



**Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge  
Annual Performance Report**

**CFDA Number: 84.412**

*Minnesota  
2012*

*Due: February 15, 2013*



Performance Report: Cover Sheet

General Information

- 1. PR/Award #: S412A120019
2. Grantee Name (Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.): Office of the Governor, State of Minnesota
3. Grantee Address: 130 State Capitol, 75 Rev Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. St. Paul, MN 55155
4. Project Director Name: Karen Cadigan Title: Director of the Office of Early Learning
Ph #: (651) 582 - 8397 Ext: ( ) Fax #: (651) 797 - 1610
Email Address: Karen.Cadigan@state.mn.us

Reporting Period Information

- 5. Reporting Period: From: 01/01/2012 To: 12/31/2012 (mm/dd/yyyy)

Indirect Cost Information

- 6. Indirect Costs
a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? [X] Yes [ ] No
b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s) approved by the Federal Government? [X] Yes [ ] No
c. If yes, provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s):

From: 07/01/2011 To: 12/31/2012 (mm/dd/yyyy) for MDE

From: 07/01/2012 To: 06/30/2013 (mm/dd/yyyy) for MDH

Approving Federal agency: [X] ED [X] HHS [X] Other (Please specify): Federal Cost Allocation

(Attach current indirect cost rate agreement to this report.)

Certification

- 7. The Grantee certifies that the state is currently participating in:

The Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program (see section 511 of Title V of the Social Security Act, as added by section 2951 of the Affordable Care Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-148));

[X] Yes

[ ] No

Programs authorized under section 619 of part B and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA);

[X] Yes

[ ] No



## Executive Summary

Please provide a brief summary of accomplishments, challenges, and lessons learned across the reform areas.

*As the first year of the RTT-ELC grant came to a close, Minnesota had started to see rapid progress in moving forward on almost all grant activities outlined in the State's Plan and Statement of Work. As with most RTT-ELC states, Minnesota found the first six months of the grant to be filled with more administrative activities than originally anticipated in the State's application. Although these activities delayed the start of multiple projects, they also helped to create a strong basis for the grant work and ensure the success of the work over the entire grant period. Now that Minnesota has a fully staffed RTT-ELC team and has further refined its processes for accomplishing the work, the State is gaining strong momentum on the work at hand and foresees meeting future performance measures in all components of the grant.*

*Despite a slower than expected start, Minnesota is pleased with results in the first year of the grant. In year one Minnesota has made Accelerated Pathways to Ratings through the TQIRS, Parent Aware, available statewide to all eligible Early Learning and Development Programs; completed its first round of Parent Aware full ratings for child care programs; made Early Learning Scholarships available in all four Transformation Zones, and provided Title I PreK Incentive grants in three of the four Transformation Zones. Additionally, supports for Early Childhood Educators, including low cost training and professional development advising for child care providers is beginning to flow out across the state. The Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System's Charter was finalized and endorsed by the Early Learning Council and the Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System's workgroup had their first meeting. The Interagency Developmental Screening Taskforce expanded its purpose to include Online Screening and a Child Care Health Consultant was hired and received certification as a Child Care Health Consultant. All of these accomplishments put Minnesota in a good place to continue to achieve the ambitious goals outlined in its State Plan.*

*Moreover, Minnesota began to see the positive impact of the RTT-ELC grant even before the first funds began flowing out to the system. The news of the RTT-ELC award spread quickly throughout the state and was the catalyst for the early childhood community, stakeholders and partners to begin to mobilize and create coalitions to coordinate efforts in preparation of these new initiatives. Beyond the funds Minnesota received with the RTT-ELC grant, Minnesota is seeing communities and programs collaborate in new and innovate ways in order to increase ELD program quality and access for children with high needs. The strong support throughout the state for RTT-ELC initiatives and early childhood in general has even contributed to budget proposals from the Governor and the state legislature that include substantial increases to the state's investment in early childhood.*

*A challenge the State continues to work on is developing a communication plan for both internal staff and partners and external programs, providers, partners and stakeholders. Over the last year, the RTT-ELC grant has created a lot of excitement throughout the state and given the state agencies more attention than is accustomed. The Office of Early Learning has learned that having a formal communication plan that identifies the who, what, why, and how for communicating the Office's work is vital to ensure success not only for the grant but for Minnesota's Early Childhood System. By being consistent and proactive in messaging and communicating, Minnesota can ensure coordination, alignment and buy-in of internal and external efforts to develop and support the system.*

## Successful State Systems

### Aligning and coordinating early learning and development across the State.

#### Governance Structure

Please provide any relevant information and updates related to the governance structure for the RTT-ELC State Plan (specifically, please include information on the organizational structure for managing the grant, and the governance-related roles and responsibilities of the Lead Agency, State Advisory Council, and Participating State Agencies).

*As described in Minnesota's application there are three key governance structures: the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care (Early Learning Council), the Children's Cabinet, and the Office of Early Learning (OEL). Each of these structures includes an explicit focus on children from birth to grade three (Early Learning Council and Office of Early Learning) and beyond (Children's Cabinet focus includes birth to workforce entry). Each of these structures was implemented under the direction of Governor Mark Dayton, who has demonstrated a strong commitment to early learning and development since before he took office, and who has institutionalized that commitment by issuing "Better Schools for a Better Minnesota: 7 Point Plan for Achieving Excellence"*

*The Minnesota Children's Cabinet is designated as the cross-agency leadership team for programs serving children and youth, and includes the Commissioners of Education, Health, and Human Services. This Cabinet, led by the Education Commissioner, meets regularly to coordinate goals, make strategic decisions, and direct state services, programs, and funds in an efficient manner for children of all ages, building strong connections between systems and programs that focus on children birth to eight and the K-12 system.*

*The Early Learning Council and the Children's Cabinet are important points of stakeholder input and cabinet level decision making, but the day to day coordination and alignment of Minnesota's early childhood system falls under the Minnesota Office of Early Learning (OEL).*

*The Governor has designated the Department of Education as the lead agency for coordination of the State Plan, through the OEL. Commissioners from the three state agencies comprising the Children's Cabinet have each signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), delineating roles and responsibilities under the State Plan.*

*The Office of Early Learning Leadership Team (Leadership Team) includes the Director of the OEL, who oversees programs currently housed in the Department of Education; the Deputy Commissioner from the Department of Health; and the Assistant Commissioner for Children and Family Services from the Department of Human Services. The Leadership Team collectively has responsibility for making recommendations to the Children's Cabinet regarding policy, budgeting, and rule making across the scope of programs currently housed in all three agencies to reduce fragmentation and improve services for young children and their families.*

*Additionally, the State Plan is monitored and coordinated on a daily basis by the RTT-ELC project manager. The project manager is guided by the RTT-ELC Leadership Implementation Team which includes decision making leaders from each of the three agencies and meets on a monthly basis to review progress on the State Plan, ensure coordination across agencies and projects, assess potential risks, and provide direction on the overall State Plan.*

## **Stakeholder Involvement**

Describe State progress in involving representatives from Participating Programs, Early Childhood Educators or their representatives, parents and families, including parents and families of Children with High Needs, and other key stakeholders in the implementation of the activities carried out under the grant.

