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Overview

The purpose of this report is to provide the Michigan Department of Education-Office of Great Start (MDE-OGS) with a summary of the work done in fiscal year 2016 piloting specific features of a proposed Quality Rating and Improvement System inclusive of programs and providers serving school-agers developed during fiscal year 2015. The features piloted were: a participation readiness process, four versions of a Self-Assessment Survey meant to capture features of structural quality and the accompanying rubrics, and two onsite assessment tools, the School-age Walk-Thru Program Quality Assessment (SA-PQA) and the Family Child Care Program Quality Assessment (F-PQA). This report provides a detailed look at the implementation process, each feature piloted, and incorporates feedback from the pilot participants. Lastly, lessons learned and recommendations can be found at the end of each section.
History

In 2014 the Michigan Department of Education-Office of Great Start contracted with the Early Childhood Investment Corporation (ECIC) to learn about the out-of-school time care and education field in Michigan. The Investment Corporation contracted with the American Institute for Research (AIR) with three key objectives:

1. Develop a definition of school-age with input from Michigan stakeholders;
2. Review current quality improvement efforts in Michigan and nationally;
3. Make recommendations to build a comprehensive Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) for school-age programming in Michigan.

As part of the project, AIR submitted three reports to provide insight and information from the field on the current landscape for out-of-school time programs in Michigan and nationally. Based on this work, ECIC submitted a set of recommendations to MDE-OGS in September 2014. With input from an Advisory Committee and the Investment Corporation, as well from information collected from 11 other states, AIR recommended a definition of school-age children for the system: kindergarten through age 12. The remaining recommendations fell into six QRIS categories. Table 1 shows each category and its associated recommendation. Michigan moved forward accepting AIR’s recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QRIS Category</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System Models</td>
<td>The school-age QRIS should be incorporated into Great Start to Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiered Program Standards</td>
<td>The Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality (M-OST Standards) should be used as the foundation for indicators of program quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Monitoring (e.g. assessment measures and tools, the role and qualifications of the assessors, and the process of assessment) should include the School-age Program Quality Assessment Tool for programs serving a school-age population. Other monitoring should remain the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Availability of Quality Ratings</td>
<td>Ratings for programs serving a school-age population should be listed on the Great Start to Quality website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to Meet Progressive Standards</td>
<td>Support to programs should take into account the age group being served to tailor content accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating System</td>
<td>The same operating system, e.g. Great Start to Quality STARS platform and WorkLife Systems should be used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
For fiscal year 2015, MDE–OGS again contracted with the Early Childhood Investment Corporation to implement the next step in development of a school-age design of Great Start to Quality, Michigan’s QRIS. Using the recommendations produced in FY14, as well as the information gathered during the previous fiscal year, the Investment Corporation determined a scope of work that would engage stakeholders in dialogue regarding the FY14 recommendations for a school-age quality rating and improvement system. These stakeholders included: families who would use the school-age design of Great Start to Quality, people managing/leading programs and services that would be potentially related to the QRIS both state and local, and people from community organizations that provide services and support families and children who would be trusted advisors to families about a QRIS. This work resulted in the development of comprehensive recommendations for how Great Start to Quality could be expanded to be inclusive of programs and providers who serve school-agers. The QRIS pilot in FY 16 was reflective of this work.
Pilot Design

In fiscal year 2016 the Early Childhood Investment Corporation was contracted by the Michigan Department of Education—Office of Great Start to pilot specific features from the recommendations developed in fiscal year 2015. The pilot was designed to include 20 programs or providers. The goal was to include as many different types of programs that serve school-agers as possible including: home-based care, stand-alone centers, programs hosted at schools, community-based organizations, and 21st Century programs.

As shown below in Figure 1, the process that each participant completed in the pilot was slightly different, however all programs completed some of bulleted steps in each box. The first step was the completion of the Pre-Self-Assessment Survey process. This was a webinar designed to provide an overview of the pilot. Next participants completed their Pilot Participant Program Information Sheet (PPPIF) and were provided with the Self-Assessment Survey (SAS) that best reflected the ages served by their program and the category of license. The PPPIF is a two page form that captured: contact information, staffing information and enrollment numbers. Following that, programs submitted their completed SAS and accompanying labeled documentation for validation. The documentation is used as evidence that a program is meeting an indicator on the SAS. If a program qualified for onsite assessment, by receiving a validated star rating of a 4 or 5 Star, they were contacted to confirm they were interested in this part of the rating process. Programs that were validated at a 4 or 5 Star and chose to decline their onsite assessment would receive a 3 Star rating. Alternatively, if a program received a 1, 2 or 3 Star the program was contacted, provided their Validation Report, a letter that explains their rating, a sample letter for families to communicate about the rating, and a link to complete the evaluation survey. Programs could indicate that they were interested in a follow-up phone call on their experience in the evaluation survey; some programs also reached out directly requesting a call to further understand their rating. The reported experiences, concerns, questions, and other insights from pilot participants is included throughout this report.
Pre-Self Assessment Survey Process
- Program participates in a live webinar or view a recording of the webinar

Self-Assessment
- Programs complete their Pilot Participant Program Information Form
- Programs complete their Self-Assessment Survey and gather/label documentation

Validation
- Program submitted completed Self-Assessment Survey and labeled documentation.
- Validator completes validation.
- If eligible and interested program receives on-site assessment(s).

Evaluation
- Program Received Validation Report
- Program Completed Evaluation
- Program participates in follow-up phone call (optional)

Figure 1
Timeline

The original timeline for this work was adjusted during planning conversations with the Michigan Department of Education-Office of Great Start. The timeline was pushed out to accommodate the development of an additional self-assessment survey version for Centers serving children from birth to age 12; as well all a review of all four pilot self-assessment surveys by the Steering Committee that led the work in FY 2015. Originally the work was planned to begin in October and conclude in July with the pilot recruitment beginning in January and the pilot closing by the end of June. Recruitment for the pilot in reality started in February however the pilot still closed in June. All pilot participants were still able to participate in the full scope of the pilot even with the timeline adjustment.

The proposed timelines for the pilot in FY 2017 has taken this experience into account and was developed with these learnings in mind.
Recruitment

Recruitment was initially planned to start on January 1, 2016 and close at the end of February. This schedule was adjusted to accommodate further preparatory work for the pilot. Prior to the recruitment of pilot participants, it was identified that the Steering Committee needed to reconvene and review the recommended indicators for the Self-Assessment Surveys (SAS). During fiscal year 2015, SASs were developed for three different types of settings: Centers that served school-agers only, Group Homes, and Family Homes. An additional SAS needed to be developed for Centers that serve children from birth to age 12. This was necessary as the pilot was designed to capture quality across the whole program, so the SAS needed to reflect quality in a program serving children from 0-12. This SAS was developed then reviewed, edited, and approved by the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was not able to convene until early February to complete this final review of all pilot SASs. Once the review was completed the final SASs were sent to the Michigan Department of Education-Office of Great Start for final approval. These tasks impacted the timeline of implementation; pushing recruitment of pilot participants into March of 2016.

In discussion with MDE-OGS, it was decided recruitment for this pilot should be targeted, using three approaches:

- Utilize the connections of the Steering Committee Members to out-of-school time programs,
- Reach out to the list of providers who self-identified as interested in participating in the focus groups during FY 15,
- Work with the Great Start to Quality Resource Centers to identify interested home-based providers.

These approaches were identified by MDE-OGS and ECIC and approved by the Steering Committee. This pilot was designed to be a testing ground for the newly developed Self-Assessment Surveys, the onsite assessment tools and the pre-self-assessment process.

The goal for recruitment was to ensure that as many types of out-of-school time programs were involved as possible, so that the results and feedback could be representative of the field. However, targeted recruitment of a larger number of child care centers serving children 5-12 programs was implemented based on guidance from MDE-OGS. Twenty-three programs were recruited for the pilot; of that total five programs dropped, leaving the final count for the pilot at 18. The programs who dropped did so at different phases. Three were dropped because they were unresponsive to emails and two asked to drop because after reviewing the Self-Assessment Survey they were no longer interested in participating. The table below shows the type of programs and how many of each participated. For ease of reading in the remainder of the report the program types are delineated into three categories: Centers 0-12, Centers 5-12 and Home.
As Table 3 shows, no Family Homes were successfully recruited; this is unsurprising as home providers have demonstrated more reluctance in joining Great Start to Quality than other program types. To assist with the recruitment of potential home-based providers the Early Childhood Investment Corporation partnered with Great Start to Quality Resource Center Directors. Although outreach was conducted and several home providers were identified, ECIC was not successful in securing home provider participation. Most identified home provider were not response to outreach from ECIC or were initially and then did not respond to follow up communications. 21st Century programs were also difficult to recruit, and two of the programs joined the pilot significantly later than most of the others. One of the 21st Century programs was hosted at a middle school, which meant that the children served were not all under the age of 13. MDE-OGS approved the inclusion of this program in the pilot as an opportunity to learn about how well the Self-Assessment Survey and onsite assessment tools may represent quality for this type of program as well. This program achieved a 4 Star rating in the pilot.

Table 4 below shows the distribution of programs by Great Start to Quality Resource Center. As the table shows, all Great Start to Quality Resource Center regions were not represented. The Northwest, Northeast, and the Upper Peninsula Resource Centers were not included. Additionally, the spread of program types participating was not equitable across program categories. This impacted the gathering of data; meaning that the results of the pilot were heavily weighed to be representative of Centers 5-12 only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Center Location</th>
<th>Centers 5-12</th>
<th>Centers 0-12</th>
<th>Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne-Oakland-Macomb</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

* If a program is 21st Century, it will not be listed in other categories

As Table 3 shows, no Family Homes were successfully recruited; this is unsurprising as home providers have demonstrated more reluctance in joining Great Start to Quality than other program types. To assist with the recruitment of potential home-based providers the Early Childhood Investment Corporation partnered with Great Start to Quality Resource Center Directors. Although outreach was conducted and several home providers were identified, ECIC was not successful in securing home provider participation. Most identified home provider were not response to outreach from ECIC or were initially and then did not respond to follow up communications. 21st Century programs were also difficult to recruit, and two of the programs joined the pilot significantly later than most of the others. One of the 21st Century programs was hosted at a middle school, which meant that the children served were not all under the age of 13. MDE-OGS approved the inclusion of this program in the pilot as an opportunity to learn about how well the Self-Assessment Survey and onsite assessment tools may represent quality for this type of program as well. This program achieved a 4 Star rating in the pilot.

Table 4 below shows the distribution of programs by Great Start to Quality Resource Center. As the table shows, all Great Start to Quality Resource Center regions were not represented. The Northwest, Northeast, and the Upper Peninsula Resource Centers were not included. Additionally, the spread of program types participating was not equitable across program categories. This impacted the gathering of data; meaning that the results of the pilot were heavily weighed to be representative of Centers 5-12 only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Pilot Programs Recruited</th>
<th>Number of Actual Pilot Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Home</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Home</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center-Stand Alone</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center- Operated by a School</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center-Operated Community-Based Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center-Operated by a for-profit organization</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center-Operated by a Nonprofit</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Century*</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

* If a program is 21st Century, it will not be listed in other categories
It was also decided recruitment of programs that are currently participating in Great Start to Quality should be intentional. Of the 18 final programs, three were already participating in Great Start to Quality. An additional program was also participating but was unaware of that at the time. This can occur because programs are generally licensed by location. So a school that hosts a Great Start Readiness Program, Head Start, 21st Century and a fee-based afterschool program could all share a license number. There is not currently a system in place to ensure that programs are aware that they may share a license. This caused one program to be unable to accept their rating as the Self-Assessment Survey they completed did not accurately represent the programs under the license number; due to the timeline of the pilot there was not an opportunity for that program to resubmit. Another program initially submitted one program but realized they shared a license with a GSRP and requested to participate with a different program prior to submission of the completed SAS.

The messaging used for recruitment can be found in Appendix 2. This messaging was approved by MDE-OGS and was provided directly to the Steering Committee members and Great Start to Quality Resource Center Directors to use to facilitate recruitment. A survey was designed to capture interest in the pilot, however interested recruits also could email the project lead directly. Some also called the project lead directly to learn more before completing the survey to indicate their interest.

The following features of the pilot were used to incentivize participation:

- Eligibility for the Participation Bonus*
- Pilot ratings will be valid for two years.
- Pilot participants can submit the completed pilot Self-Assessment Survey and supporting documents via email or via US mail.
- Free onsite assessments for those who qualify administered by valid and reliable Assessment Specialists.
- Eligibility for increased subsidy payments if the program accepts children whose families are supported by the Child Development Care subsidy.
- Programs will not have a published star rating in the traditional sense, but ratings will still be publicly posted.
- Participants will be given the opportunity to reflect on experience; feedback will be shared with the Michigan Department of Education-Office of Great Start for consideration.
- Pilot participants will be provided support, materials, and language to communicate about their pilot rating.

*As long as the program met the eligibility criteria already in place for the bonus.
LESSONS LEARNED

- Targeted recruitment was effective, however 21st Century programs and home providers both proved to be difficult to recruit. 21st Century programs are no-cost to families so the incentive of tiered reimbursement did not apply to them.
- Intentional recruitment of an inequitable spread of programs resulted in pilot data that did not allow for conclusions to be drawn about each of the four possible types of programs that could serve schoolagers. The majority of the data was reflect of programs serving only schoolagers.
- The pilot was low stakes, as a program could decline their rating, and it would never be publically posted. This is similar to Great Start to Quality and allowed for participants to complete the full process and still decline their rating. This approach was beneficial in the pilot as well.
- Recruitment of Group and Family Homes is challenging and was not particularly successful. While Great Start to Quality Resource Center Directors were able to identify programs, most never responded to outreach and thus were not even counted in the number of recruits.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Programs need to understand they may share a license. A mechanism needs to be developed to ensure that programs are aware that they may share a license number. This would ensure that when the full system launches, programs would not complete the incorrect Self-Assessment Survey. The ramifications of this could be significant. Great Start Readiness Programs (GSRP) are required to maintain a 3 Star rating, if another program in the same building were to submit and be rated a 2 Star that rating would be attached to the GSRP as well. Additionally, tiered reimbursement is tied to a program’s rating meaning that if one program in the building completes the SAS alone their rating will impact the reimbursement rate of all of the other programs at that site.
- 21st Century programs need to be encouraged to participate. Strategies to encourage 21st Century programs to participate in the system should be considered and developed, ideally with input from 21st Century program leadership and staff.
- Family and Group homes need to be recruited using multiple strategies. While RC Directors were able to identify interested providers, other outreach, during training opportunities at the RCs or exploring Michigan Providers groups on Facebook, could be utilized to reach interested programs.
- Quota sampling should be implemented in the fiscal year 2017 pilot. An equal number of each type of provider should be recruited in the 2017 pilot to gather more robust data on the validation process for all program types.
- Programs should be intentionally recruited from unrepresented Great Start to Quality Resource Center regions. The regions represented in the pilot should be representative of the full state. The northern part of the state, as well as the Upper Peninsula should be intentionally recruited from to ensure that the data gathered is representative of the diversity of programs geographically.
Pre-Self-Assessment Survey Process

The Pre-Self-Assessment Survey process (Pre-SAS) was developed for this pilot to ensure participants had a clear understanding of the full process and how to successfully participate. Similar to how some of the Great Start to Quality Resource Centers offer trainings on how to complete the Self-Assessment Survey for current system, the Pre-SAS walked through the pilot step-by-step. The Pre-SAS was designed to be offered as a live webinar where attendees could ask questions in real time as the pilot process was explained. The content of the webinar can be found in Appendix 3. The webinar was scheduled to be offered on four occasions, with times in the evening as well as during the day to accommodate the schedules of providers and program staff. Providers who had indicated interest in participating in the pilot were sent an email that outlined the purpose of the Pre-SAS and provided registration hyperlinks to the different sessions. Sessions were scheduled to be offered on: March 15, March 18, March 21 and March 24. The first session had four participants, three of which went on to complete the pilot. The second had eight participants, six of whom went on to complete the pilot. The third had two participants with one of whom went on to complete the pilot. The fourth sessions had three participants, two whom went on to complete the pilot. The other four pilot participants viewed a recording of the webinar and then contacted ECIC to move forward to the next step.

The Pre-SAS was developed to take about two hours to complete, depending on the number of questions. Participant’s questions focused mainly on clarification on a specific point or wanting to better understand the labeling process.

A summary of the content of the webinar is displayed below in Figure 2.

In the evaluation survey participants reflected on the helpfulness of the webinar using the following statements: A) The background of the pilot; B) How to complete your pilot participant program
information form; C) How to complete the Self-Assessment Survey; D) how to label supporting documentation; E) what to expect during validation; and F) what to expect during onsite assessment. The response format was “Not helpful” (1), “Neutral” (2), “Somewhat helpful” (3), “Helpful” (4), and “Very Helpful” (5). All six sub-questions had mean scores approximating “Helpful” with a range from 3.86 (SD = .95; A and F) to 4.43 (SD = .76; D). Five of fourteen participants provided comments. Three participants thought instructions could be clearer and another generally praised the training as “very helpful in every aspect.”

Questions 7A through 7E utilized the same response format as above to collect the participants’ perceived helpfulness of the pilot’s “Common Questions Document”. Participants rated the helpfulness by reflecting on how well the document addressed the following statements: A) The overall pilot; B) how to complete the Self-Assessment Survey; C) how to label supporting documentation; D) what to expect during validation; and E) the onsite assessment process. All five sub-questions had mean scores approximating “Helpful” with a range from 3.64 (SD = 1.15; E) to 4.29 (SD = .91; C). One participant additionally commented that “This was a great resource to use to figure out what was expected during the assessment.”

LESSONS LEARNED

• Based on the reporting of the pilot participants it is clear that having a process that explained how to move through the pilot was helpful in a number of ways. For most of the participants this was their first time engaging with a rating system; the Pre-SAS process provided the context around the pilot and a detailed examination of the pilot itself ensuring that all participants received the same information. The provision of this type of content to potential QRIS participants is common across the country, though the method of delivery varies.
• Due to the fact that recruitment took longer than expected, a number of participants were not able to join a live webinar offering. While this is reflective of the reality of provider’s lives, it was noticed that some of the concerns shared by providers on the evaluation survey may have been ameliorated if they had had participated in the live webinar at the beginning and ask questions.
• This process could be revisited to make it more engaging of the audience through the incorporation of polls and other mechanisms to ensure that participants are actively engaged throughout. Also, it would have been ideal to have a large number of participants in each session, so that they could potentially build off of each other’s questions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

• A state-wide training should be developed around the Self-Assessment Survey. A comprehensive Pre-Self-Assessment Survey process should be developed for the overall system that provides an overview of the QRIS and goes step-by-step through the self-assessment and validation processes in Great Start to Quality. The development of a Pre-SAS process for the full system that is implemented with fidelity by the Great Start to Quality Resource Centers would be a similar approach to Great Start to Quality Orientation, the
training required for unlicensed, subsidized providers. Requiring all providers access to participate (whether live or by watching a recording) may help avoid the “gotcha!” feeling some providers report after going through validation. This would also strengthen continuity across the state, ensuring that providers across the state have the same experience learning about Great Start to Quality.

