FCCTF Work Group- Duty #6



Review Parent Aware program participation and identify obstacles and suggested improvements.

Work Group members

Cyndi Cunningham Representative Lisa Demuth Kim Leipold Ann McCully Julie Seydel Cindi Yang

DHS support: Deb Swenson-Klatt, Michelle Lenhart

Our process

We broke down Parent Aware into the following components so that we could study each one for potential recommendations:

- POLICIES/GOVERNANCE
- STRUCTURE
- **PROVIDER OUTREACH/PROMOTION**
- PARENT OUTREACH/SEARCH TOOL
- PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Policies and Governance What we reviewed:

The CCDBG consumer education language

Section 658E. Application and Plan

Consumer and Provider Education Information. The plan shall include a certification that the State will collect and disseminate (which dissemination may be done, except as otherwise specified in this subparagraph, through resource and referral organizations or other means as determined by the State) to parents of eligible children, the general public, and, where applicable, providers—

(i) information about the availability of the full diversity of child care services that will promote informed child care choices and that concerns

(I) the availability of child care services provided through programs authorized by this subchapter and, if feasible, other child care services and other programs provided in the State for which the family may be eligible, as well as the availability of financial assistance to obtain child care services in the State;

(II) if available, information about the quality of providers, as determined by the State, that can be provided through a Quality Rating and Improvement System.

Policies and Governance What we reviewed:

- Minnesota's current Child Care and Development Fund (<u>CCDF) Plan</u> that explains how we are meeting these requirements.
- Reviewed <u>State statute 124D.142</u> that sets expectation for Minnesota/focus of our QRIS
- Parent Aware Validation study 2016 executive summary

Policies and Governance What we recommend:

- Request funding for a Validation study of Parent Aware in advance of revisions to the current Parent Aware Standards and Indicators
- Incorporate recommendations (as appropriate) into the next CCDF plan for FY 2022-2025

Parent Aware Structure What we reviewed:

Accelerated and Automatic pathways crosswalk/explanation

Crosswalk of Parent Aware standards and indicators, by rating pathway

*=optional indicators for points at three and four stars, ESA=Environment Self-Assessment, SA tool=self-assessment tool

Standard	Full-rating for non-accredited family child care (<u>PA Standards</u> and Indicators)	Accelerated for accredited family child care (<u>NAFCC standards</u>)	Automatic for School-based VPK (<u>MN statutes 124D.151</u> and other reqs for school-based settings)
Category: Teaching and relationships	One star:	Parent Aware: T1.3a. Curriculum	Parent Aware: T1.3a. Curriculum
with children	T1.1. Routines		
	11.1. Routines	use.	use.
T1. Curriculum			
T2. Play and interactions	Two stars:	NAFCC Standards: Relationships 1.1	State law, key words: Provide
T3. Learning and belonging	T1.2. Lesson plans.	 – 1.9, key words: respects and is 	comprehensive content, implement
T4. Kindergarten transition support	T3.2 Learning environment (ESA	responsive to individual needs,	curriculum, assessment and
	tool)	adapts individual routines and	instructional strategies, provide
	T4.2. Kindergarten transition plan.	interactions, learns about cultural	instruction through play-based
		traditions and is sensitive to them	learning in all domains, coordinate
	Three or four stars:		appropriate kindergarten transition,
	T1.3a. Curriculum use.	NAFCC Standards: The environment	teacher training and coaching
	T3.3. Cultural responsiveness* (SA	2.1 – 2.39, key words: many	informed by a measure of child-
	tool)	standards with requirements for	adult interactions, culturally and
	T4.3. Kindergarten transition	how the space is arranged and toys	linguistically responsive activities
	activities*	and materials	0 / 1
		NAFCC Standards: Developmental learning activities, 3.1 – 3.88 key words: engaged in learning activities, self-directed play, plan learning experiences, specific content by learning domain	

Parent Aware structure What we reviewed:

- Parent Aware Standards and indicators
- <u>Quality Documentation Portfolio</u> used to measure indicators
- Parent Aware Financial supports available at each level
- Early Childhood Indicators of Progress (ECIPS) -MN <u>Kindergarten Readiness measures</u> that guide our QRIS
- Info about curriculum (flexibility, play-based, etc.); ability to have a curriculum approved

Parent Aware Structure What we recommend:

- Create a way for an FCC provider group to be directly connected to Parent Aware on an ongoing basis (i.e. on the Parent Aware Advisory Committee) and more opportunity for input from FCC providers into changes to standards, indicators, pathways, and supports for Family Child Care.
- Review and revise Parent Aware materials to include common language that speaks to FCC providers - including creation of a separate Quality Documentation Portfolio (QDP) focused on Family Child Care.

