

Rush to Assessment: The Role Private Early Childhood Service Providers Play in Assessing Child and Program Outcomes

Larry Macmillan, Early Childhood Consultant
Roger Neugebauer, Publisher, Exchange magazine

January 12, 2006

This paper was prepared for the National Task Force on Early Childhood
Accountability, with support from Pew Charitable Trusts, the Foundation for
Child Development, and the Joyce Foundation

Executive Summary

This paper will describe efforts by large private non profit and for profit early childhood organizations to use data from assessments of children's learning and program quality for management purposes. It also reports on their experiences in implementing a variety of early childhood accountability and assessment initiatives as they manage 3,960 centers serving over 412,000 children under the age of five in all fifty states and the United Kingdom. This paper is based on interviews with senior executives conducted from October through December, 2005. The interview questions are included in Appendix A and the list of organizations and individuals interviewed are included in Appendix B.

Major Findings

- All 16 organizations treat the assessment of children's learning and program quality as a high priority. In their assessments, these organizations utilize a rich variety of assessment processes imposed on them by funding sources; nationally recognized assessment instruments; and assessment tools designed by the organizations themselves derived in large part from national assessment tools, accreditation standards and state assessment systems.
- These organizations report using the results of their assessments to:
 - Monitor quality of services
 - Develop program improvement strategies site by site and organization wide
 - Refine curriculum goals
 - Fine tune staff development initiatives
 - Communicate to parents about results being achieved
- Surprisingly, there were few objections raised to assessments imposed on organizations by federal and state agencies and other funding bodies. Most view these mandates and requirements as helpful in setting benchmarks for program quality and priorities for child assessment efforts except in instances where the assessment tools are culturally or linguistically insensitive. What is found to be challenging and counterproductive is when organizations are required simultaneously to comply with more than one set of standards and assessment routines from different agencies and funders.
- NAEYC center accreditation standards have become defacto indicators of quality for providers. Nearly all of the organizations, both non profit and for profit, either are seeking to have all their centers accredited or have adopted the NAEYC accreditation standards as their benchmarks for quality.

Recommendations:

- **Less is more.** To support private providers in using assessment for program improvement, attention needs to be paid to making assessment standards and systems imposed by government and private funders mesh better together.
- **Back to the basics.** Can agreement be reached on a common set of standards for what three and four year olds children should know and be able to do along a continuum of their unique growth, development and education?
- **One size does not fit all.** The field needs assessment instruments that are sensitive to cultural and linguistic differences.
- **Let a thousand flowers bloom.** We need to support the creativity and ingenuity being displayed by providers in pursuing their commitment to assessment.

Rush to Assessment: The Role Private Early Childhood Service Providers Play in Assessing Child and Program Outcomes

Over the course of three months, we surveyed 16 large private providers of early childhood services representing a wide range of program auspices. Two are Head Start agencies, two are local non profit multi-site systems, one is a non profit campus based program, four are national for profit chains, four are for profit chains operating in a single state, two are national chains providing services for employers and one is an accreditation collaborative. Four of these organizations are headquartered in the Northeast, four in the South, three in the Midwest, and five in the West.

We have organized the results of these surveys into the four sections that follow:

- How organizations are assessing program quality
- How organizations are assessing children's learning
- What organizations have learned from doing assessments
- How organizations react to existing accountability efforts

Section 1: How programs are assessing program quality

Tools

The 16 organizations all engage in a variety of processes for assessing program quality. Not one of them rely on a single tool or set of standards.

First, they are all required to participate in assessment processes imposed by funders and monitors – be it a federal agency, a state agency, a private foundation or an employer. In fact, most organizations are subject to assessment by more than one outside agency. [See section 4 for more details on assessments imposed from outside]

Second, nearly all the organizations voluntarily participate in accreditation programs. Twelve organizations are either actively seeking NAEYC accreditation for all their centers or have adopted NAEYC accreditation standards as their benchmarks for quality, three are seeking accreditation from other national systems, and two Head Start agencies not involved in any national accreditation systems. In conversations with these leaders, it was clear that NAEYC has set the bar for quality. Whether they are actively seeking accreditation for their centers or not, most recognize that the NAEYC standards are the commonly accepted point of comparison.