- **The FY 17 pilot should require in-person attendance to the Pre-SAS webinar.** In the FY 17 pilot it should be required that participants attend a live offering of the Pre-SAS process to ensure that all participants have the opportunity to ask questions about the process and the pilot; it would also allow for real-time “checks” for understanding by using polls during the webinar.
Self-Assessment Process

The next step in the pilot was for participants to begin the self-assessment process. This process was different from that in the current Great Start to Quality system in a few ways.

- Participants were required to complete a form called the Pilot Participant Information form, this form gathered information about each program's enrollment and staffing.
- The pilot self-assessment process was completed on paper or via email, rather than through the STARS platform.
- Participants had direct access to technical assistance from a dedicated staff person that provided a response within 24 hours if they had a question about the SAS, labeling process or other aspect of the pilot.
- Submissions of completed Self-Assessment Surveys and documentation could come through US mail or email (rather than through the STARS platform).
- Documentation for each indicator was required to be labeled directly on the page or pages of evidence.
- Participants had a single submission of documentation and their Self-Assessment Survey. There was no opportunity to submit additional documents during the pilot.
- Participants had a two week timeline to complete their Self-Assessment Survey, label their documentation and submit the materials for validation.

The self-assessment process in the pilot had three major steps: (1) completion of the Pilot Participant Program Information Form, (2) completion of the Self-Assessment Survey (SAS) and labeling of documentation and (3) submission of materials for validation.

Step 1: Pilot Participant Program Information Form (PPPIF):

After completing the Pre-Self-Assessment Survey process participants were sent an email that laid out the next step in the process, the completion of their Pilot Participant Program Information Form. This form was designed to capture information about the program that in the current system is captured through documents submitted on the STARS platform and during a validation call with a Validator. In this pilot it was agreed there would be no validation calls, and documentation should be submitted once through US mail or email. These features will be explored in more detail in the validation section of this report. The full PPPIF can be found in Appendix 4. This form was provided with a guidance document that provided step-by-step directions for completing it.

The form captured the following key pieces of program information:

- Contact information for the person completing the SAS.
- Enrollment information, for the full program and by age group.
- Staffing information including lead and assistant teachers.
- Classroom information showing how the children are grouped, or not, during the program.
Most participants had no issues completing the form, a few had questions about how to complete a specific section or forgot to complete the full form. This ease of completion was expressed in the evaluation survey with over 80% of participants sharing that it that: the form was easy to understand; B) the guidance document helped me complete the form; C) the form asked for information that I already knew OR could easily get; D) the format of the form was easy to follow; E) if I requested assistance in completing the form, it was received in a timely fashion; and F) I understood the purpose of completing this form. Questions that did arise mostly centered on how to list staff, and if staff who were “floaters” or mentors should be listed. All paid members of a program’s staff that engage with children were considered staff members during the pilot. The delineation of lead and assistant teachers was carried over from the current early childhood system, this feature was confusing for some out-of-school time programs that only have “program staff” and do not delineate between lead and assistant teachers. Of the programs who dropped from the pilot only two left at this step. The other three programs that dropped progressed to the next step of the pilot before dropping. Of these three two communicated that they would like to be dropped and stopped responding to outreach.

**Step 2: Self-Assessment Process**

After participants submitted a completed Pilot Participant Program Information Form their information was reviewed and the correct version of the Self-Assessment Survey being piloted was sent via email to the identified contact person. For the pilot there were four different Self-Assessment Surveys developed to accurately capture the quality in different program types. The name of the surveys align with how programs are licensed, as either a Center or a Home.

The versions were:

- Centers, serving school-agers (kindergarten entry to age 12) only
- Centers, serving children from birth to age 12
- Homes with assistants, serving children from birth to age 12
- Homes without assistants, serving children from birth to age 12

These versions are in alignment with the current SAS in the early childhood system; to learn more about the development of the indicators and the intentional alignment with the early childhood system please review *Recommendations for a School-age Design of Great Start to Quality*.

When a participant received their Self-Assessment Survey they were also provided with the *Pilot Common Questions* document. This document was designed to support provide the information delivered during the Pre-SAS process (webinar) in a written format. The document also provided additional guidance around labeling documentation. Participants also received a due date for their submission of a completed Self-Assessment Survey and labeled documentation.

The different versions of the piloted Self-Assessment Surveys can be found in Appendix 1. In Figure 2 the format of the indicators is shown. This format was consistent across all four versions and was developed by the Program Quality Indicator workgroup in FY 2015 as the recommended format for the
Self-Assessment Surveys. This version differs substantially from the current version in Great Start to Quality which provides only the actual indicator language. This format is, however, very similar to the guidance documents that were developed this fiscal year for the early childhood version of the system and provided the same level of detail to support programs to successfully participate in Great Start to Quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Category</th>
<th>Indicator 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>This section shows the statement that describes a feature of the staff or program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Value</td>
<td>This section shows how many points it is possible for a program to earn with each indicator. Some indicators are worth a range of points, some have a specific point value. In both cases, an indicator is either met, or not. There are no partial points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place X if applicable</td>
<td>This is where pilot participant should place an X to show that their program meets the indicator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

This section provides an explanation as to what the indicator is trying to capture and why the indicator is important.

**Suggested Documentation**

This section provides examples, and in some cases a description, of what documentation pilot participants should provide to demonstrate that they have met the indicator. These examples are not intended to define all ways that a participant could demonstrate meeting an indicator.

**To Learn More:**

This section shows the connections to the documents that outline Michigan’s definition of quality in early care and education and out-of-school time programs.

As mentioned above participants were given two weeks to complete their SAS, label their documentation, and submit the materials for validation. Question 12 of the evaluation survey assessed the participants’ experience completing the SAS within the window of two weeks with the following response options: “Two weeks was not nearly long enough, I struggled to submit on time” (1), “Two weeks was tight, but we were able to make it work” (2), “Neutral” (3), “Two weeks was enough time, I had to prioritize but it was not a hassle” (4), and “Two weeks was more than enough time” (5). The mean score was 2.21 (SD = 1.05) and approximated “Two weeks was tight, but we were able to make it work.” Summarized, most participants felt it was challenging to meet the timeline but was manageable. It should be noted that four programs requested an extension and five programs, including two of those who requested an extension submitted their SAS and supporting documentation after their due date.

Participants in the pilot had fewer questions during the self-assessment process than had been expected. The two topics that participants had questions about most often were related to the Staff Qualifications and Professional Development indicators and how best to label their supporting documentation. In terms of the indicators, participants wanted to understand if there were any equivalences to the Michigan School-age Youth Development Certification or Credential and how to count professional development hours. In regards to labelling, most participants wanted to ensure that they understood how exactly to label the documents and whether or not their approach (e.g. using
color highlighters and writing indicator numbers) was acceptable. Even given these questions most programs struggled to label documents correctly. Interestingly when asked to reflect on whether or not the labeling process helped participants to reflect on their SAS, the program as a whole and where they might like to make improvements the response was overwhelmingly positive. The mean response being that that participants “Agreed” that labeling helped them to reflect on their program.

The evaluation survey also asked participants to reflect on the format and content of the Self-Assessment Survey. Questions 9A through 9E related to the format and content of the Self-Assessment Survey: A) The format of the indicators were easy to read; B) the wording of the indicators were clear and easy to understand; C) the “Intent of Indicator Section” helped me understand the indicators; D) the “Suggested Documentation Section” helped me understand what I might use as proof that my program is meeting an indicator; and E) the “To Learn More Section” helped me connect the indicator to Michigan’s definition of quality in child care and out-of-school time settings. Response options were “Strongly Disagree” (1), “Disagree” (2), “Neutral” (3), “Agree” (4), and “Strongly Agree” (5). All five sub-questions had mean scores that approximated “Agree” with a range from 3.71 (SD = 1.14; B) to 4.50 (SD = .52; A). Four participants provided additional comments: Three comments described the Self-Assessment Survey’s wording and indicator language as vague and unclear and one additional comment provided general praise for the school-age version of the SAS.

Step 3: Submission of Materials

A key feature of the pilot was the labelling of supporting documentation. In the current system programs interact with the Self-Assessment Survey on the STARS platform and are required to upload and link documentation to most indicators. The process used in the pilot, described below, is a new possible iteration of this process that puts the onus on the program to determine which evidence is for each indicator as specifically as possible. During discussions among the Steering Committee members it was determined that rather than having Validators determine which piece of evidence is associated with each indicator, the participants should do so themselves. This was achieved by requiring participants to label the page of the document that should be reviewed for each indicator. This differs from the current system in that programs must link documents to specific indicators, but all indicators do not have to have documents linked to them, and there is no mechanism to identify which pages to review for each indicator.

There were two options for submission: US mail or email. For participants that submitted via US mail, they were provided with sticker labels to use. For programs that submitted via email multiple strategies for labeling were outlined in the Pilot Common Questions document and some programs also reached out to confirm that using something like a colored highlighter and writing the indicator number would be acceptable. The impact of this process is explored further in the Validation section of this report.

The Steering Committee also recommended that pilot participants should be able to submit their Self-Assessment Survey and labeled documentation once. This differs from the current system substantially. Currently programs are able to upload additional documentation throughout the validation
process. This ability to upload documents throughout the validation process is similar to that of other states which provide a window of time during which documentation can be provided. The features that differed that impacted the validation process more directly are listed in the Validation section of this report.

LESSONS LEARNED

- The Pilot Participant Program Information Form is a valuable tool to capture program-level details about staffing and enrollment. It also provided the Validator with some idea of what to expect when reviewing staff qualifications for programs. Feedback from participants on this form was overwhelmingly positive. Questions 8A through 8F on the pilot evaluation survey related to the pilot program intake form and utilized a true-false response format: A) The form was easy to understand; B) the guidance document helped me complete the form; C) the form asked for information that I already knew OR could easily get; D) the format of the form was easy to follow; E) if I requested assistance in completing the form, it was received in a timely fashion; and F) I understood the purpose of completing this form. Responses to the six sub-questions were very positive with 85.7% (A, B, E) to 92.9% (C, D, F) saying “True.” Three participants provided additional comments: Two participants praised the process as “very easy” and Jordan for being “very efficient with her timely responses and answers.”
- The Pilot Common Question document was useful for providers in understanding the pilot as a whole and the Self-Assessment Survey specifically.
- The inability to submit additional supporting evidence was troublesome for programs that had interacted with Great Start to Quality previously, and felt that they were in a “gotcha” situation in the pilot. Other participants also felt that if they had had an opportunity to upload additional documents they would have scored higher, and felt that the indicators were not always clear, so what documents to provide were not clear. Interestingly, there were limited questions received on what documentation could be submitted for indicators.
- Some participants struggled with labeling materials, and may have lost points because of it.
- When asked in the evaluation survey how accurately participants felt the indicators represented out-of-school time programs responses were structured between the following options the number in parentheses shows the number of participants who selected each option: “Not at all” (1); “Neutral” (2); “Somewhat accurately” (3); “Mostly accurate” (4), and “Completely accurately” (5). Most participants felt that the SAS “somewhat accurately” captured quality in out-of-school time programs.
- There was one issue during the pilot. It was discovered that the Self-Assessment Survey for Centers serving children 0-12 contained a duplicate indicator and another indicator was missing. Fortunately this was discovered after only one program had submitted. This program was already participating in Great Start to Quality, so had provided supporting documentation for the missing indicator as well. The other programs that completed that survey were made aware of the issue and a corrected version was supplied.
- When asked to reflect on the difficulty of completing the SAS participants selected from the following options: “Very challenging, I needed a lot of help understanding it” (1), “Challenging,
many of the indicators were unclear” (2), “Neutral” (3), “Mostly easy, most of the indicators were clear” (4), and “Easy, I could understand all the indicators without assistance” (5). The most common response was that the SAS was “mostly easy, most of the indicators were clear.”

- When participants were asked, “What, if anything, would have been helpful to include in the indicators of the Self-Assessment Survey? This could be things like: more examples of documentation more robust intent statements, or any other ideas you might have.” Of the comments received 57% provided overall praise to the SAS. Additional comments suggested more examples of documentations and the level of detail required in documentation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Continue the use of the Pilot Program Participant Information Form.** The information captured in the PPPIF is vital to validation; this information should be intentionally captured during the Self-Assessment process and provided to the Validator either prior to and at the beginning of a validation. This form should also include the hire date so that staff’s professional development hours can be prorated appropriately.

- **Discuss the PPPIF to determine if there should be a version that lists only staff.** The PPPIF should be revisited to determine if delineation of staff into Lead and Assistants is vital or useful when considering out-of-school time programs that only serve schoolagers.

- **Review and revise Self-Assessment Survey Staff Qualification indicators.** In the pilot Self-Assessment Survey for Centers serving children birth to 12, all early childhood staff qualifications are captured in one indicator. The same is true for the school-age staff. The grouping of school-age staff into one indicator and early childhood staff into one indicator for staff qualifications may not accurately capture the diversity of talents and experience of the staff. Participants reflected on this in their evaluations as well as during follow-up calls and felt that the quality of their program’s staff was not accurately captured. These indicators should be reviewed to ensure all staff’s qualifications are taken into consideration.

- **Consider a longer submission window for FY 17 pilot.** A three week submission window should be considered for the pilot in FY 17, however the window should be longer than two weeks to account for the realities programs face and to avoid late submissions, which impact the timeline for onsite assessment.

- **Revise the level of labeling required in supporting documentation.** Requiring programs to attach specific documents to each indicator, as shown by the participants’ evaluations was a valuable task, however for it to be made true in the full system a complete overhaul of the STARS platform would be required. In the pilot in FY 17 participants should be required to connect documentation to each indicator, and could provide a further level of detail, but page level labeling should not be required.

- **Examine the level of detail and explanation of indicators available to participants.** The format of the SAS should be examined and additional examples of supporting documents, as well as detailed explanations of the required level of detail in supporting documentation should be provided.
to participants. This will help to ensure a clear understanding of the intent and how best to
documentation demonstration of meeting an indicator.
Validation

In the pilot, 100% of the Self-Assessment Surveys were validated within 14 business days. The structure of validation in the pilot was different than that of the current system. The process in the current system is outlined below, keep in mind that not all programs are selected for validation in the current system.

1. A provider submits their materials for validation and then, if selected for random validation, they are called by a member of the validation team to confirm their program information. This includes the number and type of classrooms, the contact information, whether or not a program is NAEYC accredited, GSRP, or Head Start, and other features. This step is similar to the submission of the Pilot Participant Program Information Form, however the PPPIF asked for more specific information about classrooms, including teacher’s names and education.

2. Next, a Validator reviews the documentation uploaded by the program and begins writing the validation report.

3. After the review is finished the Validator schedules and holds a validation call to review the materials submitted, ask questions to determine if a program meets the intent of the indicator and at the end to let the program know they have an opportunity to upload additional documentation if they would like to.

4. Programs have five business days to upload additional documentation.

5. The Validator then reviews the additional documents and completes the Validation Report.

On average the validation process takes multiple weeks. The time dedicated to each programs’ validation is around five hours, with some programs taking more time and some taking less. The amount of time it takes is directly impacted by how much supporting documentation is provided, the format it is provided in, and when in the Validation window the documentation was uploaded to the STARS platform.

In the pilot, a different process was tested to determine if it could cut down on the validation time and empower the providers to be more reflective about their program and evidence.

1. Participants submit their completed Self-Assessment Survey and labeled documentation.

2. A Validator reviews the completed SAS and documentation and writes the Validation Report.

On average the validation process took 3.5 hours from the start of document review to the completion of the Validation Report. The determination not to have a validation call was made based on the structure of the Self-Assessment Survey and the requirement that each indicator have evidence tied directly to it. In the current system all indicators do not have to documentation linked to them. The Self-Assessment Surveys in the pilot were designed to capture structural features of quality. These are features of the program that are concrete, and are not designed to directly measure the experiences that children have in a setting. Structural quality measures capture features like: staff qualifications, the policies the program and families must follow, and how a program is designed to run. Given that
the Self-Assessment Survey is designed to capture these features it was decided that the need for a validation call should be tested, as to meet any indicator documentation had to be provided. If the documentation was not clear to a Validator, how would, for example, it be clear to a family that is seeking care? Helping families to find high-quality care that fits their needs is one of the main goals of a QRIS. So it was decided by the Steering Committee, and approved by MDE-OGS, that validations should be completed sans a validation call.

To ensure the two systems were in alignment, even though the process was different, the Validator for the pilot was in direct contact with Manager of Validation and Assessment as well as the two most senior Validators on staff at ECIC. The four connected using SmartSheet® creating a written record of all inquiries about whether or not evidence met the intent of an indicator. This tool helped to ensure that validations could be completed in a timely fashion and that the required evidence for indicators were similar or the same as those in the current system were assessed the same way.

In both the current system and the pilot the last step is the same (when a program is not eligible for onsite assessment) the program receives their Validation Report. The report format is very similar in both instances, however the pilot report was delivered as a PDF while in the current system providers receive their report through the STARS platform and results are delivered by a Quality Improvement Consultant, who talks through the results with the provider. In the pilot, participants could request a call to go over their results and discuss their concerns, but it was not a required step.

Of the 18 programs that participated in the pilot, eight chose to accept their ratings. The other 10 programs declined their ratings with similar reasons as those communicated by programs in the current system: they felt the rating was too low or they felt that the process was unfair or did not accurately capture the quality of their program. Participants who had additional questions or concerns were connected with via phone to further explain the process and purpose of the pilot as well as why they did or did not receive points on specific indicators. After the call, multiple participants that declined their rating still felt very positive about the process and were appreciative of the opportunity to learn about what’s coming next, and to be able to reflect on their program and generally learn more about how Michigan defines and plans to measure quality.

LESSONS LEARNED FOR FULL SYSTEM LAUNCH
This new validation process provided a number of insights into the development of the new system that could positively impact all programs and providers who are currently participating or join in the future. As explained above in both the Self-Assessment and Validation sections of this report there were specific features of the validation process that were different in the pilot than in the current system. Appendix 6 provides an analytical report on the Self-Assessment Surveys and how participants faired in the process as well as a detailed analysis of the evaluation survey results. Below are some of the conclusions drawn in the report and additional reflections on the validation process and the data
collected. In some cases specific conclusions from the report in Appendix X are not shared because the findings are already called out in a different way in this report.

**Timeline**

- The timeline of validations from start to finish could likely be shortened if participants were required to more intentionally and specifically label their documentation with clear guidance on how to do so.
- Having a single submission process meant that the Validator could complete a validation from state to finish without waiting for a program to provide additional documentation. For participants that opted to submit via US mail additional submissions could have impacted the validation timeline substantially.

