

Quality Progress Report (QPR) For New York 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 # 11537

N/A

Describe:

b. Legally-exempt family child care (care in providers' home) # 6291

N/A

Describe:

c. Licensed center-based programs # 7154

N/A

Describe:

d. Legally-exempt center-based programs # 373

N/A

Describe:

e. In-home (care in the child's own home) # 9169

N/A

Describe:

f. Other (explain)

Data are not available on the numbers of legally-exempt providers/programs caring solely for privately funded children.

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.

New York's goals/activities for funding with quality set-aside dollars are:

- Developing, implementing, or enhancing a tiered quality rating and improvement system. Within the constraints of limited funding, OCFS continues to encourage participation: 6.5% of licensed child care centers and 1.4% of licensed family child care homes are now doing so. All of those programs were able to receive technical assistance related to the QRIS during FFY 2019, which contributes to quality. With regard to the rating of participating programs, 75% of programs either increased star level from their previous rating or sustained a high-quality rating of 4 or 5 stars. The majority of programs that did not increase a star level still showed an increase in points within the current indicator level. In addition to the formal QRIS, NYS has also continued to take steps toward instituting a "shorthand" system of quality indicators that capture the elements of a child care program above and beyond regulatory compliance, and that encompasses differential monitoring of center-based and home-based programs.
- In 2019, OCFS opened a 97,000 square foot state-of-the-art training facility called the Human Services Training Center (HSTC). The training center houses five simulation environments, three of which are utilized in New Regulator Institute: a child care facility, a single-family home, and an apartment. These environments allow new regulators to practice simulations of initial inspections, complaint investigations, and routine monitoring inspections. The incorporation of simulation curriculum began at the beginning of 2019 and has significantly improved skill levels and consistency among regulatory staff.
- Supporting the training and professional development of the child care workforce continued during FFY 2019 in the form of two webcasts, two e-learnings and a full library of on-demand online training.
 - Supporting Children and Families through Good Eating Practices of Safety Throughout the Year
 - Antibias in early childhood education (e-learning)
 - Regulations: What to Expect When we are Inspecting (e-learning)
 - On-demand training - Moving and Grooving in your Child Care Program" and "Addressing Challenging Behavior: The Pyramid Model in Action"
- Supporting providers in the voluntary pursuit of accreditation through the Educational Incentive Program. In FFY 2019, the SUNY Professional Development Program (PDP) awarded 8,295 scholarships totaling \$5,194,964.

- OCFS funded no-cost Pyramid Model classroom training beginning in April 2019. Deliveries of the Pyramid Model Preschool Modules 1-3 and the Pyramid Model Infant and Toddler (I/T) Modules 1-3 will be offered at various locations throughout New York State throughout the year.
- Supporting a statewide network of 36 CCR&R agencies, along with the Early Care and Learning Council, which is the membership organization for CCR&Rs in New York State.

New York's Child Care Resource & Referral (CCR&R network provided a total 9,023 hours of intensive technical assistance during FFY 2019.

New York's CCR&R agencies, along with the Early Care and Learning Council, offered the following:

- A two-day intensive training for I/T Specialists
- Sixteen professional development opportunity events for CCR&R administrators, Health Care consultants, trainers, data administrators and other CCR&R staff.
- One, 2-Day Leadership Summits were held for the CCR&R administrators.
- Supported a two-day Master Cadre advanced training and professional development
- Forum to strengthen the skills of our Pyramid model trainers.
- Improving the quality of child care programs and services for infants and toddlers by supporting seven Infant/Toddler Regional Resource centers throughout the state. Infant Toddler Specialists provide onsite intensive technical assistance and program assessment utilizing evidence-based tools, coaching and quality enhancement strategies to enhance program quality and encourage best practices in home and center-based programs serving children birth-three years. In January of 2019, the number of Infant and Toddler Specialists increased from 24 to 57.

New York's seven Infant Toddler (I/T) Regions provided a total of 922 hours of training, 3,072 hours of I/T intensive technical assistance along with 3,045 hours of I/T phone technical assistance.

