1) Overview

To gain an understanding of the availability of child care in the State/Territory please provide the following information on the total number of child care providers. Please enter N/A when necessary.

1.1 State or Territory Child Care Provider Population

Enter the total number of child care providers that operated in the State/Territory as of September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. These counts should include all child care providers, not just those serving children receiving CCDF subsidies. Please enter N/A when necessary.

a. Licensed family child care # 11884

☐ N/A

Describe:

b. Legally exempt family child care (care in providers' home) # 6831

☐ N/A

Describe:

c. Licensed center-based programs # 7142

☐ N/A

Describe:

d. Legally exempt center-based programs # 498

☐ N/A

Describe:

e. In-home (care in the child's own home) # 9530

☐ N/A

Describe:
f. Other (explain)
Data are not available on the numbers of legally-exempt providers/programs caring solely for privately funded children.

1.2 Goals for Quality Improvement
Based on Question 7.1.1 from the FFY2016-2018 CCDF State Plan, please report your progress on the State or Territory's overarching goals for quality improvement during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. You may include any significant areas of progress that were not anticipated in the Plan, as well. For each goal listed, briefly describe the improvement with specific examples or numeric targets where possible.
New York's goals/activities for funding with quality set-aside dollars from among the ten specified in the CCDBG Act are:

• Supporting the training and professional development of the child care workforce continued during FFY 2018 in the form of three webcasts, two e-learnings and a full library of on-demand online training:
  o Examining the Business Side of Child Care: Town Hall: October 2018
  o Building Healthy Relationships with Effective Communication: April 12, 2018
  o Education for Sustainability: June 7, 2018
  o Identification and Prevention of Brain Injuries, Including Abusive Head Trauma (e-learning)
  o Implicit Bias in Early Childhood Part 1 (e-learning)
In addition, New York's CCR&Rnetwork provided a total 8,361 hours of intensive technical assistance.

• Improving the quality of child care programs and services for infants and toddlers by supporting seven Infant/Toddler Regional Resource centers throughout the state. Infant Toddler Specialists provide onsite intensive technical assistance and program assessment utilizing evidence-based tools, coaching and quality enhancement strategies to enhance program quality and encourage best practices in home and center-based programs serving children birth-three years.
In addition, New York's seven Infant Toddler Regions provided a total of 132 hours of training, 526 hours of I/T intensive technical assistant along with 282 hours of I/T phone technical assistance.
• Supporting a statewide network of 36 CCR&R agencies, along with the Early Care and Learning Council, which is the membership organization for CCR&R's in New York State. New York City Child Care Resource and Referral Consortium sponsors an annual Technical Assistance Conference for 150 infant toddler teachers, administrators, regulatory staff and related practitioners to expand knowledge of best practices and the ten components of high quality infant toddler care.

In addition, New York’s CCR&R agencies, along with the Early Care and Learning Council, offered the following:
  o A two-day intensive training for IT Specialists on the Toddler CLASS tool.
  o Sixteen professional development opportunity events for CCR&R administrators, HCC’s, trainers, data administrators and other CCR&R staff.
  o Two, 2-Day Leadership Summits were held for the CCR&R administrators.
  o Pyramid Model training was provided for CCR&R staff throughout 2018.

• Supporting compliance with state requirements for licensing, inspection, monitoring, training, and health and safety. NYS funded a study to identify trends based on regulatory citations that can inform potential training opportunities.

• Supporting providers in the voluntary pursuit of accreditation through the Educational Incentive Program. FFY 2018 totaling $4,741,890.00

• Supporting the development or adoption of high-quality program and regulatory standards related to health, mental health, nutrition, physical activity, and physical development. Administered the Medication Administration Training (MAT) rebate program by reimbursing providers the cost of the MAT certification for 1721 rebates, totaling $155,685.00. NYS funded an infant, toddler and preschool Pyramid Model training module which supports social-emotional development and strives to reduce instances of suspension and/or expulsion.

• Other activities to improve the quality of child care services: Supporting targeted professional development aligned with Quality Improvement plans for those individuals in programs participating in QUALITYstarsNY in the amount of $410,535.00. Additionally, in FFY 2018, NYS expanded the acceptance of approved training organizations making additional distance learning courses available to providers.
2) Supporting the training and professional development of the child care workforce

Goal: Ensure the State/Territory’s professional development systems or framework provides initial and ongoing professional development and education that result in a diverse and stable child care workforce with the competencies and skills to support all domains of child development. Please select N/A when necessary.

2.1 State/Territory Progression of Professional Development

2.1.1 Did the State/Territory use a workforce registry or professional development registry to track progression of professional development during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

☐ Yes.
   If yes, describe:
   The Aspire Registry is New York's Registry for the Early Childhood Workforce. In addition, the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), the union that represents New York City family-based child care providers, is working on creating a comprehensive database that will track the progression of professional development, as well as send out automated reminders when a provider is due to take any regulatory courses.

☐ No.
   If no, what alternative does the State/Territory use to track the progression of professional development for teachers/providers serving CCDF eligible children? Describe:

2.1.2 Are any teachers/providers required to participate?

☐ Yes.
   If yes, describe:
   New York City regulations require participation of all licensed center based staff aligned with permit/license renewal. Participation in the registry is also required for programs participating in QUALITYstarsNY (New York's QRIS). While participation in the registry is not yet required for the rest of the state, a significant number of programs and early childhood professionals have elected to fully participate in The Aspire Registry.
☐ No.

If no, describe:

2.1.3 How many people were in the registry as of September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? # 32583

2.2 What supports did the State/Territory make available to teachers/providers to help them progress in their education and professional pathway between October 1 and September 30 of the last federal fiscal year (check all that apply)? If available, how many people received each type of support?

☑ Scholarships (for formal education institutions)  
# 1717

☐ Financial bonus/wage supplements tied to education levels  
#

☑ Career advisors, Mentors, Coaches, or Consultants  
# 1286

☑ Reimbursement for training  
# 6810

☑ Loans  
# 1

☐ Other.  
Describe:

7264 - CCDF quality funds support a scholarship program, called the Educational Incentive Program (EIP) for income-eligible teachers/caregivers in regulated programs throughout New York State. Over the past few years, credit-bearing and credential (CDA) training have been incentivized, such that in FFY 2018, 78% percent of EIP funds went to credit-bearing or credentialing activities. Specifically, 1,405 awards worth $1.6M (or 30% of the total awarded) went to college-level, credit-bearing courses. During the course of a year, individuals could receive more than one award. CCDF Funds also support Quality Scholars which is not income based but requires participation by regulated programs to be eligible for funds.