**Pilot Participant Program Information From**

- This form was vital to completion of validations without a validation call. Currently Validators use the submitted documentation related to education and professional development hours and the validation call to determine the program staffing. This approach can cause confusion and lengthen the validation timeframe as some programs may not have uploaded documentation representing all of their staff and Validators have no way to determine this until there is a call. This form provided information about enrollment and staff at the classroom level, which allowed the Validator to be certain that all staff qualifications and professional development experiences were reviewed during validation. It also provided information about adult:child ratio. However this form did not capture the hire date of program staff, which is necessary for prorating professional development hours.

**Labeling**

- When programs were very thorough with their labeling it made the validation process more efficient and the Validator felt the overall process was more reflective of the program. However not all programs were as thorough as directed and had the Validator not given credit when evidence that clearly connected to an indicator was encountered a significant number of pilot participants would have scored below a 3 Star. This inclusion of evidence encountered during the document review was consistent across all programs. In all cases in the pilot however, when a program did not select an indicator they were not given credit, even if the evidence was present for the indicator. This was decided because the Self-Assessment Survey is meant to be completed by the program and the validation is designed to be reflective of the program’s selected indicators. In the current system Validators make note of evidence than may mean a program is meeting an unselected indicator and will discuss these with the program during the validation call.
- The labeling process, even when less than thorough, was beneficial in removing the “guess work” for the Validator. It made determining what indicator a piece of evidence was uploaded in connection to significantly easier.
- Completing the validations without a validation call was challenging when a program did not label their documents thoroughly. The capacity for the Validator to be able to connect with the
program via phone would have been beneficial in determining what indicator a piece of
documentation was linked to and to ask clarifying questions.

**Indicators**

- All pilot programs consistently scored low on the Staffing indicators related to staff educational
  obtainment due to the requirement of having the School-Age Youth Development Certification
  or Credential. This was included in all versions of the Self-Assessment Surveys (SAS) in
different ways; in the SASs for Centers 5-12 and 0-12 there were not equivalents provided for
the certification or credential for school-age staff at each point value of the indicator, which
meant that unless a staff had a certificate or credential their education was not recognized. For
example, staff who had teaching certificates received no credit related to their education.
Among participants completing the evaluation of the pilot survey, this particular requirement
was cited specifically over and over again as something that was unfair, not representative of
quality in a program. Figure 3 provided an example of how the Michigan School Age Youth
Development Certificate and Credential are represented in the pilot.
The indicators related to professional development hours were also challenging for programs to produce evidence that met the required level of detail. In many cases, programs uploaded agendas, certificates, and other pieces, but few provided evidence that showed that each staff member had completed 24 hours of professional development and that the appropriate amount of those hours were focused on the required subjects.

One program in their evaluation shared, “I feel that some of the indicators needed a little more explanation or some wording was not carried over from one to the other.” This caused confusion for this program, in their follow up call they mentioned it did not appear that all the staff qualification indicators built upon each other at each point level.

### Figure 3

- The indicators related to professional development hours were also challenging for programs to produce evidence that met the required level of detail. In many cases programs uploaded agendas, certificates and other pieces, but few provided evidence that showed that each staff member had completed 24 hours of professional development and that the appropriate amount of those hours were focused on the required subjects.

- One program in their evaluation shared, “I feel that some of the indicators needed a little more explanation or some wording was not carried over from one to the other.” This caused confusion for this program, in their follow up call they mentioned it did not appear that all the staff qualification indicators built upon each other at each point level.
• Analysis of the Validation results across all pilot participants surfaced that there were three indicators that less than 1/3 of participants were able to meet.

  o The first was indicator #2 in the Staff Qualifications and Professional Development category. This indicator is shared by the 0-12 and 5-12 versions of the SAS but not by the Home without Assistants version. The indicator reads: At least one staff has, at a minimum, a valid Michigan School-Age Youth Development Credential OR at least 25 percent of school-age staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Certificate. (1) OR At least 25 percent of staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Credential OR at least 50 percent of school-age staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Certificate. (2) OR At least 50 percent of staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Credential OR 100 percent of school-age staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Certificate. (3) OR 100 percent of school-age staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Credential AND 50 percent of staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Certificate (4). The bolded “OR’s” show where the point breaks are in the indicator. The number in parentheses after the statements shows the number of points each is worth. Of the 16 programs that shared this indicator only three were able to meet it and those that met it were all 5-12 Centers.

  o The second was indicator #6 in the Staff Qualifications and Professional Development Category which reads: Director has a graduate degree in a child-related field OR program work at least monthly with an early childhood or school age specialist who has a graduate degree in a child-related field OR program works with a Quality Improvement Consultant. Of the 17 programs in the pilot only three were able to meet this indicator.

  o The third was indicator # 2 in the Administration and Management category. This indicator read: Program has a formal advisory committee that meets regularly to coordinate programming, curriculum, goals, policies, and procedures. At least three of the following stakeholders must be included in meetings: administrators, program staff, school staff, community members, schoolagers, and families. Interestingly this indicator was met by the Center that served children from 0-12 but was only met by four of the 13 Centers serving children 5-12.

• Of all participants who indicated that they have “…a documented, graduated salary scale that takes into account education and experiences,” less than half were able to provide evidence that showed a scale that took into account the necessary factors. There was sometimes a policy around increasing salaries or promoting within, however many were missing an actual scale that took the necessary factors into account.

• In the Curriculum and Instruction section of the 13 providers who uploaded evidence for the Indicator which read: Provider has a written plan and process in place to ensure that schoolagers have planned activities and academic experiences that provide opportunities in the following content areas, social, emotional, physical, academic, creative expression, cultural, character and development and STEM, only six actually received credit. In most
cases, it was clear that all or the majority of content areas were incorporated into the daily planned activities. For example, some programs uploaded pictures of children engaging in science activities or field trip schedules with cultural activities incorporated. However, very few programs actually had a written plan regarding how these activities are planned or how the program ensures all content areas are incorporated into activities.

- During the design of the pilot it was determined that the best way to make the system feel similar was by having the total number of points in each indicator category and the cut off scores for each star rating remain the same as they are in the early childhood system. During analysis the outcome in this approach became clear. While the four SAS versions have the same number of points per category, the different number of indicators result in different point values for the same indicators across SAS versions. This variance in point value effectively results in weighted levels of importance for the same indicator across provider types in terms of how it impacts their category and total scores. This variation in value can therefore impact the resulting STAR rating the program obtains. The most striking example is the comparison of the Center 5 to 12 version with the others in the category of Curriculum and Instruction. Indicators 1, 3, 4, and 5 are valued at twice the point value on the Center 5 to 12 version as compared to the other three versions. Even more strikingly, indicator 2 is valued at four times the importance on the Center 5 to 12 version as compared to the other three versions. Restated, the presence or absence of evidence for indicator number two is four times as impactful to the category and total scores and, consequently, the final STAR rating for the Center 5 to 12 version as compared to the others.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Explore how to implement more specific labeling of supporting documentation.** As recommended in the Self-Assessment Process section the level to which programs label documentation should be considered. In the launch of a new system, costs will need to be considered. Revamping the online platform to allow for programs to label to the page level would require substantial investment. In the FY 17 pilot it is recommended that programs be provided with a mechanism to attach documentation to each indicator, but not require the page of said documentation to be labeled.

- **Design a protocol for validation call for FY 17 pilot.** During this pilot it was determined there should be no validation call; while this approach worked, the Validator expressed that a validation call of some sort would be beneficial during the process. The two providers that were already participating in the Great Start to Quality also expressed that they wanted an opportunity to explain their documentation. In the current systemValidators talk through each indicator including those a program did not indicate it is currently demonstrating in their program. It is recommended that during the FY 17 pilot a validation call protocol be developed, using the protocol in place for the early childhood system as a launching point. This recommended validation call would be different from that in the current system. The Validator would ask the necessary clarifying questions for indicators that a program selected but would not address indicators that were not selected, even if evidence for that indicator was found during validation. Currently validators will “give credit” to programs for indicators they find evidence for, even if the program did not select this.
• **Revise Staff Qualification indicators to be more inclusive of the unique talents of out-of-school time staff.** The Steering Committee should identify clear equivalences for MISAYD Certification and Credential. This should include the consideration of what should be done if a program staff has met the requirements for the certification or credential but is not a part of the program. This conversation should also address current best-practices in out-of-school time programs related to staff with specialized knowledge and how that could be recognized in the SAS.

• **Revise indicators to ensure consistency.** Indicators should be reviewed for consistent language within each indicator that has a range of possible points clearly build upon one another and the features of the indicators (e.g. the MISAYD Certification and Credential) clearly show an increase in quality that also takes into account the skills and talents of the staff.

• **Reflect on point structure and consider how maintaining the total number of points in a category and cut off scores for star levels may not be equitable across settings.** As mentioned above the value of a particular indicator in relation to a programs total score is skewed based on the SAS a program completes. This raises the question as to whether or not this was an intended result of the point structure—this issue extends to the early childhood version as well. If it was unexpected, we could consider modifications to the structure of the indicators in order to mitigate scoring discrepancies. The simplest approach would be to use the same point value for indicators that are shared across versions and to adjust the scoring rubric for the SAS versions that are affected. For example, indicators 1 through 5 in the Curriculum and Instruction category on the Center 5 to 12 version could be revalued at 1 point each (equivalent to the other three versions) and the scoring rubric for that version only would be modified. However, if we wish to consider making indicator point values homologous across versions, we should ensure that no shared indicators are permitted to have disparate values unless we believe that weighting their values is justified. This would likely result in each version having its own scoring rubric.

• **Provide further details on how to document professional development experiences.** The indicators that reference professional development should include an explanation of what a professional development log should include, as well as the level of detail required to receive credit. The SAS should clearly state that to demonstrate 24 hours of professional development the program must submit documentation that shows that each staff person at their program has completed these hours annually. For example, agendas from PD meetings alone are not a good fit as they do not show who attended the training. A better submission would be the agenda and accompanying sign in sheet.

• **Review indicators with a lens for programs that only have part-time staff.** Many programs are staffed by part-time staff only, with the Site Supervisor or someone in a similar role as the only full-time employee. The Steering Committee should take this into consideration when revising the indicators for the FY 2017 pilot.

• **Expand explanations and examples for indicators to increase relevance for Homes.** The single group home that participated was very positive about the experience, however she felt it would be beneficial to provide more suggested types of documentation that would be more common in a home child care. The Steering Committee should consider how best to identify and incorporate evidence and explanations that resonate with home providers.
• **Determine how accreditation will be recognized in the system.** What entities accredit these programs should be further explored and entities whose accreditation should be recognized in the system should be identified.

• **Determine if salary scales are confidential.** In requiring the actual scale the SAS may be requesting something that is considered confidential.

• **Define plan and process.** In all cases when an indicator references having a “plan” or “process” in place, clear guidance on what a plan should contain and what evidence would demonstrate there is a process in place should be provided. This should be included in either the Self-Assessment Survey or in an accompanying guidance document that breaks down each indicator, like the one created for the current system.
Onsite Assessment

The final step in the validation process for some programs is to have the appropriate onsite assessment tools administered. This is true in the current system focused on early childhood programs and was true for the pilot. Participants that achieved a 4 or 5 Star rating on the Self-Assessment Survey and were validated at that rating were contacted directly by ECIC to determine if they were interested in having the onsite assessment tools administered. Two tools were planned to be tested during the pilot, the complete (including school-aged indicators of quality) Family Child Care PQA and School-Age PQA, Walk-Through Version and Method. The first tool is owned by the HighScope Research Foundation and the second belongs to the Weikart Center for Program Quality (Weikart). Both tools were selected during the work in FY 15 as the potential best fit for a system inclusive of programs serving children up to age 12.

The Family Child Care PQA is already being implemented in the current system. In the pilot it was planned that Assessment Specialists would transition from using part of the tool, to using the full tool and were to be trained to be valid and reliable on the full tool. However, the only home provider who participated in the pilot did not achieve a high enough rating to be eligible for onsite assessment so the tool was not tested during the pilot.

The School-Age PQA, Walk-Through Version and Method (SA PQA) is a version of the School-age PQA that was developed by Weikart for use in programs that may not have specific program offerings that could be observed. It is designed to be used to observe program quality. Multiple staff at ECIC, including the Director of Assessment & Systems, the Manager of Validation and Assessment, and the project lead, worked directly with multiple staff at Weikart to develop protocols for how the tool would be administered during the pilot. In discussion after the pilot, it was surfaced that the SA PQA that was administered also included five supplemental scales: transitions, activity structure, recreation time, homework time and departure. While the reflections on these scales may be valuable for quality improvement, they are not figured into the final score. The protocols can be found in Appendix 5 along with the full report developed by Weikart on the assessment component of the pilot.

Working with a new partner can be challenging as two systems try to align with one another. Even with the development of protocols during the pilot it was found additional conversations were needed to ensure that the purpose of the onsite assessment, the details in the report, and the role of the Assessment Specialists were clear to both parties. In the pilot in FY 17 inter-rater reliability should be discussed to determine what additional trainings or protocols should be put into place. Additional planning conversations will ensure that process and protocols are clear and that all staff are knowledgeable. Similar to the PQA tools owned by HighScope this tool is one that has been primary used for quality improvement. As the tool is now an assessment tool for a QRIS rating training and ongoing conversations are needed to ensure alignment with the system.
During the pilot four programs qualified for onsite assessment, however only three were able to complete the process. The program that as not able to have an onsite assessment conducted was scheduled to have the assessment administered the last day of the assessment window; which was also the last day the program was running for the school year. The program reached out when the onsite assessment had not taken place earlier in the week and communicated that they did not believe an assessment conducted on the last day of the program would accurately represent their program and declined to have the tool administered on that day.

Given the small sample size of just three programs, it is difficult to draw conclusions about whether or not this is the best tool to use, especially as the SA PQA was not administered at a program that required the other PQAs to be administered, a Center birth to age 12. The current approach is to average the scores of the PQAs to arrive at the final score; this process remains untested. The tool was administered in one stand-alone center, one 21st Century program, and one for-profit afterschool program hosted at a school. This limited range of settings also does not offer additional insight into the fit of the tool for diverse types of programs.

LESSONS LEARNED

- Limiting the use of the PQA tools to only programs that achieved a 4 or a 5 Star did not provide insight into whether the tool matched well with the Self-Assessment Survey or provide a large sample pool to draw conclusions on in general. The programs that did receive onsite assessment, the School-Age PQA, Walk-Through Version and Method, did achieve the same rating as their SAS, meaning their cut off score for the PQA would not have put them at a 5 Star if they came in at a 4 Star on the SAS. However there also was no opportunity to test to see if a program that rated at a 3 Star would achieve a similar cut off score on the PQA.
- Robust, thoughtful planning conversations at the beginning of the FY 17 pilot, that delve deeply into the tool and it’s scales, as well as the needed knowledge base for inter-rater reliability will be essential. Regular check-ins during the pilot will allow for both parties to stay abreast of the current work and give the opportunity for either side to raise a concern or a question. Both parties will need a shared understanding of the purpose of the tool and its implementation.
- The three programs that qualified for a PQA reflected in the pilot evaluation survey that they felt the combination of the SAS and PQA scores “mostly accurately” reflected quality in their out-of-school time programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Administer the PQA in all programs in the FY 17 pilot.** Adjust the pilot design for FY17 so that all participants, regardless of rating, are required to have the appropriate PQA tools administered. For programs at a 1, 2 or 3 Star the score on the tool is not associated with their final rating. This will allow for testing to determine if the tool is a good fit in relation to the SAS as well as allow for a larger sample pool overall in using the tool.
- **Partner with Weikart and other stakeholders to conduct a full review and crosswalk of the SA PQA, licensing rules and the SAS.** The SA PQA should be reviewed in detail against the SAS
and licensing requirements to determine if there is overlap, and if so, the tool should be updated to avoid any overlap between the SAS indicators and the PQA. This recommendation was echoed by Weikart, “While this pilot did provide a sampling of program structures and ages of children served, additional pilot testing, obtaining feedback from stakeholders, then adjusting for a phased roll-out is recommended… An example of a potential adjustment would be to use Instructional Total Score instead of Total Score for reporting and program improvement purposes. Many programs use Instructional Total Score (which does not include the Safe Environment domain) instead of Total Score because the Environment domain is largely controlled by regulations and they prefer to focus ratings and improvement plans on the Supportive Environment, Interaction and Engagement domains which comprise the Instructional Total Score.”

- **Continue to exclude the supplemental scales in the final score on the SA PQA.** The Steering Committee should determine if the scales should be assessed during the onsite assessment visit or if they should be completed removed from the tool. Regardless, scales could be provided to the Great Start to Quality Resource Center staff to support quality improvement in programs.

- **Continue to focus on inter-rater reliability for Assessment Specialists and determine what additional training Assessment Specialist may require.** Training for the Assessment Specialists on likely programs (e.g. Child and Adult Food Care Program that participants could be a member) should be required prior to administering the SA PQA in the FY 17 pilot. Ongoing training and inter-rater reliability checks should be explored between Weikart and ECIC.
Limitations of the Pilot

The sample size of the pilot was very small, only 18 programs. This is not a large enough sample to draw conclusions about the out-of-school time field at large in Michigan. Additionally the distribution of participants across providers’ types was not equal, meaning that the results of this pilot are most representative of programs that only serve schoolagers in a Center licensed setting. Before a full system can be developed further piloting needs to take place to create a larger pool of providers, and a pool that is representative of all types of settings that care for and educate school-agers.
Conclusion

The work moving forward in designing Great Start to Quality to be inclusive of out-of-school time programs is extremely important and multi-faceted. This report provides recommendations that will support the next phase of the work, a second pilot in FY 2017. These recommendations should be used as a road map to develop an approach to validation that accurately captures quality and is informed by the field at every level.
Appendix 1: Self-Assessment Survey Versions

This Appendix hosts the four piloted Self-Assessment Surveys used during the FY 2016 pilot. The first Self-Assessment Survey is for Centers serving children from birth to age 12. The version is for Centers serving schoolagers from age five to age 12. The third Self-Assessment Survey is for Family Homes, homes without assistants. The four version is for Group Homes, homes with assistants.
1.1 Centers Serving Children 0-12
### Staff Qualifications and Professional Development

**Indicator 1**

**Description of Staff:** Could be Program Director, Site Supervisor or other title. Indicator selection should reflect qualifications of the person who is present at the program on a daily basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators (select one)</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X next to selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Director has 60 semester hours with 12 semester hours in a child related field and 1,200 hours of experience <strong>OR</strong> Child Development Associate (CDA) or Montessori credential including a minimum of 12 semester hours in Early Childhood Education / Child Development and 960 hours of experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director or site supervisor has an associates degree in child-related field with 960 hours of experience <strong>OR</strong> supervisor has a valid Michigan School Age Youth Development Credential or equivalent with 12 semester hours in child related field and 960 hours of experience <strong>OR</strong> 60 semester hours in a program leading to a bachelor's Degree in a child-related field with at least 24 of those semester hours in a child-related field.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director or site supervisor has a Bachelor's Degree or higher in a child-related field with 960 hours of experience.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director or site supervisor has Bachelor's Degree or higher in a child-related field AND a valid Michigan School Age Youth Development Credential or Equivalent.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolagers' growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care.