- Supporting compliance with state requirements for licensing, inspection, monitoring, training, and health and safety. NYS funded a study to identify trends based on regulatory citations that can inform potential training opportunities. The outcomes of over 40,000 inspections were assessed. OCFS has identified practices as a result of the study to further strengthen and enhance our inspection practices, which include: regular rotation and reassignment of licensing caseloads, modification of our inspection instrument to randomly include variable checklist items, development of formal inspection guidelines for monitoring inspections, and increased and targeted field supervision of licensing staff.
- Supporting the development or adoption of high-quality program and regulatory standards related to health, mental health, nutrition, physical activity, and physical

development. Regulations were enacted on 9/25/19 which aligned safe sleep practices with the standards set by the American Academy of Pediatrics and the New York State Department of Health. Health and safety regulations regarding food allergies, transportation, pets in child care programs and a number of other health-related initiatives were enacted as well.

- Administered the Medication Administration Training (MAT) rebate program by reimbursing providers the cost of the MAT certification for 1,725 rebates, totaling \$156,305.00. NYS funded an infant, toddler and preschool Pyramid Model training module which supports social-emotional development and strives to reduce instances of suspension and/or expulsion.
- Other activities to improve the quality of child care services: NYS revised the Early Learning Guidelines originally published in 2012. The updated foundational text provides examples of children's development from birth through age 8 and has an increased focus on family engagement, emergent multilingual learners and culturally responsive and sustaining supports.

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:

The Aspire Registry is New York's Registry for the Early Childhood Workforce. Launched in 2012, The Aspire Registry has over 70,000 profiles that have been created across the state. Enhancements have been made to the registry to enable automatic transfer of professional development to maintain accurate and timely records and for ease of use for the workforce.

In addition, the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), the union that represents New York City family-based child care providers, is working on creating a comprehensive database that will track the progression of professional development, as well as send out automated reminders when a provider is due to take any regulatory courses. This work is funded with state General Fund, not CCDF.

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:

2.1.2 Are any teachers/providers required to participate?

Yes.

If yes, describe:

New York City regulations require participation of all licensed center-based staff as of July 1, 2019. Participation in the registry is also required for programs participating in QUALITYstarsNY (New York's Quality Rating and Improvement System) this includes family child care homes and pre-k programs funded by NYSED.

While participation in the registry is not yet required for the rest of the state, a significant number of programs and early childhood professionals have elected to fully participate in The Aspire Registry. Continued expansion is happening statewide due in part to funding from the Preschool Development Grant.

No.

If no, describe:

2.1.3 How many people were in the registry as of September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?
70617

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)

5966

Financial bonus/wage supplements tied to education levels

#

Career advisors, Mentors, Coaches, or Consultants

903

Reimbursement for training

852

Loans

1

Other.

Describe:

New York City provides needs-based scholarships to potential and in-service early childhood educators to support a 12-credit Child Development Associate (CDA) (Infant/Toddler, Home-Based, and Preschool) and the state-recognized Children's Program Administrator Credential. These scholarships are funded by the City University of New York and private philanthropy funds.

In late 2019, the Governor and the City University of New York Chancellor announced an early childhood workforce scholarship for educators working 20 hours or more in licensed centers. A pilot was launched in September and more than 268 individuals have applied for the next semester.

CCDF quality funds support a scholarship program called the Educational Incentive Program (EIP) for income-eligible teachers/caregivers in regulated programs throughout New York State. Over the past few years, credit-bearing and credential (CDA) trainings have been incentivized, such that in FFY 2019, 81% percent of EIP funds went to credit-bearing or credentialing activities. Specifically, 1,310 awards worth \$1.5M (or 28% of the total awarded) went to college-level, credit-bearing courses. CCDF Funds also support Quality Scholars which is not income-based but requires participation by regulated programs to be eligible for funds. These are scholarships available to support staff working in programs that participate with QUALITYstarsNY.

In addition, UFT offers many free courses to providers that are funded with state General Fund dollars, not CCDF. These include: 120-hour CDA accreditation course, 120-hour NAFCC accreditation course, Medication Administration Training (MAT), 15-hour Health and Safety training, Pyramid Model training, Devereux Early Childhood Assessment (DECA) and Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale (FCCERS) training.

Also funded with State General Funds, not CCDF funds, the Civil Service Employees Association (CSEA), the union that represents family-based child care providers outside of New York City, offers:

- CPR/First Aid for registered, licensed and legally-exempt child care providers, assistants and substitutes. In FFY 2019, 3,501 persons received this training.
- Tuition Assistance for associate's or bachelor's degree in Early Care Education is available through participating education institutions directly via voucher or providers can pay for it and be reimbursed up to \$295 per credit hour per course up to four credits. In FFY 2019, 44 providers received tuition assistance.
- The Business of Family Care Online Courses area online courses developed by industry expert Tom Copland providing 1.5 OCFS approved training hours per course are available.
- CSEA contracts with area training providers to pay for training slots for professional development by paying the participating education institution directly via authorization. In FFY 2019, 2,207 providers received paid online training and an additional 820 providers received training in other topics areas.