In addition, UFT offers many free courses to providers. These include: 120-hour CDA accreditation course, 120-hour NAFCC accreditation course, Medication Administration Training (MAT), 15-hour Health and Safety training, Pyramid Model training, DECA and FCCERS training.
**CSEA Child Care CPR/First Aid Training Program:**
Free CPR/First Aid classes for child care providers, their assistants and volunteers are offered statewide. Activists coordinate with field staff to set-up dates, times and locations most convenient to the membership. The program continues to experience very high demand, delivering training in classes taught in English and Spanish.

**Child Care Professional Development Program:**
The CSEA Professional Development Training Program provides providers with access to training to meet regulatory requirements with no out-of-pocket cost. The program contracts with area training providers to pay for training slots. This program has been expanded to include Legally-Exempt Child Care Providers as well.

**CSEA Child Care Online Business Courses:**
Distance Learning Review Committee as approved non-credit bearing distance learning training that meets the criteria necessary to fulfill NYSOCFS child care training requirements: The Basics of Family Child Care Record Keeping and Taxes, The Business of Family Child Care, Family Child Care contracts and Policies, Marketing Your Business, Money Management and Retirement Planning, Reducing Your Risks and Legal and Insurance Issues. Each course provides 1.5 training hours. The courses provide supportive learning, access to training 24/7, and a user-friendly interface.

**CSEA CDA Scholarship Program:**
A Child Development Associate Credential (CDA) Scholarship up to $3,000 is available to all NYS Registered Family or Licensed Group Family childcare providers outside of New York City. Providers can receive a payment code to use at participating training institutions or seek reimbursement. Applicants receive CSEA/VOICE CDA payment codes by logging into the website and selecting a participating training provider.

The Lead Agency conducted a survey of New York's CCR&R network. Below are examples of the types of supports CCR&Rs make available to teachers/providers to help them progress in their education and professional pathway:
• Child Development Support Corporation provides grants to providers to enhance the
quality of their program as well as training and other professional development options that enable the program/provider to meet requirements. Example: Learning Quality Improvement, Medication Administration Training Grants.

•St. Lawrence Child Care Council provides professional development opportunities for early childhood professionals through workshops, conferences and on-site technical assistance. Assist individuals in identifying resources to help them pay for these and/or other professional development options they may choose.

•Scholarships for training provided offered by the CCR&R(SACC, CDA, conferences).

•Referrals to other agencies who may offer the direct services for education and funding.

•Work with providers to attain EIP funds and grant money through VOICE/CSEA.

•Capital District Child Care Council provides one Dianne Meckler Scholarship annually for a leader in the field to attend college coursework. In addition, they mentor CDA candidates within the 3 years of receiving the credential. Mentoring focuses on higher education coursework to meet CDA renewal requirements.

•Child Care Council of Orange County Inc. offers a 3-part series CDA training.

•Community Action Planning Council facilitates and assists with EIP applications for CDA and for conferences.

•Community Child Care Clearinghouse of Niagara provides free trainings and on-site intensive technical assistance projects. We also provided training to child care providers as required by corrective active plans by the Lead Agency.

•Chinese-American Planning Council, Inc. facilitated the 120-hour CDA training to 37 Family Child Care providers and the fee of $1,800 was waived.

•Chautauqua Opportunities, Inc. pays for the CDA course and mentoring for CDA which articulates to 11 credit hours at Jamestown Community College. After successfully earning their CDA, staff are encouraged to move towards the Early Education certification through JCC.

☐ N/A

Describe:

2.3 Did the State/Territory have other initiatives available to support professional development and the workforce during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? (e.g. Substitutes, sick/annual leave, release time, etc.)
Yes.
   If yes, describe:
   
   ☑ No.

For the questions 2.4 to 2.9 please report on the number of staff by qualification level as of September 30th of the last federal fiscal year. Count only the highest level attained by staff.

2.4 Licensed child care center director

a) How many had a Child Development Associate (CDA)?
   ☑ Unknown
   Describe:
   This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

   #: 
   %:

b) How many had an Associate’s degree in an early childhood education?
   ☐ Unknown
   Describe:

   #: 1208
   %: 12

c) How many had a Bachelor’s degree in an early childhood education?
   ☐ Unknown
   Describe:

   #: 4808
   %: 46

d) How many had a State child care credential?
   ☑ Unknown
   Describe:
   This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.
e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?
   - Unknown
   - Describe:
     This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

f) How many had an "other" degree in a field related to early childhood education or coursework equivalent to a major relating to early childhood education with experience teaching appropriate age group?
   - Unknown
   - Describe:
     This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

### 2.5 Licensed child care center teachers

a) How many had a Child Development Associate (CDA)?
   - Unknown
   - Describe:
     This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

b) How many had an Associate's degree in an early childhood education?
   - Unknown
   - Describe:
     This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.
c) How many had a Bachelor's degree in an early childhood education?
   - Unknown
   - Describe:
     This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

   #: 
   %: 

d) How many had a State child care credential?
   - Unknown
   - Describe:
     This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

   #: 
   %: 

e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?
   - Unknown
   - Describe:
     This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

   #: 
   %: 

f) How many had an "other" degree in a field related to early childhood education or coursework equivalent to a major relating to early childhood education with experience teaching appropriate age group?
   - Unknown
   - Describe:
     This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

   #: 
   %: 

2.6 Licensed family child care providers

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

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

#: 
%:

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

Unknown

Describe:

#: 2594
%: 10

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

Unknown

Describe:

#: 3267
%: 13

d) How many had a State child care credential?

Unknown

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

#: 
%:

e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?

Unknown

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

#: 
%:

f) How many had an "other" degree in a field related to early childhood education or coursework equivalent to a major relating to early childhood education with experience
teaching appropriate age group?

☑️ Unknown

Describe:

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

#: 
%

2.7 Licensed child care center directors who serve CCDF children

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

☑️ Unknown

Describe:

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

#: 
%

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

☑️ Unknown

Describe:

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

#: 
%

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

☑️ Unknown

Describe:

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

#: 
%

d) How many had a State child care credential?