**Suggested Documentation**

Documentation needs to indicate, if relevant, what field the degree was completed in. Could include: diploma, college transcript and/or training record hours.

**To Learn More:**

- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg.15
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 103
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infants and Toddler Programs, pg. 78-79

---

**Note:** Licensing defines child-related field in the following ways: For an early childhood program director means elementary education, child guidance/counseling, child psychology, family studies, and social work. For a school-age program director means early childhood education, elementary education, secondary education, physical education and recreation, child development, child guidance/counseling, child psychology, family studies, social work, human services, and youth development.
### Staff Qualifications and Professional Development

#### Indicator 2

**Description of Staff:** Staff who works only with schoolagers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators (select one)</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X next to selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least one staff has, at a minimum, a valid Michigan School-Age Youth Development Credential <strong>OR</strong> at least 25 percent of school-age staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Certificate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 25 percent of staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Credential <strong>OR</strong> at least 50 percent of school-age staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Certificate.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 50 percent of staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Credential <strong>OR</strong> 100 percent of school-age staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Certificate.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 percent of school-age staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Credential <strong>OR</strong> at least an associates degree OR 60 semester hours or higher in a child-related field <strong>OR</strong> 50 percent of staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Credential <strong>AND</strong> 50 percent of staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Certificate.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intent of Indicator

When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolagers’ growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care.

#### Suggested Documentation

Copies of Credential and/or certificates for all school-age staff.

#### To Learn More:

- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg.15
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 103
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infants and Toddler Programs, pg. 78-79
### Staff Qualifications and Professional Development

**Indicator 3**

**Description of Staff:** Staff who works only in early childhood classrooms or predominately with children who have not entered kindergarten.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators (select one)</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X next to selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 50% of early childhood staff have at a minimum a CDA or Montessori credential appropriate to age served OR 100% of staff have completed at least one postsecondary course in Early Childhood Education/Child Development OR 20 hours of community/academic training aligned with the Core Knowledge Core Competencies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of early childhood staff have at a minimum a CDA or Montessori credential appropriate to age served.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 50% of early childhood staff have at a minimum an associate degree in Early Childhood Education/child development or a child-related field including a minimum of 18 semester hours in Early Childhood Education / Child Development OR 60 semester hours in a program leading to a bachelor’s degree in Early Childhood Education/Child Development or child-related field with at least 18 semester hours in Early Childhood Education/Child Development.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of early childhood staff have at a minimum an associate degree in Early Childhood Education/Child Development or a child-related field including a minimum of 18 semester hours in Early Childhood Education / Child Development OR 60 semester hours in a program leading to a bachelor’s degree in Early Childhood Education/Child Development or child-related field with at least 18 semester hours in early childhood education/child development.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolager’s growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care.

**Suggested Documentation**

Documentation needs to demonstrate for each early childhood staff their completion of a CDA, training hours and/or progress towards or completion of a degree.

**To Learn More:**
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg.15
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 103
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infants and Toddler Programs, pg. 78-79
### Staff Qualifications and Professional Development

#### Indicator 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director and all program staff complete at least 24 hours of professional development annually.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intent of Indicator

When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolagers’ growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care.

#### Suggested Documentation

Documentation must show that all staff has completed 24 hours of professional development.

To Learn More:
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section III, Standard G
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 18-20
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 101
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 74-75, 78

---

### Staff Qualifications and Professional Development

#### Indicator 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual professional development attended by ALL staff includes at least two hours focused on cultural competence or inclusive practices related to serving children and schoolagers with special needs or disabilities and their families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intent of Indicator

When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolagers’ growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care.

#### Suggested Documentation

Documentation must show that all staff has completed 2 hours of professional development focused on cultural competence or inclusive practices related to serving schoolagers with special needs or disabilities.

To Learn More:
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section III, Standard G
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 75
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Qualifications and Professional Development</th>
<th>Indicator 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual PD attended by school age staff has at least two hours focused on specifically supporting schoolagers and their families.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Intent of Indicator** | When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolagers’ growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care. |

| **Suggested Documentation** | Documentation must show that all staff has completed two hours of professional development focused on specifically supporting schoolagers and their families. |

To Learn More:
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section III, Standard G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Qualifications and Professional Development</th>
<th>Indicator 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director has a graduate degree in a child-related field OR program work at least monthly with an early childhood or school age specialist who has a graduate degree in a child-related field OR program works with a Quality Improvement Consultant.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Intent of Indicator** | When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolagers’ growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care. |

| **Suggested Documentation** | Transcripts, diploma, documentation that demonstrates ongoing meetings with a specialist or with QIC. |

To Learn More:
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section III, Standard G
### Family and Community Partnerships

#### Indicator 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program offers family education opportunities for all families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Families are provided with opportunities to engage in family education, enrichment, family support, child development and other programs or groups. This is provided by the program or by sharing opportunities from community agencies that are designed to improve the quality of family life and support children/schoolagers' learning and development.

**Suggested Documentation**

- Written Communication, Newsletters, Statement regarding informal communication, Event Programs/Flyers, Meeting Agendas, Attendance (sign-in sheets).

**To Learn More:**

- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 11
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 105-106

#### Indicator 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider engages in informal communication with families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Staff interact informally with families to support an on-going relationship by sharing information about the children/schoolager’s development.

**Suggested Documentation**

- Written Communications (email, text message, Facebook, etc.), Newsletters, Statement regarding informal communication, Documentation of program policy (handbook, job description, staff expectations).

**To Learn More:**

- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg.11
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 105-107
### Indicator 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Indicator</strong></th>
<th><strong>Point Value</strong></th>
<th><strong>Place X if applicable</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships that take basic steps to facilitate children’s and schoolagers’ transitions before and after school, and between and among programs, agencies and schools.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

The program has a plan to work cooperatively and collaboratively with community organizations, schools and programs to facilitate transitions.

**Suggested Documentation**

Documentation must demonstrate how program helps to facilitate transitions for all children and schoolagers. Could include: needs assessment process, meeting minutes or agendas, handbook, transition plans, communication log, and/or emails.

**To Learn More:**

- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality Prekindergarten, pg. 92
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 66

### Indicator 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Indicator</strong></th>
<th><strong>Point Value</strong></th>
<th><strong>Place X if applicable</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication, education, informational materials and opportunities for families are delivered in a way that meets diverse needs (e.g. literacy level, language, cultural appropriateness).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Families are provided information and/or resources in ways that meet their individual needs. There are intentional accommodations for inclusion.

**Suggested Documentation**

Written Communications (email, text message, Facebook, etc.), Newsletters, Statement regarding informal communication, Event Programs/Flyers, Meeting agendas, Program goals, and Philosophy.

**To Learn More:**

- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 9
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 69
## Family and Community Partnerships

### Indicator 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families and schoolagers have input into the program.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intent of Indicator
Families, children and schoolagers are able to guide the direction of the program through participation on advisory boards, surveys, formal and informal evaluation, focus groups, a suggestion box, and policy making committees.

#### Suggested Documentation

#### To Learn More:
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 16

### Indicator 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships to provide or connect families to appropriate comprehensive services.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intent of Indicator
The program connects families with public/private community agencies and educational institutes to meet the comprehensive needs of children and families, and by doing so assists one another in the delivery of services and increases awareness of available resources. This indicator is focused specifically on referring families to outside entities for services.

#### Suggested Documentation
Documentation or report of on-site referrals, such as hearing/vision screenings, resource guides.

#### To Learn More:
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content Area 7 pg. 52-55
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 12
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 91-93
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 65-67
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family and Community Partnerships</th>
<th>Indicator 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program has evidence that it is involved in community organizations, partnerships, collaborations, or both that enhances its services to families, business practices, and/or child development knowledge.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Intent of Indicator</strong></th>
<th>This indicator is meant to show that the program partners or collaborates with other entities to enhance its own services to families.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Documentation</strong></td>
<td>Written communications, Newsletter, Handbook, Event programs/flyers, Meeting agendas, Attendance sign-in sheets or emails.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To Learn More:**
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
### Administration and Management

#### Indicator 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has written personal policies and procedures (handbook) that includes at least a minimum a written plan for: staff orientation, retention, evaluation and individual professional development plans.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Program has clear documentation of policies and procedures for staff.

**Suggested Documentation**

Documentation of written policies and procedures, could include the handbook or just pages of the handbook that are relevant.

**To Learn More:**

- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: p. 6 Section I Standard D, E, F; pg. 21 Section VI Letter E
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 5-6, Section I Standard B, C; pg. 11-13 Section III Standard C, D, E, G, H, K; pg. 21 Section VI Letter G
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 28
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 89-90, 97-99
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler programs, pg. 83

#### Indicator 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has a formal advisory committee that meets regularly to coordinate programming, curriculum, goals, policies, and procedures. At least three of the following stakeholders must be included in meetings: administrators, program staff, school staff, community members, schoolagers, and families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

The program has a formal advisory committee that includes members from administrators, program staff, school staff, community members, schoolagers, and
**Administration and Management**

### Indicator 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has a flexible benefit plan that may include health insurance, tuition assistance, and other benefits for staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Maintaining quality staff over a long period of time because relationships between children and staff are related to positive outcomes.

**Suggested Documentation**

Written plan, may be included in policy and procedure manual, staff manual.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 21 Section VI Letter C
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 31
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 94
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 67

### Indicator 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has paid leave time for full-time employees that may include holiday, vacation, education, or sick time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Offering paid leave time will help with retention and recruitment of quality staff.

**Suggested Documentation**

Written policies and procedures, such as policy and procedure manual, staff manual.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 21 Section VI Letter C
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 31
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 94
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 67

### Indicator 5

**Suggested Documentation**

families to provide input on program design and implementation. Advisory committee should meet at minimum twice each year.

**To Learn More:**
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: page 54 section VI
### Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has a documented, graduated salary scale that takes into account education and experiences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
A graduated salary helps to recruit and retain qualified staff.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written plan – may be included in policy and procedure manual, staff manual.

**To Learn More:**
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 94
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 67

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Indicator 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicators (select one)</td>
<td>Point Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program dedicates 20 percent of daily program time to outdoor recreation, sports, or fitness activities, with appropriate indoor physical activities available when weather or other factors prohibit play. Note: For a program who offers 24 hour or second-shift care, regular daily program time does not exceed 12 hours.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
To ensure that children and youth have the opportunity for daily physical activity. Outdoor activity is preferred but may be substituted with indoor physical activity, during inclement weather.

**Suggested Documentation**
Posted daily schedule, policy in provider handbook.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-Of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section V, Standard A
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content Area 8, pg. 60-62
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 96-97
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 69
### Environment

**Indicator 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has a process for observing each child’s health and development on a daily (ongoing for schoolagers) basis and communicating observations to the child’s family, other educators, and to specialized staff, with recommendations for family to seek medical opinions as necessary.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
- Program establishes and implements a written policy to address daily health and health care emergencies.
- Please note: Daily observation is required only for children who are not yet schoolagers.

**Suggested Documentation**
- Evidence showing how staff shares information about child’s daily health, observations and concerns with parents: Program plan, Written accident policy, Health log, Written protocols for addressing physical and/or mental health concerns. Evidence should clearly show how information is used for children and schoolagers.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-Of-School Time Standards of Quality Section I, Standard B
- Michigan Preschool Quality Assessment Form B, pg. 9
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 97
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 69-70

### Environment

**Indicator 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators (select one)</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X next to selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program is participating in the Child and Adult Food Care Program (CACFP) in good standing and has a written nutrition plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program follows guidelines that meet the CACFP meal pattern requirements and has a written nutrition plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If program serves <strong>only</strong> snacks, program follows guidelines that meet CACFP meal pattern requirements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a program does <strong>not</strong> provide food, program provides nutrition information to families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
- Program address the nutritional needs of children and youth by providing food service and nutritional education.

**Suggested Documentation**
- Written nutrition plan, show participation in CACFP, documentation showing the program follows seasonal menu guidelines

**To Learn More:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Indicator 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Point Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A regular oral care routine, including tooth brushing and/or gum wiping (for infants) at least once per day.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program has an oral care routine in place to support children's oral health which is essential to children's development and learning.

**Suggested Documentation**
Daily schedule including tooth brushing and gum wiping, Policies and procedures, Handbook.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 96-97
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 68

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Indicator 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Point Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions for reviewing and updating health records according to the most recent Early, Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) schedule for infants, and reviewing and updating records for toddlers and older children annually.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program establishes and implements a written policy to address daily health and health care emergencies.

**Suggested Documentation**
Evidence showing how health records are maintained and reviewed: Handbook, Written policies, Letters sent home. MICR reports **cannot** be only evidence. Infant's records must be updated according to EPSDT and older children's must be updated annually.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 96-97
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 69
### Curriculum and Instruction Indicator 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has a written statement of educational and developmental priorities for all children that is available to families.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
The program needs a clear mission/vision to operate. Having this plan shows intentional thinking and planning around the program.

**Suggested Documentation**
- Written vision/mission statement.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Early Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 88-80
- Michigan Early Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 62-64

### Curriculum and Instruction Indicator 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has a routine daily schedule that is predictable yet flexible; daily schedule reflects the interests and abilities of the youth and supports balanced development in the following areas: social, emotional, intellectual, academic, physical, and cultural. Daily schedule is posted for families and youth.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Provide a routine schedule that utilizes and promotes a variety of youth-centered and youth-led activities that increase the opportunity for schoolagers to develop in all areas. (social, emotional, intellectual, academic, physical, and cultural).

**Suggested Documentation**
- Photo of schedule publically posted, newsletter that shows schedule, staff handbook that supports development of schedule.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section II; Standard B,C Section IV; Standard A, E
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 30
### Curriculum and Instruction

#### Indicator 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Point Value (\text{Place X if applicable})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has a written plan and process in place to ensure that planned activities and academic experiences incorporate the diversity of the children and families within the program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Programs that provide children opportunities to identify and celebrate the diversity of their families and community increase self-esteem, feelings of acceptance and pride.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written plan and/or process.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section II; Standard B,C Section IV; Standard A, E
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 30
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 107, 112, 114-115, 120
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 84-84

#### Indicator 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Point Value (\text{Place X if applicable})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has a written plan for serving children and schoolagers with special needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program has a written plan that may include policies and practices to support the inclusion of children with special needs and assures that the child or schoolager's special needs are met.

**Suggested Documentation**
A written plan and/or process.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 13
- Michigan Early Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 98, 112-113, 120
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 69-71

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider has a written plan and process in place to ensure that <strong>schoolagers</strong> have planned activities and academic experiences that provide opportunities in the following content areas, social, emotional, physical, academic, creative expression, cultural, character and development and STEM. STEM-Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intent of Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program provides planned, intentional experiences for schoolagers that enhance their developmental outcomes and academic achievement. Programs offer active learning opportunities and support the State of Michigan Educational Technology Plan (<a href="http://www.techplan.org/">http://www.techplan.org/</a>). Programs are supporting and implementing the Michigan State Board of Education's policy on Quality Character Education (<a href="http://www.michigan.gov/documents/Character_policy_final_94134_7.pdf">http://www.michigan.gov/documents/Character_policy_final_94134_7.pdf</a>). According to the policy, character education in public schools should be secular and is best implemented using coordinated school health programs with a focus on developing positive relationships and prosocial norms among students and staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: This indicator is for schoolagers only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans, newsletters, field trips, guest presenters, weekly schedule, parent handbook.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To Learn More:
- Core Knowledge Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 27
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section V; Standard F,H, I
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 25-30
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section V, Standard F and G
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 25,30
Curriculum and Instruction  

### Indicator 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider uses an approved early childhood curriculum with all children under the age of five.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Program uses a comprehensive and documented early childhood curriculum model or education approach to guide teaching practices.

*Please Note: This indicator is for early childhood only.*

**Suggested Documentation**

Materials from publishing company, lesson plans

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 109-115

### Indicator 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider and staff discusses anecdotal notes/observations as a basis for working/teaching with each child under the age of five.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Program records and discuss anecdotal notes as the basis for planning for individual children.

*Please Note: This indicator is for early childhood only.*

**Suggested Documentation**

Sample format for notes that include what children are saying/direct quotes, Notes that include what children are doing/children's strengths, and plan for discussion of notes could include staff meeting agenda, schedule of meetings or other documentation that shows how the notes are discussed by staff.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 135
- Michigan Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 97

### Indicator 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider and staff discusses anecdotal notes/observations as a basis for working/teaching with each child under the age of five.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Curriculum and Instruction

### Indicator 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider and/or staff uses child assessment results in parent-teacher conferences at least two times a year for children under the age of five.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Program uses information form child assessments to effectively communicate children's progress with their families at least two times a year.

Please note: This indicator is for early childhood only.

**Suggested Documentation**

Newsletter, handbook, materials from publishing company, written policy, conference sign-up sheets.

**To Learn More:**

- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 11
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 136
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intent of Indicator</th>
<th>Suggested Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program records and discuss anecdotal notes as the basis for planning for individual children.</td>
<td>Sample format for notes that include what children are saying/direct quotes, Notes that include what children are doing/children’s strengths, and plan for discussion of notes could include staff meeting agenda, schedule of meetings or other documentation that shows how the notes are discussed by staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Note: This indicator is for early childhood only.

**To Learn More:**

- Michigan Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 135
- Michigan Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 97

---

## Curriculum and Instruction

### Indicator 10

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program completes annual developmental screening on each child under the age of five.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**  
Program implements a valid and reliable developmental screening tool to identify concerns and to support children's development and learning for all age groups. Please note: This indicator is for early childhood only.

**Suggested Documentation**  
Materials from publishing company, Policy in Handbook.

**To Learn More:**  
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 135  
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 95-99

---

### Curriculum and Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider uses assessment to inform individual, small group, and whole group instruction.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**  
Program uses child assessment to effectively plan activities for children's daily experiences and to support children's ongoing development and learning. Please note: This indicator is for early childhood only.

**Suggested Documentation**  
Newsletter, handbook, materials from publishing company, lesson plans.

**To Learn More:**  
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 135  
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 92
1.2 Centers Serving Children 5-12
# Staff Qualifications and Professional Development

**Indicator 1**

Description of Staff: Could be Program Director, Site Supervisor or other title. Indicator selection should reflect qualifications of the person who is present at the program on a daily basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators (select one)</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X next to selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-school time program director or site supervisor has 60 semester hours in a child-related field and 1,200 hours of experience with schoolagers OR a valid Child Development Associate (CDA) or Montessori credential with 12 semester hours in a related field AND 960 hours of experience with schoolagers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-school time program director or site supervisor has a valid Michigan School Age Youth Development Credential or equivalent with 12 semester hours in a child-related field AND 960 hours of experience with schoolagers.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-school time program director or site supervisor has an Associate’s degree in a child-related field with 960 hours of experience with schoolagers OR 60 semester hours in a program leading to a Bachelor’s degree in a child-related field with at least 24 of those semester hours in a child-related field AND 960 hours of experience with schoolagers OR has a Bachelor’s degree or higher in a child-related field.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-school time program director or site supervisor has a Bachelor’s degree or higher in a child-related field AND a valid Michigan School Age Youth Development Credential or equivalent.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolagers’ growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care.