*The implementation of Minnesota's State Plan has been developed in a manner that incorporates multiple feedback loops from participating programs, early childhood educators and other key stakeholders in the implementation of activities under the grant. For example, Parent Aware is guided by a governance structure that includes an advisory group that is made up of representatives from participating programs, the early childhood educator workforce, nonprofit partners, the Early Learning Council and leaders from each of the four Transformation Zones. Additionally, the Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment workgroup includes representatives from early childhood, K-12 and English learners. The Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System's governing body will also include stakeholders from organizations that primarily collect data that will be included in the system.*

*Moreover, each Transformation Zone has a leadership body that helps to determine policy decisions for initiatives affecting the Transformation Zone and which has been actively engaged with implementation decisions regarding many RTT-ELC activities. Minnesota has been holding quarterly meeting with the Transformation Zones to communicate progress on grant activities, receive feedback on implementation, and work collaboratively to resolve challenges across Transformation Zones or within in a specific Transformation Zone.*

*Stakeholders are also involved with supporting and carrying out some of the activities included in the Statement of Work. The nonprofit organization Parent Aware for School Readiness (PASR) is involved in the communication and promotion of Parent Aware and is funding a portion of the Parent Aware Evaluation in conjunction with the Greater Twin Cities United Way and a portion of RTT-ELC funds. Both PASR and the Greater Twin Cities United Way have been partners with the state agencies in the implementation of these activities.*

*Minnesota has also been coordinating and seeking feedback from external stakeholders in rural communities including the Minnesota Initiative Foundation leaders which have been included in conversations regarding continuous improvements on a variety of efforts including Parent Aware, Early Learning Scholarships, Title I PreK Incentives, Great Workforce Initiatives, and the Comprehensive Assessment System.*

*The Greater Twin Cities United Way and the McKnight Foundation have also sponsored efforts to promote coordination and collaboration with other similar initiatives occurring in the state of Minnesota including the Promise Neighborhood and I3 grants, the STRIVE Initiative, and the Accreditation Facilitation Project. They are also developing a Learn Together website for stakeholders to learn more about and follow the progress of each of these grants over the grant period.*

### **Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders**

Describe any changes or proposed changes to state legislation, budgets, policies, executive orders and the like that may have/had an impact on the RTT-ELC State Plan.

*The Governor recently proposed budget and policy changes that include the addition of Parent Aware ratings to Minnesota's tiered reimbursement policies. The new policy, if passed, would result in a Child Care Assistance Program rate differential of 15% for 3-star and 20% for 4-star rated programs. The legislature normally adjourns in late May, therefore the outcome of this proposal may not be known until June, 2013. Additionally, the Governor's budget includes an annual increase to State funded Early Learning Scholarships from \$3 million to \$25 million. If passed, this will increase the number of State funded Early Learning Scholarships from 690 to 5,000 a year. Both of these legislative proposals will bolster the effort of the State Plan by aligning current and dedicating new funds to the shared goals of the grant.*

*Additionally, the Department of Education adopted a two year exception for State funded Early Learning Scholarships to allow scholarships to be used in any early learning and development program participating in Parent Aware. The State's original policy was for scholarships to only be used in 3- or 4-star rated programs, but a temporary exception was granted in order to promote program participation in Parent Aware and support programs' initial steps toward improving quality. Each of the Transformation Zones was permitted to incorporate this exemption into their locally defined Early Learning Scholarship program. Of the four Transformation Zones, the White Earth Tribal Nation and Itasca County chose to include this exemption in their local scholarship program. The Northside Achievement Zone in Minneapolis and the St. Paul Promise Neighborhood designed their scholarship program with the requirement that scholarships may only be used in 3- or 4-star rated programs.*

### **Participating State Agencies**

Describe any changes in participation and commitment by any of the Participating State Agencies in the State Plan.

N/A

### **High-Quality, Accountable Programs**

#### **Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS).**

During this 1<sup>st</sup> year of RTT-ELC implementation, has the State made progress in developing a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards that include--

- (1) Early Learning and Development Standards

No

Yes

If yes, these standards currently apply to (please check all that apply):

- State-funded preschool programs
- Early Head Start and Head Start programs
- Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:
  - Center-based
  - Family Child Care

(2) A Comprehensive Assessment System

No

Yes

If yes, these standards currently apply to (please check all that apply):

- State-funded preschool programs
- Early Head Start and Head Start programs
- Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:
  - Center-based
  - Family Child Care

(3) Early Childhood Educator qualifications

No

Yes

If yes, these standards currently apply to (please check all that apply):

- State-funded preschool programs
- Early Head Start and Head Start programs
- Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:
  - Center-based
  - Family Child Care

(4) Family engagement strategies

No

Yes

If yes, these standards currently apply to (please check all that apply):

- State-funded preschool programs
- Early Head Start and Head Start programs
- Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:
  - Center-based
  - Family Child Care

(5) Health promotion practices

No

Yes

If yes, these standards currently apply to (please check all that apply):

- State-funded preschool programs
- Early Head Start and Head Start programs
- Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:
  - Center-based
  - Family Child Care

(6) Effective data practices

No

Yes

If yes, these standards currently apply to (please check all that apply):

- State-funded preschool programs
- Early Head Start and Head Start programs
- Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:
  - Center-based
  - Family Child Care

Describe progress made in developing a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards.

*Minnesota's TQRIS, based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards, was already developed at the time the RTT-ELC application was written and submitted. Therefore, no development occurred during this reporting period.*

Is the state in the process of **revising** tiered Program Standards in any of the following categories? (If yes, please check all that apply):

- Early Learning and Development Standards
- A Comprehensive Assessment System
- Early Childhood Educator qualifications
- Family engagement strategies
- Health promotion practices
- Effective data practices

For those Program Standards that have not been revised during this 1<sup>st</sup> year of implementation, is there a **plan to revise** the tiered Program Standards in the upcoming year (if yes, please check all that apply):

- X Early Learning and Development Standards
- X A Comprehensive Assessment System
- X Early Childhood Educator qualifications
- X Family engagement strategies
- X Health promotion practices
- X Effective data practices

The State has made progress in ensuring that (please check all that apply):

- TQRIS Program Standards are measurable
- TQRIS Program Standards meaningfully differentiate program quality levels
- TQRIS Program Standards reflect high expectations of program excellence commensurate with nationally recognized standards that lead to improved learning outcomes for children
- The TQRIS is linked to the State licensing system for Early Learning and Development Programs.

Please describe progress made in **revising** TQRIS Program Standards.

*No progress has been made in revising Minnesota's TQRIS Program Standards because the revision process did not begin during this reporting period. See next question for Minnesota's plan to revise the TQRIS Program Standards, below.*

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

*Minnesota's grant application describes a plan to conduct two rounds of revision processes for Minnesota's TQRIS Program Standards. These processes will occur during calendar years 2013*

and 2015. During those processes, revisions to TQRIS Program Standards in any or all of the categories listed above may be considered. The revision process conducted in 2013 will consider refinements to the existing TQRIS Program Standards, based on a thorough review of the research basis for the Minnesota TQRIS Program Standards, a public input process, and the Year 1 Parent Aware Implementation Report released by Child Trends in February 2013. The indicator revision process that will be conducted in 2015 will consider more substantial changes to the TQRIS Program Standards based on a research review, a broader public input process, and the full Parent Aware evaluation results.

**Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)**

In the table, provide data on the numbers and percentages of Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in the State’s TQRIS by type of Early Learning and Development Program. Targets must be consistent with those in the State’s application unless a change has been approved.

**Table (B)(2)c: Increasing the number and percentage of ELD Programs participating in the statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System**

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Number of programs in the state	Number and percentage of ELD programs in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System									
		Baseline		2012 (Target)		2013 (Target)		2014 (Target)		2015 (Target)	
		Actual		Actual		Actual		Actual		Actual	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool <i>Specify: school-based preschool programs funded by Minnesota's School Readiness Program</i>	509	53	10%	(158)	(31%)	(193)	(38%)	(255)	(50%)	(330)	(65%)
Early Head Start and Head Start	286*	23	10%	(123*)	(43%)	(169*)	(59%)	(212*)	(74%)	(226*)	(79%)
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C*	118*	0*	0*	(0*)	(0%*)	(0*)	(0%*)	(68*)	(58%)	(100*)	(85%)
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619*	306*	0*	0*	(0*)	(0%*)	(0*)	(0%*)	(144*)	(47%)	(174*)	(57%)
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	40*	23	58%	(34*)	(62%*)	(46*)	(66%*)	(62*)	(70%*)	(81*)	(74%*)

Licensed Programs receiving CCDF funds	3462*	203*	5%*	(277*) 112	(8%) 3%	(685*)	(16%)	(866*)	(25%)	(1212*)	(35%)
Other <i>Describe:</i> licensed centers and licensed family child care programs not receiving CCDF funds.	9422*	110*	0.1%	(57*) 59	(0.6%) <0.1%	(565*)	(6%)	(1225*)	(13%)	(1884*)	(20%)

\* Indicates that the number provided is not the same as was in the original application, and that Minnesota is proposing a change. The rationales for all proposed changes are described below.