☑️ Unknown

Describe:

This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.
e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?
   - Unknown
   Describe:
   This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

f) How many had an "other" degree in a field related to early childhood education or coursework equivalent to a major relating to early childhood education with experience teaching appropriate age group?
   - Unknown
   Describe:
   This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

2.8 Licensed child care center teachers who serve CCDF children

a) How many had a Child Development Associate (CDA)?
   - Unknown
   Describe:
   This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

b) How many had an Associate's degree in an early childhood education?
   - Unknown
   Describe:
   This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.
c) How many had a Bachelor’s degree in an early childhood education?
   - Unknown
   
   Describe:
   
   This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#: %:

d) How many had a State child care credential?
   - Unknown
   
   Describe:
   
   This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#: %:

e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?
   - Unknown
   
   Describe:
   
   This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#: %:

f) How many had an "other" degree in a field related to early childhood education or coursework equivalent to a major relating to early childhood education with experience teaching appropriate age group?
   - Unknown
   
   Describe:
   
   This information is not available in the Lead Agency system of record.

#: %:

### 2.9 Licensed family child care providers who serve CCDF children

a) How many had a Child Development Associate (CDA)?
b) How many had an Associate’s degree in an early childhood education?

Unknown

Describe:

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

#:

%:

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

Unknown

Describe:

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

#:

%:

d) How many had a State child care credential?

Unknown

Describe:

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

#:

%:

e) How many had State infant and toddler credentials?

Unknown

Describe:

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

#: 
f) How many had an "other" degree in a field related to early childhood education or coursework equivalent to a major relating to early childhood education with experience teaching appropriate age group?

☐ Unknown

Describe:

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

#:

%%

2.10 Spending

2.10.1. Did the State/Territory spend CCDF quality set aside funds to support the training and professional development of the child care workforce during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriation years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what estimated percentage of CCDF quality dollars was spent on supporting the training and professional development of the child care workforce

☐ Yes.

If yes, %: 1.83

☐ No

☐ N/A

Describe:

2.10.2 Did the State/Territory use other non-CCDF funds to support the training and professional development of the child care workforce (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

☐ Yes.

If yes, describe:

State General Funds of $7,039,142

☐ No
2.10.3 Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 towards supporting the training and professional development of the child care workforce?

☐ Yes.

☐ No

☐ N/A

If yes, describe:

To meet the progressive training requirement

2.11 Progress Update:

Describe the measures the State/Territory used to evaluate progress to improve the quality of child care programs during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.

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

As identified in the FFY2016-2018 CCDF Plan, EIP continues to prioritize acquisition of the Child Development Associate, along with other early childhood credentials and college coursework in early childhood education. In 2018, the number of CDA scholarships increased by 185 which represented an increase of $248,257 in comparison to 2016. In 2018, 81% of the EIP scholarship funds were issued to college and credential coursework, 46% went to CDA activities alone.

In 2016, OCFS funded Pyramid Model training for a cohort of child care programs. New cohorts of programs continued in 2017 and 2018. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of
Pyramid Model implementation, OCFS funded comprehensive studies in 2017 and 2018 to measure the efficacy of implementation of Pyramid Model practices. In the 2017 study, the Intervention (trained) group had an aggregate average score of 74% on Pyramid Model Key Practices, while the Comparison (untrained) group had an aggregate average score of 47% as recorded by an independent assessor utilizing the Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool. The 2018 study also included an evaluation of individuals who received coaching support, in addition to training. The coached group had aggregate average score of 80%. Both studies had a small number of participants but have provided some encouraging results. (2017 n=12, 2018 n=17)

Additionally, a study was funded to identify trends based on regulatory violation data. This data provided regionally specific detail and will be used to inform potential training opportunities for both providers and regulators.

OCFS has also continued to support development and hosting of e-learning courses. During the plan period, 493,385 course completions were recorded. This represents a 58% increase in utilization of these resources over the prior two-year period. 466,682 course completers received training that supports the federal Health and Safety topic areas. The grand means for the fourteen (14) e-learning courses which support the federal Health and Safety topic areas ranged from a 4.35 to 4.72 out of a possible score of 5.00. These means show that the e-learning participants had very high and favorable ratings for the courses. The participants indicated high satisfaction for all aspects of the courses. The overwhelming majority of participants in each course agreed that the learning objectives were clearly stated and achieved. In addition, they agreed that they would recommend the courses to others.

3) Improving early learning and development guidelines

**Goal:** To ensure the State/Territory has research-based early learning and development guidelines appropriate for children birth to age 12, including children with special needs and dual language learners that are used to inform practice, professional development, and families.

**3.1. Describe any changes or updates to the State or Territory’s early learning and development guidelines during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year**

From May to October of 2018, the New York Early Childhood Advisory Council planned and researched revision of the New York State Early Learning Guidelines. The Guidelines were
originally published in 2012, and they have been used since that time to support educator's understanding of how children develop and how they can support, encourage and affirm children's healthy development.

New York is in the process of revising the Early Learning Guidelines to include children from Birth though age 8. Additionally, age bands have been added to include 0-9 months, 8-18 months, 16-36 months, 3 years old, 4 years old, and 5 years old. They also include what educators might observe at each age band, as well as ways the educator might support the child's development at each state and in each domain.

The revision of the guidelines has five primary goals:

Goal
1. To recognize and advocate for the active inclusion of the ages five through eight in the birth-8 vision of early childhood development.
Revision
Expand guidelines from birth-5 to birth-8.

Goal
2. To provide infant-toddler teachers with more precise understanding of the critical development that happens between the ages of birth-3.
Revision
Change age groupings from 0-18 months and 18-36 months to 0-9 months, 8-16 months, 15-24 months and 24-36 months.

Goal
3. To strengthen educator's knowledge of child development in key areas as a protective factor.
Revisions
• Reduce the number of subdomains.
• Target areas of child development most often misunderstood by educators, such as Gender and Sexuality in Early Childhood.
• Expand family engagement supports within "Ways the educator might support the child's development."

Goal
4. To further the vision of anti-bias education.
Revision
• Include suggestions for supporting children whose home language is other than English in all domains.
• Describe ways that educator can promote children’s sense of belonging and affirm their identities and cultural ways of being.