**Suggested Documentation**

Documentation needs to indicate, if relevant, what field the degree was completed in. Could include: diploma, college transcript and/or training record hours. Documentation of hours of experience (“Hours of experience” means experience serving the ages and developmental abilities of children for which the center is licensed).

**To Learn More:**
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
### Staff Qualifications and Professional Development

#### Indicator 2

**Description of Staff:** Staff who works only with school-ageers or predominately with children who have entered kindergarten.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators (select one)</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X next to selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least one staff has, at a minimum, a valid Michigan School-Age Youth Development Credential OR at least 25 percent of school-age staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Certificate.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 25 percent of staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Credential OR at least 50 percent of school-age staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Certificate.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 50 percent of staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Credential OR 100 percent of school-age staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Certificate.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 percent of school-age staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Credential OR at least an Associate’s degree OR 60 semester hours or higher in a child-related field OR 50 percent of staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Credential AND 50 percent of staff has, at a minimum, a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Certificate.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolagers’ growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care.

**Suggested Documentation**

Copies of Credential and/or certificates for all school-age staff.

**To Learn More:**

- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
| **Staff Qualifications and Professional Development** | **Indicator 3** |
|---|---|---|
| **Indicator** | **Point Value** | **Place X if applicable** |
| Director and **all** program staff complete at least 24 hours of professional development annually. | 2 | |

**Intent of Indicator**
When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolagers’ growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care.

**Suggested Documentation**
Documentation must show that all staff has completed 24 hours of professional development.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section III, Standard G

| **Staff Qualifications and Professional Development** | **Indicator 4** |
|---|---|---|
| **Indicator** | **Point Value** | **Place X if applicable** |
| Annual professional development attended includes at least two hours focused on cultural competence or inclusive practices related to serving schoolagers with special needs or disabilities. | 2 | |

**Intent of Indicator**
When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolagers’ growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care.

**Suggested Documentation**
Training logs, agenda from training, documentation that demonstrates completion of required training hours in required topics.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section III, Standard G
## Staff Qualifications and Professional Development

### Indicator 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual professional development attended by school age staff has at least two hours focused on specifically supporting schoolagers and their families.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intent of Indicator
When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolagers’ growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care.

#### Suggested Documentation
Documentation must show that all staff has completed 2 hours of professional development focused on specifically supporting schoolagers and their families.

To Learn More:
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section III, Standard G

### Indicator 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director has a graduate degree in a child-related field OR program work at least monthly with a school age specialist who has a graduate degree in a child-related field OR program works with a Quality Improvement Consultant.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intent of Indicator
When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and youth’s growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care.

#### Suggested Documentation
Transcripts, diploma, documentation that demonstrates ongoing meetings with a specialist or with QIC.

To Learn More:
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section III, Standard G
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program offers family education opportunities for all families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Families are provided with opportunities to engage in family education, enrichment, family support, child development and other programs or groups. This is provided by the program or by sharing opportunities from community agencies that are designed to improve the quality of family life and support schoolagers’ learning and development.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written Communication, Newsletters, Statement regarding informal communication, Event Programs/Flyers, Meeting Agendas, Attendance (sign-in sheets).

**To Learn More:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff engages in informal communication with families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Staff interact informally with families to support an on-going relationship by sharing information about the schoolager’s development.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written Communications (email, text message, Facebook, etc.), Newsletters, Statement regarding informal communication, Documentation of program policy (handbook, job description, staff expectations).

**To Learn More:**
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships that take basic steps to facilitate schoolagers’ transitions before and after school, and between and among programs, agencies and schools.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
The program has a plan to work cooperatively and collaboratively with community organizations, schools and programs to facilitate transitions.

**Suggested Documentation**
Documentation must demonstrate how program helps to facilitate transitions for all schoolagers. Could include: needs assessment process, meeting minutes or agendas, handbook, transition plans, communication log, and/or emails.

**To Learn More:**
### Family and Community Partnerships

**Indicator 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication, education, informational materials and opportunities for families are delivered in a way that meets diverse needs (e.g. literacy level, language, cultural appropriateness).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Families are provided information and/or resources in ways that meet their individual needs. There are intentional accommodations for inclusion.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written Communications (email, text message, Facebook, etc.), Newsletters, Statement regarding informal communication, Event Programs/Flyers, Meeting agendas, Program goals, and Philosophy.

**To Learn More:**

---

### Family and Community Partnerships

**Indicator 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families and schoolagers have input into the program.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Families and schoolagers are able to guide the direction of the program through participation on advisory boards, surveys, formal and informal evaluation, focus groups, a suggestion box, and policy making committees.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written communications, Newsletter, Handbook, Event programs/flyers, Meeting agendas, Attendance sign-in sheets, Survey results.

**To Learn More:**

---
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## Family and Community Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships to provide or connect families to appropriate comprehensive services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intent of Indicator

The program connects families with public/private community agencies and educational institutes to meet the comprehensive needs of schoolagers and families, and by doing so assists one another in the delivery of services and increases awareness of available resources. This indicator is focused specifically on referring families to outside entities for services.

### Suggested Documentation

Documentation or report of on-site referrals, such as hearing/vision screenings, resource guides, notes from partners about referrals, evidence of referral log.

### To Learn More:

- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content Area 7 pg. 52-55

| Indicator 7 | |
|-------------| |
| Program has evidence that it is involved in community organizations, partnerships, collaborations that enhances its services to families, business practices, and/or child development knowledge. | 1 | |

### Intent of Indicator

This indicator is meant to show that the program partners or collaborates with other entities to enhance its own services to families.

### Suggested Documentation

Written communications, Newsletter, Handbook, Event programs/flyers, Meeting agendas, Attendance sign-in sheets or emails.

### To Learn More:

- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
### Administration and Management

#### Indicator 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has written personnel policies and procedures (handbook) that includes at a minimum a written plan for: staff orientation, retention, evaluation and individual professional development plans.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intent of Indicator

Program has clear documentation of policies and procedures for staff.

#### Suggested Documentation

Documentation of written policies and procedures, could include the handbook or just pages of the handbook that are relevant.

#### To Learn More:

- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: p. 6 Section I Standard D, E, F; pg. 21 Section VI Letter E
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 5-6, Section I Standard B, C; pg. 11-13 Section III Standard C, D, E, G, H, K; pg. 21 Section VI Letter G

---

#### Indicator 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center has a formal advisory committee that meets regularly to coordinate programming, curriculum, goals, policies, and procedures. At least three of the following stakeholders must be included in meetings: administrators, program staff, school staff, community members, schoolagers, and families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intent of Indicator

The program has a formal advisory committee that includes members from administrators, program staff, school staff, community members, schoolagers, and families to provide input on program design and implementation. Advisory committee should meet at minimum twice each year.

#### Suggested Documentation

Documentation of meetings, such as meeting minutes, agendas, meeting schedule, and/or sign-in sheets.

#### To Learn More:

- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: page 54 section VI
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration and Management</th>
<th>Indicator 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td>Center has a flexible benefit plan that may include health insurance, tuition assistance, and other benefits for staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent of Indicator</strong></td>
<td>Maintaining quality staff over a long period of time as relationships between children and staff are related to positive outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Learn More:</strong></td>
<td>Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 21 Section VI Letter C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration and Management</th>
<th>Indicator 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td>Center has paid leave time for full-time employees that may include holiday, vacation, education, or sick time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent of Indicator</strong></td>
<td>Offering paid leave time will help with the retention and recruitment of quality staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Learn More:</strong></td>
<td>Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 21 Section VI Letter C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration and Management</th>
<th>Indicator 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td>Center has a documented, graduated salary scale that takes into account education and experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Learn More:</strong></td>
<td>Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 21 Section VI Letter C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environment

#### Indicator 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program demonstrates that it has better adult: child ratios than required by licensing.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program creates an optimum environment by having more staff and fewer children than required by licensing at all times during the program’s day. This would mean:
- Grades K to 3—one adult for ten students.
- Grades 4 to 12—one adult for 15 students.

**Suggested Documentation**
Attendance documents, staffing assignments, program enrollment and all staff schedules.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-Of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 4, Section: I Standard: A
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals

#### Indicator 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program dedicates 20 percent of daily program time to outdoor recreation, sports, or fitness activities, with appropriate indoor physical activities available when weather or other factors prohibit play. Note: For a program who offers 24 hour or second-shift care, regular daily program time does not exceed 12 hours.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
A graduated salary helps to recruit and retain qualified staff

**Suggested Documentation**
Written plan, may be included in policy and procedure manual, staff manual.

**To Learn More:**
### Environment

#### Indicator 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A plan in place for observing each child’s health and development on an ongoing basis and communicating observations to the child’s family, other educators, and to specialized staff, with recommendations for family to seek medical opinions as necessary.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Program establishes and implements a written policy to address daily health and health care emergencies.

**Suggested Documentation**

Evidence showing how staff shares information about schoolagers’ health, observations and concerns with parents: Program plan, Written accident policy, Health log, Written protocols for addressing physical and/or mental health concerns.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-Of-School Time Standards of Quality Section I, Standard D

---

#### Indicator 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators (select one)</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X next to selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program is participating in the Child and Adult Food Care Program (CACFP) in good standing and has a written nutrition plan.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program follows guidelines that meet the CACFP meal pattern requirements and has a written nutrition plan.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If program serves only snacks, program follows guidelines that meet CACFP meal pattern requirements.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a program does not provide food, program provides nutrition information to families.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Program address the nutritional needs of children and youth by providing food service and nutritional education.

**Suggested Documentation**

Written nutrition plan, show participation in CACFP, documentation showing the program follows seasonal menu guidelines.

**To Learn More:**

---
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### Curriculum and Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1</strong></td>
<td>Program has a written statement of educational and developmental priorities for all schoolagers that is available to families.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intent of Indicator
The program needs a clear mission/vision to operate. Having this plan shows intentional thinking and planning around the program.

#### Suggested Documentation
Written vision/mission statement.

#### To Learn More:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 2</strong></td>
<td>Program has a routine daily schedule that is predictable yet flexible; daily schedule reflects the interests and abilities schoolagers and supports balanced development in the following areas: social, emotional, intellectual, academic, physical, and cultural. Daily schedule is posted for families and schoolagers.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intent of Indicator
Provide a routine schedule that utilizes and promotes a variety of schoolager-centered and schoolager-led activities that increase the opportunity for schoolagers to develop in all areas. (social, emotional, intellectual, academic, physical, and cultural).

#### Suggested Documentation
Written plan and/or process.

#### To Learn More:
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section V; standard A, C
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 27
### Curriculum and Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program has a written plan and process in place to ensure that planned activities and academic experiences incorporate the diversity of the schoolagers and families within the program.**

**Intent of Indicator**
Programs that provide schoolagers opportunities to identify and celebrate the diversity of their families and community increase self-esteem, feelings of acceptance and pride.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written plan and/or process.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section II; Standard B, C Section IV; Standard A, E
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 30

| Indicator 4 | 2 | |

**A written plan for serving schoolagers with special needs.**

**Intent of Indicator**
Program has a written plan that may include policies and practices to support the inclusion of schoolagers with special needs and assures that the schoolagers’ special needs are met.

**Suggested Documentation**
A written plan and/or process.

**To Learn More:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center has a written plan and process in place to ensure that planned activities and academic experiences provide opportunities in the following content areas: social, emotional, physical, academic, creative expression, cultural character and development and STEM. <strong>STEM-Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Programs provide planned, intentional experiences for schoolagers that enhance their developmental outcomes and academic achievement. Programs offer active learning opportunities and support the State of Michigan Educational Technology Plan ([http://www.techplan.org/](http://www.techplan.org/)). Programs are supporting and implementing the Michigan State Board of Education's policy on Quality Character Education ([http://www.michigan.gov/documents/Character_policy_final_94134_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/Character_policy_final_94134_7.pdf)). According to the policy, character education in public schools should be secular and is best implemented using coordinated school health programs with a focus on developing positive relationships and prosocial norms among students and staff.

**Suggested Documentation**

- Lesson plans, newsletters, field trips, guest presenters, weekly schedule, parent handbook

**To Learn More:**

- Core Knowledge Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 27
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section V; Standard F, H, I
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 25-30
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section V, Standard F and G
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 25,30
1.3 Family Home
**Staff Qualifications and Professional Development**

**Description of Staff**: Could be the Owner, License holder Lead Teacher. Should be the person who is responsible for day-to-day operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators (select one)</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X next to selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider/Licensee completed at least one post-secondary course in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or a child-related field <strong>OR</strong> 20 hours of community or academic training aligned with the Core Knowledge and/or Core Competencies for Early Childhood or Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider/Licensee has child development associate credential or Montessori credential or Michigan School-Age Youth Development Credential <strong>OR</strong> an Associate's degree or higher in an unrelated field with a minimum of 18 semester hours in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or a child-related field.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider/Licensee has an Associate's degree in Early Childhood Education or a child-related field with a minimum of 18 semester hours in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or a child-related field <strong>OR</strong> 60 semester hours in a program leading to a Bachelor's degree in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or a child-related field with at least 18 of those semester hours in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or a child-related field.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider/Licensee has a Bachelor's degree or higher in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or a child-related field <strong>OR</strong> a Bachelor’s degree or higher in any field with 30 semester hours in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or a child-related field <strong>AND</strong> 480 hours of experience.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**: When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolagers’ growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care.

**Suggested Documentation**: Documentation needs to indicate, if relevant, what field the degree was completed in. Could include: diploma, college transcripts, training hours record.

**To Learn More**:
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 15
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 103
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 78-79

*Note: Licensing defines child-related field in the following ways: For an early childhood program director means elementary education, child guidance/counseling, child psychology, family studies, and social work. For a school-age program director means early childhood education, elementary education, secondary education, physical...*
### Staff Qualifications and Professional Development

**Indicator 2**

**Description of Staff:** Could be the Owner or License holder. Must be the person identified as the Lead Teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators (select one)</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X next to selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Teacher has at a minimum, one postsecondary course in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or a child-related field <strong>OR</strong> 20 hours of community or academic training aligned with the either the Core Knowledge Core Competencies for Early Childhood or Core Knowledge Core Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals <strong>OR</strong> a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Certificate.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Teacher has, at a minimum, a CDA or a Montessori credential <strong>OR</strong> a Michigan School-Age or Youth development credential.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Teacher has, at a minimum, an Associate’s degree in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or in a child-related field with a minimum of 18 hours Early Childhood or Child Development <strong>OR</strong> 60 semester hours in a program leading to a Bachelor’s degree in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or a child-related field with at least 18 of those semester hours in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or Youth Development AND 480 hours of experience.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolagers’ growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care.

**Suggested Documentation**

Documentation needs to indicate, if relevant, what field the degree was completed in. Could include: diploma, college transcript and/or training record hours.

**To Learn More:**
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 16
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 100
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 75-76

education and recreation, child development, child guidance/counseling, child psychology, family studies, social work, human services, and youth development.
## Staff Qualifications and Professional Development

### Indicator 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead provider completes at least 20 hours of professional development annually.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolagers’ growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning.

**Suggested Documentation**

Training logs, college transcripts or other documentation that demonstrates completion of required training hours.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section III, Standard G
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 18-20
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 101
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 74-75, 78

---

## Staff Qualifications and Professional Development

### Indicator 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional development training attended by the provider includes at least two hours focused on culture competence OR inclusive practices, related to serving children of all ages with special needs or disabilities, as well as teaching diverse students and supporting children and their families.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolagers’ growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning.

**Suggested Documentation**

Training logs, agenda from training, documentation that demonstrates completion of required training hours in required topics.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section III, Standard G
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Staff Qualifications and Professional Development</strong></th>
<th><strong>Indicator 5</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Staff:</strong> Could be Program Director, Site Supervisor or other title. Indicator selection should reflect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanbe / Licensee has a graduate degree in Early Childhood, Child Development or a child-related field <strong>OR</strong> works at least monthly, with an early childhood or school age specialist or with has a graduate degree in Early Childhood, Child development or a child related field <strong>OR</strong> works monthly with a Quality Improvement Consultant.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent of Indicator</strong></td>
<td>When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and schoolagers’ growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Documentation</strong></td>
<td>Document needs to indicate the degree of the specialist and record of meetings. Could include: meeting notes; email exchanges, text messages; diploma, transcripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Learn More:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section III, Standard G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Family and Community Partnerships

#### Indicator 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program offers families education opportunities for all families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Families are provided with opportunities to engage in family education, enrichment, family support, child development and other programs or groups. This is provided by the program or by sharing opportunities from community agencies that are designed to improve the quality of family life and support schoolagers’ learning and development.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written Communication, Newsletters, Statement regarding informal communication, Event Programs/Flyers, Meeting Agendas, Attendance (sign-in sheets).

**To Learn More:**
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 11
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 105-106

#### Indicator 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider engages in informal communication with families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Staff interact informally with families to support an on-going relationship by sharing information about children and schoolager’s development.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written Communications (email, text message, Facebook, etc.), Newsletters, Statement regarding informal communication, Documentation of program policy (handbook, job description, staff expectations).

**To Learn More:**
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg.11
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 105-107
**Family and Community Partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships that take basic steps to facilitate children and schoolagers’ transitions before and after school, and between and among programs, agencies and schools.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
The program has a plan to work cooperatively and collaboratively with community organizations, schools and programs to facilitate transitions.

**Suggested Documentation**
Documentation must demonstrate how program helps to facilitate transitions for all children and schoolagers. Could include: needs assessment process, meeting minutes or agendas, handbook, transition plans, communication log, and/or emails.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality Prekindergarten, pg. 92
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 66

---

**Family and Community Partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, education, informational materials and opportunities for families are delivered in a way that meets diverse needs (e.g. literacy level, language, cultural appropriateness).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Families are provided information and/or resources in ways that meet their individual needs. There are intentional accommodations for inclusion.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written Communications (email, text message, Facebook, etc.), Newsletters, Statement regarding informal communication, Event Programs/Flyers, Meeting agendas, Program goals, and Philosophy.

**To Learn More:**
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 9
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 69
### Family and Community Partnerships

#### Indicator 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families and schoolagers have input into the program.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Families and schoolagers are able to guide the direction of the program through participation on advisory boards, surveys, formal and informal evaluation, focus groups, a suggestion box, and policy making committees.

**Suggested Documentation**

Written communications, Newsletter, Handbook, Event programs/flyers, Meeting agendas, Attendance sign-in sheets, Survey results.

**To Learn More:**
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 16

#### Indicator 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships to provide or connect families to appropriate comprehensive services.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

The program connects families with public/private community agencies and educational institutes to meet the comprehensive needs of children and families, and by doing so assists one another in the delivery of services and increases awareness of available resources. This indicator in focused specifically on referring families to outside entities for services.

