Rating (Procedure and Calculation)	ELAA	EARS	ELAC	IPEL	WSA	Total	Current Progress/ Action	Proposed Progress/ Action
Point spread	X	XXXXXX	X			8	**CCA Network Office -** We've completed some analysis of the point spread, and there's been some work done on the pecrentage of providers that got each QS point by rated level and provider type. One of the next steps is already to use the results of the UW evaluation to inform potential changes to the point spread. **CCA Regional Offices -** This is currently under examination. A special committee was generated to put forth a proposal for approval. Work recently ceased until receipt of an external point spread proposal from University of Washington.	**CCA Network Office -**We may also want to look at which points providers opt out of most frequently, although I'm not sure there's an easy data source for that (without combing through the rating readiness tools manually). Perhaps some of the points that are perceived as out-of-reach could be measured a bit differently (like requiring documentation of a practice for at least 90% of children instead of 100%) to make implementing the practice seem more likely to actually get a provider the point for it. **OneAmerica -** Award points for the languages aside from English spoken by providers/staff; this can support providers/centers in need of level 3 rating or higher!
Lack of in-depth info (UW specifically)/ not enough detail about why score was given	X	X	X		X	4	**CCA Network Office -**UW started providing more specific information about which indicators were missed on low-scoring ERS items. As a field, UW and CCA coaches have also worked together over the last few years to help the coaches better understand the most common reasons why providers don't get QS points. It's not as good as having customized explanations from UW for each provider, but it's definitely improved since the earliest ratings. From spring 2014 to spring 2015, the annual CCA survey of rated providers showed a drop in the percentage that responded they understood their rating "very well", but staff surveyed indicated that they thought the process of explaining ratings had improved. It could be that improvement took place over the course of the year, so providers that were rated in the first big wave of ratings that would have shown up in the 2015 survey (the June-July 2014 ratings) were more negative about understanding their results than the staff who were thinking about the improvement over the course of the year. We'll be able to test that theory with the 2016 survey results that will be ready in June/July. **CCA Regional Offices -**The reports in WELS were recently overhauled. Most Quality Standard items are teased out and the rationale for not earning a specific point is more easily identified. Additionally, if there are ever questions pertaining to specific circumstances, UW has always granted specific feedback to support the outcome. In the case where a mistake is identified through this request for clarity, UW has consistently responded by making the appropriate adjustment even when it is not the case that the additional point(s) will affect the outcome.	**CCA Network Office -**We could ask UW for more details about the reasons why providers scored low on CLASS Instructional Support dimensions or documentation of the reasoning for why a provider didn't get a quality standard point they were trying to earn, but that would also likely increase the cost of ratings. Perhaps it would strike a good balance if we limited the QS explanations, maybe to just the most difficult-to-get points, or maybe let the provider pick (on the rating readiness tool) up to three standards that they would want an explanation if they don't get the point.
Cultural/ Linguistic responsiveness of providers not being recognized as an asset in ratings	X	XX		X		4	**UW -** Currently the data collection team is piloting Records Review reports that indicate which components of each standard area were achieved and not achieved.	**CCA Network Office -**At one of the EARS subcommittee brainstorming sessions, it was suggested that providers could get "bonus" points for having dual-language programs, having materials for families in non-English languages, etc. **UW -** WELS could be modified to accept additional information about standard areas.

Rating (Procedure and Calculation)	ELAA	EARS	ELAC	IPEL	WSA	Total	Current Progress/ Action	Proposed Progress/ Action
Applicability to FCC, school-based, and other settings	X	XX		X		4	**CCA Regional Offices -**The beauty of the framework is its versitililty and applicability in recognizing innumerable types of facilities. It's flexibiliy affords the data collector the luxury of setting aside any bias (e.g favoring center-based care over family child care) while harvesting evidence of quality that aligns with research-based tools hailed nationally and internationally as the gold standard in early learning. School-based programs can argue that Common Core comprmises their ability to fare well in EA, ECEAP can argue they shouldn't have to be subject to licensing standards, Family Child Care providers can argue that the system is center-centric, but ultimately, it comes down to how to manage and balance the expectations of the framework in a way that does not comprimise the philosophy and value set of the institution.	**UW** - Find out more about specific FCC concerns/suggestions as well as those that relate to programs in k-12 schools.
