



ECCOnline Quality Counts Data Summary

Databook for Report 1

February 9, 2015

table of contents

Basic Site Characteristics	3
Baseline Status	6
Elements and Goals	9
Elements selected for quality improvement	9
Goals selected for quality improvement	9
Goals per Element	10
Technical Assistance Efforts and Activities	11
Method of consultation	11
Technical Assistance Efforts	11
Referrals	12
Technical assistance activities	13

ECCOnline Quality Counts Data

The following Quality Counts data comes from First 5 Alameda County’s ECCOnline data system. These data are reflective of QRIS activities of family child care (FCC) and center care (Center) sites from Cohorts 1 and 2 through 2014. These data describe the basic characteristics of QRIS sites, their baseline status, quality elements and goals selected, and technical assistance and coaching activities. The purpose of examining these data is to assess and evaluate the quality improvement and technical assistance capacity of First 5 Alameda County’s QRIS coaching program.

Basic Site Characteristics

The following exhibit displays the names of the 30 child care and early education sites from cohorts 1 (17 sites) and 2 (13 sites) that are participating the First 5 Alameda’s QRIS coaching program.

Exhibit 1. Names of participating sites in Cohorts 1 and 2

Site Names	Cohort
24-Hour Oakland Parent-Teacher Children's Center	2
Adventures In Learning	2
Asiya Jabbaar (Reaching Beyond Care) FCC	1
AUSD - Albany Children's Center	2
AUSD - Woodstock Child Development Center	1
Bay Area Child Care Center- Glankler	1
CAPE - WM. Ormand III Early Ed.uation Center	1
Charlotte Guinn (Rose's Daycare) FCC	1
Cheryl Lima, FCC	2
College Of Alameda Children's Center	2
Eden Youth Child Care Center	2
Hearts Leap North / ICRI	2
Kidango - Decoto Site	1
Kidango- Almond	1
Laura Arriaza FCC	1
Lockwood Child Development Center, OUSD	1
Lu, Xiaoling	2
Maria Gomez, FCC	2
My Space To Grow	1

Site Names	Cohort
Nancy Su- FCC	2
Olga Rodriquez, FCC	1
OUSD - Hintil Kuu Ca	1
Pei Ping Huang, FCC	1
Rosa Henriquez, FCC	2
Saint Vincent's Day Home	1
Sophia Perez- FCC	2
The Child Unique Montessori School	1
The Salvation Army- Booth Memorial Daycare	1
Through the Looking Glass	2
YMCA Of The Central Bay Area	1

Exhibit 2. City distribution of sites (N=30)

Cities	Frequency	Percent
Oakland	8	26.7
Alameda	3	10.0
Dublin	3	10.0
Fremont	3	10.0
Hayward	2	6.7
Berkeley	2	6.7
Livermore	2	6.7
Union City	2	6.7
Emeryville	1	3.3
Castro Valley	1	3.3
Albany	1	3.3
Pleasanton	1	3.3
San Lorenzo	1	3.3
TOTAL	30	100.0

Exhibit 3. Facility type (N=30)

	Frequency	Percent
Family Child Care	11	36.7
Center Care	19	63.3
TOTALS	30	100.0

Exhibit 4. Cohort distribution (N=30)

	All (N=30)	FCC (n=11)	Center (n=19)
Cohort 1	17 (56.7%)	5 (45.5%)	12 (63.2%)
Cohort 2	13 (43.3%)	6 (54.5%)	7 (36.8%)
TOTALS	30 (100%)	11 (100%)	19 (100%)

Exhibit 5. Classroom characteristics

	All (N=30)		FCC (n=11)		Center (n=19)	
	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean
Number of classrooms per site	1 - 8	3.4	1	1.0	2 - 8	4.7
Number of teachers	1 - 25	7.5	1 - 4	2.3	1 - 25	10.2
Number of enrolled	4 - 123	39.4	4 - 14	7.7	16 - 120	57.7
Number enrolled 0-3	1 - 28	7.2	1 - 4	2.6	2 - 28	12.4
Number enrolled 3-5	2 - 120	35.5	2 - 13	5.7	8 - 120	51.2

Baseline Status

This section (Exhibits 6 and 7) describes the baseline status of the 30 sites after their initial assessment. Data include total points, tier assignment and baseline score per element.