**Suggested Documentation**

Documentation or report of on-site referrals, such as hearing/vision screenings, resource guides.

**To Learn More:**
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content Area 7 pg. 52-55
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 12
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 91-93
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 65-67
## Family and Community Partnerships

### Indicator 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has evidence that it is involved in partnerships, collaborations, or both that enhances its services to families, business practices, and/or child development knowledge.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intent of Indicator
This indicator is meant to show that the program partners or collaborates with other entities to enhance its own services to families.

### Suggested Documentation
Written communications, Newsletter, Handbook, Event programs/flyers, Meeting agendas, Attendance sign-in sheets or emails.

### To Learn More:
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
## Administration and Management

### Indicator 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has a basic contract for services rendered, which may include description of payment schedule, provider and child vacation policies, sick leave for child, alternative care options, and a termination policy.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Program has written information about policies and procedure for families and staff.

**Suggested Documentation**

Documentation of written policies and procedures.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: p. 6 Section I Standard D, E, F; pg. 21 Section VI Letter E
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 89-90, 97-99
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 64, 70-73

### Indicator 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider has a professional development plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Provider is intentionally working to support their ongoing improvement and reflection on practices.

**Suggested Documentation**

Copies of professional development plans.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 5-6, Section I Standard B, C; pg. 11-13 Section III Standard C, D, E, G, H, K; pg. 21 Section VI Letter G
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: ALL
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment Form B, pg. 21
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 102
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 80

### Indicator 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families and schoolagers are engaged in program evaluation, and information obtained will be used for program improvement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Program has a regular process for ongoing program improvement.
### Environment

#### Indicator 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program demonstrates that it has better adult: child ratios than required by licensing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**: Program creates an optimum environment by having more staff and fewer children and schoolagers than required by licensing at all times during the program’s day.

**Suggested Documentation**: Attendance documents, staffing assignments, program enrollment and all staff schedules.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-Of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 21, Section VI, Letter F
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 9 page 66

#### Indicator 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program dedicates 20 percent of daily program time to outdoor recreation, sports, or fitness activities, with appropriate indoor physical activities available when weather or other factors prohibit play. Note: For a program who offers 24 hour or second-shift care, regular daily program time does not exceed 12 hours.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**: To ensure that children and schoolagers have an opportunity for daily physical activity. Outdoor activity is preferred but may be substituted with indoor physical activity, during inclement weather.

**Suggested Documentation**: Posted daily schedule, policy in provider handbook.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-Of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section V, Standard A
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content Area 8, pg. 60-62
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 96-97
### Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A process for observing each child’s health and development on an ongoing basis and communicating observations to the child’s family, other educators, and to specialized staff, with recommendations for family to seek medical opinions as necessary.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program establishes and implements a written policy to address daily health and health care emergencies.

**Suggested Documentation**
Evidence showing how staff shares information about each child or schoolagers’ health, observations and concerns with parents: Program plan, Written accident policy, Health log, Written protocols for addressing physical and/or mental health concerns.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-Of-School Time Standards of Quality Section I, Standard B
- Michigan Preschool Quality Assessment Form B, pg. 9
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 97
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 69-70

### Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators (select one)</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X next to selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program is participating in the Child and Adult Food Care Program (CACFP) in good standing and has a written nutrition plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program follows guidelines that meet the CACFP meal pattern requirements and has a written nutrition plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If program serves only snacks, program follows guidelines that meet CACFP meal pattern requirements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a program does not provide food, program provides nutrition information to families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Indicator</th>
<th>Indicateor 5</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td>A regular oral care routine, including tooth brushing and/or gum wiping (for infants) at least once per day.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**: Program has an oral care routine in place to support children's oral health which is essential to children's development and learning.

**Suggested Documentation**
- Daily schedule including tooth brushing and gum wiping
- Policies and procedures
- Handbook

**To Learn More**:
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 96-97
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 68

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Indicator</th>
<th>Indicateor 6</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td>Provisions for reviewing and updating health records according to the most recent Early, Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) schedule for infants, and reviewing and updating records for toddlers and older children annually.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**: Program establishes and implements a written policy to review and update health records, including immunization records, to ensure that children receive recommended treatment and preventative services.

**Suggested Documentation**
- Evidence showing how health records are maintained and reviewed: Handbook, Written policies, Letters sent home
- MICR reports cannot be only evidence
- Infant’s records must be updated according to EPSDT and older children’s must be updated annually

**To Learn More**:
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 96-97
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 69
### Curriculum and Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program has a written statement of educational and developmental priorities for all children that is available to families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
The program needs a clear mission/vision to operate; having this plan shows intentional thinking and planning around the program.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written vision/mission statement.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Early Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 88-80
- Michigan Early Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 62-64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A routine daily schedule that is predictable yet flexible, includes time for transition, includes indoor and outdoor activities and is responsive to each child and schoolager’s need to be active or resting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program establishes and consistently implements a daily routine that meets the individual needs of all age groups of children; plan should intentionally address needs of schoolagers.

**Suggested Documentation**
Daily schedule, handbook

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 118, 126
### Curriculum and Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider has a written plan for serving children and schoolagers with special needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intent of Indicator
Program has a written plan that may include policies and practices to support the inclusion of children with special needs and assures that the child or schoolager's special needs are met.

#### Suggested Documentation
A written plan and/or process.

#### To Learn More:
- Michigan Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg.13
- Michigan Early Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 98, 112-113, 120
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 69-71

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider has a written plan and process in place to ensure that planned activities and academic experiences incorporate the diversity of the children, schoolagers and families within the program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intent of Indicator
Programs that provide children opportunities to identify and celebrate the diversity of their families and community increase self-esteem, feelings of acceptance and pride.

#### Suggested Documentation
Written plan and/or process.

#### To Learn More:
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section II; Standard B,C Section IV; Standard A, E
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 30
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 107, 112, 114-115, 120
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 84-84
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider has a written plan and process in place to ensure that <strong>schoolagers</strong> have planned activities and academic experiences that provide opportunities in the following content areas, social, emotional, physical, academic, creative expression, cultural, character and development and STEM. <strong>STEM</strong>-Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program provides planned, intentional experiences for schoolagers that enhance their developmental outcomes and academic achievement. Programs offer active learning opportunities and support the State of Michigan Educational Technology Plan ([http://www.techplan.org/](http://www.techplan.org/)). Programs are supporting and implementing the Michigan State Board of Education’s policy on Quality Character Education ([http://www.michigan.gov/documents/Character_policy_final_94134_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/Character_policy_final_94134_7.pdf)). According to the policy, character education in public schools should be secular and is best implemented using coordinated school health programs with a focus on developing positive relationships and prosocial norms among students and staff.

Please note: This indicator is for schoolagers only.

**Suggested Documentation**
Lesson plans, newsletters, field trips, guest presenters, weekly schedule, parent handbook.

**To Learn More:**
- Core Knowledge Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 27
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section V; Standard F,H, I
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 25-30
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section V, Standard F and G
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 25,30
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Indicator 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider uses an approved early childhood curriculum with all children under the age of five.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program uses a comprehensive and documented early childhood curriculum model or education approach to guide teaching practices.

Please Note: This indicator is for early childhood only.

**Suggested Documentation**
Materials from publishing company, lesson plans

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 109-115

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Indicator 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider uses anecdotal notes/observations as a basis for working/teaching with each child under the age of five.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program records and discuss anecdotal notes as the basis for planning for individual children.

Please Note: This indicator is for early childhood only.

**Suggested Documentation**
Sample format for notes that include what children are saying/direct quotes, Notes that include what children are doing/children’s strengths, and plan for discussion of notes could include staff meeting agenda, schedule of meetings or other documentation that shows how the notes are discussed by staff.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 135
- Michigan Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 97
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Indicator 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider uses an approved child assessment tool at least two times a year with each child under the age of five.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Program implements a valid and reliable assessment tool at least two times a year to measure progress and to support children’s development and learning.

Please note: This indicator is for early childhood only.

**Suggested Documentation**

Newsletter, handbook, materials from publishing company, written policy, conference sign-up sheets.

**To Learn More:**

- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 135-136
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 95-99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Indicator 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider uses child assessment results in parent-teacher conferences at least two times a year for children under the age of five.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Program uses information form child assessments to effectively communicate children's progress with their families at least two times a year.

Please note: This indicator is for early childhood only.

**Suggested Documentation**

Newsletter, handbook, materials from publishing company, written policy, conference sign-up sheets.

**To Learn More:**

- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg.11
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 136
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 97
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Indicator 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider uses assessment to inform individual, small group, and whole group instruction.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program uses child assessment to effectively plan activities for children's daily experiences and to support children's ongoing development and learning.

Please note: This indicator is for early childhood only.

**Suggested Documentation**
Newsletter, handbook, materials from publishing company, lesson plans.

To Learn More:
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 135
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Indicator 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider completes annual developmental screening on each child under the age of five.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program implements a valid and reliable developmental screening tool to identify concerns and to support children's development and learning for all age groups.

Please note: This indicator is for early childhood only.

**Suggested Documentation**
Materials from publishing company, Policy in Handbook

To Learn More:
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 135
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 95-99
1.4 Group Home
Note: Licensing defines child-related field in the following ways: For an early childhood program director means elementary education, child guidance/counseling, child psychology, family studies, and social work. For a school-age program director means early childhood education, elementary education, secondary education, physical education.
and recreation, child development, child guidance/counseling, child psychology, family studies, social work, human

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Qualifications and Professional Development</th>
<th>Indicator 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Staff: Could be the Owner or License holder. Must be the person identified as the Lead Teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators (select one)</td>
<td>Point Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Teacher has at a minimum, one postsecondary course in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or a child-related field OR 20 hours of community or academic training aligned with either the Core Knowledge Core Competencies for Early Childhood or Core Knowledge Core Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals OR a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Certificate.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Teacher has, at a minimum, a CDA or a Montessori credential OR a Michigan School-Age or Youth development credential.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Teacher has, at a minimum, an Associate degree in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or in a child-related field with a minimum of 18 hours Early Childhood or Child Development OR 60 semester hours in a program leading to a Bachelor’s degree in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or a child-related field with at least 18 of those semester hours in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or Youth Development AND 480 hour of experience.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intent of Indicator</th>
<th>Suggested Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and youth’s growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care.</td>
<td>Documentation needs to indicate, if relevant, what field the degree was completed in. Could include: diploma, college transcript and/or training record hours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To Learn More:
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 16
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 100
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 75-76

services, and youth development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Qualifications and Professional Development</th>
<th>Indicator 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Staff: Assistants, someone who works in the program but is not a Lead Teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators (select one)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one assistant has, at a minimum, one postsecondary course in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or a child-related field OR 20 hours of community or academic training aligned with the either the Core Knowledge Core Competencies for Early Childhood or Core Knowledge Core Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals OR a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Certificate.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one assistant has, at a minimum, a CDA or a Montessori credential OR a Michigan School-Age Youth Development Credential.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one assistant has, at a minimum, an Associate degree in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or in a child-related field with a minimum of 18 hours Early Childhood or Child Development OR 60 semester hours in a program leading to a Bachelor’s degree in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or a child-related field with at least 18 of those semester hours in Early Childhood Education or Child Development or Youth Development.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent of Indicator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and youth’s growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning. College-level coursework has been shown to have a measure and positive effect on quality of care.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Documentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation needs to indicate, if relevant, what field the degree was completed in. Could include: diploma, college transcript and/or training record hours.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Learn More:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section III, Standard F pg. 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Staff Qualifications and Professional Development

**Indicator 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead provider completes at least 20 hours of professional development annually AND assistants complete 10 hours of professional development annually.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and youth’s growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning.

**Suggested Documentation**
Training logs, college transcripts or other documentation that demonstrates completion of required training hours.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section III, Standard G
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 18-20
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 101
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 74-75, 78

**Indicator 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional development training attended by the Provider/Licensee includes at least two hours focused on culture competence OR inclusive practices, related to serving children of all ages with special needs or disabilities, as well as teaching diverse students and supporting children and their families.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and youth’s growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All Staff Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Staff: Could be Program Director, Site Supervisor or other title. Indicator selection should reflect required training hours in required topics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider has experience a graduate degree in Early Childhood, Child development or a child related field OR works monthly with a Quality Improvement Consultant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intent of Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When child care providers are equipped with specialized education and training, they are better able to provide experiences and environments that support every aspect of children and youth's growth and learning. Research shows that when providers are well prepared, children are more likely to experience warmth and constructive learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document needs to indicate the degree of the specialist and record of meetings. Could include: meeting notes; email exchanges, text messages; diploma, transcripts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To Learn More:
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section III, Standard G
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 103
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 79
## Family and Community Partnerships

### Indicator 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program offers family education opportunities for all families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Families are provided with opportunities to engage in family education, enrichment, family support, child development and other programs or groups. This is provided by the program or by sharing opportunities from community agencies that are designed to improve the quality of family life and support children/schoolagers’ learning and development.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written Communication, Newsletters, Statement regarding informal communication, Event Programs/Flyers, Meeting Agendas, Attendance (sign-in sheets).

**To Learn More:**
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 11
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 105-106

---

### Indicator 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider engages in informal communication with families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Staff interact informally with families to support an on-going relationship by sharing information about the children/schoolager’s development.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written Communications (email, text message, Facebook, etc.), Newsletters, Statement regarding informal communication, Documentation of program policy (handbook, job description, staff expectations).

**To Learn More:**
## Family and Community Partnerships

### Indicator 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships that take basic steps to facilitate children’s and schoolagers’ transitions before and after school, and between and among programs, agencies and schools.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

The program has a plan to work cooperatively and collaboratively with community organizations, schools and programs to facilitate transitions.

**Suggested Documentation**

Documentation must demonstrate how program helps to facilitate transitions for all children and schoolagers. Could include: needs assessment process, meeting minutes or agendas, handbook, transition plans, communication log, and/or emails.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality Prekindergarten, pg. 92
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 66
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg.11
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards for Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 105-107

### Indicator 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication, education, informational materials and opportunities for families are delivered in a way that meets diverse needs (e.g. literacy level, language, cultural appropriateness).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Families are provided information and/or resources in ways that meet their individual needs. There are intentional accommodations for inclusion.

**Suggested Documentation**

Written Communications (email, text message, Facebook, etc.), Newsletters, Statement regarding informal communication, Event Programs/Flyers, Meeting agendas, Program goals, and Philosophy.

**To Learn More:**
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 9
### Family and Community Partnerships

#### Indicator 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families and schoolagers have input into the program.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Families, children and schoolagers are able to guide the direction of the program through participation on advisory boards, surveys, formal and informal evaluation, focus groups, a suggestion box, and policy making committees.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written communications, Newsletter, Handbook, Event programs/flyers, Meeting agendas, Attendance sign-in sheets, Survey results.

**To Learn More:**
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 16
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 69

### Family and Community Partnerships

#### Indicator 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships to provide or connect families to appropriate comprehensive services.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intent of Indicator</th>
<th>The program connects families with public/private community agencies and educational institutes to meet the comprehensive needs of children and families, and by doing so assists one another in the delivery of services and increases awareness of available resources. This indicator is focused specifically on referring families to outside entities for services.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Documentation</td>
<td>Documentation or report of on-site referrals, such as hearing/vision screenings, resource guides.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| To Learn More: | • Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 18, Section: V Standard: F  
• Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content Area 7 pg. 52-55  
• Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 12  
• Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 91-93  
• Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 65-67 |
## Family and Community Partnerships

### Indicator 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has evidence that it is involved in partnerships, collaborations, or both that enhances its services to families, business practices, and/or child development knowledge.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intent of Indicator

This indicator is meant to show that the program partners or collaborates with other entities to enhance its own services to families.

### Suggested Documentation

- Written communications
- Newsletter
- Handbook
- Event programs/flyers
- Meeting agendas
- Attendance sign-in sheets or emails

### To Learn More:

- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
### Administration and Management  
#### Indicator 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has a basic contract for services rendered, which may include description of payment schedule, provider and child vacation policies, sick leave for child, alternative care options and a termination policy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**  
Program has written information about policies and procedure for families and staff.

**Suggested Documentation**  
Documentation of written policies and procedures.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: p. 6 Section I Standard D, E, F; pg. 21 Section VI Letter E
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: All
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 21
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 80

### Administration and Management  
#### Indicator 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has evidence of staff evaluation and individual professional development plans for staff members.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**  
Program is intentionally working with all staff to support their ongoing improvement and reflection on practices.

**Suggested Documentation**  
Documentation must demonstrate there is an evaluation in place and it is administered on a regular basis and that each staff has a professional development plan. Could include blank professional development plan template, blank evaluation form and/or schedule of evaluations.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 5-6, Section I Standard B, C; pg. 11-13 Section III Standard C, D, E, G, H, K; pg. 21 Section VI Letter G
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: ALL
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 21
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 102
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 80
### Administration and Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 3</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families and schoolagers are engaged in program evaluation, and information obtained will be used for program improvement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program has a regular process for ongoing program improvement.

**Suggested Documentation**
Documented results of findings, documentation of how findings are being used to support program improvement, documentation of two evaluations annually.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 21- Section VI. Letter F
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 9 page 66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 4</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has a documented, graduated salary scale that takes into account education and experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
A graduated salary helps to recruit and retain qualified staff.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written plan – may be included in policy and procedure manual, staff manual.

**To Learn More:**
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 31
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 94
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 67

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 5</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider has a flexible benefit plan that may include health insurance, tuition assistance, and other benefits for staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Maintaining quality staff over a long period of time because relationships between children and staff are related to positive outcomes.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written plan, may be included in policy and procedure manual, staff manual.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 21 Section VI Letter C
## Administration and Management

**Indicator 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has paid leave time for full-time staff that may include</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holiday, vacation, education or sick time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**: Offering paid leave supports staff retention and recruitment of quality staff.

**Suggested Documentation**: Written policies and procedures, such as policy and procedure manual, staff manual.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 21 Section VI Letter C
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 31
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 94
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 67
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Indicator 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td>Program demonstrates that it has better adult: child ratios than required by licensing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent of Indicator</strong></td>
<td>Program creates an optimum environment by having more staff and fewer children and schoolagers than required by licensing at all times during the program's day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Learn More:</strong></td>
<td>• Michigan Out-Of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 4, Section: I Standard: A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Indicator 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td>Program dedicates 20 percent of daily program time to outdoor recreation, sports, or fitness activities, with appropriate indoor physical activities available when weather or other factors prohibit play. Note: For a program who offers 24 hour or second-shift care, regular daily program time does not exceed 12 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent of Indicator</strong></td>
<td>To ensure that children and schoolagers have to opportunity for daily physical activity. Outdoor activity is preferred but may be substituted with indoor physical activity, during inclement weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Learn More:</strong></td>
<td>• Michigan Out-Of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section V, Standard A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 96-97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environment Indicator 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A process for observing each child’s health and development on an ongoing basis and communicating observations to the child’s family, other educators, and to specialized staff, with recommendations for family to seek medical opinions as necessary.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program establishes and implements a written policy to address daily health and health care emergencies.

