**Arizona Department of Education**

**Preschool Development Grant**

**Monitoring System**

The Arizona Department of Education Early Childhood Education Section (ADE/ECE) compliance and validation monitoring system includes multiple ways to demonstrate compliance and validate quality improvements. The monitoring process is a team approach in collaboration with grant partners. A strengths-based, comprehensive *Early Childhood Quality Improvement Practices* (ECQUIP) will be used to evaluate the implementation of the *Program Guidelines for High Quality* (PGHQ) and to support grant partners through technical assistance that addresses specific issues and concerns. Sub-grantees will be required to actively participate in the ECQUIP process, which will involve the completion of the ECQUIP rubric, PDG specific forms, and a compliance visit conducted by ADE/ECE. *PGHQ* available at: (<https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=5879561caadebe0c98a80509>)

The ECQUIP (<https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=587957efaadebe0c98a8053c>) was developed by ADE/ECE as a means to assure quality, accountability, and collaboration among schools receiving early childhood funding through ADE. There are two parts to the ECQUIP Process:

1. An annual self-assessment of the early childhood program, and
2. An ECQUIP validation visit made by ECE/ADE

In part 1, ECQUIP is intended to be used as a self-evaluation and planning process for on-going quality improvements at the local level. ECQUIP provides programs with a framework for reflection and consideration of quality practices. The guidelines for conducting an ECQUIP process include the creation of an implementation plan that documents continued improvement efforts. The design of each program’s ECQUIP self-assessment is left to the local administration. There are five standards in ECQUIP:

* Standard 1: School and District Leadership
* Standard 2: Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Development
* Standard 3: Classroom and School Assessments
* Standard 4: School Culture, Climate, and Communication
* Standard 5: Fiscal Review

**The following steps represent how a local ECQUIP process looks in implementation:**

* **Step 1 ~ Assemble Team.** The first step in the ECQUIP process is to convene an early childhood education team. Each early childhood program determines locally who is to participate on the ECQUIP team. At the minimum, a team should consider administrative members from the local LEA (Early Childhood Special Education, Title I preschool representative, principal, coordinators, etc.), instructional members (preschool, kindergarten, first through third grade, Reading First coach and librarians), and community partners (other programs within the HNC, Head Start, local childcare provider, district community education, tribal partner, home visitors, Part C provider, community representative, parents, and QF participants). Together, the team works to design a self-assessment process that meets the needs of the program as a whole.
* **Step 2 ~ Choose a Standard for Improvement.** The ECQUIP team completes a self-assessment using the ECQUIP Standards and Rubrics document, provided by the ADE/ECE. Members identify strengths and needs for each standard and identify activities for improvement for each standard. Quality indicators are included with each standard to assist teams in identifying program needs and areas for improvement. The ECQUIP team should also review any QF Improvement Plans and LEA Literacy Plans as part of this step.
* **Step 3 ~ Choose a Tool.** Once the team has determined the standard for self-assessment, ADE/ECE strongly recommends the group augment the existing information related to the standard with data obtained from tools designed specifically for program and organizational assessment purposes. While not required, this can provide invaluable information for the team’s quality improvement efforts.
* **Step 4 ~ Training**. Each member of the ECQUIP team and other related personnel should have the opportunity to receive training and information about ECQUIP, the self-assessment process, tools chosen, and the QF System. With funding from the grant, regional training on the ECQUIP process will be provided in each HNC in year one of the grant.
* **Step 5 ~ Implementation of tool**. Each team determines the breadth and depth of administration of the tools used in order to gather data useful to the team. All participating members should have a working knowledge of any local tools utilized, the ECQUIP rubric, the QF Improvement plans, as well as LEA Literacy Plans.
* **Step 6 ~ Review area identified for improvement** Based on the results of any formal or informal assessments, QF assessments and Improvement Plan, and Title I improvement plans or local literacy plans, the team makes decisions related to the program’s needs and determines future direction of the improvement process.
* **Step 7 ~ Determine Strategies for Improvement and Create Enhancement Plan**. Using the information gathered through the ECQUIP, the team completes a Quality Enhancement Plan and submits it to ADE/ECE through the Arizona LEA Tracker (ALEAT) system. The intent of the Quality Enhancement Plan is to assist ECQUIP teams with their long range planning for continuous quality improvement.
* **Step 8 ~ Reporting.** Each LEA reports on the improvements generated through the HNC’s ECQUIP process each year on their Quality Enhancement Plan via the ALEAT and reviewed annually by staff.