Goal
5. To make the ELG an appealing, living document in the field.
Revision
• Include useful lists of books and materials within “Ways the educator might support the child’s development.”
• Provide reproducible forms including:
  o Observation form
  o Planning form
  o Home language survey
  o Funds of knowledge family survey
  o Transition planning form

3.2 Spending

3.2.1. Did the State/Territory spend CCDF quality set aside funds during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year on the development or implementation of early learning and development guidelines? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriation years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what was the percentage of CCDF quality dollars spent on the development or implementation of early learning and development guidelines?

☐ Yes.

If yes, %:
☐ No
☐ N/A
  Describe:

3.2.2. Did the State/Territory use other non-CCDF funds to develop or implement early learning and development guidelines (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality,
Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

☐ Yes.
   If yes, describe:
   The Revision costs were covered by City University of New York (CUNY).

☐ No
☐ N/A
   Describe:

3.2.3. Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 on developing or implementing early learning and development guidelines

☐ Yes.
   If yes, describe:

☐ No
☐ N/A
   Describe:

3.3 Progress Update:
Describe the measures used and progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.
Early Learning Guidelines (ELG) training sessions were shared offered at two annual Spring conferences: the NYAEYC annual conference and the Head Start conference. In total, 380 people attending trainings on ELG in FFY 2018.

In addition, in FY 2018 colleges and universities purchased 658 copies of the ELG and 84 copies of the Spanish ELG. These colleges and universities are using the ELG as part of their Early Childhood degree programs.

4) Developing, implementing, or enhancing a quality rating improvement system (QRIS) and other transparent system of quality indicator
Goal: To ensure the State/Territory implements a quality rating and improvement system, or other quality rating system, to promote high-quality early care and education programs.

Please provide your State/Territory's definition of high quality care, and how it relates to the tiers of your QRIS (if applicable). This may include the State/Territory’s RTT-ELC definition of high quality or high quality definition as part of the State/Territory’s Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS). If no QRIS exists describe other measures used to assess quality (may include assessment scores, accreditation, or other metric):

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

4.1 Did the status of your State/Territory quality rating and improvement system (QRIS) change during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

☐ Yes, the State/Territory QRIS is now operating
    State/Territory-wide

☐ Yes, the State/Territory QRIS is now operating as a pilot, in a few localities, or only a few levels

☐ Yes, the State/Territory is now operating another system of quality improvement.
    Describe:

☐ Yes, the State/Territory no longer has a QRIS.

☐ No, the status of the State/Territory QRIS has not changed as of September 30th of the last federal fiscal year.

4.2 Did the types of providers included in the State/Territory QRIS change during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, check which types of providers were added or removed (check all that apply):

☐ Yes

☐ Added licensed family child care

☐ Removed licensed family child care

☐ Added legally exempt family child care (care in providers' home)

☐ Removed legally exempt family child care (care in providers' home)
4.3 Is participation in the State/Territory QRIS mandatory for any group of providers?

☐ Yes
   Describe;

☐ No

☑ N/A
   Describe;
   QRIS participation was only required for sites that were funded by the Federal PEG grant in 4 communities.

4.4 Enter the number of programs that met the State’s high quality definition as of September 30 the last fiscal year:
   a) Licensed family child care # 44
   b) Legally exempt family child care (care in providers’ home) # 0
   c) Licensed center-based programs # 338
   d) Legally exempt center-based programs # 0
   e) In-home (care in the child's own home) # 0

☐ N/A
   Describe:
   Legally-exempt and in-home care providers are not eligible for QRIS participation.

4.5 Enter the number of CCDF children in high quality care by age grouping as of September 30 of the last federal fiscal year:
a) Birth to 35 months 

b) 3 years up to kindergarten entry 

c) School Aged (post kindergarten entry) 

d) Other. Describe:

☐ N/A

Describe:

Multiple, separate data systems/tables track quality ratings, provider licensing/registration data, child care subsidy payments, and child demographic data. As a result, a manual matching process would be required to match providers with high quality ratings to CCDF providers to CCDF children. Additionally, that manual process would have to be done separately for upstate and NYC. It is not feasible to identify all such programs and children for the year. The ACF-801 sample data can be used to calculate rough estimates. However, given the difficulties of matching as well as the very low number of quality-rated programs in general (due, in large part, to the low availability of NY’s QRIS, QUALITYstarsNY -- resource constraints holds down the total number of QUALITYstarsNY participants), statewide projections from the ACF-801 sample should be used cautiously. For FFY2017-18 Q4, 2.5% of children birth to 35 months who were receiving child care subsidies (or 0.6% of children receiving subsidies) were in high quality care programs (QUALITYstarsNY rated 3-5 stars); 3.6% of children 3 through 5.99 years of age receiving child care subsidies (or 1.3% of children receiving subsidies) were in high quality care programs; and 1.4% of children 6 years of age or older receiving child care subsidies (or 0.5% of all children receiving subsidies) and in high quality programs. Corresponds to an estimated 750, 1500, and 650 CCDF children in high quality care per month, or 1150, 2300, and 1000 children annually unduplicated, respectively.

4.6 Provide the percentage of CCDF children in high quality care by age grouping as of September 30 of the last federal fiscal year:

a) Birth to 35 months %

b) 3 years up to kindergarten entry %

c) School Aged (post kindergarten entry) %

d) Other. Describe:
Describe:
Multiple, separate data systems/ tables track quality ratings, provider licensing/ registration data, child care subsidy payments, and child demographic data. As a result, a manual matching process would be required to match providers with high quality ratings to CCDF providers to CCDF children. Additionally, that manual process would have to be done separately for upstate and NYC. It is not feasible to identify all such programs and children for the year. The ACF-801 sample data can be used to calculate rough estimates. However, given the difficulties of matching as well as the very low number of quality-rated programs in general (due, in large part, to the low availability of NY’s QRIS, QUALITYstarsNY -- resource constraints holds down the total number of QUALITYstarsNY participants), statewide projections from the ACF-801 sample should be used cautiously. For FFY2017-18 Q4, 2.5% of children birth to 35 months who were receiving child care subsidies (or 0.6% of children receiving subsidies) were in high quality care programs (QUALITYstarsNY rated 3-5 stars); 3.6% of children 3 through 5.99 years of age receiving child care subsidies (or 1.3% of children receiving subsidies) were in high quality care programs; and 1.4% of children 6 years of age or older receiving child care subsidies (or 0.5% of all children receiving subsidies) and in high quality programs. Corresponds to an estimated 750, 1500, and 650 CCDF children in high quality care per month, or 1150, 2300, and 1000 children annually unduplicated, respectively.