- CDA Scholarships are provided directly through contract with trainers or through reimbursement of eligible expenses up to \$3,000. In FFY 2019, 118 providers received CDA scholarships.
- CSEA also covers the cost of National Association for Family Child Care Accreditation, and registration fee for statewide and local training conferences (30 providers in FFY 2019), as well as professional development for pyramid and other topic trainings. In FFY 2019, 1,217 providers received financial assistance to pay for professional development training.
- In FFY 2019, CSEA covered the registration fee for 125 providers to attend the National Association for the Education of Young Children conference.
- Lastly, in FFY 2019, CSEA provided \$500 Quality Grants to 8,466 child care providers. These grants assist providers with purchasing equipment and supplies, health and safety items, or to cover operating expenses related to licensure or renewal.

NYS Early Care and Learning Council (ECLC) - CCDF Quality funds support training specifically targeted for directors of school age programs and child care centers. This training is offered at no cost to the participants of ECLC's Early Care Management Training, Director's Institute. Workshops support child care center directors in all counties across the state by training both new and experienced child care center directors in all topics essential to running a safe, high quality program.

Plans of Study - OCFS regulations set educational standards for persons applying for director and head teacher positions. Staff can fill these positions while in the process of meeting the regulatory requirements. This opportunity supports staff in their education and professional pathway.

The Lead Agency conducted a survey of New York's CCR&R network. Below are examples of the types of supports CCR&Rs make available to teachers/providers to help them progress in their education and professional pathway:

- Child Development Support Corporation provides grants to providers to enhance the quality of their program as well as training and other professional development options that enable the program/provider to meet requirements. Example: Learning Quality Improvement, Medication Administration Training Grants.
- St. Lawrence Child Care Council provides professional development opportunities for early childhood professionals through workshops, conferences and on-site technical assistance. Assist individuals in identifying resources to help them pay for these and/or other professional development options they may choose.
- Scholarships for training provided offered by the CCR&R (SACC, CDA, conferences).
- Referrals to other agencies who may offer the direct services for education and funding.
- Work with providers to attain EIP funds and grant money through VOICE/CSEA.

CCR&R

- Child Care Aware of Steuben and Schuyler is currently conducting a career

pipeline project that provides Health and Safety and First Aid and CPR training at no cost as well as minor home repairs and other safety material that may be needed to finish the registration process. Via our CCR&R Community Strategies, this CCR&R offers incentives, training, and ongoing TA for various projects and no cost CPR and First Aid training for up to 32 programs.

- St. Lawrence Child Care Council: Grants available for Health and Safety Class
- Child Care Solutions: Scholarships for CDAs through EIP and CSEA Voice scholarships.
- Brightside Up, Inc.:
 - 102 participants received EIP Scholarship funding for training/CDA.
 - 72 participants received Quality Scholar Dollars for training/CDA.
 - 92 Family Child Care providers received funding for training/CDA from CSEA.
 - 5 newly registered family child care providers received funding through the City of Albany Poverty Reduction Initiative to pay for Health & Safety, CDA, CPR/First Aid, & finger printing to support their registration.
 - 1 FCC received funding for program materials.
- Child Care Council of Westchester: two grant-supported CDA classes
- Chautauqua Opportunities, Inc.: In the form of EIP for Associate CDA credentials and with Quality Scholars approximately 24 providers received EIP funding for the CDA credentialing course, 4 for coaching and approximately 300 received supports from QualityStarsNY
- Child Care Coordinating Council of the North County provided support for providers to apply for State EIP Funding, the VOICE/CSEA Union Funding, and a small grant through the Adirondack Foundation.
- Cornell Cooperative Extension: scholarships to their conferences
- Committee for Hispanic Children and Families assisted providers in submitting their application for NY State EIP scholarship funding through the SUNY PDP system. In addition, provided training tuition assistance to providers in the form of one-time grants through the CCR&R contract.
- Chinese-American Planning Council, Inc.:
 - Grants for MAT training
 - Grant of \$250 for supplies
 - Scholarship of \$2,000 for CDA training \$425 for CDA Application and \$120 for CDA books
 - \$100 scholarship to cover the costs of First Aid/CPR;
 - \$225 scholarship to cover the cost for 15-hour Health & Safety training ○ \$250 for Business Training & Book and Supplies

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:

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:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

d) How many had a State child care credential?