For example, Deepa MacPherson, Children's Creative Learning Centers, states: *“We feel that NAEYC is the cornerstone of what we believe in. The self-study materials often mirror what we consider to be job descriptions. In addition to self-study materials we use their parent and staff guidelines as a resource to create our own policies and procedures. We utilize tools from NAEYC as training modules for our staff as well as helping create educational programs for our families.”*

Voluntary accreditation is recognized as making a difference. Judy Witmer, Hildebrandt Learning Centers, comments on participation in accreditation this way: *“It is exciting to take part in improving the quality of our program. We feel we have reduced turnover by staff taking pride in their accomplishments to become accredited.”* Alison Pepper, Quality New York notes from their experience helping programs become accredited that: *“Overall agencies and practice has improved. Programs develop professional development plans, improvement plans and once accredited are better quality and have a more stable staff.”*

Joyce Anderson, Children’s Choice Learning Centers, in a statement which seems to sum up the findings on participation in accreditation initiatives, states that accreditation *“has formed the basis of corporate practice.”*

Third, many of the organizations are using nationally-normed assessment tools and/or curricula with built in quality standards and assessment tools. Head Start agencies (as well as one for profit and one non profit organization that operate some Head Start centers) utilize Head Start instruments such as NRS and the Head Start Performance Standards. Five agencies reported using ECERS/ITERS. A variety of other tools are used by at least one of the organizations: Creative Curriculum, High/Scope, ATI/Galileo, PALS, DLM Express, and Kaplan Lap-D.

Finally, all of the organizations reported using their own in-house standards and assessment tools. These tools for the most part have been developed by borrowing relevant parts of existing national tools and standards such as NAEYC accreditation, ECERS/ITERS, state quality initiatives, and state and local Pre-K standards. For the most part these in-house systems incorporate classroom observations by teachers and directors, and surveys completed by staff and parents. In a few instances, observations are completed by management staff from an organization’s headquarters or by outside consultants.

Using research-based standards and criteria was a key element in developing tools for measuring program quality. Some good examples of this “cross fertilization” from standards from many initiatives are program quality evaluations used by the UCLA Early Care and Education program in California, Hildebrandt Learning Centers headquartered in Pennsylvania, The Children’s Courtyard headquartered in Texas, and Bright Horizons headquartered in Massachusetts which also operates in the United Kingdom and is influenced by standards outside the United States. Both Children’s Courtyard and Children’s Choice Learning Centers, with headquarters in Texas, report being influenced by the Texas Primary Education Literacy Inventory and the Texas Pre-K Curriculum Guidelines

All Head Start programs interviewed reported using the Head Start Program Review Instrument for Systems Monitoring (PRISM) and Performance Standards as a basis for measuring program quality. They used these instruments for developing annual program self-assessments using parents, staff, board and community members to review some of

the PRISM components looking at how their program is doing in the areas of Disabilities, Education, Family and Community Partnerships, Health, and Program Management and Operation. There are instances where these tools are augmented by the programs locally designed tools and/or by local or state quality initiatives when the organization operates both Head Start and non-Head Start programs or is a part of a quality initiative. Programs like Rainbow Child Development headquartered in Michigan, for example, participate in several state and federal child care funding initiatives. Their program is part of Step Up For Quality and the Early Learning Initiative in Ohio, and Kentucky STARS in Kentucky along with others. All of these additional efforts influence the nature of their program quality assessment tools used in their Head Start sites.

Timing

With regard to frequency of program assessment, programs typically perform an annual program quality evaluation. Some programs, like Children’s Choice Learning Centers, have established ongoing electronic parent feedback opportunities for parents at the point of daily check-in or via e-mail where parents can provide their own open-ended feedback. In addition to annual self-assessment, Head Start programs receive an external program quality evaluation as part of their Federal review every 3 years.