In the original application, "Program" was defined as the building site where direct services are delivered. We are proposing to make a change such that for programs funded by IDEA, Part B and Part C, "program" is defined as the district which organizes and administers services for children with special needs. For all other program types (school-based preschool, Early Head Start and Head Start, programs funded under Title I, licensed programs receiving CCDF funds, and licensed child care programs not receiving CCDF funds), "Program" will continue to be defined as the building site where direct services are delivered.

**For state-funded preschool**, the total number of programs in the state was estimated based on the total number of districts offering Minnesota's School Readiness program, and an estimated average number of sites across districts. The baseline number is the number of School Readiness-funded school-based PreK sites rated at the end of the Parent Aware pilot (June 30th, 2011) according to the Parent Aware Rating Tool Database. The 2012 numbers are the number of School Readiness-funded school-based PreK sites rated as of December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2012, as verified by both the Parent Aware Rating Tool Database and the records at the Department of Education. Minnesota is aware that there are additional state-funded school-based PreK programs operating without School Readiness funding. We are not yet able to capture that number of sites but hope to do so in the future.

**For Early Head Start and Head Start**, the original total number of programs was based on the results of a survey of Head Start programs conducted by the CCR&R system in 2010. Because better information is now available at the Department of Education, Minnesota is proposing a change to the total number of programs. Using SFY2013 Minnesota State Head Start Program Plans, we now can more accurately state that there are 286 Head Start/Early Head Start sites in the state. (This does not include home-based Head Start since home-based Head Start is not eligible for participation in Parent Aware.) The baseline number is the number of Head Start and Early Head Start sites rated at the end of the Parent Aware pilot (June 30th, 2011) according to the Parent Aware Rating Tool Database. The 2012 numbers are based on the number of Head Start/Early Head Start sites rated as of December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2012, as verified by both the Parent Aware Rating Tool Database and the records at the Department of Education. Because we are proposing changing the total number from 232 to 286, the target numbers for future years will also need to be raised to maintain the target percentages.

**For programs funded by IDEA Parts B and C**, the original definition of programs funded by IDEA Parts B and C was any program that serves at least one child with an IEP or IFSP. Using this definition, the original total number of programs funded by IDEA Part B was estimated based on the following assumptions: (a) all Head Start programs have at least one child with an IEP or IFSP, (b) 80% of school-based and Title I preschool programs enroll at least one child with an IEP or IFSP, (c) approximately 10% of child care programs enroll at least one child with an IEP or

IFSP. For programs funded by IDEA Part C, because so few children in IDEA Part C are served in settings other than home-based special education services, Minnesota estimated only a small number of child care programs (not Head Start or school-based programs) would serve these children. Any of these programs could be rated in the TQRIS but would be rated as a Head Start program, a school-based program, or a licensed child care program rather than being rated as an IDEA program.

Minnesota is proposing a revision to its definition of IDEA Parts B and C for purposes of implementing projects within the Race to the Top: Early Learning Challenge application. The proposed definition would define IDEA funded programs as those programs operated by the local education agencies identified as eligible to receive Part C or Part B funds and who sign statements of assurances that pertain to regulatory compliance and appropriate use of funds. Under this revised definition, other programs that may enroll a child with a disability are not considered IDEA funded programs for purposes of Race to the Top: Early Learning Challenge.

If this proposed definition change is implemented, then the total number of programs in the state can be pulled from administrative numbers from the Minnesota Department of Education for Part C and Preschool Special Education programs.

Using this revised definition, IDEA funded programs are not currently eligible to be rated under Minnesota's TQRIS. However, as part of the RTT grant, Minnesota intends to develop "new standards related to serving children with an IEP and IFSP" (See Activity 3.3 on p104 of Minnesota's RTT-ELC grant application). When such standards are developed, IDEA funded programs will be eligible to participate in the Parent Aware rating system. The revised targets assume a rating process will be developed and finalized during 2013. Ratings will begin in early 2014.

Changing the baseline number of programs means that the target numbers for future years have to be adjusted to maintain target percentages in 2014 and 2015.

**For programs funded under Title I of ESEA**, the original total number of program funded by Title I was estimated based on the number of children reported to be served by school districts in the SFY2010 federal Consolidated State Performance Plan. This methodology is not ideal because it relies on estimation and involves data from two different time frames (child data from SFY2010 and ratings data for December 31, 2011). Therefore, Minnesota is proposing an improved methodology for determining the total number of programs funded by Title I. Instead of using child data from 2010 to estimate the number of programs as of December 31, 2011, Minnesota is proposing to use the Department of Education's financial records to determine which school districts were using Title I funds for preschool in SFY2012 (for which December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2011 is the median date), and then cross-referencing that list of districts with the list of districts with rated PreK sites as of December 31, 2011. In other words, the revised baseline data reflects the number of ELD sites in school districts that reported using Title I funds for Preschool in SFY2012 and were also in the TQRIS as of December 30, 2011.

The 2012 data also uses the newly proposed methodology. It reflects the number of ELD sites in school districts that reported using Title I funds for Preschool in SFY2013 and were also in the TQRIS as of December 31, 2012.

Efforts are underway to increase the number of school districts using Title I funds for Preschool, so Minnesota expects to see an increase each year in the total number of Title I funded ELD programs/sites. Because this denominator is constantly growing, Minnesota is proposing using the current year's total number of Title I-funded ELD programs to calculate the percentage of Title I-funded programs that are in the TQRIS that year. This would mean that rather than use 40 as the denominator to determine the percent of programs that are rated each year, we would base each year's percentage on the actual total number of Title I programs operating in the state. For example in 2012, 14 new Title I programs began operating and 37 programs were rated. Thus, 37 out of 54 (69%) Title I-

funded programs were rated in the TQRIS. Because the number of Title I programs is increasing each year, a goal of 97% in 2015 is not reasonable. Based on the expectation that Title I programs will not be able to get rated the same year that the Title I is first implemented, Minnesota is proposing a new target of 74% for 2015. If the goal is met, Minnesota will have achieved a more than 350% increase in the number of rated Title I programs in the state (from 23 rated program in 2011 to 81 rated programs in 2015).

**For programs receiving CCDF funds,** the original total number of programs was based on the number of Minnesota and Tribal licensed programs issued a payment in February or March of 2011 for a child of any age, as pulled from MEC2 (the child care subsidy administration data system). This number included 13 licensed Head Start and Early Head Start programs paid during this time period. Minnesota has determined a more accurate methodology for restricting this number to only children not yet in Kindergarten and is proposing a change to the total number of programs. The proposed total number of eligible programs is the number of Minnesota and Tribal licensed programs issued a payment for care provided in a single month (October of each year) to a child who was not yet in Kindergarten. This methodology provides a clearer snapshot of participation in CCDF subsidies and aligns with federal ACF-801 reporting. Using this methodology, the total number of programs would be 3,462 instead of 4,391. Changing the baseline number of programs means that the target numbers for future years have to be adjusted to maintain target percentages.

The original baseline number of Parent Aware-rated programs receiving CCDF funds was an estimate based on data from a survey of all child care programs in the state, conducted by the CCR&R system in 2010. The survey asks providers to report whether they are currently caring for children receiving subsidy assistance through CCAP. The data from the survey was used by the Parent Aware evaluation to determine whether each Parent Aware-rated program had reported caring for children on CCAP. The 2010 evaluation report determined that 84% percent of Parent Aware-rated programs reported currently caring for children participating in the Child Care Assistance Program. This 84% estimate was then applied to the number of programs participating in Parent Aware in the autumn of 2011.

While this estimate may accurately reflect the number of rated programs that receive CCDF funds at some point during the year, Minnesota believes it inflates the number of rated programs that receive CCDF in any given month. Therefore, Minnesota is proposing a change in methodology for calculating the baseline number of programs receiving CCDF funds. The proposed methodology uses MEC2 (the child care subsidy administration data system) to determine the number of Minnesota and Tribal licensed programs issued a payment for care provided in a single month (October 2011) to a child who was under the age of 5 (as of September 1, 2011) that were also rated in Parent Aware as of December 31, 2011. This change, if accepted, would reduce the baseline figure from 329 rated programs to 203 rated programs.

