

Quality Progress Report (QPR) For Virginia FFY 2019

1) Overview

To gain an understanding of the availability of child care in the State/Territory please provide the following information on the total number of child care providers. Please enter N/A when necessary.

1.1 State or Territory Child Care Provider Population

Enter the total number of child care providers that operated in the State/Territory as of September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. These counts should include all child care providers, not just those serving children receiving CCDF subsidies. Please enter N/A when necessary.

a. Licensed family child care # 1452

N/A

Describe:

b. Legally exempt family child care (care in providers' home) # 1000

N/A

Describe:

c. Licensed center-based programs # 2616

N/A

Describe:

d. Legally exempt center-based programs # 877

N/A

Describe:

e. In-home (care in the child's own home) # 0

N/A

Describe:

The State does not monitor, regulate, or collect information on In-home child care.

f. Other (explain)

1.2 Goals for Quality Improvement

Based on Question 7.1.1 from the FFY2016-2018 CCDF State Plan for the FFY2018 QPR and Question 7.1.2 from the FFY2019-2021 CCDF State Plan for FFY2019-2021 QPRs, please report your progress on the State or Territory's overarching goals for quality improvement during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. 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.

Increase the number and percent of children in licensed care:

A. Virginia has increased the number of licensed family child care from 1434 in FFY 2018 to 1452 in FFY 2019

B. Virginia has increased the number of legally exempt family child care from 947 in FFY 2018 to 1000 in FFY 2019

C. Virginia has increased the number of legally exempt center-based programs from 877 in FFY 2018 to 966 in FFY 2019

Increase the number and percent of children in quality rated care: The number of children in Virginia Quality (VA's QRIS) quality rated programs continue to increase from 47,029 in FFY 2018 to 51,749 in FFY 2019. This is an increase of 4,720 children, 10% increase.

Increasing the number of CCDF providers that participate in the QRIS: The number of providers in Virginia Quality increased from 1127 in FFY 2018 to 1268 in FFY 2019. That is an increase of 12.5%.

Increasing the number of QRIS providers at Levels 3, 4, and 5:

Level 3: Curriculum and Assessment. This standard measures how programs intentionally promote children's learning and development. Level 3 providers increased from 497 in FFY 2018 to 562 in FFY 2019. An increase of 65 Level 3 providers.

Level 4 and Level 5 are the highest two levels: Based on observation they measure environment and interactions. Environment measures the types of materials available to the children and the types of activities they are involved in throughout the day. Interactions measure if children experience high quality interactions with teachers and peers. Level 4 providers increased from 97 in FFY 2018 to 122 in FFY 2019; an increase of 25 Level 4 providers. Level 5 providers increased from 38 in FFY 2018 to 55 in FFY 2019; an increase of 17 Level 5 providers.

James Madison University-Child Care Provider Shared Training Education and Professional Services - In FFY 2018 there was no data for evaluation for JMU/S.T.E.P.S. Project. For FFY 2019 the project has had a 62% increase in Family Day Home participants. The project recruited 28 Family Day Home providers to participate in the program. There are 15 FDH providers in the Western Region, 10 FDH providers in the Piedmont Region, and 3 FDH providers in the Eastern Region. The goal is to expand the availability of quality child care for

infants and toddlers, children with disabilities, and children in need of non-traditional hours. The Virginia Early Childhood Foundation - Facilitated the School Readiness Committee (State Advisory Committee) in work to address the development and alignment of an effective professional development and credentialing system for the early childhood education workforce in the Commonwealth, including:

- A. Development of a universal associate degree program that leads directly into baccalaureate degree programs at participating universities. This new pathway leads to teacher licensure with a focus on the entire continuum of early childhood from birth through age 8.
- B. Continued facilitation of the higher education workgroup to align and evaluate existing and new programs at the associate and baccalaureate levels.
- C. Undertaking a study to examine the impact of higher education coursework on early educator practice.

Virginia Early Childhood Foundation, through the Federal Preschool Development Grant B - 5, has undertaken the coordination of CLASS classroom observations and to provide teacher feedback and targeted professional development in partnership with leadership of 10 pilot communities. (approximately 2,700 teachers).

2) Supporting the training and professional development of the child care workforce

Goal: Ensure the State/Territory's professional development systems or framework provides initial and ongoing professional development and education that result in a diverse and stable child care workforce with the competencies and skills to support all domains of child development. Please select N/A when necessary.

2.1 State/Territory Progression of Professional Development

2.1.1 Did the State/Territory use a workforce registry or professional development registry to track progression of professional development during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

Yes.

If yes, describe:

No.

If no, what alternative does the State/Territory use to track the progression of professional development for teachers/providers serving CCDF eligible children?

Describe:

A professional development registry has been under development and during the reporting period was not utilized to track teacher's progression of professional

development. Phase 1 user acceptance testing was completed September 30, 2019. To date, practitioners can create a professional profile that encompasses self-reported employment, compensation, training, and educational credentials. Practitioners can request that supporting documentation be reviewed to determine a Career Pathway level designation. However, a state level process is not currently in place to track professional development progression.

2.1.2 Are any teachers/providers required to participate?

Yes.

If yes, describe:

Virginia Preschool InitiativePlus teachers were required to enroll from October 1, 2018 through July 31, 2019 when the grant funded program ended.

No.

If no, describe:

2.1.3 How many people were in the registry as of September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? # 437

2.2 What supports did the State/Territory make available to teachers/providers to help them progress in their education and professional pathway between October 1 and September 30 of the last federal fiscal year (check all that apply)? If available, how many people received each type of support?

Scholarships (for formal education institutions)

2253

Financial bonus/wage supplements tied to education levels

29

Career advisors, Mentors, Coaches, or Consultants

12856

Reimbursement for training

26

Loans

0

Other.

Describe:

Incentives were given to 124 providers for progress on obtaining an endorsement,

credential, or certificate. Scholarships were given to 78 providers to attend a statewide conference.

N/A

Describe:

2.3 Did the State/Territory have other initiatives available to support professional development and the workforce during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? (e.g. Substitutes, sick/annual leave, release time, etc.)

Yes.

If yes, describe:

Through the PDG B5, teachers and leaders in 10 pilots and 27 jurisdictions were provided training on Classroom Assessment Scoring System for the purpose of building understanding of the tool and the importance of interactions. Training and support were provided to raters to achieve reliability on the tool across Infant, Toddler, and PreK platforms. Pilots were able to use funds to support additional professional development depending upon community need. Additionally, eligible teachers at PDG B5 registered sites were awarded a stipend as part of a Randomized Control Trial conducted by the University of Virginia's EdPolicy Works center and will participate in workforce surveys to track the impact of the stipend.

No.

For the questions 2.4 to 2.9 please report on the number of staff by qualification level as of September 30th of the last federal fiscal year. Count only the highest level attained by staff.

2.4 Licensed child care center director

a) How many had a Child Development Associate (CDA)?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

b) How many had an Associate's degree in an early childhood education?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data

#:

%:

c) How many had a Bachelor's degree in an early childhood education?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

d) How many had a State child care credential?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

f) How many had an "other" degree in a field related to early childhood education or coursework equivalent to a major relating to early childhood education with experience teaching appropriate age group?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

2.5 Licensed child care center teachers

a) How many had a Child Development Associate (CDA)?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

b) How many had an Associate's degree in an early childhood education?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

c) How many had a Bachelor's degree in an early childhood education?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

d) How many had a State child care credential?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:
%:

e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?

[checked] Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:
%:

f) How many had an "other" degree in a field related to early childhood education or coursework equivalent to a major relating to early childhood education with experience teaching appropriate age group?

