Safety

Base line or floor of quality below which no service may legally operate

Exempt Programs

Illegal Unlicensed Operations

Criminal Sanctions

Abuse & Neglectful Care

Revised from YOUNG CHILDREN Vol. 34 No. 6 Sept. 1979, pp. 22-27
Gwen G Morgan and updated by Rick Fiene, Dec 2012.
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)
Zellman & Fiene Validation Framework (2012)

• First Approach (Standards)
  – CI x *Caring for Our Children/Stepping Stones/13 Key Indicators of Quality Child Care*

• Second Approach (Measures)
  – CI x RA + KI x DM

• Third Approach (Outputs)
  – PQ x CI

• Fourth Approach (Outcomes)
  – CO = PD + PQ + CI + RA + KI
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State Example: Georgia
Current Use of Validation Methodology

• Commissioned study to examine validity of licensing compliance determination.
  – All licensed child care centers and family child care homes are given an annual compliance determination.
  – Compliance determination is used for eligibility purposes in many of the state’s early care and education initiatives.

• Zellman and Fiene’s methodology is used to guide Georgia’s Quality Rated validation model.

• All validation activities are paired with interrater reliability activities.
Current Compliance Determination System

• Compliance determination is based on “core rules.”
  – Subset of licensing rules that are “theoretical” determinants
  – Observed multiple times during the year
  – When a core rule is cited, a severity level (low, medium, high, extreme) is assigned
Current Compliance Determination System

• A program compliance status is computed by counting the number of core rule categories cited and weighting the level of risk.
  – An annual compliance determination worksheet is used to compute a program’s compliance status.
  – The formula is complex and not always easy to communicate.
  – All programs receive their compliance determination on July 1 and the determination remains in effect for the next fiscal year.
• In FY13, approximately 8% of programs were determined to be non-compliant.
Compliance Determination

Validity Study

• Examined a subset of programs’ licensing history data for a four-year period.

• Extracted key indicators from licensing history data. Correlated to Georgia Core Rules and to program quality data.
  – From 2007-2009, Georgia commissioned an independent study to measure quality among a representative statewide sample.
  – This data was correlated with the licensing data for validity study.
Specific Research Questions

• Do the core rules for child care centers and family child care homes serve as overall key indicators of compliance?

• Does the annual compliance determination worksheet appropriately designate programs as compliant or non-compliant related to health and safety?

• Are the core rules for child care centers and family child care homes related to program quality?
Research Questions
Not Addressed in Study

• Does “compliance” truly indicate the overall health and safety of programs?
  – Since most programs are “compliant,” data set is skewed.
  – Need a large sample of programs with injury/fatality data. This requires many years of longitudinal licensing data.

• Should core rules or core rule categories be used in determining compliance?
  – Study did not test out different models of compliance determination.

• How should multiple visits be computed in a compliance determination system?
## Key Indicator Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Providers In Compliance on Rule</th>
<th>Programs Out of Compliance on Rule</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td><strong>Z</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>W</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[A = \text{High Group} + \text{Programs in Compliance on Specific Rule.}\]
\[B = \text{High Group} + \text{Programs out of Compliance on Specific Rule.}\]
\[C = \text{Low Group} + \text{Programs in Compliance on Specific Rule.}\]
\[D = \text{Low Group} + \text{Programs out of Compliance on Specific Rule.}\]
\[W = \text{Total Number of Programs in Compliance on Specific Rule.}\]
\[X = \text{Total Number of Programs out of Compliance on Specific Rule.}\]
\[Y = \text{Total Number of Programs in High Group.}\]
\[Z = \text{Total Number of Programs in Low Group.}\]

**High Group** = Top 25% of Programs in Compliance with all Rules.

**Low Group** = Bottom 25% of Programs in Compliance with all Rules.
General Conclusions of Compliance Validity Study

• “Statistical” key indicators correlate with “theoretical” core rules.
• “Statistical” key indicators correlate with compliance determination.
• Some correlations were found with quality data. Like much good research, this raised as many questions as answers.
Recommendations

• Use key indicators with core rules.
  – “Using both risk assessment and key indicator rules together is an ideal differential monitoring approach. Most states use one or the other but generally not together.” (Fiene, 2014, p. 10)

• Simplify the annual compliance determination worksheet.

• Utilize recent quality data for family child care homes to re-analyze the relationship between compliance and quality.
Next Steps

• Review core rules.
• Review compliance determination formula.
• Continue interrater reliability.
• Streamline compliance determination validity with Quality Rated validity.
  – Is “compliance” an appropriate entry point?
  – Combine licensing data with portfolio and observation data from Quality Rated.
  – Connect both compliance and Quality Rated data with Pre-K data.
Questions, Reflections, Comments?
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Bentley Ponder, Ph.D.
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Bentley.Ponder@decal.ga.gov

-or-

Richard Fiene, Ph.D.
Research Institute for Key Indicators LLC (RIKI)
DrFiene@gmail.com
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