Exhibit 6. Average baseline scores

	All (N=30)		FCC (n=11)		Center (n=19)	
	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean
Total points	7 - 31	17.6	7 - 19	9.3	15 - 31	22.4
Tier assignment	2 - 4	2.7	2 - 4	2.2	2 - 4	3.1
QRIS Elements						
Child observation	1 - 4	2.4	1 - 4	1.4	1 - 4	2.9
Developmental health screening	1 - 5	2.1	1 - 4	1.3	1 - 5	2.5
Lead teacher	1 - 5	2.6	1 - 5	1.8	2 - 5	3.1
Teacher-child interaction (CLASS)	2 - 4	3.0	2 - 3	2.9	3 - 4	3.1
Ratio or group size	2 - 5	4.2	--	--	2 - 5	4.2
Environment rating (ERS)	0 - 5	2.6	0 - 4	1.7	1 - 5	3.1
Director qualification	0 - 5	2.3	0 - 2	0.2	2 - 5	3.5

Exhibit 7. Baseline scores by site

Site Names	Total points	Tier	Ch. Obs.	Dev. Hlth. Scr.	Lead Tchr.	CLASS	Rto. Grp.	ERS	Dir. Qual.
Center Child Care									
CAPE - WM. Ormand III Early Education Center	31	4	4	4	5	4	5	5	4
The Salvation Army- Booth Memorial Daycare	27	4	4	5	4	3	4	3	4
College Of Alameda Children's Center	26	4	4	5	4	3	4	3	3
Saint Vincent's Day Home	26	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	5
YMCA Of The Central Bay Area	26	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4
Through the Looking Glass	26	3	4	5	2	3	5	4	3
AUSD - Woodstock Child Development Center	25	3	4	2	4	3	4	3	5
The Child Unique Montessori School	23	3	2	2	4	3	5	3	4
AUSD - Albany Children's Center	23	3	4	2	2	3	4	3	5
Bay Area Child Care Center- Glankler	22	3	2	1	5	3	4	3	4
Lockwood Child Development Center, OUSD	22	3	2	2	4	3	4	3	4
Kidango - Decoto Site	22	3	4	2	2	3	4	3	4
Kidango- Almond	21	3	3	3	2	3	4	3	3
Hearts Leap North / ICRI	20	3	1	1	2	4	5	5	2
24-Hour Oakland Parent-Teacher Children's Center	20	3	3	1	3	3	4	2	4
OUSD - Hintil Kuu Ca	19	2	2	2	2	3	5	3	2
Eden Youth Child Care Center	17	2	3	1	2	3	2	4	2
Adventures In Learning	15	2	1	1	2	3	3	2	3
My Space To Grow	15	2	1	1	2	3	5	1	2
Family Child Care									
Maria Gomez, FCC	19	4	4	4	5	3	0	3	0
Asiya Jabbaar (Reaching Beyond Care) FCC	11	2	1	1	2	3	0	4	0
Cheryl Lima, FCC	9	2	2	1	1	3	0	2	0
Laura Arriaza FCC	8	2	1	1	2	3	0	1	0
Lu, Xiaoling	8	2	1	1	1	3	0	2	0
Nancy Su- FCC	8	2	1	1	1	3	0	2	0
Olga Rodriquez, FCC	8	2	1	1	2	3	0	1	0

Site Names	Total points	Tier	Ch. Obs.	Dev. Hlth. Scr.	Lead Tchr.	CLASS	Rto. Grp.	ERS	Dir. Qual.
Pei Ping Huang, FCC	8	2	1	1	2	3	0	1	0
Rosa Henriquez, FCC	8	2	1	1	1	3	0	2	0
Sophia Perez- FCC	8	2	1	1	1	3	0	0	2
Charlotte Guinn (Rose's Daycare) FCC	7	2	1	1	2	2	0	1	0

Elements and Goals

The following data (Exhibits 8 – 10) reflect QRIS elements and goals that make up the Quality Improvement Plans (QIP) and Action Plans for each site based on the baseline assessments/observations of the Technical Assistance coaches.

Elements selected for quality improvement

Exhibit 8. Elements selected for quality improvement

Element	All (N=30)	FCC (n=11)	Center (n=19)
Environmental rating	29 (96.7%)	10 (90.9%)	19 (100%)
Developmental health screening	28 (93.3%)	10 (90.9%)	18 (94.7%)
Lead teacher qualifications	25 (83.3%)	9 (81.8%)	16 (84.2%)
Teacher-child interactions	25 (83.3%)	8 (72.7%)	17 (89.5%)
Child observation	20 (66.7%)	2 (18.2%)	18 (94.7%)
Director qualifications	11 (36.7)	0	11 (57.9%)
Ratio or group size	1 (3.3%)	0	1 (5.3%)