Provider outreach and promotion What we reviewed:

- Overview materials available <u>on Parent Aware website</u> program page & <u>link to recruiters</u>
- How do we identify the benefits of involvement particularly for FCC providers? (see "Let Your Stars Shine")
- Provider Perceptions Report

Provider outreach and promotion what we reviewed:



ParentAware.org | 888.291.9811

Child Trends Provider Perception Survey

- Conducted in 2018
- Included 517 Full-Rating Pathway participants
- 75% were licensed FCC (390)
- Also included non-rated programs and those who chose not to re-rate



Perception of barriers Full-Rating Participants

Report Recommendations

- 31% concerned about lack of access to grants and Early Learning Scholarships, particularly lack of grants for Four-Star Rated programs. *Note, this will begin at the end of the current cohort.*
- 17% were concerned about required paperwork.

Perception of barriers Previously-Rated Providers

There were many reasons that people didn't re-Rate; the largest reason (28%) was the time and staff resources needed.

Figure 28. Primary Reasons Affecting Previously Rated Providers Decision not to Re-Rate in Parent Aware (n = 46)



Perception of barriers Non-Rated Providers

Most non-Rated providers don't participate because they don't need to attract families to their programs. A significant proportion also don't feel it's worth the investment of their time.

Figure 19. Top Reasons Affecting non-rated Providers' Decision NOT to Join Parent Aware (n = 721)

- I don't need it to attract families to my program 70%
- It is not worth the investment of my time 43%
- > I don't trust that a Parent Aware Rating accurately reflects my program's quality 28%
- > I don't believe early care and education programs should be rated 21%
- > The application/Rating process is difficult 19%
- > There is not enough financial incentive to join 15%
- I don't need to improve the quality of my program 11%
- I am waiting to hear from other programs/providers about their experience first 5%
- Parent Aware does not provide enough support for programs/providers- 1%

Provider outreach and promotion What we recommend:

- Streamline the amount of paperwork that is required as part of the Indicator measures in the Quality Documentation Portfolio (QDP).
- Educate County officials (not just licensors) as to their responsibility and role in child care as an economic development. This would include promoting Parent Aware and utilization of Early Learning Scholarships.

Parent Outreach/search tool What we reviewed

- Parent's <u>Perceptions of the Parent Aware website</u>
 <u>& Search tool</u>- Child Trends
- How do parents find out about different settings and their attributes?-Finding Child Care tool

Parent Outreach/search tool What we recommend:

• Communicate the **voluntary nature of Parent Aware** to parents with more clarity (i.e. not rated does not equal bad quality).

Program Implementation What we reviewed



Program Implementation What we reviewed:

- Programs' <u>experiences with Building Quality</u> report
- <u>Requirement for Parent Aware Coach endorsement</u>
- Parent Aware <u>Quality Coaching</u> and Rating process overview

Program Implementation What we recommend:

- Improve Coaching process effectiveness (more info about support options and consistent messaging regarding acceptable evidence)
- Improve **Develop process**/structure for online Quality Documentation Portfolio (QDP) submission.

Intersections with other duties

- FCC provider mentoring: Is there a way to provide ongoing communication and support (beyond quality improvement grants; between cohorts)
- Licensing regulations/Tiered Licensure: Does language around eligibility for Parent Aware need to be reviewed?

This is the current language about eligibility:

Child care centers and family child care programs licensed with the Minnesota Department of Human Services must not have licensing sanctions, including conditional license; temporary immediate suspension; suspension; revocation; or a maltreatment determination within the last year.

• **Training/Develop Help Desk:** As tutorials are developed for general support with the Develop system, access to the Parent Aware online portal may also be included here.

Questions?