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

2.5 Licensed child care center teachers

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

d) How many had a State child care credential?

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

2.6 Licensed family child care providers

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

d) How many had a State child care credential?

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

2.7 Licensed child care center directors who serve CCDF children

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

d) How many had a State child care credential?

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

2.8 Licensed child care center teachers who serve CCDF children

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

d) How many had a State child care credential?

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

2.9 Licensed family child care providers who serve CCDF children

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

d) How many had a State child care credential?

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?

Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#:

%:

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, %: 6.25

No

N/A

Describe:

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:

State General Funds of \$11,863,560

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:

To meet the ongoing training requirement

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.

Since 2008, CCDF funds have supported an annual evaluation of SUNY's general child care training, Educational Incentive Program, and Medication Administration Training. In addition to providing descriptive, comparative, and longitudinal analyses of demographic data so as to enhance and more effectively target future training, each year the evaluations have honed in on specific questions of policy-relevant interest.

As identified in the FFY 2019-2021 CCDF Plan, EIP continues to prioritize acquisition of the Child Development Associate, along with other early childhood credentials and college course work in early childhood education. In FFY 2018-2019, the number of CDA scholarships increased by 340 which represented an increase of \$357,777 in comparison to 2017-2018. In 2018-2019, 81% of the EIP scholarship funds were issued to college and credential coursework, 47% went to CDA activities alone.

In 2019, OCFS sponsored Pyramid Model trainings across the state at no charge to child care program staff. OCFS also continued to promote and support other New York State Pyramid Model training activities. In order to evaluate the impact of Pyramid Model implementation on teaching staff who participated in the training and on the children in their classrooms, OCFS funded a comprehensive study in 2019 comprised of an extensive online survey that was sent to all individuals who had completed one or more modules of Pyramid Model training since 2016. This study expanded the reach of studies conducted in 2017 and 2018.

Teaching staff who responded to the survey (n=157) reported increasing their use of all Pyramid Model strategies given a scale ranging from 1 ("no increase") to 5 ("large increase") with an aggregate mean of 3.96. Of the 144 individuals who answered the question about the change in frequency of challenging behavior in their classrooms since they took the training, 80% reported that it had decreased. Eighty-six percent agreed or strongly agreed that their effectiveness in the classroom had improved since taking the training. Surveyed preschool teachers who had received or were receiving coaching increased their use of all Pyramid Model strategies after training to a larger extent than their non-coached counterparts (4.20 vs. 3.79 out of 5).

OCFS has also continued to support development and hosting of e-learning courses.

Between October 1, 2018 and September 30, 2019, 338,152 course completions were recorded. This represents a 20% increase in utilization of these resources over the prior one-year period. There were 255,201 course completers who received training that supports the federal Health and Safety topic areas. The grand means for the fourteen (14) e-learning courses which support these areas ranged from a 4.38 to 4.69 out of a possible score of 5.00. These means show that the e-learning participants had very high and favorable ratings for the courses. The participants indicated high satisfaction for all aspects of the courses. The overwhelming majority of participants in each course agreed that the learning objectives were clearly stated and achieved. In addition, they agreed that they would recommend the courses to others.

During the FFY, PDP began developing Level 2 evaluations for each e-learning course in the form of a post-test. In July 2019, the new post-test was implemented for Looking at Implicit Bias in Early Childhood. Of those who completed the online training and took the post-test, 91.5% passed and received a training certificate.

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.

From October 1, 2018 to September 30, 2019, a team of child development experts continued the revision of the New York State Early Learning Guidelines, completed a draft of new guidelines, and submitted them to stakeholders and experts across New York State for review. The Guidelines were originally published in 2012, and they have been used since that time to support educators' understanding of how children develop and how they can support, encourage, and affirm children's healthy development.

The new Early Learning Guidelines provide examples of children's development at 0-9 months, 8-16 months, 15-24 months, 24-36 months, 3-years-old, 4-years-old, and 5-, 6-, 7- and 8-years old. The revised Guidelines include increased supports for family engagement, emergent multilingual learners, and culturally responsive and sustaining supports. The revised Guidelines also provide lists of books and learning materials for educators, as well as reproducible forms.