Quality Control (subjective nature of assessments)	X	X			XX	4	**CCA Network Office -**UW already has a quite rigorous system for quality control and reliability checks in place. **CCA Regional Offices -**UW data collectors couldn't be held to higher standards. Their internal system of checks coupled with the incredible investment they make yearly by importing experts directly from the institutions make for zero room for subjectivity. **UW** - The classroom assessment tools used in EA have been shown to be both reliable and valid and are linked to child outcomes in peer reviewed research. The data collection team undergoes rigorous training and ongoing reliability checks in live coding environments including checks with the authors of the tool. The EA data collection team adheres to rigorous standards that exceed those of many other states.	**CCA Network Office -**Maybe we need to publize the rating QA process and rater check process more? It seems like the kind of thing that people find boring and don't care about, until they have a problem with their rating. **UW -** Find out more about specific concerns and suggestions around reliable and valid data collection tools.
Time consuming			X			1	**CCA Regional Offices -**Facilities and institutions that can't or don't want to invest the time necessary to meet the standard of quality can choose to opt out of the participation.	
Long wait for results		XX	X		XX	5		**CCA Regional Offices -**Ratings could go out on a rolling basis, however, I would hesistate to consider this option if it compromised the accuracy of the rating. **UW** - EA timelines are on par with other states with comparable data collection processes. Some states only publish ratings twice per year. view the QRIS compendium and/or reach out to other RTT states with similar standards to see how they handle their rating timelines.

Rating (Procedure and Calculation)	ELAA	EARS	ELAC	IPEL	WSA	Total	Current Progress/ Action	Proposed Progress/ Action
Not enough technical assistance/ support staff			X			1	**CCA Regional Offices** -Child Care Aware field staff are committed to supporting child care facilities in meeting the threshold so they can continue their quality improvement efforts in coaching. To ensure resources are utilized in a way that allows the greatest impact, field staff must constantly monitor the engagement level of the overall facility. There are instances when low engagement or follow through on the part of the facility could cause an adjustment in services. This is to ensure that the improvements made during TA/RRC/Coach time are sustainable.	**OneAmerica** -What's the potential of adding DEL staff with cultural competencies needed to support diverse providers?
Differences across different types of program standards and ratings			X	X	X	3		
Single observation doesn't offer true reflection - would like preliminary observation to contribute to score and to be conducted by same rater			X		XX	3	**CCA Regional Offices** -This would be a concern if the standard was incredibly high. The reason the thresholds are so low (average of a 2 of 7 is pretty low) is to afford a little extra room for teachers to have bad days, or for children to be sick.	
Does not allow for/ account for cultural differences (cradle boards/swaddling)		X		X		2		**CCA Network Office** -I think this is a tricky one, because we need to be careful about identifying specific behaviors that aren't necessarily linked to child development, but rather are used as a proxy for something that is. For example (and I am by no means an expert in this area), I would think that a cultural tendency to not talk to children very much would be something we would not want to make accomodations for, because it's directly related to child development. On the other hand, something like eye contact is used as an indicator of positive climate, and positive climate is the thing we really care about, so it would make sense to adjust our expectations of eye contact to match what would be indicative of a positive climate for that culture. **UW** - There is a Tribal addendum to ERS in the works in BC, we could explore this and other tools. **OneAmerica** -Determine if there's a way to assess "cultural equivalency" and add different cultural practices to accepted practices where possible
Rater not familiar with culture of provider				X		1	**CCA Regional Offices** -The rater doesn't have the luxury of wearing any other lens than that of the tool. That's what makes it "valid and reliable." If the rater were allowed to account for cultural considerations, it would be impossible for the scale to achieve this necessary distinction. **UW** - EA has a very diverse data collection team, programs are encouraged to let their CL know of any preferences and every attempt is made to accommodate within protocol (e.g., programs can request a DC that has experience working with Tribal Nations).	**UW -** Find out how other states handle this and gather more feedback. **OneAmerica** -Raters should send out a pre-visit survey based on supplied demographic information (i.e. langauges spoken, etc.) to asses whether a cultural navigator/consultant can be brought in for assessments and also provide linguistic support

Rating (Procedure and Calculation)	ELAA	EARS	ELAC	IPEL	WSA	Total	Current Progress/ Action	Proposed Progress/ Action
Tribes would like the option to provide their own reviewers/ design culturally appropriate assessment				X		1		**OneAmerica** -Support - if an effective model is developed, DEL should examine ways to incorporate with diverse providers
Lack of in-depth information prior to rating - don't know how to prepare/ what to expect		X		X		1	**CCA Regional Offices** -Child Care Aware field staff are committed to supporting child care facilities in meeting the threshold so they can continue their quality improvement efforts in coaching. To ensure resources are utilized in a way that allows the greatest impact, field staff must constantly monitor the engagement level of the overall facility. Field staff can adjust frequency and length of visits according to the needs of the facility. This is where in-depth assistance in preparation for rating would occur.	**OneAmerica** -Develop "what to expect" guides in multiple modes (youtube videos, visuals, text-based guides, translation support) that can also be used by trusted community partners to share information
Limited days of implementation of new policy that fulfills EA - 30 days		X				1		
U of WA presentation accessible		X				1		**UW** - Need more information.