**Suggested Documentation**
Evidence showing how staff shares information about each child or schoolagers’ health, observations and concerns with parents: Program plan, Written accident policy, Health log, Written protocols for addressing physical and/or mental health concerns.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Out-Of-School Time Standards of Quality Section I, Standard B
- Michigan Preschool Quality Assessment Form B, pg. 9
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 97
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 69-70
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 69

### Environment Indicator 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators (select one)</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X next to selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program is participating in the Child and Adult Food Care Program (CACFP) in good standing and has a written nutrition plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program follows guidelines that meet the CACFP meal pattern requirements and has a written nutrition plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If program serves <strong>only</strong> snacks, program follows guidelines that meet CACFP meal pattern requirements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a program does <strong>not</strong> provide food, program provides nutrition information to families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program address the nutritional needs of children and schoolagers by providing food service and nutritional education.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written nutrition plan, show participation in CACFP, documentation showing the program follows seasonal menu guidelines

**To Learn More:**
### Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A regular oral care routine, including tooth brushing and/or gum wiping (for infants) at least once per day.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intent of Indicator

Program has an oral care routine in place to support children’s oral health which is essential to children’s development and learning.

#### Suggested Documentation

Daily schedule including tooth brushing and gum wiping, Policies and procedures, Handbook

#### To Learn More:

- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 96-97
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 68

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provisions for reviewing and updating health records according to the most recent Early, Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) schedule for infants, and reviewing and updating records for toddlers and older children annually.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intent of Indicator

Program establishes and implements a written policy to review and update health records, including immunization records, to ensure that children receive recommended treatment and prevention services.

#### Suggested Documentation

Evidence showing how health records are maintained and reviewed. Handbook, Written policies, Letters sent home -MICR reports cannot be only evidence -Infant’s records must be updated according to EPSDT and older children’s must be updated annually.

#### To Learn More:

- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 96-97
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 69
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Indicator 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Point Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program has a written statement of educational and developmental priorities for all children that is available to families.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent of Indicator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Documentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Learn More:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Michigan Early Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 88-80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Michigan Early Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 62-64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Indicator 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Point Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A routine daily schedule that is predictable yet flexible, includes time for transition, includes indoor and outdoor activities and is responsive to each child and schoolager’s need to be active or resting.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent of Indicator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Documentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Learn More:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 118, 126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Curriculum and Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider has a written plan and process in place to ensure that planned activities and academic experiences incorporate the diversity of the children, schoolagers and families within the program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Programs that provide children opportunities to identify and celebrate the diversity of their families and community increase self-esteem, feelings of acceptance and pride.

**Suggested Documentation**

- Written plan and/or process.

**To Learn More:**

- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section II; Standard B,C Section IV; Standard A, E
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 30
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 107, 112, 114-115, 120
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 84-84

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Indicator 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Point Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider has a written plan for serving children and schoolagers with special needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intent of Indicator</th>
<th>Program has a written plan that may include policies and practices to support the inclusion of children with special needs and assures that the child or schoolager’s special needs are met.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Documentation</td>
<td>A written plan and/or process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To Learn More:
- Michigan Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg.13
- Michigan Early Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 98, 112-113, 120
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 69-71
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Indicator 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider has a written plan and process in place to ensure that <strong>schoolagers</strong> have planned activities and academic experiences that provide opportunities in the following content areas, social, emotional, physical, academic, creative expression, cultural, character and development and STEM. STEM-Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program provides planned, intentional experiences for schoolagers that enhance their developmental outcomes and academic achievement. Programs offer active learning opportunities and support the State of Michigan Educational Technology Plan ([http://www.techplan.org/](http://www.techplan.org/)). Programs are supporting and implementing the Michigan State Board of Education's policy on Quality Character Education ([http://www.michigan.gov/documents/Character_policy_final_94134_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/Character_policy_final_94134_7.pdf)). According to the policy, character education in public schools should be secular and is best implemented using coordinated school health programs with a focus on developing positive relationships and prosocial norms among students and staff.

Please note: This indicator is for schoolagers only.

**Suggested Documentation**
Lesson plans, newsletters, field trips, guest presenters, weekly schedule, parent handbook.

**To Learn More:**
- Core Knowledge Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 27
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section V; Standard F,H, I
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 25-30
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: Section V, Standard F and G
- Core Knowledge and Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals: Content area 2, pg. 25,30
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Indicator 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider uses an approved early childhood curriculum with all children under the age of five.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
- Program uses a comprehensive and documented early childhood curriculum model or education approach to guide teaching practices.
- Please Note: This indicator is for early childhood only.

**Suggested Documentation**
- Materials from publishing company, lesson plans

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 109-115

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Indicator 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider and staff discusses anecdotal notes/observations as a basis for working/teaching with each child under the age of five.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
- Program records and discuss anecdotal notes as the basis for planning for individual children.
- Please Note: This indicator is for early childhood only.

**Suggested Documentation**
- Sample format for notes that include what children are saying/direct quotes, Notes that include what children are doing/children’s strengths, and plan for discussion of notes could include staff meeting agenda, schedule of meetings or other documentation that shows how the notes are discussed by staff.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 135
- Michigan Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 97
### Curriculum and Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs uses an approved child assessment tool at least two times a year with each child under the age of five.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program implements a valid and reliable assessment tool at least two times a year to measure progress and to support children’s development and learning.

Please note: This indicator is for early childhood only.

**Suggested Documentation**
Materials from publishing company, Policy in Handbook.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 135-136
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 95-99

### Curriculum and Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider and/or staff uses child assessment results in parent-teacher conferences at least two times a year for children under the age of five.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program uses information from child assessments to effectively communicate children’s progress with their families at least two times a year.

Please note: This indicator is for early childhood only.

**Suggested Documentation**
Newsletter, handbook, materials from publishing company, written policy, conference sign-up sheets.

**To Learn More:**
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg.11
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 136
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 97
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Indicator 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program completes annual developmental screening on each child under the age of five.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program implements a valid and reliable developmental screening tool to identify concerns and to support children's development and learning for all age groups. Please note: This indicator is for early childhood only.

**Suggested Documentation**
Materials from publishing company, Policy in Handbook

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 135
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 95-99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Indicator 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider uses assessment to inform individual, small group, and whole group instruction.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program uses child assessment to effectively plan activities for children's daily experiences and to support children's ongoing development and learning. Please note: This indicator is for early childhood only.

**Suggested Documentation**
Newsletter, handbook, materials from publishing company, lesson plans.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 135
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 92
Appendix 2: Recruitment Messaging

This appendix hosts the messaging that was provided to Steering Committee members and Great Start to Quality Resource Center Directors to support active recruitment of pilot participants.

1.1 Recruitment Language

Hello everyone!

To those of you who were able to participate in the focus groups about the School Age Design of Great Start to Quality, thank you so much for your time and expertise. It was greatly appreciated. There is another opportunity for you to contribute to the School Age Design of Great Start to Quality, if you are interested. As some of you may know the Michigan Department of Education-Office of Great Start has tasked the Early Childhood Investment Corporation with piloting the indicators and self-assessment survey format created during the School Age Design work during fiscal year 15.

The pilot will be for 20 providers, representing as many licensed or registered care setting types as possible that provide care and education for schoolagers. This will include center-based, school-based, community-based and home-based providers. Pilot participants will complete an orientation process and then will complete the MDE-OGS approved pilot Self-Assessment Survey. All Self-Assessment Surveys will be validated and a written report of the findings, as well as the program’s achieved Star Rating will be provided to participants. Participants whose score qualifies them for an on-site assessment will have the option of deciding whether they would like to remain at a 3 Star rating or if they would like to have the appropriate Program Quality Assessment (PQA) tools administered. Participants are eligible for tiered reimbursement as well as the Participation Bonus, if they meet the other eligibility qualifications.

If you think that you may be interested in participating please review the information below. If the pilot sounds like you’re ready to commit you to you can complete this survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/DDPHXDQ. Please be sure to complete the full survey, or your program will not be eligible for participation in the pilot. Recruitment will close when 20 pilot participants are identified; a waiting list will be maintained for the pilot. Questions about the pilot can be directed to Jordan Blough-Orr, JordanBlough-Orr@ecic4kids.org.
Pilot Overview

The goal of this project is to pilot the indicators and the self-assessment process that were developed during the School Age Design work in FY 2015, to measure the quality of programs and providers serving children and schoolagers up to the age of 12. A total of 20 programs and providers will complete the pilot Self-Assessment Survey; those who are eligible will have the opportunity to have an on-site assessment conducted.

Timeline

The pilot will run from February until August 2016. A brief outline of the steps in participation are outlined below. Further details will be provided during the Pre-Self-Assessment Survey process.

Pilot participants will:

1. Complete pre-Self-Assessment Survey Process
2. Receive blank Self-Assessment Survey
3. Complete Self-Assessment Survey
4. Gather and label supporting documentation
5. Submit Self-Assessment Survey for validation
6. Receive validation report and in some cases your final Rating
7. Receive phone call that program is eligible for on-site assessment
8. Decide if interested in on-site assessment
9. Schedule on-site assessment window or decline onsite assessment
10. Have on-site assessments administered
11. Receive PQA report
12. Receive final rating
13. Complete evaluation

Eligibility

The pilot will consist of 20 licensed and registered settings. To participate in the pilot participants must:

- Be providing care for at least one schoolager.
- Complete your Self-Assessment Survey (SAS) within two weeks of receipt.
- Agree not to photocopy the pilot SAS and must agree to return all copies to ECIC.
Provide a timeframe for on-site assessment within five business days from receiving communication that they are eligible for on-site assessment.

Agree to complete the evaluation survey after they have finished the rating process.

Participants may:

- Volunteer for a follow up phone interview after they have finished the rating process.
- Leave the pilot at any time with no penalty. They will be eligible to participate in Great Start to Quality at another time, if they should choose.

Basics

There are a few phases of the pilot, they are briefly outlined below.

- The first step in the pilot process will require all pilot participants to complete the Pre-Self-Assessment Survey webinar before they can receive their Self-Assessment Survey. The webinar will be offered multiple times to give participants a variety of opportunities to complete it. After completing the webinar, pilot participants will be emailed a copy of the pilot Self-Assessment Survey.
- Participants who elect to submit via snail mail will be sent a postage paid envelope to send in their completed Self-Assessment Survey and supporting documentation back to the Early Childhood Investment Corporation for validation.
- Once submitted, all Self-Assessment Surveys will be validated. A validator, who is trained in the validation process and familiar the four piloted Self-Assessment Surveys will review each participants’ completed Self-Assessment Survey and supporting documentation and will determine the points that a program is eligible for on each indicator.
- After validation is complete participants will receive a written report sharing the results of their validation and will be informed as soon as possible if they are eligible for on-site assessment and what next steps they need to take.
- Programs that receive an on-site assessment will receive a report(s) that shares the results of their PQA.
- All pilot participants, after their rating is final, will complete an evaluation survey to reflect on their experiences in the pilot. Participants can also elect to participate in a phone interview to further explore their experiences and feedback on the validation process and with the Self-Assessment Survey.

Benefits

There are variety of benefits to participating in this pilot.

Pilot participants are:

- Pilot participants are eligible for the Participation Bonus as long as they meet the eligibility requirements.
- Pilot ratings will be valid for two years.
Pilot participants can submit the completed pilot Self-Assessment Survey and supporting documents via email or via snail mail.

Free on-site assessments for those who qualify administered by valid and reliable Assessment Specialists.

Pilot participants will still be eligible for increased subsidy payments if the program accepts children whose families are supported by the Child Development Care subsidy. Program will not have a published Star Rating in the traditional sense, but rating will still be publicly posted.

Participants will be given opportunity to reflect on experience; your feedback will be shared with the Michigan Department of Education-Office of Great Start for consideration.

Pilot participants will be provided support, materials, and language to communicate about their pilot rating.

**Communicating about your Rating**

Pilot ratings will not display on the parent search on [www.GreatStartToQuality.org](http://www.GreatStartToQuality.org); however all pilot participants will be listed on a document that will be hosted on the site. Participants will receive a certificate with their rating and assistance will be available to help with updating their program profile on [www.GreatStartToQuality.org](http://www.GreatStartToQuality.org) to show that they participated in the pilot and have a rating.
Appendix 3: Pre-Self-Assessment Survey Webinar Content

This Appendix provides the slides that utilized in the pilot’s Pre-Self-Assessment Survey webinar. All pilot participants were required to view this webinar, either live or using a recording, prior to the self-assessment portion of the pilot.
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What is Great Start to Quality?
Great Start to Quality

Michigan’s Quality Rating and Improvement System for Child Care and Preschool Programs

- Led by Michigan Department of Education, Office of Great Start
- Implemented by the Early Childhood Investment Corporation
- Funded by the state’s federal Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) block grant.
Goals

- Promote the health and development of children to assure that children with the highest needs are participating in high quality settings
- Empower parents to become savvy consumers who choose high quality for their children
- Offer policymakers effective tools to improve the quality of early learning and care
- Provide accountability so that donors, legislators and taxpayers feel confident investing in quality
- Give providers a roadmap to, and supports for, quality improvement
Five Common Elements

Great Start to Quality Program Indicators

Great Start to Quality STARS, Validation, Program Quality Assessment

Resource Centers, Workforce Development, Quality Improvement Resources, *Great Start to Quality* Orientation, T.E.A.C.H., Consultation

GreatStartToQuality.org

Validation and Evaluation
History and Purpose

- Launched in the fall of 2011
- Re-launched in June 2013 – Version 2.0
- Rates the quality of participating child care and preschool programs using a common set of standards
- Designed to increase the quality of early learning and care provided in all licensed child care and preschool programs
- Helps parents find the best child care and preschool for their children
Great Start to Quality Resource Centers

- Access to professional development
- Great Start to Quality Orientation for unlicensed subsidized providers
- Access to quality improvement consultation
- Technical assistance to help providers get started
- Access to quality improvement resources
Participating in Great Start to Quality

Diagram showing the process from Start to Finish: Start, Update Program Information, Complete Self-Assessment Survey, Upload Evidence of Self-Assessment Survey, Submit Self-Assessment Survey, Quality Improvement Planning and Implementation, Validation of Self-Assessment Survey, Assessment, Published Rating, Finish.

GreatStartToQuality.org
History of the School Age Design of Great Start to Quality
School Age Design 2014

In 2014 the Early Childhood Investment Corporation contracted with American Institutes for Research to engage stakeholders from across the state and nation with three objectives:

- Develop a definition of school age with input from Michigan stakeholders.
- Review current school age quality improvement efforts in Michigan and nationally.
- Make recommendations to build a comprehensive quality rating and improvement system for school age programming in Michigan.
Foundational Elements

As a result of the School Age Design work in 2014 it was recommended that:

- The system should include programs and providers serving children from kindergarten entry to age twelve.
- The system should feel similar to Great Start to Quality.
- The standards used to measure program quality should take into account work done to develop the Michigan Out of School Time Standards of Quality.
School Age Design 2015

In 2015 over 30 stakeholders worked to develop specific recommendations for how Great Start to Quality could include licensed and registered programs and providers caring for children up to the age of 12.
Pilot Overview

- The goal of this pilot is to test run the indicators that were developed to measure the quality of programs and providers serving children and youth up to the age of 12.

- 20 providers and programs will complete the pilot Self-Assessment Survey; those who are eligible will have the opportunity to have an on-site assessment conducted.
Benefits of Participation

Pilot participants are:

- Eligible for the Participation Bonus as long as they meet eligibility requirements.
- The first in the field to measure the quality of your program with the new Self-Assessment Survey.
- Able to submit supporting documents via technology or via snail mail.
- Eligible for tiered reimbursement.
- Able to decide whether or not to accept the pilot rating, which is valid for 2 years.
- Given the opportunity to reflect on experience and feedback will be shared with the MDE-OGS for consideration.
Participant Requirements

Participants must:

- Complete your Self-Assessment Survey (SAS) within two weeks of receipt.
- Agree not to photocopy the pilot SAS and must agree to return all copies to ECIC.
- Accept an agreed upon timeframe for on-site assessment within five business days from receiving communication that they are eligible for on-site assessment.
- Agree to complete the evaluation survey after they have finished the rating process.

Participants may:

- Volunteer for a follow up phone interview after they have finished the rating process.
- Leave the pilot at any time with no penalty. They will be eligible to participate in Great Start to Quality at another time, if they should choose.
ECIC Requirements

Early Childhood Investment Corporation will:

- Respond to request for assistance within 48 business hours.
- Complete the validation of Self-Assessment Surveys within two weeks.
- Ensure that The HighScope Educational Research Foundation and/or The Weikart Center for Program Quality complete on-site assessments in a timely manner within the agreed upon window for observation.
Pilot Process

1. Participant completes Pre-Self-Assessment Survey Process.
2. Program completes program information.
3. Investment Corporation provides blank Self-Assessment Survey.
4. Participant reviews Self-Assessment Survey.
5. Participant completes Self-Assessment Survey.
6. Participant gathers and labels supporting documentation.
7. Participant reviews completed Self-Assessment Survey and documentation to ensure accuracy and that there is documentation for each indicator selected.
8. Participant submits completed Self-Assessment Survey and documentation to the Investment Corporation for validation.
9. Investment Corporation validates participant’s Self-Assessment Survey.

GreatStartToQuality.org
Pilot Process Cont’d

Participant is validated at 1 Star, 2 Star or 3 Star Rating.

Participant is validated at 4 or 5 Star rating and is eligible for on-site assessment.

Investment Corporation contacts participant to make they aware they are eligible for on-site assessment.

Participant declines on-site assessment and is rated a 3 Star.

Participant is interested in on-site assessment.

On-site Assessment occurs.

Participant agrees to timeframe for unannounced on-site assessment to occur.

Participant completes pilot evaluation.

Participants receives PQA Report(s) and final Star Rating.
Step 1. Pre-SAS Process

This process is in place so that pilot participants:

- Have a basic understanding of Great Start to Quality
- Understand how the work done in FY 14 and 15 inform the School Age Pilot.
- Understand the process of the pilot.
- Can successfully participate in the pilot.
Pilot participants are required to provide information about their program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilot Program Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Person</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>License Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site/Program Name</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enroll Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Licensed Capacity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infants (birth until 1 year of age)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toddlers (1 year of age until 36 months of age)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschoolers (30 months of age until eligible to attend a grade of kindergarten or higher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Age (a child who is eligible to attend a grade of kindergarten or higher, but less than 13 years of age)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Step 2. Program Information

### Classroom Information - Lead Teachers and Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom/Group Name</th>
<th>Age Range Served</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Lead Teacher Name</th>
<th>Lead Teacher Maiden Name</th>
<th>Credentials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Classroom Information - Assistant Teachers and Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom/Group Name</th>
<th>Assistant Teacher Name</th>
<th>Assistant Teacher Maiden Name</th>
<th>Credentials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 3. Self-Assessment Survey

There are four versions of the SAS

- Centers serving children birth to age 12.
- Centers serving children from kindergarten entry to age 12.
- Group or Family Homes with assistants.
- Group or Family Homes without assistants.
Step 3. Self-Assessment Survey

The pilot Self-Assessment process is different from the one currently followed in Great Start to Quality.