[checked] Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:
%:

2.6 Licensed family child care providers

a) How many had a Child Development Associate (CDA)?

[checked] Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:
%:

b) How many had an Associate's degree in an early childhood education?

[checked] Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:
%:

c) How many had a Bachelor's degree in an early childhood education?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

d) How many had a State child care credential?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

f) How many had an "other" degree in a field related to early childhood education or coursework equivalent to a major relating to early childhood education with experience teaching appropriate age group?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

2.7 Licensed child care center directors who serve CCDF children

a) How many had a Child Development Associate (CDA)?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

b) How many had an Associate's degree in an early childhood education?

Unknown

Describe:

The state does not collect this data.

#:

%:

c) How many had a Bachelor's degree in an early childhood education?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

d) How many had a State child care credential?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

f) How many had an "other" degree in a field related to early childhood education or coursework equivalent to a major relating to early childhood education with experience teaching appropriate age group?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

2.8 Licensed child care center teachers who serve CCDF children

a) How many had a Child Development Associate (CDA)?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

b) How many had an Associate's degree in an early childhood education?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

c) How many had a Bachelor's degree in an early childhood education?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

d) How many had a State child care credential?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

f) How many had an "other" degree in a field related to early childhood education or coursework equivalent to a major relating to early childhood education with experience teaching appropriate age group?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

2.9 Licensed family child care providers who serve CCDF children

a) How many had a Child Development Associate (CDA)?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:

%:

b) How many had an Associate's degree in an early childhood education?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:
%:

c) How many had a Bachelor's degree in an early childhood education?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:
%:

d) How many had a State child care credential?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:
%:

e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:
%:

f) How many had an "other" degree in a field related to early childhood education or coursework equivalent to a major relating to early childhood education with experience teaching appropriate age group?

Unknown

Describe:

The State does not collect this data.

#:
%:

2.10 Spending

2.10.1. Did the State/Territory spend CCDF quality set aside funds to support the training and professional development of the child care workforce during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriation years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what estimated percentage of CCDF quality dollars was spent on supporting the training and professional development of the child care workforce

Yes.

If yes, %: 51

No

N/A

Describe:

The 51% is comprised of:

\$830,000 UVA CASTL

\$648,396 QRIS training and professional development

\$4,912,205 Infant Toddler Network expenditures

\$750,000 Child Care Aware/Subsidy

\$550,000 Child Care Aware Quality/Endorsements

\$625,000 Child Care Aware/Infant Toddler coursework

\$223,235 Penn State University Provider Pre-Service Training

\$50,000 Virginia Cross-sector Professional Development Train the Trainer 101

\$600,000 Virginia Child Care Provider Scholarship Program

\$75,000 Community College Workforce Alliance

\$9,264,601

2.10.2 Did the State/Territory use other non-CCDF funds to support the training and professional development of the child care workforce (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

Yes.

If yes, describe:

897,050 - Project Pathfinder Scholarships, General State Funds, \$1 million funded for SFY (7/1/18-6/30/19). \$897,050 expended during FFY 2019

1,500,000 - Mixed-Delivery Preschool Programs, State General Funds, \$1.5 million

SFY (through the Virginia Department of Education). Amount of FFY funds were not available so SFY (7/1/18-6/30/19) were used.

2,037,560 - Preschool Development Grant B - 5, Federal Funds, \$9.9 million appropriated for the state (\$7,633,085 appropriated to VECF through the VDOE). Funded amount is for the 12/28/18 - 12/30/19 period. FFY 2019 VECF expenditures are \$2,037,560

\$2,000 - Grant from United Way Rappahannock for SBRA Annual Fall Conference

\$566,318 - Support QRIS implementation - Northern Region

\$31,724 - Support QRIS implementation - Northern Region

\$8,750 - Training of Trainers, Training and Materials for PALS, ASQ and Conscious Discipline - VECF

\$55,931 - To support professional development to QRIS providers in the VQ South Western Region - United Way Southwest

Total = \$5,099,333

No

N/A

Describe:

2.10.3 Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 towards supporting the training and professional development of the child care workforce?

Yes.

If yes, describe:

The state expects to continue to spend some of the increased CCDF funding from the Consolidated Appropriations Act 2018 towards continued support of the training and professional development of the child care work force through such initiatives such as Child Care Aware of Virginia, the Virginia Child Care Provider Scholarship Program, Virginia Cross-Sector Professional Development, Penn State Child Care Provider Pre-Service Training, JMU S.T.E.P.S Program, Project Pathfinders, Mixed-Delivery systems, Community College Workforce Alliance, and all Virginia Quality activities that promote professional development of the early care workforce.

No

N/A

Describe:

2.11 Progress Update:

Describe the measures the State/Territory used to evaluate progress to improve the quality of child care programs during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year.

Include examples and numeric targets where possible.

JMU/Child Care Provider S.T.E.P.S. - JMU measured progress by tracking the number of Family Day Home providers enrolled and supported by a Specialist: During SFY October 1, 2018 through September 30, 2019 the project recruited 28 FDH providers to participate in the program. The project requires a minimum of 5 and a maximum of 15 FDH providers to be recruited for each targeted region. Currently, Regional Specialists are working with the FDH providers to strengthen business practices, offer non-traditional hours to families who need care, provide slots for infants and toddlers, and care for children with special needs. The program has also collaborated with other early childhood agencies and stakeholders to assist FDH providers in reaching goals set for building the supply of FDH providers located in targeted under-served areas. No data was available for evaluation of the program in FFY 2018. In FFY 2019 JMU/S.T.E.P.S. program has had an increase of 62% of FDH participants.

Child Care Aware of Virginia - CCAoVA measured progress by tracking the completion rates of early childhood endorsements. Educators can access coursework in child development online through a partnership with the Community College Workforce Alliance or in classroom based settings provided through the Infant Toddler Specialists Network. CCAoVA assists child care providers in earning the endorsement through review of the course work and practicum, then awarding the endorsement. During SFY October 1, 2018 through September 30, 2019 CCAoVA awarded 127 Infant/Toddler endorsements, 3 Preschool endorsements, and 11 School Age endorsements.

Virginia Quality measured progress in the following ways:

A. The number of TA assignments made through the Virginia Quality Access online system.

The system tracked the number of TA assignments made in response to the number of online requests. In FFY 2019 there were 1094 TA assignments made to assist providers working on Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) goals related to Virginia Quality Standards.

B. The VA Quality Hub offered 8 TA Webinars in FFY 2019 for the TA Specialists and Raters. The webinars offered and successfully completed were Curriculum Specialist Refresher, ERS/CLASS Specialist Refresher, a 2 part Curriculum Validation Training, Curriculum Specialist Spring Refresher, CLASS Specialist Refresher, Overview of the New Website Features for Coordinators, TA Fall Refresher, and VA Quality Annual Rater Refresher. All webinars were recorded and successful completion tracked.

Higher level indicators include such items as:

Percent of early care and education programs that participate in Virginia's voluntary child care and early education quality rating and improvement system. 22% participated as of June 2018 with 27% participation rate as of June 2019. (Data extracted from VA Quality system based on the state fiscal year.)

The Infant Toddler Specialist Network measured progress in the following ways:

A. The average percentage increase of participants' knowledge of the Infant Toddler Specialist training topic for FFY 2019 was 17.9%. The average percentage increase of participants' knowledge of the Infant Toddler Mental Health Consultant training topic for FFY 2019 was 11%.