This same methodology was used to determine the number of rated programs in 2012. The 2012 numbers include Minnesota and Tribal licensed programs issued a payment for care provided in a single month (October 2012) to a child who was under the age of 5 (as of September 1, 2012) that were also rated in Parent Aware as of December 31, 2012.

Changing the baseline number of programs means that the target numbers for future years would have to be adjusted to maintain target percentages.

**For Licensed centers and licensed family child care programs not receiving CCDF funds:** the total number of programs is the total number of licensed child care programs (not including Head Start programs), based on data collected by the CCR&R system in NACCRRAware, minus the number of licensed programs receiving CCDF funds. The original total number of programs was 8493, which was reached by subtracting 4391 (the original number of programs receiving CCDF funds) from the total number of licensed programs in the state (12884).

Because these numbers are inextricably linked, if the proposed change to the total number of programs receiving CCDF funds is accepted, then a change also needs to be made to the total number of programs not receiving CCDF funds.

In the RTT application, the baseline number of licensed child care programs not receiving CCDF funds was determined by subtracting the number of child care program receiving CCDF funds (including Head Start programs) from the total number of child care programs that were rated in the autumn of 2011. Minnesota is proposing changing this number to reflect the total number of licensed child care programs rated as of December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2011 (which was 313) minus the number of licensed child care programs receiving CCDF funds (which was 203). This change, if accepted, would increase the baseline figure from 9 programs to 110 programs.

Changing the baseline number of programs means that the target numbers for future years have to be adjusted to maintain target percentages.

Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the State's TQRIS System by the end of the grant period.

*Minnesota has and continues to implement a number of strategies to ensure that measureable progress is made in increasing the number and percentage of the Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the State's TQRIS System by the end of the grant period. In 2012, a coordination framework, involving key partners and stakeholders, was established to ensure effective implementation of Parent Aware through workgroups and teams. Each group has a defined purpose and strategies to which it contributes. Existing grant contracts with Child Care Resource & Referral agencies and other organizations contributing to Parent Aware implementation were modified to reflect the activities and deliverables described in Minnesota's Scope of Work. In addition, a TQRIS Specialist was hired in April, 2012 to oversee Parent Aware implementation. Existing state agency staff also continue to contribute significantly to implementation activities. These include:*

*Targeted Recruitment: In 2012, recruitment efforts were targeted primarily toward Early Learning and Development programs eligible for Minnesota's Accelerated Pathway to Rating, including accredited child care programs, Head Start programs and school-based PreK programs. School-based PreK and Head Start programs were sent an "optional" application with their annual program plans. These types of Early Learning and Development programs access information in variety of ways: through a special section for School Readiness and Head Start programs on the Parent Aware website, by webinar, via listserv updates, through site visits around the state and individual advising via phone and email. These efforts continue in 2013.*

*Additionally, organizations within Minnesota's Child Care Resource and Referral System were and remain under contract to recruit licensed child care providers for Parent Aware's full rating process. Contracts contain clear target numbers of providers on a local level, providing direction for participation levels in each six-month rating cohort. Licensed child care programs are recruited through a variety of methods that vary by what is effective on a local level. All licensed child care providers are invited to attend a Parent Aware Information Session and those interested in participating are invited to a Parent Aware Orientation Session. There are special*

*efforts to recruit programs who are serving Children with High Needs. This is identified, in part, through data on programs serving children who receive CCDF funds.*

*Quality Improvement Supports and Incentives: In Fall 2012, participating Parent Aware Early Learning and Development programs in select communities around Minnesota were able to enroll income eligible children for Early Learning Scholarships. All Early Learning and Development programs participating in the full rating process have access to a variety of quality improvement supports. Child care programs serving higher percentages of Children with High Needs have the option of participating in a year-long coaching relationship focused on a strengths-based approach to building quality in areas reflecting Parent Aware standards and indicators. Additionally, these programs can receive up to \$1,500 in quality improvement dollars. All child care programs receive technical assistance through the rating process which is six- months in duration. Rated programs are displayed on the Parent Aware website and offered a Parent Aware marketing kit for use at their facility (i.e. cubby hooks, lawn sign, and banner).*

*Marketing: Parent Aware is marketed to eligible Early Learning and Development programs and to parents through a variety of strategies that include a newly revamped website (parentawareratings.org), a social media campaign for parents, press releases (which have resulted in articles in local newspapers), language specific videos (Hmong, Somali, and Spanish), direct in-person outreach to programs, letters to all accredited child care programs, postcards to all eligible providers in the expansion areas featuring the benefits of Parent Aware and integration of Parent Aware messaging to Child Care Resource and Referral Staff. Our key messages have been tested via focus groups and surveys for effectiveness.*

*Systems Building: There are system building efforts underway to ensure that providers have the information they need to participate. For example, we are working with the Minnesota Department of Human Services Licensing Division and Tribal Child Care Licensors to ensure that licensors have the information they need to be ambassadors for Parent Aware when in contact with new and existing licensed child care programs. We are in the early stages of linking the Parent Aware data system to the child care licensing data system.*

*Public-Private Partnerships and Stakeholder Communication: We are engaged in a public-private partnership with Parent Aware for School Readiness and the Greater Twin Cities United Way. These organizations play unique roles in the marketing and recruitment of providers to participate in Parent Aware. Parent Aware for School Readiness contributes to marketing to providers and parents. For example, Parent Aware for School Readiness funded the revamping of the appearance and content of parent information on the Parent Aware website in 2012. The Greater Twin Cities United Way funds the Accreditation Facilitation Project, an initiative that supports child care programs to become accredited. Minnesota is working with the Accreditation Facilitation Project to fully align the program with Parent Aware so that programs will have the option of completing both programs simultaneously. More broadly, communication with many state and local stakeholders has been enhanced through email updates that will continue at regular intervals going forward along with a planned retreat of all implementation partners in February, 2013.*

**Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs.**

Has the State made progress in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS that (please check all that apply):

- X Includes information on valid and reliable tools for monitoring such programs
- X Has trained monitors whose ratings have an acceptable level of inter-rater reliability
- X Monitors and rates Early Learning and Development Programs with appropriate frequency
- X Provides quality rating and licensing information to parents with children enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs (*e.g.*, displaying quality rating information at the program site)
- X Makes program quality rating data, information, and licensing history (including any health and safety violations) publicly available in formats that are easy to understand and use for decision making by families selecting Early Learning and Development Programs and families whose children are enrolled in such programs.

Describe progress made in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS.

*In 2012, Minnesota has made solid progress in its RTT-ELC plan and Scope of Work for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development programs, including:*

- *The CLASS observation tool is used with licensed (non-accredited) child care centers programs that select a three or four star rating in the Parent Aware full rating process.*
- *CLASS observers maintain a process for inter-rater reliability.*
- *Parent Aware ratings issued in 2012 are valid for two years. All one-year ratings issued under the Parent Aware pilot have expired as of December 31, 2012.*
- *Quality Rating/program information and licensing information is publically available on the Parent Aware website and the Minnesota Department of Human Services Licensing Look up, respectively.*
- *The TQRIS Specialist, hired in April, 2012, oversees the work of rating staff as well as providing policy and administrative leadership for Parent Aware.*
- *A contract was awarded in November, 2012 to increase the number of rating staff, as needed, to accommodate the growth in program applications for Parent Aware ratings.*
- *A Parent Aware Data Project Manager was hired in April, 2012 to manage Parent Aware systems development work, including the contract described below.*
- *A Request for Proposals was issued in December, 2012, with a proposal submission deadline in February, 2013, to develop a comprehensive data and case management system for Minnesota's TQRIS and its Professional Development System. The selected vendor will provide for continued progress in supporting the professional development of Early Childhood Educators, collect program and classroom characteristics from program directors, generate program ratings, and provide case management functions for those who provide supports to Early Childhood Educators and programs.*

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs by the end of the grant period.

- *In our first Parent Aware cohort beginning in July 2012, we were not able to establish inter-rater reliability for Parent Aware ratings as our permanent staff had not been hired. As staff is hired, we have a plan in place for establishing and maintaining inter-rater reliability. This is included in the contract of the vendor selected to conduct the quality rating process.*
- *Plans are underway to make program quality rating data, information and licensing history accessible publically in an on-line format.*

**Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs.**

Has the state made progress in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in your State TQRIS through the following policies and practices? (If yes, please check all that apply.)