- Participants may select to participate via mail correspondence.
- There is no validation call; all indicators must be supported with documentation.
- Participants will label documentation to show how it should be reviewed in relation to the submitted Self-Assessment Survey.
Step 3. Self-Assessment Survey

The SAS is built off of Michigan’s definition of quality in these settings.

- **Core Knowledge and Core Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals**
  - “Core knowledge and competencies describe the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed by professionals to provide high-quality afterschool and youth development programming and support the learning and development of children and youth.”

- **Michigan Out of School Time Standards of Quality**
  - “The Michigan Out-of-School Time (MOST) Standards of Quality are designed to assist schools and other organizations in developing high quality, comprehensive OST programs for all children and youth in grades K-12. The standards are based on research concerning quality programs for school-age children and youth.”
Step 3. Self-Assessment Survey

- **Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten**
  
  "Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten is meant to provide guidance to all early care and education programs for providing all three- and four-year-old children with opportunities to reach essential developmental and educational goals. Carefully developed early learning expectations linked to K-12 expectations can contribute to a more cohesive, unified approach to young children’s education. Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten includes both Quality Program Standards for Prekindergarten Programs and Early Learning Expectations for Three- and Four-Year-Old Children. Clear research-based expectations for the content and desired results of early learning experiences can help focus curriculum and instruction. By defining the content and outcomes of young children’s early education, the early learning expectations will lead to greater opportunities for preschoolers’ positive development."

- **Michigan’s Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs**
  
  "(ECSQ-IT) is intended to help early childhood programs provide high-quality settings and to respond to the diversity of children and families. The ECSQ-IT builds on the minimum regulations detailed in the Licensing Rules for Child Care Centers and Licensing Rules for Family and Group Child Care Homes and incorporates the essential elements of the program and child outcome standards required for various other early childhood programs. In addition, they are aligned with the Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten (ECSQ-PK), Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs."
Step 3. Self-Assessment Survey

The Self-Assessment Survey has five Categories, which are color-coded to the labelling system.

- Staff Qualifications and Professional Development
- Family and Community Partnerships
- Administration and Management
- Environment
- Curriculum and Instruction
### Step 3. Self-Assessment Survey Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Director or site supervisor has an associate degree in child-related field with 300 hours of experience. OR supervisor has a valid Michigan School Age Youth Development Credential, or equivalent.</td>
<td>250 semester hours in child-related field and 800 hours of experience.</td>
<td>600 hours of experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director or site supervisor has a valid Michigan School Age Youth Development Credential, or equivalent.</td>
<td>33 semester hours in child-related field and 800 hours of experience.</td>
<td>600 hours of experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director or site supervisor has a Bachelor's Degree or higher in a chil-related field.</td>
<td>240 semester hours in a child-related field.</td>
<td>500 hours of experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director or site supervisor has a Bachelor's Degree or higher in a child-related field.</td>
<td>240 semester hours in a child-related field.</td>
<td>500 hours of experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality, Section II, Standard II.32
- Early Childhood Professional National, pp. 1-12
- Early Childhood Professionals National, pp. 1-12
- Early Childhood Professionals National, pp. 1-12

**Suggested Resources:**
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality, Section II, Standard II.32
- Early Childhood Professional National, pp. 1-12
- Early Childhood Professionals National, pp. 1-12
- Early Childhood Professionals National, pp. 1-12

**Website:**
- GreatStartToQuality.org
### Step 3. Self-Assessment Survey Format

#### Family and Community Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program offers parenting education opportunities for all families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**

Families are provided with opportunities to engage in family education, enrichment, family support, child development and other programs or groups. This is provided by the program or by sharing opportunities from community agencies that are designed to improve the quality of family life and support children's learning and development.

**Suggested Documentation**

Self-Assessment, Written Communication, Newsletters, Statement regarding informal communication, Event Programs/Flyers, Meeting Agendas, Attendance (sign-in sheets).

---

*To Learn More:*

- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 11
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 105-106
Step 3. Self-Assessment Survey

### Administration and Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program has written personal policies and procedures (handbook) that includes at a minimum a written plan for staff orientation, retention, evaluation and individual professional development plans.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Program has clear documentation of policies and procedures for staff.

**Suggested Documentation**
Documentation of written policies and procedures, could include the handbook or just pages of the handbook that are relevant.

To Learn More:
Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: p. 6 Section I Standard D, E, F; pg. 21 Section VII Letter E
Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality: pg. 5-6, Section I Standard B, C; pg. 11-13 Section III Standard C, D, E, G, H, K; pg. 21 Section VII Letter G
### Step 3. Self-Assessment Survey

#### Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators (select one)</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X next to selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program is participating in the Child and Adult Food Care Program (CACFP) in good standing and has a written nutrition plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program follows guidelines that meet the CACFP meal pattern requirements and has a written nutrition plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If program serves only snacks, program follows guidelines that meet CACFP meal pattern requirements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a program does not provide food, program provides nutrition information to families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of indicator**

Program addresses the nutritional needs of children and youth by providing food service and nutrition education.

**Suggested Documentation**

Written nutrition plan, show participation in CACFP, documentation showing the program follows seasonal menu guidelines

To Learn More:

Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality pg. 7 Section I Standard G, H, J
### Step 3. Self-Assessment Survey

**Curriculum and Instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program has a written statement of educational and developmental priorities for all children that is available to families.

**Intent of Indicator**
The program needs a clear mission/vision to operate; having this plan shows intentional thinking and planning around the program.

**Suggested Documentation**
Written vision/mission statement.

**To Learn More:**
- Michigan Early Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 88-89
- Michigan Early Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, pg. 62-64

---

GreatStartToQuality.org
Step 4. Review Self-Assessment Survey

While reviewing your Self-Assessment Survey, ECIC is available to answer some types of questions.

- We can answer questions like:
  - What does this word/phrase mean?
  - Did I calculate my outdoor time correctly?
  - How should I label a document that counts for two indicators?

- We cannot answer questions like:
  - Does this document count for this indicator?
  - Will we definitely receive points if we...?
  - We don’t do something exactly like this, we do X, will we still get points?
Step 5. Completing the Self-Assessment Survey

Each participant will have two weeks to complete their Self-Assessment Survey, gather and label documentation and return it to ECIC.

- Participants who need additional time or labels should contact ECIC as soon as they realize the need.
Step 5. Completing the Self-Assessment Survey

- To complete each Indicator:
  1. Read the indicator(s) and its intent.
  2. Place an X if your program meets the indicator and has documentation to support it.
  3. Review the documents referenced in the *To Learn More* section to further understand the intent.
  4. Gather and label your documentation so that for each indicator you’ve selected there is documentation that demonstrates that you’ve met it.
### Step 5. Self-Assessment Survey Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Place X if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program offers parenting education opportunities for all families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intent of Indicator**
Families are provided with opportunities to engage in family education, enrichment, family support, child development and other programs or groups. This is provided by the program or by sharing opportunities from community agencies that are designed to improve the quality of family life and support children's learning and development.

**Suggested Documentation**
Self-Assessment, Written Communication, Newsletters, Statement regarding informal communication, Event Programs/Flyers, Meeting Agendas, Attendance (sign-in sheets).

To Learn More:
- Michigan Out-of-School Time Standards of Quality, pg. 17-18, Section V Standard D, F
- Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA®) Form B, pg. 11
- Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, pg. 105-106
Step 6. Labeling Supporting Documentation

Labeling documentation is an essential part of this pilot.

- Documents will not be returned; participants should send photocopies; rather than originals.
- Make sure that sensitive information like social security numbers are blacked out.
- Each indicator is numbered; participants have been provided with stickers that are colored and number coded to each indicator.
- Participants should label every page of a document that supports an indicator.
Step 6. Labeling Supporting Documentation

How to Label

- On the applicable page of each document in the upper right hand corner place the sticker that corresponds to the color and number of the indicator.

- For document pages that support multiple indicators place all corresponding stickers in the upper right hand corner.
Step 6. Labeling Supporting Documentation

All documents should be labelled for each indicator it might support. It is likely that one document will support multiple indicators.

- Example: if your program has a handbook it likely will support multiple indicators. A participant should use stickers to label the pages that are applicable for each indicator. If page 12 of the handbook is the outdoor time policy it should be labeled with a yellow 4 sticker. If page 24 of the handbook has a statement about formal communication it should be labeled with a blue 2 sticker.
Step 6. Labeling Supporting Documentation
Step 6. Labeling Supporting Documentation

Paper Submission vs Electronic Submission

- Pilot participants have the unique opportunity in this pilot to submit hard copies of documents; rather than scanned or uploaded version.
- Participants will identify how they would like to submit when they receive their blank Self-Assessment Survey.
- Participants are encouraged, but not required, to submit electronically via email.
- Documents will not be returned; please send in copies rather than originals.
Step 7. Review for Submission

While completing your final review participants ask themselves these two questions:

- Have I clearly marked each indicator that I want validated?
- Have I provided labelled documentation for each indicator; with each page labelled for the corresponding indicators?
Step 8. Submission of Self-Assessment Survey

Participants must submit their completed Self-Assessment Survey and supporting documentation within two weeks of receiving the blank copy.

- Participants submitting via email should send documents as a zipped folder.

Participants will receive confirmation of receipt of the completed Self-Assessment Survey and documentation within 24 business hours.
Step 8. Submission of Self-Assessment Survey

A few things to remember:

- Participants may only submit once; only documents submitted with the completed Self-Assessment Survey will be reviewed.

- An indicator that is left blank will be given no points, even if there is documentation associated with it.

- No changes can be made to your Self-Assessment Survey after submission.
Step 9. Validation

Validation for the pilot will be completed within two weeks of receiving a participant’s completed Self-Assessment Survey.

- Participants will receive a validation report via email after their validation is complete.
- Participants who are eligible for on-site assessment will be contacted via phone to determine if they are interested in on-site assessment.
- Participants should review their validation report and contact ECIC with any questions or concerns.
Step 10. Validation Report

- Within two weeks of submission participants will receive their written validation report.
- This report will show each indicator, and the validated score for each indicator. In instances where the self-assessed score is different from the validated score a brief rationale statement will be provided.
On-site Assessment 101
What is it?

On-site assessment is:

- Unannounced on-site program observations will be conducted during regular hours of operation.
- Participants will be provided a window of time when the observations will take place.
- The goal is to see a typical day at your program with the majority of the children in attendance.
- *It is essential that the lead teacher(s) be present.*
Who does it?

- Assessment Specialists are trained by either The HighScope Educational Research Foundation or The Weikart Center for Program Quality.
- Each Assessment Specialist completes reliability training annually to ensure the integrity of program ratings.
Assessment Tools

- Four different tools are used for on-site assessment.
  - Family Child Care PQA®
  - Infant and Toddler PQA®
  - School Age PQA
  - Preschool PQA®
Eligibility for On-site Assessment

Participants that are validated at a 4 or 5 Star are required to have an on-site assessment to confirm their quality prior to receiving their published rating.

- Participants may decline on-site assessment; these participants will be validated at a 3 Star.
- If the window provided for the assessment does not accommodate your program, you may also decline the observation and will be validated at a 3 Star.
What to Expect During On-site Assessment

- Assessment Specialists are:
  - There to observe, they will not ignore a child, but will also not engage with children or staff.
  - Taking notes throughout the observation.
  - Not allowed to answer any questions about the observation.
  - Employed by multiple organizations and may not all come on the same day.
  - Able to ask questions of the lead teacher, if needed.
On-site Assessment Results

- Participants will receive a detailed written report of their on-site assessment within 45 days of all the assessments being administered.
Communicating with Families
Communicating with Families

Pilot participants will be provided with materials to communicate with the families they serve about the pilot.

Participants will receive:

- A certificate with your rating on it.
- A letter explaining your rating and the pilot.
- A template letter to provide to families.
- A link to the page on the Great Start to Quality website that hosts the pilot participants’ ratings.
- Assistance updating your program profile on Great Start to Quality.
Evaluation
Evaluation

- All pilot participants will be provided a link to an online survey to reflect and share feedback about their experience in the pilot.

- Pilot participants will also have the opportunity to indicate that they would be willing to participate in a phone interview about their pilot experience.

All feedback will be used to inform a report about the pilot to be submitted to Michigan Department of Education-Office of Great Start for consideration.
Questions?
Contact Information

Jordan Blough-Orr
Early Childhood Specialist
Email: JordanBlough-Orr@ecic4kids.org

Funding from the Office of Great Start within the Michigan Department of Education supports the implementation of Great Start.
Appendix 4: Pilot Participant Program Information Form

This appendix contains the Pilot Participant Program Information Form. This form was completed by all pilot participants prior to receiving their Self-Assessment Survey. The form was designed to capture basic program information, enrollment numbers and staffing information by classroom and teacher. The version hosted here includes the guidance that was provided to pilot participants to support them to complete the form correctly.
1.2 Pilot Program Information Form with Guidance

**Purpose:** This document is for the use of participants in the School Age Pilot of Great Start to Quality in 2016 implemented by the Early Childhood Investment Corporation (ECIC). This document explains how pilot participant should complete the Pilot Participant Program Information Form. This form must be completed before a blank pilot Self-Assessment Survey will be provided. The green text explains what information should be put in each section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Person/Role</th>
<th>SAS Send Date</th>
<th>License Number</th>
<th>SAS Return Date</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>SAS Send Date</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>SAS Send Date</th>
<th>SAS Send Date</th>
<th>SAS Send Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This should be the person who is completing the Self-Assessment Survey and will be the main contact for the pilot; please also provide their title.</td>
<td>ECIC USE, please leave blank.</td>
<td>This should be the license number for the Program. Please note, using the word shared if this license number is shared among multiple Programs.</td>
<td>ECIC USE, please leave blank.</td>
<td>This should be the number the Contact Person can be reached.</td>
<td>ECIC USE, please leave blank.</td>
<td>This should list the location of the program. If the mailing address (i.e. where materials should be sent to) is different from the program address please list both in the format shown below.</td>
<td>ECIC USE, please leave blank.</td>
<td>This should be the email address the Contact Person can be reached. This is where all communications from ECIC will be sent.</td>
<td>ECIC USE, please leave blank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site/Program Name:</td>
<td>If applicable, please provide the name of the Program. This could be the business name (ex: Tammy's Teddy Bear Care) or the name of the program itself (ex: YMCA Prime Time). If your program does not have a name, this can be left blank.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director or Site Coordinator Name</td>
<td>This should be the name of the person who is responsible for day-to-day oversight of the program. They may not or may not be on site every day. Please provide, if applicable, the maiden name as well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snail Mail or Electronic Submission</td>
<td>Please indicate if your program will be submitting your completed Self-Assessment Survey via snail mail or email.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Center</td>
<td>ECIC USE, please leave blank.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day of school year programming</td>
<td>When, if at all, does your program switch from school year programming to summer programming? Please be as specific as possible; providing the date if you are able.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Participating in Great Start to Quality</td>
<td>Please indicate if your program is currently participating in Great Start to Quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information will be kept on record by ECIC for up to two years for all pilot participants. It will be used to maintain contact with pilot participants and streamline the process. Pilot participant should check their information carefully and make any corrections. The Contact Person should be someone who regularly checks their email; it is likely that the Program Director or Site Coordinator could be the contact person; but participants may select someone at their discretion.

**Enrollment Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licensed Capacity</th>
<th>This should show the number of children the Program is licensed to enroll.</th>
<th>Current Number in Care</th>
<th>Still Enrolling Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infants (birth until 1 year of age)</td>
<td>How many infant are currently enrolled in the Program?</td>
<td>If you are still accepting additional children in this age group use a Y. If you are not currently accepting more children use a N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This information will be used to help inform multiple indicators. It is essential that all sections are filled out with what is currently true about the program. The age range definitions are directly from the child care center licensing rules. The numbers in this table should match the total of those in the Classroom Information.

If your program runs an AM and PM schedule please delineate in these boxes how many of each age group are present during each session. If your program runs more than two sessions, please make it clear how many children in each age group are present during each sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group Description</th>
<th>How many are currently enrolled in the Program?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toddler (1 year of age until 30 months of age)</td>
<td>How many toddlers are currently enrolled in the Program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschoolers (30 months of age until eligible to attend a grade of kindergarten or higher)</td>
<td>How many preschoolers are currently enrolled in the Program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Agers (a child who is eligible to attend a grade of kindergarten or higher, but less than 13 years of age)</td>
<td>How many schoolagers are currently enrolled in the Program?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Classroom Information is collected so that the Staff Qualifications and Professional Development indicators are validated as accurately as possible. In some programs there will not be separate classrooms or groups of children that are led by specific adults. For example, in some after school programs there will be children from the age of 5 up to the age of 12 present; this is perfectly okay. In these instances the Classroom/Group Name box should be left blank, all other sections of the table should be completed as fully as possible. In some programs there are additional staff with different Classroom Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom/Group Name</th>
<th>Age Range Served</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Lead Teacher Name</th>
<th>Lead Teacher Maiden Name</th>
<th>Credentials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ginny's Rabbits</td>
<td>3 year olds - 5 year olds</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ginny Roberts</td>
<td>Ginny Foster</td>
<td>Bachelor's Degree in Elementary education with a ZS endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Program</td>
<td>5 year olds - 12 year olds</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Samantha Jones</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Michigan School Age Youth Development Credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kids</td>
<td>9 year olds - 12 year olds</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Norm Richard</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Associate's Degree in child development, Michigan School Age Youth Development Certificate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List the credentials of the Lead Teacher. This should include things like, Bachelor's Degree in Early Childhood, Michigan School Age Youth Development Certificate and/or Credential, Montessori endorsement.
titles, such as aides and volunteers. Please only provide the information for staff who are paid. Volunteers’ qualifications are not currently being pilot tested.

If your program runs multiple sessions, for example an AM and a PM group, please make it clear which staff are present during which sessions. The way that sessions are labeled in these tables should match the way they are labelled in the Enrollment Information table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom/Group Name</th>
<th>Assistant Teacher Name</th>
<th>Assistant Teacher Maiden Name</th>
<th>Credentials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The information here should match that provided above in the Lead Teacher and Staff section.</td>
<td>Who is identified as the paid staff that works with this group or in the program?</td>
<td>If the Assistant Teacher has a different maiden name that may show up on transcripts, diplomas or other documents please list it here.</td>
<td>List the credentials of the Lead Teacher. This should include things like, Bachelor’s Degree in Early Childhood, Michigan School-Age Youth Development Certificate and/or Credential, Montessori endorsement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: On-site Assessment Report and Protocols

This Appendix hosts the report developed by the David P. Weikart Center for Program Quality reflecting on the on-site assessments completed using the School-Age PQA, Walk-Through Version and Method. This section also hosts the onsite assessment protocols used during the pilot.
Appendix 6: Analysis of Pilot Evaluation Report

This appendix hosts the full analysis of the pilot and pilot participant evaluation survey.