B. 27 providers successfully passed the classroom based Infant and Toddler Endorsement courses during FFY 2019. This number may reflect duplication as some providers participate in more than one course.

C. The average overall evaluation score for trainings conducted by Infant Toddler Specialist was a 4.95 out of a possible score of 5.

D. The average overall evaluation score for trainings provided by Infant Toddler Mental Health Consultants was 4.87 out of a possible score of 5.

3) Improving early learning and development guidelines

Goal: To ensure the State/Territory has research-based early learning and development

guidelines appropriate for children birth to age 12, including children with special needs and dual language learners that are used to inform practice, professional development, and families.

3.1. Describe any changes or updates to the State or Territory's early learning and development guidelines during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year

The State did not make any changes or updates to early learning and developmental guidelines during the last federal fiscal year.

3.2 Spending

3.2.1. Did the State/Territory spend CCDF quality set aside funds during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year on the development or implementation of early learning and development guidelines? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriation years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what was the percentage of CCDF quality dollars spent on the development or implementation of early learning and development guidelines?

Yes.

If yes, %:

No

N/A

Describe:

The State did not make any changes or upgrades to early learning and development guidelines in the last federal fiscal year.

3.2.2. Did the State/Territory use other non-CCDF funds to develop or implement early learning and development guidelines (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

Yes.

If yes, describe:

No

N/A

Describe:

3.2.3. Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 on developing or implementing early learning and development guidelines

Yes.

If yes, describe:

No

N/A

Describe:

3.3 Progress Update:

Describe the measures used and progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.

N/A

4) Developing, implementing, or enhancing a quality rating improvement system (QRIS) and other transparent system of quality indicator

Goal: To ensure the State/Territory implements a quality rating and improvement system, or other quality rating system, to promote high-quality early care and education programs.

Please provide your State/Territory's definition of high quality care, and how it relates to the tiers of your QRIS (if applicable). *This may include the State/Territory's RTT-ELC definition of high quality or high quality definition as part of the State/Territory's Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS). If no QRIS exists describe other measures used to assess quality (may include assessment scores, accreditation, or other metric):*

4.1 Did the status of your State/Territory quality rating and improvement system (QRIS) change during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

Yes, the State/Territory QRIS is now operating
State/Territory-wide

- Yes, the State/Territory QRIS is now operating as a pilot, in a few localities, or only a few levels
- Yes, the State/Territory is now operating another system of quality improvement.

Describe:

- Yes, the State/Territory no longer has a QRIS.
- No, the status of the State/Territory QRIS has not changed as of September 30th of the last federal fiscal year.

4.2 Did the types of providers included in the State/Territory QRIS change during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, check which types of providers were added or removed (check all that apply):

- Yes
 - Added licensed family child care
 - Removed licensed family child care
 - Added legally exempt family child care (care in providers' home)
 - Removed legally exempt family child care (care in providers' home)
 - Added licensed center-based programs
 - Removed licensed center-based programs
 - Added legally exempt center-based programs
 - Removed legally exempt center-based programs
 - Added in-home (care in the child's own home)
 - Removed in-home (care in the child's own home)
 - Other.

Describe:

- No

4.3 Is participation in the State/Territory QRIS mandatory for any group of providers?

- Yes

Describe;

Some funding sources required participation in the state QRIS, which is voluntary. The VPI Plus Program grantees were required to participate until July 31, 2019 at which time the grant funded programs ended. Head Start phased in a requirement for

participation in the state QRIS with an initial compliance date of September 2018 however, that compliance date has been extended.

No

N/A

Describe;

4.4 Enter the number of programs that met the State's high quality definition as of September 30 the last fiscal year:

- a) Licensed family child care # 1
- b) Legally exempt family child care (care in providers' home) # 0
- c) Licensed center-based programs # 54
- d) Legally exempt center-based programs # 122
- e) In-home (care in the child's own home) # 0

N/A

Describe:

During FFY 2018, Level 3 was included in the count for high quality programs. In FFY 2019, Level 3 was redefined as good quality while high quality was further clarified to include only Levels 4 and 5, which are measured by on-site observation of environment and interactions. As noted in Section 1; the number of Level 3 providers in FFY 2019 was 562

4.5 Enter the number of CCDF children in high quality care by age grouping as of September 30 of the last federal fiscal year:

- a) Birth to 35 months # 1059
- b) 3 years up to kindergarten entry # 4876
- c) School Aged (post kindergarten entry) # 0
- d) Other. Describe:

Virginia Quality focuses on childcare and early learning providers serving children birth through PreK, and does not include School Age children in it's quality measurements. Note in FFY 2018 this count included all children served in Levels 3, 4, and 5. In FFY 2019 only children served in Levels 4 and 5 are included.

N/A

Describe:

4.6 Provide the percentage of CCDF children in high quality care by age grouping as of September 30 of the last federal fiscal year:

- a) Birth to 35 months % 7
- b) 3 years up to kindergarten entry % 15
- c) School Aged (post kindergarten entry) % 0
- d) Other. Describe:

Virginia Quality focuses on childcare and early learning providers serving children birth through PreK, and does not include School Age children in its quality measurements.

Note in FFY 2018 this count included all children served in Levels 3, 4, and 5. In FFY 2019 only children served in Levels 4 and 5 are included.

N/A

Describe:

4.7 Provide the number of programs that participated in the State/Territory's QRIS in the last fiscal year.

4.7.1 What is the total number of *eligible* child care settings for QRIS or other transparent system of quality indicators?

i. Licensed Child Care Centers:

2108

N/A

Describe:

License-Exempt Providers:

Department of Education Virginia Preschool Initiative =631

Religious Exempt CDC and Subsidy Vendor = 130

Voluntary Registered FDH and Subsidy Vendor = 94

Department of Defense = 3

Total 858 License-Exempt Providers

Eligible universe of child care settings is based on a point in time report from the VDSS licensing data base run August 29, 2018 for licensed child care centers,

licensed family child care homes, and license-exempt providers regulated by licensing who are also subsidy vendors. License-exempt Department of Education (DOE) VPI count is from the DOE VPI report as of the Actual Fiscal Year, 2018. The Department of Defense (DoD) category is the total number of DoD operated facilities enrolled in the QRIS and included in the monthly program count. The DoD Child Development Programs system has its own quality support structure and most do not pursue enrollment in Virginia Quality.

ii. Licensed Family Child Care Homes:

1507

N/A

Describe:

License-Exempt Providers:

Department of Education Virginia Preschool Initiative =631

Religious Exempt CDC and Subsidy Vendor = 130

Voluntary Registered FDH and Subsidy Vendor = 94

Department of Defense = 3

Total 858 License-Exempt Providers

Eligible universe of child care settings is based on a point in time report from the VDSS licensing data base run August 29, 2018 for licensed child care centers, licensed family child care homes, and license-exempt providers regulated by licensing who are also subsidy vendors. License-exempt Department of Education (DOE) VPI count is from the DOE VPI report as of the Actual Fiscal Year, 2018. The Department of Defense (DoD) category is the total number of DoD operated facilities enrolled in the QRIS and included in the monthly program count. The DoD Child Development Programs system has its own quality support structure and most do not pursue enrollment in Virginia Quality.

iii. License-Exempt Providers:

858

N/A

Describe:

License-Exempt Providers: Department of Education Virginia Preschool Initiative = 631

Religious Exempt CDC and Subsidy Vendor = 130

Voluntary Registered FDH and Subsidy Vendor = 94

Department of Defense = 3

Total 858 License-Exempt Providers

Eligible universe of child care settings is based on a point in time report from the VDSS licensing data base run August 29, 2018 for licensed child care centers, licensed family child care homes, and license-exempt providers regulated by licensing who are also subsidy vendors. License-exempt Department of Education (DOE) VPI count is from the DOE VPI report as of the Actual Fiscal Year, 2018. The Department of Defense (DoD) category is the total number of DoD operated facilities enrolled in the QRIS and included in the monthly program count. The DoD Child Development Programs system has its own quality support structure and most do not pursue enrollment in Virginia Quality.

