Early Achievers Accreditation Approval Model proposal

WASHINGTON EARLY ACHIEVERS
PREPARING CHILDREN FOR SUCCESS IN SCHOOL

Washington State Department of Early Learning

Accreditation and the ESA

(11)

(a) The department shall accept national accreditation that meets the requirements of this subsection (11) as a qualification for the early achievers program ratings.

(b) Each national accreditation agency will be allowed to submit its most current standards of accreditation to establish potential credit earned in the early achievers program. The department shall grant credit to accreditation bodies that can demonstrate that their standards meet or exceed the current early achievers program standards.

Accreditation

In general, accreditation evaluates the:

- center's staff qualifications
- parent communication
- interactions, curriculum
- health and safety
- administration

Programs undergo:

- in-depth self-assessments
- independent observation
- approval by professional experts

QRIS and Accreditation in Other States

- 9 states award increased points for accreditation
- 12 states assign an automatic rating at the highest level or require accreditation to achieve the highest level of rating
- 2 states have tied accreditation to their state's Tiered Reimbursement initiatives
- 3 states offer financial incentives for facilities that are either undergoing or have achieved accreditation by approved organizations
- 5 states offer an "alternative pathway" or streamlined application process in the QRIS for programs that are accredited

Accreditation in Washington

Accreditation	Total
American Montessori Society (AMS)	10
Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI)	2
National Accreditation Commission for Early Care and Education Programs (NAC)	37
Montessori School Accreditation Commission (MSAC)	2
National Association for Family Child Care (NAFCC)	36
National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)	100
Association Montessori Internationale (AMI)	2
Montessori Institute of America (MIA)	7
AdvancED	5
Other	18

* Data as of October 2015

Accreditation Model Approval Pilot

AMI Association Montessori Internationale

NAFCC National Association for Family Child Care

NAEYC National Association for the Education of Young Children

Example of Template

Early Achievers Performance Standard	Verification Required in Early Achievers	Correlative Accreditation Standard:	Verification Methodology in Accrediting Program
Professional Development and Training			
Center Director or Program Supervisor Qualifications **Lvl 3- 1 pt AA in ECE Related Field** **Lvl 4-2pts BA in ECE Related Field** **Lvl5 – 4ptsMA in ECE Related Field**	Certificates, transcripts, diplomas, course descriptions are sufficient to determine levels meeting the current standard		

Additional Documentation

We may also ask the Accrediting body to verify:

- Demonstrated fiscal and administrative capability
- Accreditation program must be established for at least 3 years
- Verifiable, public listing of accredited programs
- Administrative Policies to avoid conflicts of interest and address issues such as deferred status, withdrawal of accreditation, appeal processes, and complaints.
- Academic qualifications and formal training requirements of the applicant's staff by the accrediting group.

Additional Documentation Cont.

- Continuous Improvement/Quality Assurance Peer-reviewers, training procedures, and instruments used in the process are evaluated for reliability and validity.
- Self-Evaluation that includes parents, staff, and program administrators.
- On-site program review
- Accreditation decision made by experts in the field after a review of all documentation
- Evidence-based and periodically updated

Proposed Facility Rating Process

1. Facilities will follow the process identified by the accreditation review.

2. The rating will be logged in MERIT.

3. Facilities will verify their accreditation every 3 years and provide any needed additional documentation updates.

Questions to Consider

1. What ideas or concerns would you like to share about the list of additional documentation?

2. Should the review subcommittee be from this group or DEL?

3. What ideas or concerns would you like to share about the Approval models used by other states?