The New York Early Childhood Advisory Council engaged a graphic designer to make the Guidelines into an appealing and accessible document. The Guidelines will be printed and distributed to child care programs and higher education faculty in December 2019.

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:

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:

The Revision costs were covered by City University of New York (CUNY) and federal PDG Birth-5 grant funds.

New York Association for the Education of Young Children (NYAEYC) offers a professional development series called Interest Driven Learning. There are three sessions, each a full day, that provides early childhood professionals with the knowledge necessary to create curriculum that embodies New York's "core beliefs." These sessions include foundational training on how to use the New York State Early Learning Guidelines in day to day work providing care for children.

There were 29 IDL sessions offered during this reporting period.

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.

Early Learning Guidelines (ELG) training sessions are being held as part of the work in the federal PDG B-5 grant.

In addition, in FFY 2019, colleges and universities were sent copies of the newly-revised ELG and the Core Body of Knowledge. These colleges and universities are using the ELG as part of their Early Childhood degree programs.

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):*

Programs distinguished by a dedicated and trained staff demonstrating knowledge and competence in family engagement, child development, positive guidance strategies, and culturally-competent and strength-based, child-centered practices. The top three levels of New York's five-tiered QRIS are considered to be reflective of high-quality care.

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;

QRIS participation was only required for sites that were funded by the Federal PEG grant in 4 communities.

Also, rule CFR 1302.53(b)(2), all Head Start programs (with limited exceptions) are required to participate in the state's Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) & the recent Federal Register release of an action item to the Final Rule stated a "delay in compliance date" in regards to the QRIS participation requirement, updated the compliance date to September 30, 2019.

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 # 41
- b) Legally-exempt family child care (care in providers' home) # 0
- c) Licensed center-based programs # 298
- d) Legally-exempt center-based programs # 0
- e) In-home (care in the child's own home) # 0

N/A

Describe:

The 41 licensed family child care providers are 3-5 star rated. The 298 licensed center-based programs are 3-5 star rated; this does not include school-based programs.

Legally-exempt and in-home care providers are not eligible for QRIS participation.

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 #
- b) 3 years up to kindergarten entry #
- c) School Aged (post kindergarten entry) #
- d) Other. Describe:

N/A

Describe:

Multiple, separate data systems/tables track quality ratings, provider licensing/registration data, child care subsidy payments, and child demographic data. As a result, a manual matching process would be required to match providers with high quality ratings to CCDF providers to CCDF children. Additionally, that manual process would have to be done separately for upstate and NYC. It is not feasible to identify all such programs and children for the year. The ACF-801 sample data can be used to calculate rough estimates. However, given the difficulties of matching as well as the very low number of quality-rated programs in general (due, in large part, to the low availability of NY's QRIS, QUALITYstarsNY -- resource constraints hold down the total number of QUALITYstarsNY participants), statewide projections from the ACF-801 sample should be used cautiously. For FFY2018-19 Q3, 1.5% of children birth-to-35 months who were receiving child care subsidies (or 0.4% of children receiving subsidies) were in high quality care programs (QUALITYstarsNY rated 3-5 stars); 3.9% of children 3 through 5.99 years of age receiving child care subsidies (or 1.4% of children receiving subsidies) were in high quality care programs; and 0.2% of children 6 years of age or older receiving child care subsidies (or 0.1% of all children receiving subsidies) and in high quality programs. Corresponds to an estimated 400,

1500, and 100 CCDF children in high quality care per month, or 600, 2300, and 150 children annually unduplicated, respectively.

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 %
- b) 3 years up to kindergarten entry %
- c) School Aged (post kindergarten entry) %
- d) Other. Describe:

N/A

Describe:

Multiple, separate data systems/tables track quality ratings, provider licensing/registration data, child care subsidy payments, and child demographic data. As a result, a manual matching process would be required to match providers with high quality ratings to CCDF providers to CCDF children. Additionally, that manual process would have to be done separately for upstate and NYC. It is not feasible to identify all such programs and children for the year. The ACF-801 sample data can be used to calculate rough estimates. However, given the difficulties of matching as well as the very low number of quality-rated programs in general (due, in large part, to the low availability of NY's QRIS, QUALITYstarsNY -- resource constraints hold down the total number of QUALITYstarsNY participants), statewide projections from the ACF-801 sample should be used cautiously. For FFY2018-19 Q3, 1.5% of children birth to 35 months who were receiving child care subsidies (or 0.4% of children receiving subsidies) were in high quality care programs (QUALITYstarsNY rated 3-5 stars); 3.9% of children 3 through 5.99 years of age receiving child care subsidies (or 1.4% of children receiving subsidies) were in high quality care programs; and 0.2% of children 6 years of age or older receiving child care subsidies (or 0.1% of all children receiving subsidies) and in high quality programs. Corresponds to an estimated 400, 1500, and 100 CCDF children in high quality care per month, or 600, 2300, and 150 children annually unduplicated, respectively.