Applications

Organizations participate in assessment systems imposed by funders in order to maintain funding, or, in the case of state tiered reimbursement systems, to increase funding levels. However, they engage in voluntary accreditation systems and in-house assessment processes in order to improve program quality.

Organizations reported utilizing results of program assessments to identify centers needing improvement and to establish improvement plans that are followed up over the course of the year. For example, Bill Van Huis from La Petite Academy indicated that...*“when we identify a center with quality deficiencies, we use the results to tailor a plan for bringing the center back up to expected levels of quality.”* This was a common assertion.

One organization indicated that program assessments are used to recognize exceptional results. Sharon Bergen from Knowledge Learning Corporation headquartered in Oregon reports: *“District managers use quality assessment in goal setting with center directors as part of a constant cycle of assessment and quality improvement.”* She also reports they *“use assessment to recognize strong performance – where centers with consistently high quality scores are recognized and rewarded.”*

On the other hand, no organizations reported using assessments in a punitive fashion. Centers found to be falling below organizational standards are typically provided support in improving, rather than punishment for their failure.

In addition, organizations reported using results of program assessments to refine staff development initiatives. When program assessments identify areas of weakness, the typical response is to adjust staff development plans to shore these areas up. For example, Judy Witmer, Hildebrandt Learning Centers, reported that from program quality assessments...*"findings are used to focus the annual corporate Professional Development Conference, at the monthly directors meetings, and to develop individual learning plans."*

Centers also report results of program assessments to parents and in some cases to employer sponsors. The purpose of these reports is to both convey the quality of services children are receiving, but also to demonstrate to parents and employers that the organization cares enough about the quality it delivers to systematically monitor it.

Section 2 – How organizations are assessing children’s learning

Tools

Organizations all engage in active assessment of children’s learning. Programs used mandated child assessments when attached to funding sources such as the National Reporting System (NRS), some quality initiatives, or state pre-K funds. In addition to these mandated assessments, programs reported developing their own child assessments using research-based and/or curriculum-linked assessment tools. Established assessment tools like High/Scope Child Observation Record and Creative Curriculum Checklist were used in part or in whole in 56% of the programs to identify measurable learning objectives for children. Several programs reported using the ECERS or ITERS classroom rating scale as an indicator for children’s learning in addition to their use in measuring program quality even though they measure environments rather than individual child progress and learning. Most programs use child portfolios linked with parent conferencing where portfolios represent a sampling of significant work by children indicating their progress and these samples and their meaning are shared with parents.

Head Start programs use the National Reporting System (NRS) and rely on other national screening tools such as the Early Screening Inventory Revised (ESI-R) to meet performance standards. In addition, they reported using additional research based curricula such as High/Scope and Creative Curriculum in developing their own assessment tools to guide classroom practice and to measure children’s learning progress. Anne Quinn, from Puget Sound Educational Services District, a provider of Head Start in two of the highest populated counties in Washington, reports having developed a developmental checklist relying heavily on several resources including Creative Curriculum and tailoring their child assessment tool to meet the needs of their very ethnically and culturally diverse service area. The outcomes have been tracked over five years creating program norms over time.

Non-Head Start programs reported using High/Scope, Creative Curriculum or other research based curricula and curricula based assessment tools in part or in whole for developing their own tools and observational approach to child assessment. These tools

often included State Pre-K standards, standards from Local and State Quality Initiatives where they existed, state early learning standards when states had them, and School Readiness indicators when they were available. Many programs reported using classroom rating criteria from NAEYC Accreditation, ECERS and ITERS, and reference to Developmentally Appropriate Practice in developing an overall measure to identify that learning was taking place in the classroom because of the high classroom rating. In addition, some programs reported using nationally recognized screening tools for assessing children with possible disabilities, special needs, or challenging behavior. Use of research-based curricula and standards was a key component reported for all programs interviewed in their choosing learning goals and measurement criteria when developing their own tools for measuring children's learning.