Goals selected for quality improvement

Exhibit 9. Goals selected for quality improvement

Goal	All (N=30)	FCC (n=11)	Center (n=19)
Enhance teacher knowledge with higher education	25 (83.3%)	9 (81.1%)	16 (84.2%)
Enhance program environment	21 (70.0%)	6 (54.5%)	15 (78.9%)
Enhance teacher observation skills	18 (60.0%)	2 (18.2%)	16 (84.2%)
Enhance ability to provide instructional support	13 (43.3%)	3 (27.3%)	10 (52.6%)
Implement universal developmental screenings	12 (40.0%)	3 (27.3%)	9 (47.4%)
Enhance director knowledge and skills with professional development	10 (33.3%)	0	10 (52.6%)
Other	9 (30.0%)	5 (45.5%)	4 (21.1%)
Enhance teacher-child interactions	6 (20.0%)	1 (9.1%)	5 (26.3%)
Program ability to identify children not meeting developmental milestones	6 (20.0%)	2 (18.2%)	4 (21.1%)
Support child with special needs	4 (13.3%)	1 (9.1%)	3 (21.1%)
Enhance business and fiscal practices	4 (13.3%)	0	4 (21.1%)
Enhance teacher communication with family	4 (13.3%)	1 (9.1%)	3 (15.8%)

Goal	All (N=30)	FCC (n=11)	Center (n=19)
Enhance ability to manage challenging behavior	2 (6.7%)	0	2 (10.5%)
Improve staff relationships and communications	0	0	0
Enhance teacher management of classroom	0	0	0
Improve ratios and group size	0	0	0

Goals per element

Exhibit 10. Number of sites that selected goals per quality element

Goal	QRIS Elements						
	Ch. Obs.	Dev. Hlth. Scr.	Lead Tchr.	CLASS	Rto. Grp.	ERS	Dir. Qual.
Enhance teacher knowledge with higher education			25				
Enhance program environment						21	
Other	2	3		6		9	
Enhance teacher observation skills	18						
Enhance ability to provide instructional support				13			
Implement universal developmental screenings		12					
Enhance director knowledge and skills with professional development							10
Enhance teacher-child interactions				6			
Program ability to identify children not meeting developmental milestones		6					
Support child with special needs		4					
Enhance business and fiscal practices					1	2	1
Enhance teacher communication with family		4					
Enhance ability to manage challenging behavior				2			

Technical Assistance Efforts and Activities

The data in this section (Exhibits 11-18) reflect the technical assistance and coaching efforts through a variety of methods.

Method of consultation

Exhibit 11. Methods of consultation used to provide technical assistance

Method of consultation	All	FCC	Center
Onsite	932 (88.1%)	240 (89.6%)	692 (87.6%)
Telephone	54 (5.1%)	14 (5.2%)	40 (5.1%)
Email	54 (5.1%)	7 (2.6%)	47 (5.9%)
Other	18 (1.7%)	7 (2.6%)	11 (1.4%)
TOTALS	1058 (100%)	268 (100%)	790 (100%)

Technical assistance efforts

Exhibit 12. Average number of contacts, time (hours) and days spent providing coaching, overall

	All	FCC	Center
Mean number of contacts	35.3	24.4	41.6
Mean amount of time in hours (including prep and consultation)	70.9 hours	57.1 hours	78.9 hours
Mean number of days	313	276	336

Exhibit 13. Average number of contacts and amount of time spent providing coaching per element

Elements	All		FCC		Center	
	Contacts	Time	Contacts	Time	Contacts	Time
Environment rating	17.0	37.7 hours	15.9	40.9 hours	17.1	35.7 hours
Other	8.4	18.4 hours	4.0	9.6 hours	10.9	24.4 hours
CLASS	6.4	32.1 hours	2.1	13.8 hours	9.9	37.6 hours
Developmental health screen	3.2	6.2 hours	1.8	4.8 hours	4.1	6.8 hours
Lead teacher qualifications	0.2	2.5 hours	0.2	2.1 hours	0.2	2.9 hours
Child observation	0.2	2.3 hours	0.1	2 hours	0.3	2.3 hours
Ratio and group size	0.2	2.1 hours	0.3	3.1 hours	0.2	1.3 hours
Director qualifications	<0.1	2 hours	--	--	0.1	2 hours

Exhibit 14. Average number of contacts, time and days providing coaching overall, by cohort