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:

7476

N/A

Describe:

ii. Licensed Family Child Care Homes:

13177

N/A

Describe:

iii. License-Exempt Providers:

#

N/A

Describe:

Legally-exempt providers are not eligible for QRIS participation.

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:

492

% 6.5

ii. Licensed Family Child Care Homes:

N/A

Describe:

185

% 1.4

iii. License-Exempt Providers:

N/A

Describe:

Legally-exempt and in-home care providers are not eligible for QRIS participation.

#

%

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: #
- 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:

4.9 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: #
- 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:

4.10 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: # 492
- b) Licensed Family Child Care Homes: # 18
- c) Legally-exempt care in providers home: # 0
- d) Legally-exempt center-based programs: # 0
- e) In-home (care in the child's own home): # 0

No

N/A

Describe:

Legally-exempt and in-home providers are not eligible for QRIS participation.

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, %: 0.5

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, %:

State General Funds of approximately \$5 million.

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.

QUALITYstarsNY most recent re-rating report shows that 75% of re-rated programs either increased their star level or sustained a high-quality rating of 4 or 5 Stars in their most recent rating. There are many programs making progress in quality improvement, even if they do not increase a star level when re-rated, the majority of programs show an increase in points at the indicator level. Furthermore, our goal to increase quality over time is reflected in the data that shows 10% fewer programs received 1- and 2-Star Ratings and 10% more program received 4- and 5-Star Ratings than in their previous rating cycle. These significant gains show the effectiveness of QUALITYstarsNY to improve the quality of early childhood programs across the state.

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 # 57
- b) Number of Specialists available to providers serving CCDF children # 57
- c) Number of infant toddler specialists available specifically trained to support FCC providers # 57
- d) Number of providers served # 2484
- e) Total number of children reached # 6429

N/A

Describe:

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 # 528
- b) Number of licensed family child care providers # 1134
- c) Number of license-exempt providers of care in their home # 165
- d) Number of center directors # 432

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 #
- b) Number of licensed family child care providers #
- c) Number of license-exempt providers of care in their home #
- d) Number of center directors #

N/A Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

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 # 58
- b) Consultants available to providers serving CCDF children # 58

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)

<https://ccaoa.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=a7cace10038a41f283dd06705a2e612e>

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 Early Care and Learning Council (ECLC) as the centralized hub does not work directly with the FCCs.

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, %:

No

N/A

Describe:

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:

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:

New York continues to research how best to program expenditures for this activity. Current plans include, but are not limited to, enhanced subsidy rates for providers who provide high-quality care for infants & toddler, enhancing training opportunities to these providers and providing materials/supplies to providers of infant/toddler care.

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.

The seven Infant Toddler Regions continue to meet and work on planning activities to improve the supply and quality of infant care.

The lead agencies of I/T networks are currently providing technical assistance, resources and training to legally-exempt providers, family child care providers and family group providers with the goal of increasing the number of children cared for and improving the services offered. Example: a legally-exempt provider currently cares for two children and after receiving training, technical assistance and resources, becomes a family child care provider is now caring for five children including an infant and a toddler. With lower tuition rates and subsidy dollars, low income families have access now to higher quality child care slots across the state.

ECLC has also hired a Director of Infant & Toddler Mental Health; Director of Research and Evaluation and during the time frame this report covers, had begun the Search for a Director of Child Care Supply. The ECLC also provided Protective Factors Training for one Infant Toddler Specialist from each Region.

Training for providers continues to be a high priority. The I/T Regional Services centers have been planning many types of training opportunities to meet the needs of the community.

OCFS continues to meet with all partners to strengthen infant/toddler-focused and aligned cross-sector systems, increase public and private partnerships through NYS that advance

key outcomes for infants/toddlers and address social determinants of health, supporting early childhood programs to improve transition practices from early learning up through kindergarten, actively creating a NY Early Intervention and Child Care Cross-Agency Coordination and Collaboration Action plan implementation process.

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.