The regional context and market in which the programs operate influences the kinds of child assessments conducted. Programs in Pennsylvania and Kentucky for example, participating in quality "STARS" programs, shaped their assessments to fulfill the expectations of the "STARS" programs. Programs participating in other state-funded efforts such as Universal Pre-K in California, Success by Six in Pennsylvania, or using Texas Pre-K guidelines, for example, were influenced by the standards imposed by these state funding streams.

One program in Texas, Children's Choice Learning Centers, was involved in a local school readiness initiative in which children's progress toward benchmarks for school readiness developed by the school district were measured and reported to parents every 6 weeks. These progress reports became part of the child's portfolio and were shared with the school district upon transition of the child to the public school. One provider was asked to develop a school readiness assessment and to report children's progress to the corporate sponsor.

It should be noted that before we started the interviews, we expected organizations to report doing assessments in response to parents demanding evidence of the success of their children (the "will my child be ready for Harvard" mentality). In fact only a few organizations reported such demands being made at with great frequency.

Jim Greenman, Senior Vice President, Bright Horizons Family Solutions, for example, observed: "*Parents tend not to be as concerned over their children's readiness with the exception of geographic areas where competition is heavy for entry into private schools.*" Bright Horizons Family Solutions reports having developed regional responses to unique school readiness environments with more strategically offered age appropriate pre-academic experiences.

On the other hand, most organizations responded to a general awareness of parents' increased concerns for quality of care. Those interviewed noted that compared to parent involvement in the past, today's consumers of early childhood services are more aware of the need for a center to provide quality care and education services for their children. The great attention in the press to brain research findings on the importance of the early years has clearly influenced parents' expectations. These heightened expectations are

demonstrated in the questions parents ask at intake and in their high levels of interest in what their children are doing every day. Parents today may not be more savvy than in the past about assessing center quality, but they are more cognizant that the level of quality matters.

All programs but one organized their assessment around cognitive, emotional, physical, and social development. In addition all but two programs included health assessments. 75% included assessments related to approaches to learning. One program reported organizing their child assessments around Language, Literacy and Math.

Timing

The frequency of assessment varied by program. Nine of the programs reported conducting child learning assessments two (3 programs) or three (6 programs) times a year. Two programs identified child assessment as an ongoing process and two other programs identified assessment frequency linked to findings with more frequent assessment when programs warranted closer monitoring. One program conducted a quarterly assessment linked with the use of Creative Curriculum. One program in Texas issued a Pre-K academic progress report to parents every six weeks. In addition, there were ongoing monitoring efforts in most programs where an outside early childhood expert often from the corporate regional office or headquarters depending on the size of the organization, worked with classroom teachers on curriculum development and assessment on a quarterly or monthly basis.

Applications

Results from assessing children's learning are used in a variety of ways depending on agency organizational structure, size and the measured results. Almost universally, programs report the assessment of children's learning informing practice through goal setting for children and/or classrooms, professional development for staff, and parent communication.

Typically, results of child assessments are used to identify centers and classrooms where child results are especially low. When centers or classrooms with poor results are identified, management typically works with the center staff to develop plans for improvement. It should be noted that no organization reported using child assessments to identify low performing teachers individually.

In addition, organizations typically use results of child assessments to inform parents. Center directors and teachers share the results of child assessments with parents either informally or in formal parent conferences. Or, centers report generalized results for the entire center in center communication vehicles.

In some areas, results are shared in the transition of children to the public school. Judy Witmer, Hildebrandt Learning Centers, reports they follow up with parents to see how

the transition to school is going and send all of the monthly summaries to school with the child.

Section 3: What organizations have learned from doing program and child assessments

Assessment information has improved the dialogue between teachers and parents.

We have found that one of the most important benefits of our assessment format is the dialogue and interchange that occurs between the parents and the teachers. It gives both parties an opportunity to sit down together and focus on that particular child's successes and areas for growth. Nancy Jacobson, Director of Training and Staff Development, New Horizon Child Care, Inc. and Kinderberry Hill Child Development Centers.