In part 2 of the process, ADE/ECE will monitor the Grant sub-grantees for both compliance and validation of local on-going ECQUIP meetings. Monitoring of program sites is a proactive approach to ensuring the sub-grantees are following guidelines and providing high-quality and comprehensive educational programs that promote improved student achievement.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| An ADE/ECE formal monitoring schedule will be as follows: | **Year 1 (FY16)** | **Year 2 (FY17)** | **Year 3 (FY18)** | **Year 4 (FY19)** |
| All programs | All programs | All programs | All programs |

The monitoring visit will be pre-scheduled by ADE/ECE with the sub-grantee to be visited. The on-site monitoring of the preschool programs will include, if applicable:

* + Classroom visitations
  + Interviews with program teachers and administrators
  + Review of children’s academic records such as portfolios/work samples and teacher anecdotal observation notes (ongoing progress monitoring data)
  + Review of program compliance information
  + Review of program documentation and requirements such as ECQUIP meeting results, documentation of family income, licensure, accreditation information (if applicable), and collaboration documentation
  + Review of the Child Find system
  + Fiscal compliance review

The ADE/ECE formal monitoring will conclude with a meeting with the sub-grantee administrator(s) within the HNC or staff to discuss observations and to provide technical assistance if needed. ADE/ECE will be responsible for collecting and analyzing data to ensure program compliance and continued growth on state level goals.

**ON-SITE REVIEW**

**Preschool Development Grant FY18**

**ADE/ECE Monitoring for Early Childhood Quality & Compliance**

**Date of Visit: Date Date of Follow-Up (if applicable): Date**

**Sub-Grantee/Program:**

**Sub-Grantee/Program HNC or District:**

**Number of allocated PDG slots (based on current award or proposal):**

**Number of current children enrolled:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program Contact(s) and Email/Phone #** | **ADE Contact(s) and Email/Phone #** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Notes:  Items for Follow-Up: |