- Program and provider training
- Program and provider technical assistance
- Financial rewards or incentives
- Higher, tiered child care subsidy reimbursement rates
- Increased compensation

**Number of tiers/levels in the State TQRIS**   4  

**How many programs moved up at least one level within the TQRIS over the last fiscal year?**

- State-funded preschool programs   0
- Early Head Start   0
- Head Start programs   0
- Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA   0
- Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA   0
- Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:
  - Center-based   0
  - Family Child Care   0

**How many programs moved down at least one level within the TQRIS over the last fiscal year?**

- State-funded preschool programs   0
- Early Head Start   0
- Head Start programs   0
- Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA   0
- Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA   0
- Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:
  - Center-based   0
  - Family Child Care   0

Has the State made progress in developing high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS in the following areas? (If yes, check all that apply.)

- Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet State preschool standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, or there is a reciprocal agreement between State preschool and the TQRIS)
- Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet Federal Head Start Performance Standards (e.g., content of the standards is the

same, there is a reciprocal agreement between Head Start and the TQRIS, or there is an alternative pathway to meeting the standards)

- Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet national accreditation standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, or an alternative pathway to meeting the standards)
- Early Learning and Development Standards
- A Comprehensive Assessment System
- Early Childhood Educator qualifications
- Family engagement strategies
- Health promotion practices
- Effective data practices
- Program quality assessments

Please provide more detail on your development of high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS.

*Minnesota's TQRIS high-quality benchmarks at the highest levels of the TQRIS were already developed at the time the RTT-ELC application was written and submitted. Therefore, no development of benchmarks occurred during this reporting period.*

For those areas where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in developing high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS by the end of the grant period.

*Because Calendar Year 2012 represented the first year of ratings issued under Parent Aware's statewide expansion and because ratings are issued for a two-year period, no movement up or down rating levels was possible during the reporting period. Minnesota will consider possible revisions to its high-quality benchmarks at the highest levels of the TQRIS during the revision processes scheduled for 2013 and 2015. (See narrative for "Plan for revision of the TQRIS Program Standards".)*

**Performance Measures (B)(4)(c)(1) and (2)**

In the table below, provide data on the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

<b>Performance Measure for (B)(4)c-1: Increasing the number of ELD Programs in the top tiers of the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System</b>	
	Baseline and annual targets - Number of ELD programs in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System

	Baseline	2012 (Target) Actual	2013 (Target) Actual	2014 (Target) Actual	2015 (Target) Actual
	#	#	#	#	#
Total number of programs covered by the TQRIS	1,405	3,996	7,780	10,538	14,112
Number of programs in Tier 1 (Lowest tier)	4	(40) 30	(150)	(300)	(450)
Number of programs in Tier 2	24	(70) 16	(250)	(500)	(750)
Number of programs in Tier 3	64	(90) 5	(350)	(700)	(1,050)
Number of programs in Tier 4 (Highest tier)	301	(454) 478	(741)	(1,110)	(1,450)

The number of programs covered by the TQRIS is the total number of programs that are eligible for TQRIS participation. This number came from Minnesota's NACCRRAware data system, which tracks providers of all types. Providers in NACCRRAware were counted if they meet any of the following criteria: program is part of Head Start, program is a school-based program serving preschoolers, or program is located in a Parent Aware expansion county.

Baseline data points were generated by the Parent Aware evaluation team using data provided by the Parent Aware program that included all ratings issued as of June 30, 2011. The total number of Parent Aware rated programs as of June 30, 2011 was 393.

The 2012 data comes from the Parent Aware Rating Tool Data system and includes all programs with an active rating as of December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2012. The total number of Parent Aware rated programs as of December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2012 was 529. In other words, Minnesota reached 81% of its target of 654 rated programs.

The number of programs in tier 4 includes programs rated through the full rating process and programs rated through the Accelerated Pathway to Rating.

In the table below, provide data on the number and percentage of children with high needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

<b>Performance Measure for (B)(4)c-2: Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in ELD programs that are in the top tiers of the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System</b>						
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Number of Children with High Needs served	Baseline and annual targets - Number and percentage of Children with High Needs Participating in Programs that are in the <i>top tiers</i> of the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System				
			2012 (Target)	2013 (Target)	2014 (Target)	2015 (Target)
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual

	by programs in the State	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool <i>Specify:</i> school-based preschool programs funded by Minnesota's School Readiness Program	23,317	2,857	12%	(7,228) 7,401	(31%) 32%	(8,860)	(38%)	(11,658)	(50%)	(13,990)	(60%)
Early Head Start and Head Start	14,096	3,397	24%	(6,997) 11,163	(50%) 79%	(8,797)	(62%)	(10,297)	(73%)	(10,897)	(77%)
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C*	5,013	0*	0%*	(0*) 0	(0%*) 0%	(0*)	(0%*)	(1253*)	(25%*)	(2507*)	(50%*)
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619*	11,017	0*	0%*	(0*) 0	(0%*) 0%	(0*)	(0%*)	(2754*)	(25%*)	(4958*)	(45%*)
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	2246*	1182*	53%	(1,854*) 1812	(57%*) 56%	(2,579*)	(61%*)	(3,488*)	(66%*)	(4,690*)	(71%*)
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	20,292*	4049*	20%*	(4261*) 2,395	(21%) 12%	(4870*)	(24%)	(6088*)	(30%)	(8117*)	(40%)

\* indicates that the number is not the same as was in the original application. All proposed changes are described below.

Minnesota defines the top tiers as 3 and 4 stars.

**For state-funded preschool**, the total number of Children with High Needs served comes from the Minnesota Department of Education's School Readiness Annual Report 2010-2011 and only includes children receiving more than 30 hours of service/involvement per year. The baseline numbers are then restricted only to children served in programs rated by Parent Aware as of June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2011. The 2012 number comes from the Minnesota Department of Education's School Readiness Annual Report 2011-2012 and only includes those children who are served in programs/sites that are rated by Parent Aware as of December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2012.

**For Early Head Start and Head Start**, the total number of Children with High Needs served comes from data pulled from the MN Head Start Funded Enrollment report for SFY2012 as reported to the Minnesota Department of Education by programs receiving Head Start funds. The count includes only children served in the following setting types: Center-based, combination sites, family child care, and child care centers. It does not include home-based settings. The baseline numbers are based on the numbers of children reported by the Head Start programs rated by Parent Aware as of June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2011. Since Head Start programs are only eligible for 4-star ratings, all rated programs are in the top tiers. The 2012 number comes from the MN Head Start Funded Enrollment report for SFY2013 and only includes children served in programs that were rated by Parent Aware as of December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2012.

**For programs funded by IDEA Parts B and C**, the total number of children served in programs funded by IDEA was determined based on numbers of preschool-aged children with an IEP or IFSP as reported to the Minnesota Department of Education via the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS).

The baseline number of children served in IDEA funded programs that are rated in the TQRIS was based on a particular definition of “programs funded by IDEA Parts B and C.” As explained in Table B2c, the original definition of programs funded by IDEA Parts B and C was any program that serves at least one child with an IEP or IFSP. Minnesota is proposing a revision to its definition of IDEA Parts B and C for purposes of implementing projects within the Race to the Top: Early Learning Challenge application. The proposed definition would define IDEA funded programs as those programs operated by the local education agencies identified as eligible to receive Part C or Part B funds and who sign statements of assurances that pertain to regulatory compliance and appropriate use of funds. Under this revised definition, other programs that may enroll a child with a disability are not considered IDEA funded programs. If this newly proposed definition is accepted, then the baseline number of children in rated programs will need to be revised to reflect the fact that IDEA funded programs (as newly defined) are not currently eligible to be rated in the TQRIS. Therefore, Minnesota is proposing that the baseline be revised to zero.