4.7.2 Of the total number eligible, what is the total number and percentage of child care settings in the State/Territory that participated in the QRIS or other transparent system of quality indicators?

i. Licensed Child Care Centers:

N/A

Describe:

Percentage calculation is the total number of participants in QRIS divided by the total number of eligible participants for each category of the eligible universe.

$642 / 2108 = 30\%$

642

% 30

642

% 30

ii. Licensed Family Child Care Homes:

N/A

Describe:

Percentage calculation is the total number of participants in QRIS divided by the total number of eligible participants for each category of the eligible universe.

Total Family Child Care Homes in QRIS = 219

$219 / 1507 = 15\%$ (rounded up from 0.145).

219

% 15

219

% 15

iii. License-Exempt Providers:

N/A

Describe:

Percentage calculation is the total number of participants in QRIS divided by the total number of eligible participants for each category of the eligible universe.

License-Exempt Providers: Department of Education Virginia Preschool Initiative = 359 Religious Exempt CDC and Subsidy Vendor = 34 Voluntary Registered FDH and Subsidy Vendor = 3 Department of Defense = 11

Total license-exempt providers in QRIS = 407

$407 / 858 = 47\%$

407

% 47

4.8 Did the State/Territory provide one-time grants, awards or bonuses connected to (or related to) QRIS during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, how many were provided to the following types of programs during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

Yes

- a) Licensed center-based programs: # 100
- b) Licensed Family Child Care Homes: # 35
- c) Legally exempt care in providers home: # 0
- d) Legally exempt center-based programs: # 1
- e) In-home (care in the child's own home): # 0

No

N/A

Describe:

4.9 Did the State/Territory provide on-going or periodic quality stipends connected to (or related to) QRIS during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, how many programs received on-going or periodic quality stipends connected to (or related to) QRIS during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

Yes

- a) Licensed center-based programs: # 8
- b) Licensed Family Child Care Homes: # 0
- c) Legally exempt care in providers home: # 0
- d) Legally exempt center-based programs: # 6
- e) In-home (care in the child's own home): # 0

No

N/A

Describe:

4.10 Did the State/Territory provide ongoing technical assistance related to the QRIS or other quality rating system during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If so, how many programs received ongoing technical assistance during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

Yes

- a) Licensed center-based programs: # 561
- b) Licensed Family Child Care Homes: # 90
- c) Legally exempt care in providers home: # 0
- d) Legally exempt center-based programs: # 23
- e) In-home (care in the child's own home): # 0

No

N/A

Describe:

4.11 Did the State/Territory provide higher subsidy rates related to the QRIS or other quality rating system during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If so, how many programs received higher subsidy payment rates due to their QRIS rating during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

Yes

- a) Licensed center-based programs: #
- b) Licensed Family Child Care Homes: #
- c) Legally exempt care in providers home: #
- d) Legally exempt center-based programs: #
- e) In-home (care in the child's own home): #

No

N/A

Describe:

4.12 Spending

4.12.1 Did the State or Territory use CCDF quality set aside funds to support QRIS or other quality rating system during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriation years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what estimated percentage of CCDF quality dollars was spent supporting QRIS or other quality related improvements?

Yes.

If yes, %: 15

No

N/A

Describe:

4.12.2 Did the State or Territory use other non-CCDF funds to support QRIS or other quality rating system (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

Yes.

If yes, %:

\$566,318 to support QRIS implementation of early learning and development guidelines for Virginia Quality Northern Region salaries and benefits of early childhood professionals - VECF

\$31,724 to support QRIS implementation of early learning and development guidelines for Virginia Quality Northern Region salaries and benefits of early childhood professionals - Northern QRIS

\$39,741 to support QRIS implementation of early learning and development guidelines of early childhood professionals through PDG B5 Virginia Quality Northern Region

\$116,147 to support QRIS implementation of early learning and development guidelines for Virginia Quality Northern Region from the State Mixed-Delivery Grant

Total = \$753,930 = 4%

No

N/A

Describe:

4.12.3. Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 to support QRIS or other quality rating systems?

Yes.

If yes, describe :

No

N/A

Describe:

4.13 Progress Update:

Describe the measures used and progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.

QRIS Standards for Child Care and Preschool Programs are used to measure progress in improving the quality of care at programs participating in the State quality rating and improvement system. The quality standards are:

1. Basic Health and Safety - Compliance with regulating authority Level 1 - eligibility (Quality improvement measures begin with Level 2)
2. Education and Qualifications (assessed by documentation) Level 2
3. Curriculum and Assessment (assessed by documentation and observation) Level 3
4. Learning Environment and Interactions (assessed by observation) Level 4 and Level 5

Link to VA Quality Standards: VA Quality standards summary documents

http://www.virginiaquality.com/sites/default/files/VA_Quality_Standards_0.pdf

Between October 1, 2017 and September 30, 2019 QRIS tracked the number of programs in each level and considered the increase or decrease in the number and/or percentage of programs at each level. Many programs progressed upward, as illustrated by the summary data below. In addition to the overall increase in the number of programs participating (many of which came in at Level 1), there are significant increases in the numbers of programs in the higher levels of QRIS

QRIS Data

10/01/2017 Level 1 = 38, Level 2 = 65, Level 3 = 423, Level 4 = 40, Level 5 = 7 Total = 573

09/30/2018 Level 1 = 347, Level 2 = 148, Level 3 = 497, Level 4 = 97, Level 5 = 38 Total = 1127

09/30/2019 Level 1 = 329, Level 2 = 200, Level 3* = 562, Level 4 = 122, Level 5 = 55 Total = 1268

*508 current Level 3's are Fast Track programs. The Fast Track option allows programs already demonstrating quality in education /qualifications and curriculum to enter VA Quality at Level 3.

Additional QRIS measurable indicators referenced in CCDF 2019-2021 State Plan:

The percentage of early care and education (ECE) programs that are participating in QRIS

out of the eligible universe: FFY 2019 - 28% of the eligible universe participated in QRIS.

Progress of participating programs maintained and/or moved up levels during a 12 month period and at annual ratings: FFY 2019 - Number of sites moving up at least one level since launch: 399 (34%); Number of sites moving up two levels since launch: 99 (8%)

Increase in Environmental Rating Scale and Classroomroom Assessment Scoring System average scores upon renewal ratings: N/A - Since ERS/CLASS scores are good for 3 years. In FFY 2019 no renewals were due. Renewals are due in FFY 2020.

Post training evaluations via surveys: 16 Modules from the Virginia Quality Online Professional Development Series were available this year on the Learn Point website. <http://viriniaquality.learnpointlms.com> Modules continue to be shared with several ECE partners, such as ITSN, Community Colleges, and Smart Beginnings. At the end of the SFY 4th quarter, there were 1,562 user accounts in the VA Quality system. 15,004 modules were completed. The most viewed modules this year were: Building Cultural Competence, Play Based Learning, High Quality Interactions, and Intentional Teaching. Three new modules were completed this year; one on Social Emotional Development and two on cognition and General Knowledge. As of July 31, 2019 86% (160/186) of survey respondents rated the module content as very helpful/extremely helpful. Full Year Module Survey results can be found at: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-SFPJPJJY7>

5) Improving the supply and quality of child care programs for infants and toddlers

Goal: Ensure adequate and stable supply of high quality child care with a qualified, skilled workforce to promote the healthy development of infants and toddlers. Please report on all activities funded by quality dollars and infant toddler set-aside.