\*Evidence should be observed, indicated, and/or collected to support the component findings. Some of the PDG components can be reviewed and marked or noted before the ADE/ECE monitoring visit.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PDG COMPONENT** | **Evidence and Notes** |
| **Licensing** | |
| The program is licensed and in good standing with an applicable licensing agency. DHS/applicable licensing agency certificate is current, valid, and posted.  Yes  No | *Reviewer should confirm the licensing certificate posted at facility and review* [*"in good standing"*](http://azdhs.gov/licensing/index.php#azcarecheck) *with licensing agency.* *Facility must maintain current license and “in good standing” status.*  Evidence- Licensing certificate:  License Number:       Date of Expiration: Date  Notes: |
| **HNC ECQUIP/Community of Practice (specific to district/charter programs)** | |
| [ECQUIP Rubric](https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=586d667daadebe1114465428) is completed with evidence collected and a standard for improvement has been selected.  Yes  No  N/A | *Reviewer should confirm in the district/HNC ECQUIP Rubric for the program’s participation if the program is not a district/charter.*  Evidence- ECQUIP Self-Assessment Rubric:  Evidence (Other):  Notes: |
| [ECQUIP Quality Enhancement Plan](https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=587957efaadebe0c98a8053c) has been submitted on ALEAT.  Yes  No  N/A | Evidence- ECQUIP Quality Enhancement Plan:  Evidence (Other):  Date submitted into ALEAT: Date  Date reviewed/accepted by ADE: Date  Notes: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PDG COMPONENT** | **Evidence and Notes** |
| **HNC ECQUIP/Community of Practice (for all programs)** | |
| The program participates in the local school district’s ECQUIP and attends meetings regularly (in person or electronically/telephonically).  Yes  No | Evidence- ECQUIP Meeting agenda(s), sign-in sheets:  Evidence (Other):  Notes: |
| The program has in place and is following the HNC written protocol in place to determine a program’s “most in need” children/families.  Yes  No | Evidence- Written protocol for “most in need”:  Evidence (Other):  Notes: |
| The program has in place and is following the HNC written protocol to share “wait list” for children/families.  Yes  No | Evidence- Written protocol for “waitlist”:  Evidence (Other):  How will the program share wait list information with other local HNC programs?  Notes: |
| The program has a [written plan for Kindergarten transition](https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=5888dda6aadebe0850217dcb) using the state and HNC template.  Yes  No | Evidence- Kindergarten Transition Plan:  Date submitted into ALEAT: Date  Date reviewed/accepted by ADE: Date  Notes: |
| The program participates in and offers the comprehensive services (LRE, Child Find, Family Engagement and other support services) that were identified by the HNC.  Yes  No | Evidence:  What comprehensive services does the program provide?    Notes: |
| The program has completed and submitted the appropriate PDG Scope of Work documents into ALEAT by the defined ADE deadline.  Yes  No | *Reviewer should confirm PDG Scope of Work documents in ALEAT*.  Evidence- Uploaded “Child Find Analysis”, “Comprehensive PD Plan”, “Educational Attainment Plans”, “Family Engagement Plan”, “Kindergarten Transition Plan”, and any other applicable SOW forms:  Notes: |
|  | |
| **Child and Family Eligibility** | |
| Program ensures all children participating in the PDG program are income eligible.  Yes  No  How many files were reviewed?  % of files in compliance | *Reviewer should confirm at least 10% of awarded slots for income eligibility and ensure that families are not charged additional fees during the PDG hours of operation. Reviewer will follow up within 30 days if % of files in compliance is not 100%.*  Evidence- [PDG Child/Family Application](https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=5910fe381130c012b0fa49e2):  Evidence(Other):  Notes: |
| Program ensures that all children participating in the PDG program are four years of age and were four before September 1 of the current school year.  Yes  No  How many files were reviewed?  % of files in compliance | *Reviewer should confirm at least 10% of enrollment records for age eligibility. Reviewer will follow up within 30 days if % of files in compliance is not 100%.*  Evidence:  Notes: |
| **Early Childhood Assessment System** | |
| A comprehensive written [Early Childhood Assessment System](https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=58efcb706f53b721f8089716) is being implemented.  Yes  No | Evidence- Written protocol including 45 Day Screener, Evaluation, ongoing progress monitoring, protocol for data use, etc.:  Evidence (Other):  Notes: |