4.7 Provide the number of programs that participated in the State/Territory’s QRIS in the last fiscal year.

4.7.1 What is the total number of eligible child care settings for QRIS or other transparent system of quality indicators?

i. Licensed Child Care Centers:
   # 7466
   N/A
   Describe:

ii. Licensed Family Child Care Homes:
iii. License-Exempt Providers:

# 13619

☐ N/A

Describe:

Legally-exempt providers are not eligible for QRIS participation.

4.7.2 Of the total number eligible, what is the total number and percentage of child care settings in the State/Territory that participated in the QRIS or other transparent system of quality indicators?

i. Licensed Child Care Centers:

☐ N/A

Describe:

# 566
% 7.6

ii. Licensed Family Child Care Homes:

☐ N/A

Describe:

# 189
% 1.4

iii. License-Exempt Providers:

☑ N/A

Describe:

Legally-exempt and in-home care providers are not eligible for QRIS participation.
4.8 Did the State/Territory provide one-time grants, awards or bonuses connected to (or related to) QRIS during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, how many were provided to the following types of programs during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

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

☐ No
☐ N/A
Describe:

4.9 Did the State/Territory provide on-going or periodic quality stipends connected to (or related to) QRIS during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, how many programs received on-going or periodic quality stipends connected to (or related to) QRIS during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

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

☑ No
☐ N/A
Describe:

4.10 Did the State/Territory provide ongoing technical assistance related to the QRIS or other quality rating system during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If so, how many programs received ongoing technical assistance during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

☑ Yes
a) Licensed center-based programs: # 568
b) Licensed Family Child Care Homes: # 198
c) Legally exempt care in providers home: # 0
d) Legally exempt center-based programs: # 0
e) In-home (care in the child's own home): # 0

☐ No
☐ N/A

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

4.11 Did the State/Territory provide higher subsidy rates related to the QRIS or other quality rating system during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If so, how many programs received higher subsidy payment rates due to their QRIS rating during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

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

☐ No
☐ N/A

Describe:

4.12 Spending

4.12.1 Did the State or Territory use CCDF quality set aside funds to support QRIS or other quality rating system during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriation years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what estimated percentage of CCDF quality dollars was spent supporting QRIS or other quality related improvements?

☐ Yes.

  If yes, %: 0

☐ No
☐ N/A
Describe:

4.12.2 Did the State or Territory use other non-CCDF funds to support QRIS or other quality rating system (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

☐ Yes.
  If yes, describe:
  State General Funds of approximately $5 million.

☐ No
☐ N/A
  Describe:

4.12.3. Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 to support QRIS or other quality rating systems?

☐ Yes.
  If yes, describe:

☑ No
☐ N/A
  Describe:

4.13 Progress Update:
Describe the measures used and progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.
QUALITYstarsNY engaged the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment to do a validation study of the QRIS standards and ratings. The findings revealed high correlation with sites that were rated as 4 and 5-stars. An example from the Teaching Supports Domain Materials dimension: 64 percent of teaching staff working in three-star centers reported having a working computer and printer compared to 77 percent of teaching staff in five-star centers. Additional findings highlighted the opportunities and challenges in making
improvements in workplace climate with particular reference to leadership, funding, allocation of funding, and staffing. An example from the Teaching Supports Domain Staffing and Professional Responsibilities Dimension: only 45 percent of teaching staff agreed that there are enough staff to help during breaks. These findings have already begun to make an impact in the approach the Quality Improvement Specialists make on continuous quality improvement work.

Below are excerpts from a QUALITYstarsNY announcement:

Findings from the report suggest several areas in which QUALITYstarsNY successfully reflects and encourages supportive work environments through its ratings and quality improvement work with programs. "Teaching staff working in higher-rated programs tended to assess their work environments more positively," according to the key findings of the report. Moreover, educators in sites with the highest rating of Five Stars had overall higher scores on the survey-reflecting a more supportive and positive work environment.

It is clear from the report, however, that there is still significant work to be done to address the critical challenges faced by early learning teachers. Inadequate wages for early childhood educators is a well-documented trend that is reinforced by the findings of this report. A majority of teachers surveyed indicated that they struggle with meeting their general monthly expenses such as food, housing, or health care expenses. Additionally, insufficient staffing and difficulties with paid professional development were identified as workplace concerns for approximately half of respondents.

5) Improving the supply and quality of child care programs for infants and toddlers

Goal: Ensure adequate and stable supply of high quality child care with a qualified, skilled workforce to promote the healthy development of infants and toddlers. Please report on all activities funded by quality dollars and infant toddler set-aside.

5.1. Provide the total number of State funded Infant Toddler Specialists available to providers during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year.
   a) Number of Specialists available to all providers # 24
   b) Number of Specialists available to providers serving CCDF children # 24
c) Number of infant toddler specialists available specifically trained to support FCC providers # 24

d) Number of providers served # 1709
e) Total number of children reached # 2925

☐ N/A

Describe:

5.2. Provide the number of professionals receiving any State-funded on-site coaching in infant and toddler practice during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year.

a) Number of licensed center-based teachers # 18

b) Number of licensed family child care providers # 16

c) Number of license-exempt providers of care in their home # 15

d) Number of center directors # 18

☐ N/A

Describe:

5.3. Of the number of professionals listed in question 5.2, what percentage served CCDF children during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

a) Number of licensed center-based teachers # 18

b) Number of licensed family child care providers # 16

c) Number of license-exempt providers of care in their home # 15

d) Number of center directors # 18

☐ N/A

Describe:

5.4. Provide the total number of State funded infant and toddler health consultants in the State or Territory during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year.

a) Consultants available in State # 50

b) Consultants available to providers serving CCDF children # 50

☐ N/A

Describe:

5.5. Did the State/Territory conduct an analysis of supply and demand for infant toddler slots and to identify areas of focus to build supply during October 1 to
September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

☐ Yes

(please provide link)  https://protect2.fireeye.com/url?k=385576ca-647180ab-38578fff-0cc47a6d17e0-ca0851d09a03044f&u=https://earlycareandlearning.org/our-voice-advocacy/

☐ No

☐ N/A

Describe:

5.6. Provide the number of staffed FCC networks supported by the CCDF funds through direct agreement with a centralized hub or community-based agency during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year.

a) Number of staffed FCC networks: 

Describe what the hub provides to participating FCC providers:

☐ N/A

Describe:

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

5.7 Spending

5.7.1. Did the State or Territory use CCDF quality set aside funds in addition to the 3% infant and toddler set-aside to improve the supply and quality of child care programs and services for infants and toddlers during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If so, what estimated percentage of CCDF quality dollars was spent supporting the quality and supply of infant and toddler care? The State or Territory should not include the 3% infant and toddler set-aside in the estimated percentage.