5.1. Provide the total number of State funded Infant Toddler Specialists available to providers during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year.

- a) Number of Specialists available to all providers # 21
- b) Number of Specialists available to providers serving CCDF children # 21
- c) Number of infant toddler specialists available specifically trained to support FCC providers # 21
- d) Number of providers served # 418
- e) Total number of children reached # 6818

N/A

Describe:

Total number of children reached = 4107 through Infant and Toddler Specialist and 2711 through Infant Toddler Mental Health Consultants = 6818

5.2. Provide the number of professionals receiving any State- funded on-site coaching in infant and toddler practice during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year.

- a) Number of licensed center-based teachers # 809
- b) Number of licensed family child care providers # 233
- c) Number of license-exempt providers of care in their home # 48
- d) Number of center directors # 188

N/A

Describe:

5.3. Of the number of professionals listed in question 5.2, what percentage served CCDF children during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

- a) Number of licensed center-based teachers # 25
- b) Number of licensed family child care providers # 75
- c) Number of license-exempt providers of care in their home # 100
- d) Number of center directors # 45

N/A

Describe:

5.4. Provide the total number of State funded infant and toddler health consultants in the State or Territory during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year.

- a) Consultants available in State # 9
- b) Consultants available to providers serving CCDF children # 9

N/A

Describe:

5.5. Did the State/Territory conduct an analysis of supply and demand for infant toddler slots and to identify areas of focus to build supply during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

Yes

(please provide link)

No

N/A

Describe:

5.6. Provide the number of staffed FCC networks supported by the CCDF funds through direct agreement with a centralized hub or community-based agency during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year.

a) Number of staffed FCC networks: #

Describe what the hub provides to participating FCC providers:

N/A

Describe:

The hub does not have an agreement to staff FCC networks.

5.7 Spending

5.7.1. Did the State or Territory use CCDF quality set aside funds in addition to the 3% infant and toddler set-aside to improve the supply and quality of child care programs and services for infants and toddlers during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If so, what estimated percentage of CCDF quality dollars was spent supporting the quality and supply of infant and toddler care? The State or Territory should not include the 3% infant and toddler set-aside in the estimated percentage.

Yes.

If yes, %: 5

No

N/A

Describe:

\$320,000 - JMU/S.T.E.P.S. Coaches Family Day Home providers who are currently providing care for infants and toddlers, or who wish to begin caring for infants and toddlers. The program also assists in improving the practices of FDH providers through collaborations with agencies like ITSN, and CCAoVA

\$625,000 - CCAoVA provides technical assistance for child care providers who care for infants and toddlers, and provide statewide professional development opportunities for child care providers who care for infants and toddlers.

Total \$945,000

5.7.2. Did the State or Territory use other non-CCDF funds to improve the supply and quality of child care programs and services for infants and toddlers (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

Yes.

If yes, describe:

\$10,000 from Virginia Beach GrowSmart Foundation sponsored by Geico. Cohort Partnership to move program through VQ levels

\$372,770 Support QRIS implementation of early learning and development guidelines and the professional development of the early childhood workforce - VECF

\$20,938 Support QRIS implementation of early early learning and development guidelines and the professional development of the early childhood workforce

\$39,741 Support programs serving infants and toddlers

\$24,433 from PDG B5 for professional development and curriculum

\$108,500 from PDG B5 for site payments of childcare center stipends

\$14,000 from PDG B5 for site payments of FDH stipends

\$369,830 from PDG B5 for educator stipends

\$960,212 Total

No

N/A

Describe:

5.7.3. Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 to improve the supply and quality of child care programs and services for infants and toddlers?

Yes.

If yes, describe:

The state expects to spend \$1,300,000 of the increased CCDF funds to increase and improve the supply of providers serving infants and toddlers.

No

N/A

Describe:

The CCDBG Act of 2014 included changes targeted at improving the supply and quality of infant-toddler care. Lead Agencies are encouraged to systematically assess and improve the overall quality of care infants and toddlers receive, the systems in place or needed to support and enhance the quality of infant and toddler providers and the capacity of the infant and toddler workforce to meet the unique needs of very young children, and the methods in place to increase the proportion of infants and toddlers in higher quality care.

5.8 Progress Update:

Describe the measures used and progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.

Virginia Infant Toddler Specialist Network measures and progress include:

- A. Mean pre-ITERS-R score was 3.07 or "minimal" quality for programs completing intensive on-site coaching provided by Infant Toddler Specialist; mean post ITERS-R score was 3.95 or "minimal to good" quality, which yielded a statistically significant increase between ITERS-R pre and post scores
- B. Mean pre-FCCERS-R score was 2.83 or "minimal" quality for programs completing intensive on-site coaching provided by Infant Toddler Specialist; mean post FCCERS-R score 3.81 or "minimal to good" quality, which yielded a statistically significant increase between FCCERS-R pre and post assessments scores
- C. Pre-to-post health and safety checklist scores for programs completing intensive on-site coaching provided by Infant and Toddler Specialists increased on average of 31.5% for 42 of

- the 51 programs (religious exempt child day care centers, family day homes not licensed)
- D. Overall increase in the use of 1-2-3 READ! strategies from 2.63 to 3.60 for providers completing follow-up TA after receiving Network early literacy training (pre and post coaching as measured by the Infant/Toddler Environment Checklist)
 - E. The average percentage increase of participants' knowledge of the Infant Toddler Specialist training topic for FFY 2019 was 17.9%
 - F. The average percentage increase of participants' knowledge of the Infant Toddler Mental Health Consultant training topic for FFY 2019 was 11%
 - G. For programs completing intensive on-site coaching, 718 goals or an average of about 4 goals per program, were created with the Infant Toddler Specialist with verification that 679 (94.5%) of these goals were accomplished
 - H. For programs completing on-site coaching on social emotional topics, 142 goals, or an average of about 3 goals per program were created with the Infant Toddler Mental Health Consultants with verification that 100 (70.4%) of these goals were accomplished
 - I. The Pyramid Infant-Toddler Observation Scale assessment tool was not implemented until May 2019 and therefore minimal post assessments have been completed. For those that have been completed the mean pre-TPITOS score was 63.7% for programs completing on-site coaching on social emotional topics the mean post-TPITOS score was 82.4%
 - J. The overall evaluation score for the trainings conducted by Infant Toddler Specialists was 4.95 out of a possible 5
 - K. The overall evaluation score for trainings conducted by Infant Toddler Mental Health Consultants was 4.87 out of a possible 5
 - L. The average overall quality of on-site coaching provided by Infant Toddler Specialists was 4.95 out of a possible 5

QRIS funding to improve the supply and quality of child care programs and services for infants and toddlers was measured by tracking the number of infant and toddler children served; the number of programs serving infants and toddlers; and the percentage of QRIS infant and toddler programs in the QRIS system. In FFY 2019 there was an increase in the total number of infant and toddler children served and the total number of QRIS programs serving infants and toddlers in comparison to FFY 2018. However, the percentage of programs serving infants and toddlers out of all QRIS programs dropped by 1%. Note: FFY 2019 had an increase of 90 new programs that only served ages 3 - PreK due to requirements of some publicly funded programs to enter VA Quality (VPI, Mixed Delivery), while some of the new programs to enter VA Quality serve birth through PreK.