However, as part of the RTT grant, Minnesota intends to develop “new standards related to serving children with an IEP and IFSP” (See Activity 3.3 on p104 of Minnesota’s RTT–ELC grant application). When such standards are developed, IDEA funded programs will be eligible to participate in the Parent Aware rating system. The revised targets assume (a) a rating process will be developed and finalized during 2013, (b) ratings will begin in early 2014, and (c) most IDEA funded programs will receive a rating in the top tiers of the TQRIS.

**For programs funded under Title I of ESEA** The original total number of children served came from the SFY2010 federal Consolidated State Performance Plan. This methodology is not ideal because data from SFY2010 is outdated and cannot appropriately be linked to ratings data (as described in Table B2c). Instead, we propose a change in methodology to align with how we are counting numbers of rated programs, as described in Table (B)(2)(c). If the proposed change in methodology is approved for Table B2c, then Minnesota would also request a change to the methodology used here.

Similarly, the original baseline data was an estimate made by the Title I staff in the Department of Education based on staff knowledge of which districts were participating in Parent Aware and the child numbers from the SFY2010 federal Consolidated State Performance Plan. Minnesota is proposing a revised methodology for determining the number of children in highly rated programs. The revised baseline data reflects the number of children receiving preschool education in districts that reported (via the Department of Education’s financial records) using Title I funds for Preschool in SFY2012 and were also in the top tiers of the TQRIS as of December 31, 2011. The 2012 data reflects the number of children receiving preschool education in districts that reported using Title I funds for Preschool in SFY2013 and were also in the top tiers of the TQRIS as of December 31, 2012.

Efforts are underway to increase the number of school districts using Title I funds for Preschool, so Minnesota expects to see an increase each year in the total number of Children with High Needs served in Title I funded

programs. Because this denominator is constantly growing, Minnesota is proposing using the current year's total number of children to calculate the percentage of children in Title I-funded programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS. For example in 2012, the number of children in Title I programs increased from 2246 to 3252. Of the 3252 children in Title I programs, 1812 were in programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS. Thus, Minnesota proposes reporting 56% for 2012 (1812/3252) rather than 81% (1812/2246).

Minnesota's proposed targets are based on the assumption that the total number of children receiving preschool education funded by Title I will increase by 45% from 2011 to 2012, then by 30% from 2012 to 2013, then by 25% from 2013 to 2014 and from 2014 to 2015. It also assumes that the percentage of children in rated sites increases by 4 percentage points in the first two years and then by 5 percentage points the last two years. More details are available upon request.

**For programs receiving CCDF funds in the form of subsidy payments,** the original total number of Children with High Needs came from MEC2 (subsidy administration data), based on the SFY2011 monthly average number of children served by CCAP. This number was then weighted according to the average percent of children on CCAP that are under the age of 5. Because the calculation was done in fall of 2011, the final child age distribution data for 2011 was not yet available. Because of this limitation, Minnesota is proposing a revised total number of children based on final 2011 child age distribution data. When the number of children was recalculated using final 2011 child age distribution data, the total number of children drops from 21,175 to 20,292.

The original baseline number of children in highly rated programs was an estimate of the number of children receiving payments from the Child Care Assistance Program as estimated by the Parent Aware evaluation team and reported in the 2010 Parent Aware evaluation report. That report estimated that 38% (248/658) of children served in Family Child Care (across all star levels) were receiving CCAP and 28% (3976/14313) of children served in child care centers/preschools (across all star levels) were receiving CCAP. To arrive at the baseline number, these two numbers (248 & 3976) were summed for a total of 4,224. That number mistakenly includes children receiving CCAP across all rated child care programs rather than just children in licensed programs with 3- or 4-star ratings. Therefore, Minnesota is proposing a more accurate methodology for determining the number of children in highly-rated care. The proposed methodology uses MEC2 data to determine the number of children not yet in Kindergarten served by a 3 or 4 star Parent Aware rated provider (rated as of December 31, 2011) during the month of October 2011. After re-calculating the 2011 numbers using this improved methodology, Minnesota proposes revising the baseline number to be 4049 children.

The 2012 data is pulled using this proposed methodology and includes the number of children not yet in Kindergarten, served by a 3 or 4 star Parent Aware rated provider (rated as of December 31, 2012) during the month of October 2012. Reporting October service data allows most child care provider bills to be submitted and paid by the time the data must be pulled in January.

(A child is determined to be "not yet in Kindergarten" if the child was not yet 5 years old as of September 1<sup>st</sup> of the relevant year.)

Changing the baseline number of children means that the target numbers for future years have to be adjusted to maintain target percentages.

For those areas where progress has not been made, describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs by the end of the grant period.

*Early Learning Scholarships and Title I PreK Incentives are two strategies in Minnesota's State Plan for promoting access to high-quality programs. See pages 48-49 for an update on these two access strategies.*

*Targeted outreach is being conducted through other social service programs serving families with Children with High Needs. For example, Minnesota is working to develop links between Parent Aware and Child Care Resource and Referral agencies, Child Care Assistance, WIC, and other programs.*

*The Governor recently proposed budget and policy changes that include the addition of Parent Aware ratings to Minnesota's tiered reimbursement policies. The new policy, if passed, would result in a Child Care Assistance Program rate differential of 15% for 3-star and 20% for 4-star programs. The legislature normally adjourns in late May, therefore the outcome of this proposal may not be known until June, 2013.*

#### **Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS.**

Has your State made progress in validating the effectiveness of the TQRIS?

- Yes  
 No

Describe progress made in validating the effectiveness of the TQRIS, or, if progress has not been made, describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made by the end of the grant period.

*Minnesota's plan to validate the effectiveness of the TQRIS focuses on four goals:*

*Goal 1: The Evaluation will examine the effectiveness of indicators by evaluating the methods used to determine when a quality indicator has been met, the patterns of indicators met by programs, and the experience of programs in meeting those indicators.*

*Goal 2: The Evaluation will examine how well the hybrid rating structure is differentiating quality by comparing star ratings to quality as determined by both the CLASS and the Environmental Rating Scales and by examining which indicators at each level are most challenging for providers.*

*Goal 3: The Evaluation will examine the linkages between star ratings and children's progress toward school readiness by analyzing the relationship between a child's gains over the course of a school year and the quality rating of the program in which the child was served.*

*Goal 4: The Evaluation will examine the effectiveness of quality improvement supports and the extent to which the TQRIS rating scale can detect changes in quality over time.*

*In addition to these four goals, the Evaluation is also examining the effectiveness of the TQRIS implementation by documenting implementation practices and periodically interviewing and/or surveying a wide variety of stakeholders (community leaders, state agency staff, quality coaches, and Early Learning and Development Programs) about their experience with the TQRIS.*

*To adequately engage in each of the four primary goals, the Evaluation needs an ample supply of data on a variety of program types, rating types, and rating levels. For that reason, these analyses will not begin until at least 150 programs have received ratings through the full rating process. We expect to reach that goal by late 2013.*

*In the meantime, the Evaluation has conducted a study of the first 11 months of Parent Aware implementation. That Year One Implementation Report will be released in February 2013.*

Please describe the State's strategies for determining whether TQRIS tiers accurately reflect differential levels of program quality.

*Goal 1 and Goal 2 of the Evaluation aim to determine whether TQRIS tiers accurately reflect differential levels of program quality. Once 150 programs have received ratings through the full rating process, the Evaluation will analyze data on which indicators these programs met and whether certain program types are more likely to meet particular indicators. Because programs utilizing the Accelerated Pathway to Rating (Head Start programs, School-based PreK programs, and accredited child care programs) are not required to submit evidence that they have met all the indicators, the Evaluation will collect survey data from programs in order to examine the characteristics and practices of these programs as well.*

*In addition, the Evaluation will be conducting Evaluating Rating Scale observations and CLASS observations in a variety of program types with ratings across the four tiers. Once ratings and observation data is available for 500 fully-rated programs and a comparable sample of programs rated through the Accelerated Pathway to Rating, they will analyze whether and the extent to which programs at higher tiers are receiving higher scores on these observed measures of quality and whether scores on these observational measures are correlated with particular*

*program characteristics and practices.*

Please describe the State's strategies, challenges, and progress toward assessing the extent to which changes in quality ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness.