☐ Yes.

If yes, %: 5.89

☐ No

☐ N/A

Describe:
5.7.2. Did the State or Territory use other non-CCDF funds to improve the supply and quality of child care programs and services for infants and toddlers (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

☐ Yes.
   If yes, describe:

☐ No
☐ N/A
   Describe:

5.7.3. Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 to improve the supply and quality of child care programs and services for infants and toddlers?

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

☐ No
☐ N/A
   Describe:

The CCDBG Act of 2014 included changes targeted at improving the supply and quality of infant-toddler care. Lead Agencies are encouraged to systematically assess and improve the overall quality of care infants and toddlers receive, the systems in place or needed to support and enhance the quality of infant and toddler providers and the capacity of the infant and toddler workforce to meet the unique needs of very young children, and the methods in place to increase the proportion of infants and toddlers in higher quality care.

5.8 Progress Update:
Describe the measures used and progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.

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

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

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

OCFS continues to meet with all partners to strengthen infant/toddler-focused and aligned cross-sector systems, increase public and private partnerships through NYS that advance key outcomes for infants/toddlers and address social determinants of health, supporting early childhood programs to improve transition practices from early learning up through kindergarten, actively creating a NY Early Intervention and Child Care Cross-Agency Coordination and Collaboration Action plan implementation process.

6) Establishing or expanding a statewide system of child care resource and referral services

Goal: State/Territory provides: services to involve families in the development of their children, information on a full range of child care options, and assistance to families in selecting child care that is appropriate for the family’s needs and is high quality as determined by the State/Territory.

6.1. Describe how CCDF quality funds were used to establish or expand a statewide system of child care resource and referral services during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year.

Neither established nor expanded, but maintained. Our Child Care Resource and Referral
network spent $10,047,947 CCDF quality funds in FFY 2018. This represents 2.36% of CCDF quality dollars. Federal child care funds have supported this network since 1982.

6.2. Did the State/Territory change its use of symbols or simple icons, such as stars or levels, to communicate levels of quality for child care programs beyond what may be communicated to parents about licensing status and compliance during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

☐ Yes
   Describe:

☑ No
☐ N/A
   Describe:

6.3 Spending

6.3.1. Did the State or Territory use CCDF quality set aside funds to establish or expand a statewide CCR&R during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriation years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what estimated percentage of CCDF quality dollars was spent to establish or expand a statewide CCR&R?

☑ Yes.
   If yes, %: 2.36

☐ No
☐ N/A
   Describe:

6.3.2. Did the State or Territory use other non-CCDF funds to establish or expand a statewide CCR&R (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

☐ Yes.
   If yes, describe:
   Â
6.3.3. Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds to establish or expand a statewide CCR&R?

☑️ No
☐ N/A

Describe:

☐ Yes.

If yes, describe:

☑️ No
☐ N/A

Describe:

6.4. Progress Update:
Describe the measures used and progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.

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

7) Facilitating compliance with State/Territory requirements for inspection, monitoring, health and safety standards and training, and State/Territory licensing standards

Goal: To ensure child care providers maintain compliance with State/Territory licensing, inspection, monitoring, and health and safety standards and training.

7.1. Has the State/Territory aligned health and safety standards with the following:
a) Caring for Our Children Basics

☑ Yes.
☐ No.

If not, describe:

b) Head Start

☐ Yes.
☑ No.

If not, describe:
These programs comply with NYS child care regulations as well as federal guidelines.

c) State pre-k

☐ Yes.
☑ No.

If not, describe:
Those pre-K programs that operate in community-based child care centers comply with NYS child care regulations as well as federal guidelines.

7.2. Check if pre-service/ongoing (or both) training is provided to child care staff on the following:

☑ Licensing Standards
☑ Ongoing health and safety training or education
☑ Monitoring Protocols
☐ N/A

Describe:

7.3 Complaints regarding child care providers received during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year

7.3.1 How many complaints were received regarding providers during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?
7.3.2 What was the average length of time between receiving the complaint and taking steps to respond to a complaint during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?
2.5 days

7.3.3 How many complaints received an on-site follow-up inspection during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

7.3.4 How many of the complaints resulted in one or more substantiated violations in the program or provider site identified during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

7.3.5 How many child care providers had CCDF funding revoked as a result of an inspection during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

7.3.6 How many child care providers closed as a result of an inspection during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

7.3.7 Please provide any additional information regarding health and safety complaints and inspections in the State or territory during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year:

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

Re: 7.3.1 - 4137 complaints received total (3151 facilities with one or more complaints). Licensed providers defined based on facility status in Closed, Licensed, Registered, Revoked/Suspended/Renewal Denied. LE providers defined based on facility status: Application (Received, Requested, Withdrawn, Denied, i.e. had never reached the status of L/R) or Illegal.

Re: 7.3.2 - 2.5 days from complaint receipt to response (earliest inspection or inspection attempt). 3.5 days from complaint to inspection date.

Re: 7.3.3 - NOTE: All 4137 complaints that were received during FFY17-18 also received an on-site inspection specifically associated with that complaint. Of those 4137, 4090 occurred in FFY17-18 and 47 occurred in FFY18-19.

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

Re: 7.3.5 - It is not possible to determine whether child care providers had their CCDF
funding revoked due to the results of an inspection because New York's system of record for child care licensing/registration/enrollment has only limited linkage to the child care subsidy payment system.

Re: 7.3.6 - n=2051 providers that closed in FFY17-18. Of those, 189 Providers closed from an enforcement status. It is possible that additional providers closed due to the results of an inspection without going into an enforcement status.