Assessment has helped programs set program goals and children's learning objectives with more confidence and clarity because they are based in research.

We have found assessment valuable in setting program standards at the beginning and to use these standards to set expectations, training and ongoing evaluations. Assessment has made teachers more deliberate in their teaching, reminds teachers of what is important for child growth and development and has helped keep the focus on educational objectives not activities to fill the day. Sharon Bergen, Senior Vice President of Education and Training, Knowledge Learning Corporation.

Teacher qualifications can influence consistency and has led to clearer communication

We have found that how teachers interpret the questions and instructions used in assessment and then use the results to plan curriculum may vary based on teacher qualifications. This has led us to focus on clearer communication to insure more consistency. Rebecca Hogland, Education Coordinator, Rainbow Child Development Center

For tools to be useful the staff using them must be well trained and reliable on the instruments. Alison Pepper, Coordinator, Quality New York

There is an increased focus on literacy

We have expanded our literacy focus developing "Classic Curriculum" which is a proprietary literacy based curriculum which uses corporate level identified books and associated curriculum webbing for all programs. Joyce Anderson, VP Education and Training, children's Choice Learning Centers

We have increased our focus on writing and the written word to prepare children entering schools that are forcing curriculum down to earlier levels.
Jim Greenman, Senior Vice President, Bright Horizons Family Solutions

Increased numbers of English Language Learners has shifted overall scores.

We have found that over the past five years of outcome assessment, scores have shifted with increasing numbers of English Language Learners. Anne Quinn,
Program Director, Puget Sound Educational Service District

Using the findings of assessment must be done with care.

It is important to be very sensitive when presenting the findings to programs in order to get their buy-in to improving rather than feeling overwhelmed or failed.
Alison Pepper, Coordinator, Quality New York

When programs were asked if they had changed practice based on their perceptions that parents wanting more objective data on how their children stack up with others in terms of readiness, programs reported that parents were confident that the program was adequately preparing their children. This may be linked to the increase in more progress rich communication with parents resulting from sharing portfolios and results of assessment. There were some regional differences reported earlier, where pressure from schools or pressure for children to qualify for private schools led to some program modification.

Section 4: How programs react to existing accountability efforts.

Organizations reported being subject to numerous accountability systems. Organizations operating in a single state or community may be required to respond to as many as four assessment systems. For example, an agency may operate Head Start centers and be subject to Head Start requirements, it could be in a state with a tiered reimbursement system and its assessment system, it may operate centers for employers and be answerable to annual contract reviews, and it may participate in a state pre-k system with its standards. For organizations operating in more than one state, the potential for accountability multiplies dramatically.

Surprisingly, organizations did not express objections to individual assessment systems. They reported that, in fact, most systems offered useful models of benchmarks for measuring program quality.

However, in some cases those interviewed expressed concerns with the programmatic and cultural relevance of some of the assessment systems. For example, Judy Witmer, Hildebrandt Learning Centers, notes existing accountability efforts... *“can be challenging when persons set standards with limited or no overall view of the field.”*

This caution is mirrored by Jim Greenman, Bright Horizons Family Solutions, who states existing accountability efforts are “*somewhat helpful in establishing a baseline for programs,*” but notes that; “*some standards are not very realistically based in terms of practice. Standards can be challenging when discipline experts [from the health arena, for example] make them in isolation and do not include input from practitioners from the field taking into consideration program budgets and talent pools.*”

In addition, many interviewed expressed concerns with the cultural relevance of assessment systems. For example, Doug Baid, Associated Early Care and Education in Boston, reported that the Head Start NRS tool ...”is seriously flawed from a cultural perspective. Many of the questions asked to children make no sense to children in low income communities.”