CCR&R services were expanded, as the total network spent \$11,863,560 CCDF quality funds in FFY 2019, as compared to \$10,047,947 in FFY 2018. This represents 14.4% of CCDF quality dollars, which is a vast percentage increase from the previous FFY. Federal child care funds have supported this network since 1982.

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, %: 14.4

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.

Continued funding and monitoring of annual measurable milestone numbers reflect a reasonable level of service for each proposed county within the available funding allocated per county. There are core functions that include activities and services not captured in the measurable milestones but remain services that CCR&Rs are contractually required to provide. The CCR&R contractors are also to see that quality services are provided.

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:

b) Head Start

Yes.

No.

If not, describe:

These programs comply with NYS child care regulations as well as federal Office of Head Start performance standards.

c) State pre-k

Yes.

No.

If not, describe:

Those pre-K programs that operate in licensed/permitted child care centers comply with NYS child care regulations.

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 # 2895

b) Licensed-exempt providers # 1060

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?

2.6 days

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? # 3928

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? # 1421

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? # 56

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? # 201

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:

Note: Responses for 7.3.1 - 7.3.6 includes only data about programs under the regulatory authority of the Lead Agency. Thus, they do not include New York City Day Care Centers.

Re: 7.3.1 - 3955 complaints received total (2915 facilities with one or more complaints). Licensed providers defined based on facility status in Closed, Licensed, Registered, Revoked/Suspended/Renewal Denied. LE providers defined based on facility status: Application (Received, Requested, Withdrawn, Denied, i.e. had never reached the status of L/R) or Illegal.

Re: 7.3.2 - 2.6 days from complaint receipt to response (earliest inspection or inspection attempt). 3.2 days from complaint to inspection date.

Re: 7.3.3 - NOTE: All 3955 complaints that were received during FFY18-19 also received an attempted on-site inspection specifically associated with that complaint. Of those 3955, 3928 occurred in FFY18-19, 22 occurred in FFY19-20, and five providers did not have an on-site inspection recorded in CCFS because either the program closed within days of the complaint or too little information was received to locate the provider for inspection.

Re: 7.3.4 - data reports only provide complaint allegations that were substantiated or not, and do not identify other violations that may have been cited as part of the inspection.

Re: 7.3.5 - n=56 providers who entered a suspended status during the year. During a suspended status, providers cannot care for children and would therefore not be eligible to receive CCDF funds. However, it is not possible to determine the reasons these 56 child care providers were suspended because New York's system of record for child care licensing/registration/enrollment has only limited linkage to the child care subsidy payment system.

Re: 7.3.6 - n=1977 providers that closed in FFY18-19. Of those, 201 providers closed from

an enforcement status. It is possible that additional providers closed due to the results of an inspection without going into an enforcement status.

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:

OCFS tracks inspection results, including whether or not there is a corrective action plan, but there would be no way to tell the total number of staff that received TA based on inspection results, with the possible exception of FDC providers which are typically a single person providing child care.

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, %: 63.6

No

N/A

Describe:

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:

Preschool development funds, state funds, and private philanthropy are used to support Start with Stars, a component of QUALITYstarsNY that works to facilitate

regulatory compliance for inspections, monitoring, health and safety standards and training, and State/Territory licensing standards. Approximate combined total funding for Federal FFY 2019 was \$1.5 million.

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:

New York did spend CCDF funds to comply with CCDBG Health & Safety components during Federal Fiscal Year 2019 and intends to do the same during Federal Fiscal Year 2020.

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.

OCFS implemented new regulations in September 2019 to support legislation that was enacted in April 2019. This focus of the regulatory and statutory changes was to support implementation and alignment of CCDBG requirements around background checks, annual inspections and training. While OCFS already had existing standards and rules in these areas, they were not fully aligned with the CCDBG requirements.

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:

QUALITYstarsNY uses standards developed by leading experts in the field of early childhood development and learning across New York State to provide a common framework for the elements of high quality in early care and education programs. There are 75 standards organized into four categories: Learning Environment, Family Engagement, Qualifications and Experience and Management and Leadership. A program's rating is determined using a point system based on the 75 different indicators, resulting in a one- to five-star rating with "five stars" denoting highest quality. To augment the rigor of the point system, an independent evaluation of a site's classrooms or a provider's home using the Environmental Rating Scale (ERS) tool is used.

b) To measure effective practice, describe:

N/A

c) To measure age appropriate child development, describe:

N/A

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:

QUALITYstarsNY uses standards developed by leading experts in the field of early childhood development and learning across New York State to provide a common framework for the elements of high quality in early care and education programs. There are 75 standards organized into four categories: Learning Environment, Family Engagement, Qualifications and Experience and Management and Leadership.