The number of infants and toddlers (birth through 35 months) serviced in QRIS: FFY 2018 - 13,716; FFY 2019 - 15,298, an increase of 1,582 or 11.5%

The number of QRIS programs serving infants and toddlers: FFY 2018 - 631; FFY 2019 - 697, an increase of 66 programs or 10.5%

The percentage of early care and education programs that participate in QRIS that serve infants and toddlers:

FFY 2018 - Total QRIS programs - 1127, 55.9% serving infants and toddlers

FFY 2019 - Total QRIS programs - 1268, 54.9% serving infants and toddlers

6) Establishing or expanding a statewide system of child care resource and referral services

Goal: State/Territory provides: services to involve families in the development of their children, information on a full range of child care options, and assistance to families in selecting child care that is appropriate for the family's needs and is high quality as determined by the State/Territory.

6.1. Describe how CCDF quality funds were used to establish or expand a statewide system of child care resource and referral services during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year.

Virginia did not use CCDF quality funds to establish or expand child care resource and referral services during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. However, CCDF quality funds were used to maintain the resource and referral system at a constant level.

6.2. Did the State/Territory change its use of symbols or simple icons, such as stars or levels, to communicate levels of quality for child care programs beyond what may be communicated to parents about licensing status and compliance during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

Yes

Describe:

No

N/A

Describe:

6.3 Spending

6.3.1. Did the State or Territory use CCDF quality set aside funds to establish or expand a statewide CCR&R during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriation years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what estimated percentage of CCDF quality dollars was spent to establish or expand a statewide CCR&R?

Yes.

If yes, %:

No

N/A

Describe:

6.3.2. Did the State or Territory use other non-CCDF funds to establish or expand a statewide CCR&R (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

Yes.

If yes, describe:

No

N/A

Describe:

6.3.3. Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds to establish or expand a statewide CCR&R?

Yes.

If yes, describe:

No

N/A

Describe:

6.4. Progress Update:

Describe the measures used and progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.

Specific measures include:

- A. The number of families served and related demographics
- B. The number of providers receiving assistance in becoming licensed
- C. CCAoVA provides the number of TA services provided to Levels 1, 2, and 3
- D. The number of providers receiving virtual and print publications
- E. Monthly data log assessments to ensure accuracy of provider data
- F. The number of child care providers in the National Data System Provider data base
- G. The number of Information Updates in the Work Life Provider database
- H. The number of child care providers using the Online Provider Services
- I. The results of customer follow-up surveys
- J. Four quarterly reports and one annual report submitted with 30 days of the quarter end
- K. The number of meetings attended and involvement in planning activities
- L. Successful on-site sub-recipient monitoring visits

Total number of families served - 2637

Total number of referrals - 5347

Total number of children served - 2916

Total number of trainings to include CPR/First Aid = 65; Trauma Informed Care = 29;

Emergency Preparation = 25 Total = 119

Total number of providers receiving print and virtual publications = 6200

7) Facilitating compliance with State/Territory requirements for inspection, monitoring, health and safety standards and training, and State/Territory licensing standards

Goal: To ensure child care providers maintain compliance with State/Territory licensing,

inspection, monitoring, and health and safety standards and training.

7.1. Has the State/Territory aligned health and safety standards with the following:

a) Caring for Our Children Basics

Yes.

No.

If not, describe:

Caring for Our Children was used as a reference, but standards do not totally align with licensing, inspection, monitoring, and health and safety standards training.

b) Head Start

Yes.

No.

If not, describe:

Head Start Standards were used as a reference, but standards do not totally align with licensing, inspection, monitoring, and health and safety standards training.

c) State pre-k

Yes.

No.

If not, describe:

State Pre-K Standards were not used as a reference.

7.2. Check if pre-service/ongoing (or both) training is provided to child care staff on the following:

- Licensing Standards
- Ongoing health and safety training or education
- Monitoring Protocols
- N/A

Describe:

7.3 Complaints regarding child care providers received during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year

7.3.1 How many complaints were received regarding providers during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

- a) Licensed providers # 843
- b) Licensed-exempt providers # 104

7.3.2 What was the average length of time between receiving the complaint and taking steps to respond to a complaint during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

This data is not available

7.3.3 How many complaints received an on-site follow-up inspection during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year ? # 600

7.3.4 How many of the complaints resulted in one or more substantiated violations in the program or provider site identified during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year ? # 277

7.3.5 How many child care providers had CCDF funding revoked as a result of an inspection during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? # 10

7.3.6 How many child care providers closed as a result of an inspection during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? # 6

7.3.7 Please provide any additional information regarding health and safety complaints and inspections in the State or territory during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year:

Complaint inspections are unannounced. Inspection results are posted online and in the facility.

7.4 How many child care staff, including caregivers, teachers, and directors, received coaching or TA to improve their understanding and adherence to health and safety standards (as a result of an inspection) during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

- a) Licensed child care center staff: #
- b) Licensed family child care staff: #
- c) Licensed exempt child care staff: #
- d) Licensed exempt family child care staff: #

e) N/A

Describe:

While data on the exact number of professionals in each category is not available, 15,153 inspections were conducted (licensed centers = 9,444, licensed family day

homes = 4122, exempt child care centers = 998, exempt family day homes = 589).
Technical assistance aimed at improving the provider's understanding and compliance with health and safety standards occur at every inspection.

7.5 Spending

7.5.1 Did the State or Territory spend CCDF quality set aside funds on facilitating compliance with State/Territory requirements for inspections, monitoring, health and safety standards and training, and State/Territory licensing standards during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriations years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what estimated percentage of CCDF quality dollars was spent on facilitating compliance with State/Territory requirements?

Yes.

If yes, %: 23

No

N/A

Describe:

\$223,325 utilized for Penn State University Pre-Service Training required for early childhood educators entering the workforce in subsidy programs.

\$4,223,325 Background Checks

7.5.2 Did the State or Territory use other non-CCDF funds (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) on facilitating compliance with State/Territory requirements for inspections, monitoring, health and safety standards and training, and State/Territory licensing standards during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

Yes.

If yes, describe:

No

N/A

Describe:

7.5.3. Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 facilitate compliance with State/Territory requirements for inspections, monitoring, health and safety standards and training, and State/Territory licensing standards?

Yes.

If yes, describe:

The Virginia Department of Social Services (VDSS) pays for fingerprinting fees for all individuals in child care programs that are licensed, registered, or regulated, including child care programs that are subsidy vendors. The cost of each fingerprint background check was \$57.00. If the individual was a volunteer, the cost was \$38.00. VDSS is billed for these child care fingerprint background checks from the state fingerprint vendor. This initiative relieves the child care provider of the burden of covering these costs, and helps ensure that all individuals submit fingerprint background checks. Background checks are screened by the VDSS Office of Background Investigations, and any individual who is found to have a barrier crime conviction is not eligible to work or provide service to children.

The State expects to continue to support Pre-Service Training for early childhood educators entering the workforce in programs that participate in the subsidy program.

No

N/A

Describe:

7.6 Progress Update:

Describe the measures used and progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.