The biggest concern raised about cultural relevance had to do with language limitations. For example, Sharon Bergen, Knowledge Learning Corporation, pointed out a state pre-k evaluation tool absolutely could not be applied in centers serving primarily Spanish-speaking populations. She concluded that there is a need to allow for flexibility based on auspices, region, and program identity. She concludes, “*the greatest challenge is when policy makers want one tool to measure all children in all settings. This often is the case with Universal Pre-K initiatives where participants are measured by one tool. We have found that there is no one tool out there that effectively measures all children of all cultural backgrounds, with all the various parent expectations and with all types of programs with varying goals. We have concluded that you need a toolkit – not one tool.*”

However, the main concern expressed by contributors to this report is that having many layers, often each with its own tools for measuring identical or similar program characteristics or child outcomes, leads at best to duplication and inefficiency for the provider and at worst a sense of confusion and overload. This duplication may also dilute the use of the results to improve the program and instruction and lead providers into a “box checking” modality rather than a more in-depth analysis and use of the information gained.

Gay Macdonald, from UCLA Early Care and Education, reports that existing accountability efforts are “*very time consuming and require effort and intentionality to make the experience work for the program overall and not just be a pro forma experience.*” Alison Pepper, Coordinator of Quality New York, an Accreditation collaborative working with child care providers in New York noted that; “*programs often have three or more outside entities monitoring their activity such as Universal Pre-K, Health for Licensing, Administration for Children’s Services, and Head Start. This can be very confusing to many providers.*”

Conclusion

Those of us who have worked in the early childhood arena for over a quarter of a century recall the major push made by advocates and their political allies in the 1970's to enact Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements. Our goal was to institutionalize program standards that could be used as quality benchmarks to guide and assess early childhood programs receiving federal funds. Alas, this effort failed and advocates moved on to other causes.

Recently the ground has shifted and programs now must be responsive to a wide range of national, state, and local standards and related assessment interventions. Early childhood providers view these accountability systems with mixed feelings. Although for the most part they find these programs to offer useful quality benchmarks for their centers, they express reservations about the cultural and programmatic relevance of some systems, and they find having to respond to multiple layers of assessments confusing and overwhelming.

In recent years as well, voluntary center accreditation systems have gained tremendous traction. While the majority of centers in the nation still reside outside of these systems, there is increasing recognition among providers and funders (and to a lesser extent parents), that being accredited is a "good housekeeping seal of approval." And, because of its dominant position among the accreditation systems, NAEYC center accreditation has become what the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements were intended to be.

Most significantly, early childhood providers today see assessment as a necessary and valuable business practice. All the organizations surveyed for this report commit considerable resources to conducting in-house assessments (over and above any funder requirements). These assessments are used to develop site-specific and organization-wide program improvement strategies, to refine curriculum goals, to fine tune staff development initiatives, and to communicate to parents about results being achieved.

This was not the case ten years ago certainly. Many organizations conducted ongoing staff appraisals, conducted parent surveys, and engaged in child observations tied to parent conferences. But few were as deeply committed to assessment as organizations are today. Bill van Huis from La Petite Academy, for example, observed, "Today it's a whole new ball game. Organizations need to be highly quality-focused to survive in this competitive environment. In the past evaluation was a secondary concern, something you did if you had the time. Today it's a necessity."

What has caused this shift in priorities? From our interviews a few clues emerged...

- The high level of attention to brain research findings which underscore the importance of the early years has raised public awareness of and respect for early childhood programs. Parents now see high educational value in placing their children in early childhood programs. As a result, they have high expectations for

these programs

- During the mid-1990's, the supply of child care started to outstrip demand in many parts of the country. Then recently, the advent of state funded pre-K programs in growing numbers of states increased the competition in many communities for three- and four-year old children. Thus child care has become increasingly competitive. Organizations, both non profit and for profit, which in the past gauged their success in terms of growth, now are focusing their energy on enrollment levels. To gain a competitive edge in building enrollments in a tight market, organizations must demonstrate their commitment to quality by engaging in and sharing the results of assessments.
- Finally, there simply are many more field-tested assessment tools available for organizations to use than there were ten years ago. In addition, technology has made it possible to record and analyze data and to disseminate findings to key players more easily than ever before.

