

## Quality First Baseline and Progress Data Assessment: QF Rating Scale

6.3.2011

The Quality First baseline sample consists of **250** statewide funded child care providers (178 Centers; 72 homes) spread across 30 Regional Partnership Councils (Navajo Nation not included). Of the 250 providers, **126** (50.4%) received a progress assessment in 2011.

The QF Rating Scale was applied on the baseline and progress sample utilizing scores from two measures: (1) **ERS**- Environmental Rating Scales (ECERS, ITERS, and FCCERS); (2) **CLASS**-Classroom Assessment (Domains: Emotional Support, Instructional Support, and Classroom Organization).

BASELINE (250): 178 QF Center and 72 Home Based Care Providers' Rated Using QF Star Rating Scale								
Star Rating Level	Number of Centers (% against 178)	Large Centers	Medium Centers	Small Centers	Number of Homes (% against 72)	Large Homes	Medium Homes	Small Homes
RISING STAR 1*	54 (30%)	8	36	10	30 (42%)	0	1	29
PROGRESSING STAR 2*	113 (63.5%)	29	65	19	36 (50%)	0	0	36
QUALITY 3*	10 (5.5%)	2	5	3	6 (8%)	0	1	5
QUALITY PLUS 4*	1 (.5%)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH QUALITY 5*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PROGRESS (126): 93 QF Center and 33 Home Based Care Providers' Rated Using QF Star Rating Scale								
Star Rating Level	Number of Centers (% against 93)	Large Centers	Medium Centers	Small Centers	Number of Homes (% against 33)	Large Homes	Medium Homes	Small Homes
RISING STAR 1*	13 (14%)	3	8	2	8 (24.24%)	0	0	8
PROGRESSING STAR 2*	73 (78.5%)	21	44	8	21 (63.6%)	0	0	21
QUALITY 3*	6(6.5%)	0	4	2	3 (9.1%)	0	0	3
QUALITY PLUS 4*	1(1%)	1	0	0	1 (3.03%)	0	0	1
HIGH QUALITY 5*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## QF Gain Score Analysis

The data analysis on the provider quality rating showed a statistically significant increase in mean scores (1.77 to 1.94) from baseline to the progress assessment approximately 12-18 months later;  $t(125) = 2.74, p = .007$  (2- tailed paired t-test).

Comparing 126 QF Centers and Home based providers on their initial versus progress rating scores showed that:

- 86.5% (109 of 126) of providers either improved or maintained their QF rating level
  - ❖ 36 Providers (24 Centers and 12 Homes) improved their QF star rating from a 1 to 2; 2 to 3 or 3 to 4 Stars
  - ❖ 73 Providers (58 Centers and 15 Homes) maintained their QF rating (e.g.: Remained at a Star rating of 2)
- 13.5% (17 of 126) of providers showed a decline in their QF rating level
  - ❖ 11 Centers and 6 Home care providers showed a decline in star rating (e.g.: went down from a QF rating of 3 to 2)

An initial review of data from 53 providers who had an increase in Quality Rating (36) or a decline (17) showed that in the shift was contributed by the changes in scores in the following subscales of ERS and CLASS:

- **ERS:** Activities, Interactions, Language-Reasoning (ECCERS), Listening and Talking (ITERS and FCCERS), Program Structure and Space and Furnishing
- **CLASS:** Instructional Support and Classroom Organization

An important additional observation on the 17 providers who declined in rating shows that 4 providers who received the CLASS assessment in addition to ERS decreased their rating in spite of maintaining their initial ERS scores in progress. The CLASS subscale that consistently contributed to this decrease was the Instruction Support score.

Overall results show that the majority of child care providers, both at baseline and progress, were at a 2 Star rating level (Progressing star).

**Pilot Study Results**

A pilot study was implemented to test the Quality First Point Scale (version 2010) on a sample group of 32 child care providers. The QF Rating Scale was applied to the pilot sample utilizing scores from three measures: (1) ERS- Environmental Rating Scales (ECERS, ITERS, and FCCERS); (2) CLASS-Classroom Assessment Scoring Assessment (Domains: Emotional Support, Instructional Support, and Classroom Organization), and (3) Quality First Point Scale. A breakdown of the provider rating distribution is shown in the table below, and is consistent with the distribution in the baseline and progress assessment analysis showing the largest distribution of providers at the 2-Star level.

Pilot Study Sample: 30 Center and 2 Home Based Care Providers' Rated Using QF Star Rating Scale								
Star Rating Level	Number of Centers (% against 32)	Large Centers	Medium Centers	Small Centers	Number of Homes (% against 2)	Large Homes	Medium Homes	Small Homes
RISING STAR 1*	4 (13.33%)	1	3	0	1 (50%)	0	0	1
PROGRESSING STAR 2*	25 (83.33%)	6	10	9	1 (50%)	0	1	0
QUALITY 3*	1(3.33%)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
QUALITY PLUS 4*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH QUALITY 5*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0