	All	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Mean number of contacts	35.3	51.5	14.0
Mean amount of time in hours (including prep and consultation)	70.9 hours	99.4 hours	33.6 hours
Mean number of days	313	443	129

Exhibit 15. Average number of contacts and amount of time spent providing coaching per element, by cohort

Elements	All		Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
	Contacts	Time	Contacts	Time	Contacts	Time
Environment rating	17.0	37.7 hours	21.7	45.7 hours	10.1	26.3 hours
Other	8.4	18.4 hours	12.1	23 hours	3.5	10.5 hours
CLASS	6.4	32.1 hours	11.2	34.7 hours	0.1	1.5 hours
Developmental health screen	3.2	6.2 hours	5.7	6.2 hours	--	--
Lead teacher qualifications	0.2	2.5 hours	0.2	3.1 hours	0.2	1.2 hours
Child observation	0.2	2.3 hours	0.2	1.5 hours	0.2	3.8 hours
Ratio and group size	0.2	2.1 hours	0.3	1.7 hours	0.1	3.5 hours
Director qualifications	<0.1	2 hours	0.1	2 hours	--	--

Referrals

Exhibit 16. Number and percent of referrals

Referrals	All	FCC	Center
TOTAL NUMBER OF REFERRALS	263	50	213
Resource and referral	37 (14.1%)	7 (14.0%)	30 (14.1%)
CLASS training	32 (12.2%)	2 (4.0%)	30 (14.1%)
Help Me Grow/Inclusion Coordinator	26 (9.9%)	5 (10.0%)	21 (9.9%)
Other	24 (9.1%)	8 (16.0%)	16 (7.5%)
CARES Plus resources	24 (9.1%)	3 (6.0%)	21 (9.9%)
DRDP training	19 (7.2%)	3 (6.0%)	16 (7.5%)
LIIF business/fiscal consultation and FCC workshops	18 (6.8%)	6 (12.0%)	12 (5.6%)
Community college	16 (6.1%)	4 (8.0%)	12 (5.6%)
CA Child Care Health Program	14 (5.3%)	1 (2.0%)	13 (6.1%)
Facility grant	13 (4.9%)	4 (8.0%)	9 (4.2%)

Referrals	All	FCC	Center
My Teaching Partner (MTP)	13 (4.9%)	2 (4.0%)	11 (5.2%)
CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing	7 (2.7%)	0	7 (3.3%)
Cohorts	5 (1.9%)	2 (4.0%)	3 (1.4%)
First 5 training	5 (1.9%)	1 (2.0%)	4 (1.9%)
Mentor	3 (1.1%)	0	3 (1.4%)
California Department of Education	3 (1.1%)	0	3 (1.4%)
Community care licensing	2 (0.8%)	2 (4.0%)	0
Follow up to previous referral	2 (0.8%)	0	2 (0.9%)

Technical assistance activities

Exhibit 17. Number and percent of technical assistance activities

Activities	All	FCC	Center
TOTAL NUMBER OF ACTIVITIES	989	186	803
Sharing resources, providing information or knowledge	292 (29.5%)	70 (37.6%)	222 (27.6%)
Observation and feedback	192 (19.4%)	40 (21.5%)	152 (18.9%)
All staff/classroom team meeting	150 (15.2%)	18 (9.7%)	132 (16.4%)
On-site training	127 (12.8%)	16 (8.6%)	111 (13.8%)
Videotaping	78 (7.9%)	0	78 (9.7%)
Other	74 (7.5%)	20 (10.8%)	54 (6.7%)
Assistance with grant application	17 (1.7%)	7 (3.8%)	10 (1.2%)
Meeting with higher level administration	17 (1.7%)	0	17 (2.1%)
Grant visit with LIIF program officer	15 (1.5%)	4 (2.2%)	11 (1.4%)
Modeling/demonstration of activities	13 (1.3%)	6 (3.2%)	7 (0.9%)
QRIS Saturday or evening training	7 (0.7%)	5 (2.7%)	2 (0.2%)
Learning community	5 (0.5%)	0	5 (0.6%)
Visit to another child care program	2 (0.2%)	0	2 (.2%)

harder+company
community research

Harder+Company Community Research is a comprehensive social research and planning firm with offices in San Francisco, Davis, San Diego, and Los Angeles, California. Harder+Company's mission is to help our clients achieve social impact through quality research, strategy, and organizational development services. Since 1986, we have assisted foundations, government agencies, and nonprofits throughout California and the country in using good information to make good decisions for their future. Our success rests on providing services that contribute to positive social impact in the lives of vulnerable people and communities.

harderco.com