| Program conducts a developmental screening on all children.  Yes  No  How many files were reviewed?  % of files in compliance | *Reviewer should confirm at least 10% of PDG enrollment records and request evidence that screening is conducted at most within the first 45 days of the child’s attendance in the program. Reviewer will follow up within 30 days if % of files in compliance is not 100%.*  Evidence:  Notes: |
| Teaching Strategies GOLD data has been recorded to demonstrate ongoing progress of children and has been completed on all eligible participants.  Yes  No  How many portfolios were reviewed? | *Reviewer should review at least 10% of eligible portfolios/TSG data using “Child Observations and Portfolio Rubric” for the most recently completed Checkpoint. This can be reviewed prior to on-site review.*  Evidence- Child Observations and Portfolio Rubric:  Evidence (Other):  Date Reviewed by ADE: Date  Notes: |
| All eligible children have a valid AZED ID number.  Yes  No | *Reviewer should verify that all children are assigned an AZED ID number in the online assessment tool.*  Evidence:  Notes: |
| **Teaching and Instructional Staff** | |
| Instructional staff is highly qualified or have an educational attainment plan in place.    Yes  No | *Reviewer should verify degree/certification and/or educational attainment plans (via ALEAT) of PDG instructional staff.*  Evidence:  Notes: |
| Certified instructional staff salaries are comparable to the salaries of the local district K-12 instructional staff.  Yes  No | *Reviewer should cross check the local district’s comparable certified salary schedule with the program’s grant application in GME.*  Evidence- District certified salary schedule:  Evidence (Other):  Notes: |
| The program has a [Comprehensive PD Plan](https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=5888d7f5aadebe0850217db1), uploaded into ALEAT by the defined ADE deadline, and instructional staff participate in professional development according to the PD plan.  Yes  No | Evidence- PD plan with PD sign-in sheets:  Evidence (Other):  Date submitted into ALEAT: Date  Date reviewed/accepted by ADE: Date  Notes: |
| Instructional staff are registered in the [Arizona Early Childhood Workforce Registry](https://www.azregistry.org/).  Yes  No | Evidence- Print-out of Registry participant list:  Evidence (Other):  Notes: |
| Instructional staff are given sufficient preparation or planning time to complete lesson planning, GOLD entry, planning time with classroom instructional staff team and etc.  Yes  No | *Reviewer should interview instructional staff and administrative staff as necessary to ensure sufficiency of prep/planning time. Prep/planning time should be outside of the “instructional hours” during which children are in the PDG classroom.*  Evidence- Instructional staff schedules, staff sign-in sheets:  Evidence (Other):  Notes: |
| **Continuous Quality Improvement** | |
| The program is enrolled in Quality First and is participating in the comprehensive [Quality First services](http://www.qualityfirstaz.com/providers/how-quality-first-works/) as identified by the HNC.  Yes  No | Evidence:  What is the program’s current star rating?  1  2  3  4  5  Pending  Not Yet Assessed  What is the program’s previous star rating, if applicable?  1  2  3  4  5  N/A  Notes: |
|  | |
| The program implements a system for self-evaluation based on the [*PGHQ*](https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=5879561caadebe0c98a80509)and [ECQUIP](https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=587957efaadebe0c98a8053c).  Yes  No | What is the program’s self-evaluation tool?  How is the program using the tool?  Evidence:  Notes: |
| **Curriculum, Instruction, and Learning Environments** | |
| The program has an [evidence-based curriculum](http://www.azed.gov/ece/preschool/) based on standards, thoughtful planning, and design.  Yes  No | *Refer to “Preschool Curriculum”:* [*www.azed.gov/ece/preschool*](http://www.azed.gov/ece/preschool)*.*  What curriculum is the program using?  Evidence:  Notes: |
| Program ensures developmentally appropriate, culturally, and linguistically responsive instruction.  Yes  No | *Reviewer should conduct a brief classroom observation of at least 10% of the sub-grantee’s PDG funded classrooms. Refer to Standard 4 of the PGHQ:* [*www.azed.gov/ece/resources*](http://www.azed.gov/ece/resources)*.*  Evidence:  Notes: |
| The program is adhering to the ratios of 1 adult to 10 children and no more than 20 children in the classroom (regardless of size of room and/or number of teachers).  Yes  No | *Reviewer should conduct a brief classroom observation of at least 10% of the sub-grantee’s PDG funded classrooms and cross-check the number of children attending the program with the number of TSG portfolios.*  What is the ratio of children to instructional staff?  Evidence:  Notes: |
| Program ensures they are providing full-day services.  Yes  No | *Reviewer should confirm that the classroom schedule reflects a 6 hour day and ask program: How many hours per day are children in the PDG classroom? Children must be in the PDG classroom for at least 6 hours.*  Evidence:  Notes: |