1. A health and safety checklist (based on licensing's staff's observation of frequent and/or critical health and safety issues)
2. Infant/Toddler Environmental Checklist that touches health and safety (utilizing a Likert scale with 1 = almost none and 4 = numerous); verification of achievement goals
3. Survey to programs receiving on-site technical assistance
4. Satisfaction surveys after trainings

QRIS measurable indicators:

1. The percentage of early care and education (ECE) programs that are participating in QRIS
2. Increase in Environmental Rating Scale results

8) Evaluating the quality of child care programs in the State/Territory, including evaluating how programs positively impact children

Goal: State/Territory investment in effective quality improvement strategies using reliable data from evaluation and assessment

8.1. What assessment tool(s) did the State/Territory use in center based programs during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

a) To measure program quality, describe:

Virginia Quality measures structural quality through education and curriculum documentation review, with an on-site Curriculum Validation Visit. Process quality is measured with the ERS and CLASS assessment tools. The Infant Toddler Specialist Network measures program quality with ITERS-R, health and safety checklist, and Infant/Toddler Environmental Checklist.

b) To measure effective practice, describe:

Part of the QRIS Curriculum Validation Visit involves an on-site observation of Developmentally Appropriate Practice, in alignment with NAEYC's DAP guidelines. ERS and CLASS are also used to measure effective classroom practices. The Infant Toddler Specialist Network measures effective practice using TPITOS* and Infant/Toddler Environmental Checklist.

*The Teaching Pyramid Infant-Toddler Observation Scale is an assessment instrument that measures fidelity to Tier 1 Universal Practices of the Pyramid Model in infant toddler care settings. The TPITOS' three sections consist of an observational checklist, interview, and evaluation of environmental and teacher red flags. This observation tool captures a glimpse of the daily environmental and provider practices that promote or hinder social emotional development in infants and toddlers.

c) To measure age appropriate child development, describe:

Virginia Quality/QRIS does not collect any child specific information, however programs must include age-appropriate assessments within their curriculum practices as part of their Curriculum Standard measurement.

d) Other, describe:

N/A

N/A

Describe:

8.2. What assessment tool(s) did the State/Territory use to measure quality of program and effective practice in family child care programs during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

a) To measure program quality, describe:

Virginia Quality measures structural quality through education and curriculum documentation review, with an on-site Curriculum Validation Visit. Process quality is measured with the FCCERS-R and CLASS assessment tools. The Infant and Toddler Specialists Networks uses FCCERS-R, health and safety checklist, and the Infant/Toddler Environmental Checklist to measure program quality.

b) To measure effective practice, describe:

Part of the Curriculum Validation Visit involves an on-site observation of Developmentally Appropriate practices, in alignment with NAEYC's DAP guidelines. FCCERS-R and CLASS are also used to measure effective family child care home practices. Additionally the Infant Toddler Specialist Network uses TPITOS, and Infant/Toddler Environmental Checklist.

c) To measure age appropriate child development, describe:

Virginia Quality/QRIS does not collect any child specific information, however family child care homes must include age-appropriate assessments within their curriculum practices as part of the Curriculum Standard Measurement.

d) Other, describe:

N/A

N/A

Describe:

8.3 Spending

8.3.1. Did the State or Territory spend CCDF quality set aside funds on evaluating the quality of child care programs, practice, or child development during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriation years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what estimated percentage of CCDF quality dollars was spent on evaluating child care programs, practice, or child development?

Yes.

If yes, %: 1

No

N/A

Describe:

\$ 38,800 of CCDF funds was used to conduct 97 QRIS Level 4/5 on-site observations
\$11,742 Post ITERS/FCCERS assessments conducted by contractors and Infant
Toddler Specialists

\$2,772 Travel costs of Infant Toddler Specialists to conduct post ITERS/FCCERS
assessments

\$1,363 Post TPITOS assessments conducted for Network participants

Total = \$54,676

The mathematical equation for all percentages calculated is the total in the particular section/question divided by the total quality expenditures for the grant year.

8.3.2 Did the State or Territory use other non-CCDF funds development (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) to evaluate the quality of child care programs, practice, or child development during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

Yes.

If yes, describe:

Through the Preschool Development Grant Birth-through-Five (PDG B5), teachers and leaders in 10 pilots from 27 jurisdictions were provided training on CLASS, both for the purpose of building understanding of the tool and the importance of interactions as well as training raters and supporting them to achieve reliability on the tool across Infant, Toddler, and PreK forms. Pilots budgeted significant portions of their funds to train local observers to measure the quality of child care programs through the CLASS tool. By September 30, pilots claimed reimbursement for \$173,031 spent on CLASS capacity building.

The Mixed Delivery Preschool Program by Virginia Early Childhood Foundation utilized State General Fund Appropriation of \$1.5 million SFY (six \$250k grants to continue to develop and evaluate mixed-delivery preschool)

No

N/A

Describe:

8.3.3. Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 on evaluating the quality of child care programs in their state?

Yes.

If yes, describe:

No

N/A

Describe:

8.4 Progress Update:

Describe the measures used and progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.

QRIS assesses child care programs' attainment and maintenance of quality improvement standards beyond licensing/regulated compliance for basic health and safety:

A. Level 1 confirms that a program requesting to enroll is in good standing with a recognized regulatory authority and has completed QRIS Orientation

B. Level 2 (Education and Qualifications) measures include completion of required online learning modules and evidence of ECE formal education attainment.

C. Level 3 (Curriculum and Assessment) uses a curriculum checklist, CLASS/ERS self-study tools, and curriculum validation.

D. Levels 4/5 use ERS/CLASS observation average scores.

The tools have versions applicable to type of setting (Classroom Based or Family Day Home child care) and the ages of the children.

The effectiveness of QRIS is measured by:

Number of participating programs: On 10/01/2018 there were 1127 programs participating in QRIS compared to 1268 on 9/30/2019 an increase of 12.5%

Number of Programs that maintain or increase their assessed quality level over time: The website data base did not capture this level of detail by program, but did track the overall program totals by level.

The effectiveness of the Infant Toddler Specialist Network is measured by:

A. Numbers of programs participating in on-site consultations

B. Number of providers attending training

C. ITERS and FCCERS average scores

D. Health and safety checklist for unlicensed programs

E. Verification of goal attainment (from on site TA)

F. Infant/Toddler Environmental Checklist (from 1-2-3 READ! coaching)

G. Pre- and post-knowledge measures

H. Before and after pictures

I. Qualitative documentation of outcomes achieved

Virginia Infant Toddler Specialist Network measures and progress include:

A. 192 child care programs completed Network Level 1 services (32 hours on-site TA for family day homes, 40 hours for centers with 1-3 infant/toddler classrooms, 80 hours for centers with 4-6 infant/toddler classrooms, 120 hours for centers with 7 or more infant/toddler classrooms)

- B. 66 child care programs participated in Network infant toddler mental health coaching
- C. Mean pre-ITERS score was 3.07 or "minimal" quality for programs completing on-site coaching provided by Infant Toddler Specialist: mean post ITERS score was 3.95 or "minimal to good" quality
- D. Mean FCCERS score was 2.38 or "minimal" quality for program completing on-site coaching provided by Infant Toddler Specialists: mean post-FCCERS score was 3.81 or "minimal to good" quality
- E. Pre-to-post-health and safety checklist scores for programs completing on-site coaching provided by Infant Toddler Specialists increased 31.5% of 42 of the 51 programs (religious exempt child day care centers and family day homes not licensed)
- F. Overall increase in the use of 1-2-3 READ! strategies from 2.63 to 3.60 for providers completing follow-up technical assistance after receiving Network early literacy training
- G. For programs completing intensive on-site coaching, 718 goals or an average of about 4 goals per program were created with Infant Toddler Specialist verification that 679 (94.5%) of the goals were accomplished
- H. For programs completing on-site coaching on social emotional topics, 142 goals or an average of about 3 goals per program, were created with Infant Toddler Mental Health Consultants with verification that 100 (70.4%) of these goals were accomplished
- I. The average percentage increase of participants' knowledge of the Infant Toddler Specialist training topic for FFY 2019 was 17.9%
- J. The average percentage increase of participants' knowledge of the Infant Toddler Mental Health Consultant training topic for FFY 2019 was 11%
- K. 8200 participants trained by ITS (count may reflect duplication)
- L. 3978 participants trained by ITMHC (count may reflect duplication)
- M. 38 programs received TA from CDR staff (count is duplicated)
- N. 64 providers received TA from CDR staff (count is duplicated)
- O. 418 unduplicated programs received on-site Network services
- P. 1258 unduplicated providers received on-site Network services