7.4 How many child care staff, including caregivers, teachers, and directors, received coaching or TA to improve their understanding and adherence to health and safety standards (as a result of an inspection) during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?
   a) Licensed child care center staff: #
   b) Licensed family child care staff: #
   c) Licensed exempt child care staff: #
   d) Licensed exempt family child care staff: #
   e) N/A

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

7.5 Spending

7.5.1 Did the State or Territory spend CCDF quality set aside funds on facilitating compliance with State/Territory requirements for inspections, monitoring, health and safety standards and training, and State/Territory licensing standards during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriations years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what estimated percentage of CCDF quality dollars was spent on facilitating compliance with State/Territory requirements?

☐ Yes.

   If yes, %:

☐ No
7.5.2 Did the State or Territory use other non-CCDF funds (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) on facilitating compliance with State/Territory requirements for inspections, monitoring, health and safety standards and training, and State/Territory licensing standards during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

☐ Yes.
   If yes, describe:

☐ No
☐ N/A

Describe:

7.5.3. Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 facilitate compliance with State/Territory requirements for inspections, monitoring, health and safety standards and training, and State/Territory licensing standards?

☑ Yes.
   If yes, describe:
   New York does intend to spend CCDF funds to comply with all of the CCDBG Health & Safety components during Federal Fiscal Year 2019.

☐ No
☐ N/A

Describe:

7.6 Progress Update:
Describe the measures used and progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.

As a result of OCFS’ research into actions that result in quality improvement, OCFS changed
its inspection/monitoring goals to include routine, unannounced monitoring inspections of all licensed and registered programs on a quarterly basis. Unannounced inspections encourage compliance with regulatory standards. OCFS conducts unannounced inspections and monitoring of all programs unless the reason for the inspection is relative to initial applications or renewal activities. It was decided, that prior to proceeding with a differential monitoring pilot, OCFS would conduct an inter-rater reliability study of its inspection staff. OCFS completed the inter-rater reliability study in 2018 to assess the validity of inspection outcomes. The study confirmed substantial levels of reliability among its inspectors. As a result of the study and to further enhance the quarterly monitoring inspection process, OCFS revised its inspection instrument; to not only include core health and safety items, but to also populate with 20 additional random checklist items to promote variability in each monitoring inspection.

8) Evaluating the quality of child care programs in the State/Territory, including evaluating how programs positively impact children

Goal: State/Territory investment in effective quality improvement strategies using reliable data from evaluation and assessment

8.1. What assessment tool(s) did the State/Territory use in center based programs during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?
   a) To measure program quality, describe:
      N/A

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

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

   d) Other, describe:
      QUALITYstarsNY primarily uses the program standards/Standards Inventory and The Environmental Rating Scales (ERS) to assess programs; Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale (ECERS), and Infant Toddler Environmental Rating Scale (ITERS).
8.2. What assessment tool(s) did the State/Territory use to measure quality of program and effective practice in family child care programs during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?

a) To measure program quality, describe:
N/A

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

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

d) Other, describe:
QUALITYstarsNY primarily uses the program standards/Standards Inventory and the Family Child Care Environmental Rating Scale (FCCERS) to assess family child care programs.

N/A

8.3 Spending

8.3.1. Did the State or Territory spend CCDF quality set aside funds on evaluating the quality of child care programs, practice, or child development during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriation years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what estimated percentage of CCDF quality dollars was spent on evaluating child care programs, practice, or child development?

☐ Yes.

If yes, %:
8.3.2 Did the State or Territory use other non-CCDF funds development (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) to evaluate the quality of child care programs, practice, or child development during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

☐ Yes.
  If yes, describe:

☐ No
  ☐ N/A
  Describe:

8.3.3. Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 on evaluating the quality of child care programs in their state?

☐ Yes.
  If yes, describe:

☐ No
  ☐ N/A
  Describe:

8.4 Progress Update:
Describe the measures used and progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.

Until New York's quality rating and improvement system, QUALITYstarsNY, is universally available, the Lead Agency New York State would benefit from a quality "shorthand" to evaluate the quality of child care programs and services and expand consumer education as to what constitutes quality in a child care program. New York State's goal is to create a
system of quality indicators that capture the elements of a child care program's characteristics above and beyond regulatory compliance.

Private foundation funding provided OCFS with the services of an outside expert (Dr. Richard Fiene, Director, Research Institute for Key Indicators, and a retired professor from Pennsylvania State University). Needing the initiative to be fiscally neutral once it is implemented, a leaner approach to site inspections is needed. Thus, with Dr. Fiene's assistance, New York began work to develop a system of differential monitoring using existing regulatory staff to collect additional quality data.

During the process of Dr. Fiene's efforts to identify the strongest predictors of full regulatory compliance in child care programs, he recommended that OCFS conduct a test of inter-rater reliability among regulatory staff. With the assistance of the National Association for Regulatory Administration and other experts, OCFS examined the reliability of its current monitoring system, which was determined to be very strong. In April 2018, OCFS and Early Childhood Partners NYC (a private foundation funders' collaborative) convened a roundtable, Creating A Reliable And Viable Approach For Child Care Quality Indicators: Follow-up Roundtable, at which OCFS summarized the results of the study of inter-rater reliability of child care licensing inspectors; the New York Department of Health described the development of health indicators; and the New York City Department of Education presented on its quality standards for its prekindergarten programs.

To date, a draft set of indicators that will be the foundation of an approach to differential monitoring of family-based child care has been created. The New York State Department of Health developed a set of health indicators that includes both physical and social-emotional indicators (developed in collaboration with the New York State Office of Mental Health).

Work is beginning to identify quality indicators that are already embedded in the state's child care regulations, along with other indicators identified by research as predictive of program quality, such as those that are included in QUALITYstarsNY and New York's Early Learning Guidelines. Still to come: indicators from other domains, differential monitoring frameworks created for other modalities of care, with corresponding quality indicators, piloting, systems changes, staff training, and finally, statewide implementation.
9) Supporting providers in the voluntary pursuit of accreditation

Goal: Support child care programs and FCCs in the voluntary pursuit of accreditation by a national accrediting body with demonstrated, valid, and reliable program standards of quality

9.1. How many providers did the State or Territory support in their pursuit of accreditation during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year?
   a) Number of licensed center based providers # 0
   b) Number of licensed FCC providers # 5
   c) Number of center based providers that serve CCDF children # 0
   d) Number of FCC providers that serve CCDF children # 0
   ☐ N/A
   Describe:

9.2 Spending

9.2.1 Did the State or Territory spend CCDF quality set aside funds on accreditation during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriation years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what estimated percentage of CCDF quality dollars was spent on evaluating child care programs, practice, or child development?
   ☑ Yes.