| Program is enrolled in the [Empower Program](http://azdhs.gov/prevention/nutrition-physical-activity/empower/index.php) and has written policies to address each of the ten standards as a statement of intent or commitment to implement the evidence-based health and safety standards.  Yes  No | Evidence- Staff/program handbook:  Evidence (Other):  Notes: |
| The program is implementing strategies to provide support so all children have access and fully participate in the learning (i.e., Arizona’s MTSS).  Yes  No | *Reviewer should interview instructional staff and administrative staff as necessary to ensure the implementation of strategies to support all children to have access and participate in learning.*  Evidence- Lesson plans with notes regarding individualized instruction:  Evidence (Other):  Notes: |
| **Inclusion of Children with Special Needs** | |
| The program participates in the local school district’s Child Find, and the “Child Find Analysis” has been uploaded into ALEAT by the defined ADE deadline.  Yes  No | *Reviewer should request evidence that supports all components of the Child Find requirements. Programs that are not districts/charters should collaborate with the local school district around marketing, making referrals, and sharing resources related to Child Find.*  Evidence:  Date submitted into ALEAT: Date  Date reviewed/accepted by ADE: Date  Notes: |
| Notification provided to parents regarding their placement options for child enrollment in the least restrictive environment (LRE).  Yes  No | *Reviewer should request evidence such as a policy or procedure that indicates the continuum of placement options within the program and within the larger HNC/district. Refer to LRE in “PDG Guidance Manual”.*  Evidence:  Notes: |
| The program participates in the HNC’s system-building to improve outcomes for children with special needs to ensure that by PDG Year 4 each classroom is serving at least 10% (or 2 per class) children with special needs.  Yes  No | How many PDG children with special needs are currently attending?  If 0, what efforts is the program taking to support this component:  Evidence- Written protocol for inclusion:  Evidence (Other):  Notes: |
| **Fiscal** | |
| Program is enrolled in the Grant’s Management System (GME) and has submitted the current grant application by the defined ADE deadline.  Yes  No | Evidence:  Date submitted into GME: Date  Date reviewed/accepted by ADE: Date  Notes: |
| Original and legible records are kept for all goods and services purchased with grant funds.  Yes  No | *Reviewer should confirm records such as purchase orders and seek evidence of equipment in classroom(s).*  Evidence:  Notes: |
| A record of employee time and effort is maintained.  Yes  No | Evidence:  Notes: |
|  | |
| Administrative costs are at the allowable rate or lower.  Yes  No | *For more information, see definition of administrative costs in the “PDG Guidance Manual”. Reviewer should confirm that the administrative costs do not exceed the allowable rate in GME.*  What is the program’s total award amount?  What is the amount of the allowable administrative costs?  What is the program’s total administrative cost in GME?  Evidence:  Notes: |
| Program ensures match funds at a minimum of 20% of the total cost of services.  Yes  No | *For more information, review matching funds section in the “PDG Guidance Manual”.*  Evidence:  Notes: |
| **Attendance** | |
| The program has a written attendance and an absentee policy in the parent handbook.  Yes  No | Evidence- Written attendance and absentee policy:  Evidence (Other):  Notes: |
| The program maintains records of attendance of children in PDG classroom(s).  Yes  No | How does the program record attendance?  Evidence:  Notes: |
| The program has a written suspension/expulsion policy for children in the PDG classroom(s).  Yes  No | Evidence- Written suspension or expulsion policy:  Evidence (Other):  Notes: |
| The program has documented monthly attendance/ suspension in the [online survey](http://www10.ade.az.gov/SelectSurveyNET/TakeSurvey.aspx?SurveyID=n2M0m66K) by the 15th of the month for the previous month’s data.  Yes  No | Evidence:  Notes: |
| Have any children from the PDG classroom/s been suspended or expelled within the current fiscal year?  Yes  If so, how many?  No | *Reviewer should request reasons for and documentation of any expulsions.*  Evidence:  Notes: |

**Completing the Monitoring Process:**

*Reviewer, if any of the components are marked as “NO”, please review action steps and timeline with the sub-grantee/program and create a “PDG Monitoring Action Plan” to ensure compliance with all components by the defined ADE/ECE deadline. All PDG Monitoring & Compliance Review documents, including any collected copies of evidence, should be included and stored in the program’s ADE electronic file and a copy of the results should be sent to the sub-grantee/program via email.*