Experience varies depending on when/ where provider enters process		X				1	**CCA Regional Offices** -This was the case early in the system's rollout. Since then, system refinement has created a more uniform experience for the provider.	**OneAmerica** -More self assessments for providers that uses an asset-based frame "I can/I have" statements
Multi-system/ blended programs (ECEAP/HS/ECLIPSE/CC/etc)		X				1		
Fear of unknown		X				1	**CCA Regional Offices** -Child Care Aware staff are well-trained and deeply rooted in all aspects of Relationship-Based Professional Development. The fear typically subsides as more information is provided.	
Rumors		X				1		**CCA Regional Offices** -Licensors are in the best position to be champions of Early Achievers. They need to be thoughtfully and respectfully brought into the fold. It is possible they are not the source of many rumors, but in areas where licensor support of EA is steadfast there is a strong correlation to higher participation. **OneAmerica** -Contract with CBOs to provide factual information, develop youtube channel/videos in multiple languages to provide factual info from DEL
Rating expectations are unreasonable		X		X		2		

Rating (Procedure and Calculation)	ELAA	EARS	ELAC	IPEL	WSA	Total	Current Progress/ Action	Proposed Progress/ Action
Rerate process is confusing		X				1		**OneAmerica** -Employ more plain language usage to make rating/re-rating process more accessible
Rating data reports only available in English		X				1	**CCA Network Office** -CCA has been talking to 3SI about a Spanish version of the ratings dashboard report that we'll hopefully be able to pilot in the June rating cycle. DEL has been supportive of creating the Spanish version.	**OneAmerica** -Contract with trusted CBOs to provide technical and linguistic support to DEL to help with outreach
Allowances for staff turnover right before rating					XX	2	**CCA Regional Offices** -This is something that can be communicated with the Community Liaison from UW. If a facility experiences turnover right before rating, they can postpone until they feel confident in the facility's ability to meet the threshold. If this is a chronic concern, it likely has a deleterious effect on the quality of the facility as a whole, and, therefore, is an appropriate consideration in determining a rating.	
Rating process is disruptive for classroom and children					X	1		**UW** - Many programs have various visitors to their classroom on an ongoing basis and data collection fits right into this. For programs that are not used to having visitors it might help to have a CCQB (practice assessment conducted by CCA) or volunteer to host a data collection training (reliability visit).
Possibility of replacing ERS and CLASS with culturally appropriate tools				X		1		**CCA Regional Offices** -ERS-3 is rumored to afford greater leniency in terms of the physical environment. Transitioning to this updated version would likely be grossly costly, but may address this concern. **OneAmerica** -Yes!!!
Rating calendar doesn't accommodate provider schedules					X	1	**CCA Network Office** -This is in the final stages of revision. **CCA Regional Offices** -EARS approved an improved version of the cohort calendar and consideration of provider schedules was nicely reflected in the changes. **UW** - Update to the data collection schedule has been proposed.	
Accuracy of translated materals		X				1		**OneAmerica** -Have 2nd or 3rd party "reverse translate" documents to ensure they convey the same information across langauges