A program's rating is determined using a point system based on the 75 different indicators, resulting in a one- to five-star rating with "five stars" denoting highest quality. To augment the rigor of the point system, an independent evaluation of a site's classrooms or a provider's home using the Environmental Rating Scale (ERS) tool is used.

b) To measure effective practice, describe: N/A

c) To measure age appropriate child development, describe: N/A

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, %:

No

N/A

Describe:

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:

Combined funds from preschool development grant, state funds and private have been used to evaluate the quality of child care programs. This amount totaled \$420,000 in FFY 2019.

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.

Until New York's quality rating and improvement system, QUALITYstarsNY, is universally available, New York State has continued to take steps to institute a "shorthand" system of quality indicators that capture the elements of a child care program's characteristics above and beyond regulatory compliance. Foundational to New York's approach is that the indicators under development can be assessed during a program inspection by staff who may not have a background in early childhood, and that the indicators encompass differential monitoring between center-based and home-based programs. A draft set of indicators focused on health and mental health has been created in consultation with the New York State Department of Health and the New York State Office of Mental Health. NYS expects meaningful progress to continue during FFY 2020, including incorporating indicators from other domains, and launching a pilot study of their use during a standard monitoring inspection.

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 # 0
- b) Number of licensed FCC providers # 2
- c) Number of center based providers that serve CCDF children # 0
- d) Number of FCC providers that serve CCDF children # 0

N/A

Describe:

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, %: CCDF Funds were used to provide EIP Scholarships to 7 Family Child Care providers/programs in the amount of \$4,525 for Family Child Care Accreditation

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.

New York State Network for Youth Success (NYSNYS), formerly AfterSchool Works! NY, offers a rigorous program accreditation for School-Age Child Care (SACC) programs that is available statewide. Thirty-seven programs are currently accredited in NYS. Information on the accreditation, including the manual, standards, etc. can be found on the NYS website here: <http://networkforyouthsuccess.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/2018-Manual-9.10.18.pdf>

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:

State funds, preschool development funds, and private philanthropy have been used to support the development or adoption of high-quality program standards related to health, mental health, nutrition, physical activity, and physical development during the last federal fiscal year. The approximate total amount for Federal FFY 2019 was \$6,523,558.

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.

- Accreditation for SACC programs: Thirty-seven programs are currently accredited in NYS.
- OCFS offers an Educational Incentive Program (EIP) that reimburses child care staff for training expenses taken to meet child care topics listed in regulation. The EIP program, however, prioritizes those training dollars toward course work completed to meet the requirements of the Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential, the New York State Children's Program Administrator Credential, School-Age Child Care

Credential, Infant and Toddler Child Care and Education Credential or the Infant Toddler Child Development Associate Credential, as well as Family Child Care Accreditation administered by the National Association for Family Child Care, and the National Administrator Credential.

- Over the past few years, credit-bearing and credential (CDA) training have been incentivized, such that in FFY 2019, the number of CDA scholarships increased by 340 which represented an increase of \$357,777 in comparison to 2018. In 2019, 81% of the EIP scholarship funds were issued to college and credential coursework, 47% went to CDA activities alone.

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:

We have no other activities to report. That said, OCFS has relationships with various advocacy groups and organizations that are able to offer professional development and conference opportunities for school-age providers as well as develop targeted technical assistance to further meet the needs of providers. We do not, however, assess the progress of those organizations.

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, %:

No

N/A

Describe:

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:

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:

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.

OCFS conducts on-going review of reported serious injuries and fatalities in all child care programs and takes appropriate action when warranted. Instances of reported serious

injuries and fatalities result in a complaint investigation and/or site visit to the program for assessment and subsequent enforcement action, if warranted.

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

OCFS has existing regulatory authority to respond to health and safety issues and take enforcement action, if warranted. Assessment is done at the time that incidents occur.

OCFS has also added regulations that provides the authority to impose a safety plan while investigating allegations against a program, so that immediate measures can be taken to safeguard children, when warranted, pending the outcome of an investigation. A safety plan is a written strategy in which the Office imposes restrictions on a licensed or registered child care program when allegations of risk of harm to child(ren) exist in the program or are made against a person working, volunteering, visiting or living at the site of the child care program.