9) Supporting providers in the voluntary pursuit of accreditation

Goal: Support child care programs and FCCs in the voluntary pursuit of accreditation by a national accrediting body with demonstrated, valid, and reliable program standards of quality

9.1. How many providers did the State or Territory support in their pursuit of accreditation during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

- a) Number of licensed center based providers #
- b) Number of licensed FCC providers #
- c) Number of center based providers that serve CCDF children #
- d) Number of FCC providers that serve CCDF children #

N/A

Describe:

The State does not fund accreditation for providers.

9.2 Spending

9.2.1 Did the State or Territory spend CCDF quality set aside funds on accreditation during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriation years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what estimated percentage of CCDF quality dollars was spent on evaluating child care programs, practice, or child development?

Yes.

If yes, %:

No

N/A

Describe:

9.2.2 Did the State or Territory use other non-CCDF funds development (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) to support accreditation during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

Yes.

If yes, describe:

No

N/A

Describe:

9.2.3. Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 to support accreditation for child care providers?

Yes.

If yes, describe:

No

N/A

Describe:

9.3 Progress Update:

Describe the measures used and progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.

N/A

10) Supporting the development or adoption of high-quality program standards related to health, mental health, nutrition, physical activity, and physical development

Goal: Assist programs to meet high-quality comprehensive program standards relating to health, mental health, nutrition, physical activity, and physical development

10.1 Quality Indicators

10.1.1 Does the State/Territory have quality improvement standards that include indicators covering the following areas beyond what is required for licensing?

Yes.

No. Skip to 10.2

10.1.2 If yes, check which indicators, the State/Territory has established.

Health, nutrition, and safety of child care settings

Physical activity and physical development in child care settings

Mental health of children

Learning environment and curriculum

- Ratios and group size
- Staff/provider qualifications and professional development
- Teacher/provider-child relationships
- Teacher/provider instructional practices
- Family partnerships and family strengthening
- Other

Describe:

10.2 Spending

10.2.1. Did the State or Territory spend CCDF quality set aside funds on supporting the development or adoption of high-quality program standards related to health, mental health, nutrition, physical activity, and physical development during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriation years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what estimated percentage of CCDF quality dollars was spent on these standards?

Yes.

If yes, %:

No

N/A

Describe:

10.2.2 Did the State or Territory use other non-CCDF funds development (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) to support the development or adoption of high-quality program standards related to health, mental health, nutrition, physical activity, and physical development during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

Yes.

If yes, describe:

No

N/A

Describe:

10.2.3 Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 to support the development or adoption of high-quality program standards?

Yes.

If yes, describe:

No

N/A

Describe:

10.3 Progress Update:

Describe the measures used and progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.

N/A

11) Other activities to improve the quality of child care services as long as outcome measures relating to improved provider preparedness, child safety, child well-being, or kindergarten-entry are possible

Goal: To improve the quality of child care programs and services related to outcomes measuring improved provider preparedness, child safety, child well-being, or kindergarten-entry

11.1 Progress Update:

Based on the State/Territory's response to Question 7.9.1 of the FFY2016-2018 CCDF Plan for FFY2018 QPR and Question 7.11 of the FFY2019-2021 CCDF Plan for FFY2019-2021 QPRs describe progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible. If the State or Territory is using measures not described in the current State Plan to evaluate please also describe:

State legislation was passed in 2019 to support implementation of the Virginia Kindergarten Readiness Program (VKRP), a statewide initiative focused on building a more comprehensive understanding of school readiness and success for children. Beginning in

August 2019, all divisions began assessing students at kindergarten entry in the readiness domains of literacy (through the Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening or PALS), mathematics (through the Early Mathematics System or EMS), and self-regulations and social skills (through the Child Behavior Ratings Scale or CBRS) with students being assessed again at the end of the kindergarten year. Reports and instructional resources are generated by the VKRP system to inform teachers, instructional leaders, and families of skill areas that need support at both the classroom level (for teachers and instructional leaders) and individual student levels. By December 2020 Virginia will have a comprehensive set of data to reveal Virginia's current kindergarten-entry preparedness.

11.2 Spending:

11.2.1 Did the State or Territory spend CCDF quality set aside funds on other activities to improve the quality of child care services during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriation years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what estimated percentage of the CCDF quality dollars was spent on these standards?

Yes.

If yes, %: 1

No

N/A

Describe:

The State spent \$320,000 CCDF quality set aside funds on activities conducted by James Madison University's S.T.E.P.S. program to improve the quality of family child care services during FFY 2019.

The mathematical equation for all percentages calculated is the total in the particular section/question divided by the total quality expenditures for the grant year.

11.2.2 Did the State or Territory use other non-CCDF funds development (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) to improve the quality of child care services during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

Yes.

If yes, describe:

Mixed-Delivery Preschool Program by the Virginia Early Childhood Foundation used \$1.5 million of state general funds to improve the quality of child care services during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year

VECF Innovative Partnership Grants used \$250,000 of state general funds to improve the quality of child care services

No

N/A

Describe:

11.2.3 Does the State/Territory expect to use at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 on other activities to improve the quality of child care services as long as outcome measures relating to improved provider preparedness, child safety, child well-being, or kindergarten-entry are possible?

Yes.

If yes, describe:

The state expects to continue to use at least some of the increased CCDF funds to continue to support the activities of Child Care Aware of Virginia, James Madison University Child Care Provider S.T.E.P.S. program, and Penn State University Pre-Service Training to improve the quality of child care services as long as outcome measures relating to improved provider preparedness, child safety, child well-being, or kindergarten-entry are possible.

No

N/A

Describe:

12) Lead Agencies must submit an annual report, as required at 45 CFR Â§ 98.53(f)(4), describing any changes to State/Territory regulations, enforcement mechanisms, or other State/Territory policies addressing health and safety based on an annual review and assessment of serious child injuries and any deaths occurring in child care

programs receiving CCDF, and in other regulated and unregulated child care centers and family child care homes, to the extent possible. (Note: This requirement is effective FFY 2019. States/Territories do not have to include this report with the FFY 2018 QPR submission.)

a) Describe the annual review and assessment of serious injuries and any deaths occurring in child care programs receiving CCDF, and in other regulated and unregulated child care centers and family child care homes, to the extent possible.

The Virginia Department of Social Services (VDSS) website provides an online form for CCDF-participating child care program and other programs to report serious child injuries and deaths. These reports are entered onto a spreadsheet each month by the VDSS Division of Licensing Programs Home Office. The Information from the reports is analyzed and organized into various tables to track specific data (ex. number of injuries each month based on gender, region, location of injury, etc.). Any concerning trends or reports are presented to the Home Office management for guidance on the next course of action (i.e., investigation by the regional office, training, etc.).

b) Describe any changes to State regulations, enforcement mechanisms, or other States policies addressing health and safety based on the annual review and assessment.

There have been no identified changes made to State regulations thus far.