All these trends point to the incredible opportunity now confronting the Early Childhood Accountability Project. Never before has there been such widespread support for assessing the quality of early childhood programs. Early childhood professionals, parents, public officials, and politicians are enthusiastic about the value of assessing quality.

From our small part in this project, we would humbly offer these recommendations based on what we have found ...

- **Less is more.** Rather than striving to create another layer of assessment, the greatest contribution that could be made would be to find a way to help the various funding bodies to work better together to improve conditions for children. Devise methods for standards imposed and assessed by funders to mesh well together. While this august panel may not be able to convince major federal and state players to change their standards, they may, for example, be able to propose strategies for providers to deal with overlapping and conflicting standards. Or, it may be possible to raise all the players awareness of the dangers of overlapping accountability by convening them to help with solutions.
- **Back to the basics.** Given the plethora of tools and their many variations it is important to consider developing a commonly recognized and culturally appropriate set of standards for what three and four year old children should know and be able to do along a continuum of their unique growth, development and education.
- **One size does not fit all.** One important objective the project could accomplish would be to highlight the necessity for making assessment culturally sensitive. Encourage the development of parallel systems in multiple languages. Ours is the

most diverse nation in the world – we should be able to take that into account in developing our assessment tools.

- **Let a thousand flowers bloom.** There is a tremendous amount of creativity and ingenuity being displayed by organizations around the country in the area of assessment. While this energy results in diverse approaches, it nonetheless reflects a common commitment to enhancing quality, provides an organizing force for program development, and enlivens communication between teachers and parents. Whatever you do, support the continued potential of this creative force.

Program	Contact	Location	Organization Type	# of Sites	# of 3-5 Year-Old Children
New Horizon CC & Kinderberry Hill CDC	Nancy Jacobson, Director of Training & Staff Development	Plymouth, MN	For Profit National Multi-Site	63	2,000
Knowledge Learning Corp.	Sharon Bergen, Senior VP of Education & Training	Portland, OR	For Profit National Multi-Site	2,000	267,000
Children's Creative Learning Centers	Deepa MacPherson, VP HR	Sunnyvale, CA	For Profit National Multi-Site	13	800
Rainbow CDC	Rebecca Hogland, Ed. Coordinator	Lathrup Village, MI	For Profit National Multi-Site	40	1,500
UCLA Early Care & Education	Gay Macdonald, Executive Director	Los Angeles, CA	Campus Child Care	3	150
Southern Oregon Child & Family Council	Alan Berlin, Executive Director	Central Point, OR	Non-Profit Multi-Site Head Start agency	18	803
Hildebrandt Learning Centers	Judy Witmer, COO & Program & Curriculum Coordinator	Wilke-Barre, PA	For Profit Multi-Site Corporation	30	2,200
The Children's Courtyard	Kris Curtis, Director of Education	Arlington, TX	For Profit Regional Multi-Site	50	8,000
Bright Horizons Family Solutions	Jim Greenman, Senior VP	Watertown, MA	For Profit International Multi-Site	600	35,000
Children's Choice Learning Centers	Joyce Anderson, VP Education & Training	Plano TX	For Profit National Multi-Site Corporation	11	3,000
PSESD	Anne Quinn, Child Development & Outreach Services Director	Renton, WA	Multi-Site Head Start in Educational Services School District	54	1,703
La Petite Academy	Bill Van Huis, Vice President	Chicago, IL	For Profit National Multi-Site	655	70,000
Quality New York	Alison Pepper, Coordinator	New York, NY	Accreditation Collaboration (Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, Child Care Inc. and Bankstreet College)	150	12,000

Associated Early Care and Education	Doug Baird, President & CEO	Boston, MA	Non Profit Multi-Site community system	106	940
The Sheltering Arms DBA Early Education & Family Centers	Diane Bellem, Vice President for Family Development	Atlanta, GA	Non-Profit Multi-Site	17	1,606
The Sunshine House, Inc.	Mickie Jennings, Director of Educational Services	Greenwood, SC	For Profit National Multi-Site Corporation	150	5,336