   If yes, %: CCDF Funds were used to provide EIP Scholarships to 5 Family Child Care providers/programs in the amount of $4,635 for Family Child Care Accreditation
   ☐ No
   ☐ N/A
   Describe:

9.2.2 Did the State or Territory use other non-CCDF funds development (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) to support accreditation during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.
   ☑ Yes.

   If yes, describe:
9.2.3. Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 to support accreditation for child care providers?

☐ Yes.
   If yes, describe:

☐ No
☐ N/A
   Describe:

9.3 Progress Update:
Describe the measures used and progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.

New York State Network for Youth Success (NYSNYS), formerly AfterSchool Works! NY, offers a rigorous program accreditation for School-Age Child Care (SACC) programs that is available statewide. Thirty-nine programs are currently accredited in NYS. Information on the accreditation, including the manual, standards, etc. can be found on the NYSNYS website here: https://protect2.fireeye.com/url?k=23dd3352-7ff04f1-23dfca67-000babda0106-4361a043b588cf9b&uhttp://www.afterschoolworksny.org/AfterschoolProgramAccreditation-resources.html

10) Supporting the development or adoption of high-quality program standards related to health, mental health, nutrition, physical activity, and physical development

Goal: Assist programs to meet high-quality comprehensive program standards relating to health, mental health, nutrition, physical activity, and physical development
10.1 Quality Indicators

10.1.1 Does the State/Territory have quality improvement standards that include indicators covering the following areas beyond what is required for licensing?

- Yes.
- No. Skip to 10.2

10.1.2 If yes, check which indicators, the State/Territory has established.

- Health, nutrition, and safety of child care settings
- Physical activity and physical development in child care settings
- Mental health of children
- Learning environment and curriculum
- Ratios and group size
- Staff/provider qualifications and professional development
- Teacher/provider-child relationships
- Teacher/provider instructional practices
- Family partnerships and family strengthening
- Other

Describe:

Â

10.2 Spending

10.2.1. Did the State or Territory spend CCDF quality set aside funds on supporting the development or adoption of high-quality program standards related to health, mental health, nutrition, physical activity, and physical development during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriation years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what estimated percentage of CCDF quality dollars was spent on these standards?

- Yes.

If yes, %:

- No

Describe:
10.2.2 Did the State or Territory use other non-CCDF funds development (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) to support the development or adoption of high-quality program standards related to health, mental health, nutrition, physical activity, and physical development during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

☐ Yes.

If yes, describe:

$1.1M of PEG funds were used to help early childhood pre-K programs adopt the QUALITYstarsNY standards, which address all of those topic areas.

☐ No

☐ N/A

Describe:

10.2.3 Does the State/Territory expect to spend at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 to support the development or adoption of high-quality program standards?

☐ Yes.

If yes, describe:

☐ No

☐ N/A

Describe:

10.3 Progress Update:
Describe the measures used and progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible.
• Accreditation for SACC programs: Thirty-nine programs are currently accredited in NYS.

• OCFS offers an Educational Incentive Program (EIP) that reimburses child care staff for training expenses taken to meet child care topics listed in regulation. The EIP program, however, prioritizes those training dollars toward course work completed to meet the
requirements of the Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential, the New York State Children's Program Administrator Credential, School-Age Child Care Credential, Infant and Toddler Child Care and Education Credential or the Infant Toddler Child Development Associate Credential, as well as Family Child Care Accreditation administered by the National Association for Family Child Care, and the National Administrator Credential.

Over the past few years, credit-bearing and credential (CDA) training have been incentivized, such that in FFY 2018, the number of CDA scholarships increased by 185 which represented an increase of $248,257 in comparison to 2016. In 2018, 81% of the EIP scholarship funds were issued to college and credential coursework, 46% went to CDA activities alone.

11) Other activities to improve the quality of child care services as long as outcome measures relating to improved provider preparedness, child safety, child well-being, or kindergarten-entry are possible

Goal: To improve the quality of child care programs and services related to outcomes measuring improved provider preparedness, child safety, child well-being, or kindergarten-entry

11.1 Progress Update:
Based on the State/Territory's response to Question 7.9.1 of the FFY2016-2018 CCDF Plan describe progress made during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year. Include examples and numeric targets where possible. If the State or Territory is using measures not described in the current State Plan to evaluate please also describe:
We have no other activities to report. That said, OCFS has relationships with various advocacy groups and organizations that are able to offer professional development and conference opportunities for school-age providers as well as develop targeted technical assistance to further meet the needs of providers. We do not, however, assess the progress of those organizations.

11.2 Spending:

11.2.1 Did the State or Territory spend CCDF quality set aside funds on other activities to improve the quality of child care services during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? This includes CCDF funds from all available appropriation years that were spent during the fiscal year. If so, what estimated percentage of the CCDF quality
dollars was spent on these standards?

☐ Yes.

If yes, %:

☑ No

☐ N/A

Describe:

11.2.2 Did the State or Territory use other non-CCDF funds development (for example, TANF funds spent directly on quality, Preschool Development Funds, state or local funds, etc.) to improve the quality of child care services during October 1 to September 30 of the last federal fiscal year? If yes, describe the source of the funding and the total amount.

☐ Yes.

If yes, describe:

☑ No

☐ N/A

Describe:

11.2.3 Does the State/Territory expect to use at least some of the increased CCDF funds from the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 on other activities to improve the quality of child care services as long as outcome measures relating to improved provider preparedness, child safety, child well-being, or kindergarten-entry are possible?

☐ Yes.

If yes, describe:

☑ No

☐ N/A

Describe:

12) Lead Agencies must submit an annual report, as required at 45 CFR Â§ 98.53(f)(4), describing any changes to State/Territory regulations, enforcement mechanisms, or other State/Territory policies addressing health and safety based on an annual review and assessment of serious child injuries and any deaths occurring in child care
programs receiving CCDF, and in other regulated and unregulated child care centers and family child care homes, to the extent possible. (Note: This requirement is effective FFY 2019. States/Territories do not have to include this report with the FFY 2018 QPR submission.)

a) Describe the annual review and assessment of serious injuries and any deaths occurring in child care programs receiving CCDF, and in other regulated and unregulated child care centers and family child care homes, to the extent possible.

New York is not submitting a response to this question for FFY 2018.

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

New York is not submitting a response to this question for FFY 2018.