*Goal 3 of the Evaluation aims to assess the extent to which quality levels are related to children's learning. Child assessment data will be collected by a team of trained assessors in the fall and spring of each school year for a sample of preschool-aged children in rated programs of various program types at all four quality levels. These two points in time will allow the Evaluation to determine the amount of growth in learning each child is demonstrating. The evaluation will then analyze the data to determine the relationship between the child's progress and the quality rating of the program in which the child is served.*

*In order to assess the extent to which changes in quality ratings are related to progress in children's learning, we will need to have a sufficient sample of children in a sufficient number of programs whose rating has changed over time. While we hope to have such a sample, it may be difficult to collect an adequately large sample over the four years of the RTT-ELC grant because ratings last two years and not all programs will experience a change in their quality rating during the grant period.*

## **Focused Investment Areas -- Sections (C), (D), and (E)**

### **Check the Focused Investment Areas addressed in your RTT-ELC State Plan:**

- X (C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.
- X (C)(2) Supporting effective uses of Comprehensive Assessment Systems.
- (C)(3) Identifying and addressing the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs to improve school readiness.
- (C)(4) Engaging and supporting families.
  
- X (D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.
- X (D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.
  
- X (E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.
- X (E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.

*Grantee should complete those sections that correspond with the focused investment areas outlined in the grantee's RTT-ELC application and State Plan.*

## **Early Learning and Development Standards**

The State has made progress in ensuring that its Early Learning and Development Standards (check all that apply):

- X Are developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate across each defined age group of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers;
- X Cover all Essential Domains of School Readiness;
- X Are aligned with the State's K-3 academic standards; and
- X Are incorporated in Program Standards, curricula and activities, Comprehensive Assessment Systems, the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and professional development activities.

Describe the progress made, where applicable. In addition, describe any supports that are in place to promote the understanding of and commitment to the Early Learning and Development Standards across Early Learning and Development Programs.

*The State Early Childhood Indicators of Progress (ECIPs) Revision Work Group has met and has 3 more meetings scheduled. At the end of those meetings, the revision schedule and process will be finalized, along with naming members of the revision work group. The work group will develop the revisions to the identified sections of the ECIPs.*

*The Request for Proposal process has closed for the contractor to facilitate the revision work group and manage the public input process as well as input from experts. Work from this*

*contractor is expected to begin no later than the end of February, 2013.*

*The contract for developing training on the standards should be in place before the end of January.*

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

N/A

### **Comprehensive Assessment Systems**

The State has made progress in implementing a developmentally appropriate Comprehensive Assessment System working with Early Learning and Development Programs to (check all that apply):

- X Select assessment instruments and approaches that are appropriate for the target populations and purposes;
- X Strengthen Early Childhood Educators' understanding of the purposes and uses of each type of assessment included in the Comprehensive Assessment Systems;
- X Articulate an approach for aligning and integrating assessments and sharing assessment results; and
- Train Early Childhood Educators to appropriately administer assessments and interpret and use assessment data in order to inform and improve instruction, programs, and services.

Describe the progress made, where applicable.

*To date, Minnesota has made considerable progress toward the goals listed above.*

*The State has made progress in improving the delivery of developmental and social-emotional screening and is on target in this area based on the timelines listed in the Scope of Work. Activities during the reporting period have focused on identifying challenges and opportunities that will inform the development of the implementation, training, and evaluation plan to pilot online access to the Ages & Stages Questionnaires, Third Edition (ASQ-3) and Ages & Stages Questionnaires: Social Emotional (ASQ:SE) screening tools. Activities where progress has been made include:*

- *An Online Screening Coordinator was hired in August 2012*
- *The focus and goals of the Interagency Developmental Screening Task Force have been expanded to include an advisory function for planning/implementation of online screening*
- *An analysis of online screening across multiple sectors within seven-county metro, Transformation Zones and several other communities in greater Minnesota has been*

*conducted and challenges and opportunities for online screening have been identified*

*Concurrent with screening activities, Minnesota has made progress in creating the building blocks for a comprehensive assessment system which includes formative assessments for children in early learning and development programs, kindergarten entry assessments (KEA) and the early elementary grades. To date, the following activities have been completed:*

- An Early Childhood Assessment Specialist hired October 2012*
- A review of Minnesota and other state assessment systems and data collection efforts resulted in recommendations for taskforce activities in 2013. Activities include formal written purpose of assessments within the system, formal feedback loops with community practitioners and leaders, professional development for ELD providers, limiting tools for formative assessment and kindergarten entry to those which best align with the Minnesota's early learning standards.*
- Assessment system taskforce was created (first meeting 12-17-12) representing multi-sectors within ELD. Sectors include K-12 administrators, superintendents, licensed teachers, child care providers, early childhood special education, assessment specialists, English learners specialists, preschool coordinators and professional development leadership. Within the taskforce, sub-groups were created to accomplish the following goals; (a) KEA recommendations, (b) formative assessment recommendations, (c) communications and (d) data system alignment. Each subgroup has a written charge and formal reporting template.*
- Taskforce will continue to meet and maintain timely recommendations based on RTT-ELC activities.*

*Activities to improve the ability of ELD programs to choose, use and interpret assessment data have been delayed due to contracting. Contracts related to these activities will be executed in January 2013 and will first identify gaps and barriers to professional development (PD) on assessment as well as provide recommendations on how the MN Centers of Excellence can be instrumental in the implementation of concentrated PD on assessment statewide.*

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

*State agency representatives and contractors have met several times to finalize workplans based on the delays experienced. Time lines and activities have been revised to ensure that all required activities will be completed and reported by December 2015.*

## Health Promotion

The State has made progress in (check all that apply):

- Establishing a progression of standards for ensuring children’s health and safety;
- Ensuring that health and behavioral screening and follow-up occur; and
- Promoting children’s physical, social, and emotional development across the levels of your TQRIS Program Standards;
- Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators who are trained and supported in meeting the health standards;
- Promoting healthy eating habits, improving nutrition, expanding physical activity; and
- Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual targets.

Describe the progress made, where applicable.

*This focus area was not included in Minnesota’s State Plan.*

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State’s strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

N/A

### Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)

In the table, provide data on leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable statewide targets. Targets must be consistent with those in the State’s application unless a change has been approved.

<b>Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.</b>					
	<i>Baseline and annual targets</i>				
	<b>Baseline (from application)</b>	<b>2012 (Target)</b>	<b>2013 (Target)</b>	<b>2014 (Target)</b>	<b>2015 (Target)</b>
		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Number of Children with High Needs screened</b>					
<b>Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment</b>					
<b>Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care</b>					

**Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.**

	<i>Baseline and annual targets</i>				
	<b>Baseline (from application)</b>	<b>2012 (Target)</b>	<b>2013 (Target)</b>	<b>2014 (Target)</b>	<b>2015 (Target)</b>
		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care</b>					
<i>[Please indicate if baseline data are actual or estimated; describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.]</i>					

Describe strategies for moving forward on meeting the targets for performance measure (C)(3)(d).

N/A

**Engaging and Supporting Families**

The State has made progress in (check all that apply):

- Establishing a progression of culturally and linguistically appropriate standards for family engagement across the levels of your Program Standards;
- Including information on activities that enhance the capacity of families to support their children’s education and development;
- Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators trained and supported to implement the family engagement strategies; and
- Promoting family support and engagement statewide, including by leveraging other existing resources.

Describe the progress made, where applicable.

*This focus area was not included in Minnesota’s State Plan.*

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State’s strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

N/A

## Early Childhood Education Workforce

### Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials.

The State has made progress in developing (check all that apply):

- A common, statewide Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework designed to promote children's learning and development and improve child outcomes; and
- A common, statewide progression of credentials and degrees aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Describe the progress made, where applicable.

*Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework has made progress on multiple activities during the first year of the grant including:*

- *Project Management Plan in place*
- *Relevant documents reviewed: examples of core competencies from other states, Minnesota Board of Teaching (BOT) Standards for Early Childhood, report and recommendations from ARRA funded public comment and draft revision*
- *Preliminary draft of integration of BOT Standards and Core Competencies demonstrates alignment and potential gaps*
- *Exploratory one on one meetings with stakeholders held to discuss opportunities and impact on implementation have generated enthusiasm and support*
- *Writing team members and expectations for participation have been identified*
- *Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework will include a teaching standard regarding the understanding of physical, social, emotional, language, cognitive and creative development and be linked to the Early Childhood Indicators of Progress (ECIPs)*
- *Preliminary identification of implementation team completed*
- *Implementation team will help identify a revision schedule which could potentially align with that of the ECIPs revision schedule*
- *Development of strong collaboration between the Early Childhood Professional Scholarships project and Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework*

Describe State progress in engaging postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers in aligning professional development opportunities with the State Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

*Progress on activities to align professional development opportunities with the State Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework include:*

- *Initial meetings held with chair of Minnesota Association of Early Childhood Teacher Educators (MnAECTE) and ACCESS (membership organizations for instructors in two and four year institutes of higher education). Plan to attend MnAECTC meeting to share additional information and updates with membership. Members of both organizations*

*are interested in being involved in writing and implementation teams. Integration of standards and core competencies take place at opportune times as IHEs are in process of demonstrating course alignment with BOT standards.*

- *Identification of IHEs currently offering early childhood programming through recently completed ARRA activity and T.E.A.C.H. materials.*
- *Preliminary conversations held with Minnesota Center for Professional Development (responsible for state registry and support information regarding career lattice), state network for Child Care Resource and Referral (primary inservice delivery system), Centers for Excellence (additional inservice deliver system). Supportive of the integration of BOT standards and core competencies. Interested in participating in the implementation team.*
- *Initial meeting with administrative staff from the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities to look at how the state professional development system activities can align with and support programming at two and four year institutions.*

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in any or all of these workforce areas by the end of the grant period.

*Progress is being made in all areas of the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. Staff change lead to slight changes in details of scope of work and timelines, but the outcomes remain the same.*

### **Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.**

The State has made progress in improving the effectiveness and retention of Early Childhood Educators who work with Children with High Needs with the goal of improving child outcomes (check all that apply):

- X Providing and expanding access to effective professional development opportunities that are aligned with your State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework;
- X Implementing policies and incentives that promote professional and career advancement along an articulated career pathway that is aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and that are designed to increase retention, including
  - X Scholarships
  - X Compensation and wage supplements,
  - Tiered reimbursement rates,
  - Other financial incentives
  - Management opportunities
- X Publically reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention
- X Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for --
  - X Increasing the number of postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and the number of Early Childhood

- Educators who receive credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework; and
- X Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Describe the progress made, where applicable.

*Minnesota has made progress on multiple activities in the Great Workforce Initiatives during the first year of the grant including:*

- *Low-cost training was provided to Family, Friend and Neighbor caregivers to meet the new legislative training requirement that went into effect on November 1, 2011 for legal non-licensed providers serving families receiving child care assistance.*
- *Providers from Hmong, Latino, Somali and East African groups were recruited as part of an emergent new American immigrant network. Trainings were offered quarterly in health, safety and child development.*
- *CCR&R Quality Coaches provided coaching and technical assistance services to 75 fully rated early child care providers going through Parent Aware. Providers receiving these services can earn up to 26 hours of Core Competency VIII: Professional Development and Leadership to move up the Career Lattice.*
- *Professional Development Coordinators, located in the CCR&R agencies, provided professional development advising services primarily to child care providers throughout the state of Minnesota. The Professional Development Coordinators have specialized experience and training to assist early care and education providers assess their current qualifications and training needs through standardized tools such as the Minnesota Individual Training Needs Assessment survey, as well as a Parent Aware Training Prep Guide, which provides information for providers to determine training that will meet the specific training requirements of Parent Aware Star levels. Lastly, the Professional Development Coordinators assisted early care and education providers with the development of professional development plans, including obtaining information about professional development opportunities and resources. This work is operational and ongoing.*
- *The Center for Inclusive Child Care (CICC) employs coaches, consultants and trainers with expertise in developmental disabilities, special health care needs and behavioral disorders. These individuals provide specialized coaching, consultation and technical assistance to early care and education providers who have children with special needs in their care. RTT-ELC funding enhanced CICC services, especially to those programs participating in Parent Aware, as well as expand intensive services availability statewide. Work is in progress to develop a regional consultation plan with reference to children with special needs.*
- *Low cost training was made available statewide to all early care and education providers for both the MN Child Care Credential (which meets Parent Aware training requirements) as well as 54 hours of state developed training in content areas required to achieve higher ratings in Parent Aware. Additional Parent Aware training is projected*

*to be completed in 2014. This additional training will be more rigorous in terms of content, with possible opportunity for providers to use this training as credit for prior learning if enrolling in 2-year institutions of higher education. This development work is in progress.*

- A 30 hour Minnesota Infant/Toddler Certificate curriculum is under development that will meet the training requirements for Parent Aware, and also qualify participants to meet the Minnesota Association of Infant and Early Childhood Mental Health professional endorsement at Level 1. The MN Infant/Toddler Certificate program will offer another opportunity for early care and education providers to achieve higher professional competencies.*
- All providers participating in the Parent Aware and providers who receive CCR&R grants are enrolling in the Minnesota Professional Development Registry. The Registry helps practitioners at any level of experience and training track their professional development and helps guide them in taking approved training and establish a pathway to professional growth through a Career Lattice. Investments are underway to provide technical upgrades and increased staffing to accommodate expected increases in participation in the Registry.*
- T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® scholarships help early childhood and school-age care professionals increase their levels of education, compensation and commitment to the field. Scholarships cover 80% of the costs of tuition and books as well as release time and a bonus upon completion of a degree program. An advisory committee has been formed to look at how the T.E.A.C.H scholarship model can be enhanced to support more early childhood professionals, particularly those serving large numbers of at risk children.*
- Career guidance services were and continue to be available through the Minnesota Center for Professional Development. Services assist early childhood practitioners in creating a professional development plan to address their educational and occupational goals.*

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

*Progress is being made in all areas.*

**Performance Measures (D)(2)(d)(1) and (2):**

In the tables below, indicate State progress toward meeting ambitious yet achievable targets for:

- (1) Increasing the number of postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and the number of Early Childhood Educators who receive credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework; and

(2) Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

**Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1): Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators receiving credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.**

	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>2012 (Target) Actual</b>	<b>2013 (Target) Actual</b>	<b>2014 (Target) Actual</b>	<b>2015 (Target) Actual</b>
Total number of “aligned” institutions and providers	16	(25) 16	(35)	(45)	(51)
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an “aligned” institution or provider	471*	(555*) 555	(809*)	(883*)	(954*)

\* indicates that the number is not the same as was in the original application. All proposed changes are described below.

**Total number of “aligned” institutions and providers:** See Table (A)(1)-11 in the application. It shows 16 aligned institutions – MNCPD, MNAEYC, National Council for Professional Recognition, and 13 Technical/Community Colleges. No additional progress was made in 2012 to impact the number of aligned institutions.

**Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an “aligned” institution or provider:** The original number submitted by Minnesota in its RTT application was the sum of all the numbers in the first column of Table D2d2. However, some of those numbers reflected cumulative numbers of providers with a credential and some reflected the number of credentials that had been earned in the last year. Minnesota is proposing to change all rows in Table D2d2 to reflect yearly gains rather than cumulative numbers. If that change is accepted, the total number of early childhood educators that were credentialed each year must also change in this table. The revised baseline number shown above (471) reflects the sum of the numbers in the Baseline (2011) column of Table D2d2 for Credential Types 1 through 6, but not Credential Type 7, since that number can only be obtained in a cumulative format. Similarly, the 2012 actual number reflects the sum of the actual numbers in the 2012 column of Table D2d2 for Credential Types 1 through 6. Similarly, Minnesota is also proposing revised targets for 2012 through 2015 that would be the sum of the target numbers in the relevant column in Table D2d2 for Credential Types 1 through 6.

**Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2): Increasing number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.**

<b>Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)</b>	Baseline and Annual Targets -- Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year									
	<b>Baseline</b>		<b>2012 (Target) Actual</b>		<b>2013 (Target) Actual</b>		<b>2014 (Target) Actual</b>		<b>2015 (Target) Actual</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Credential Type 1</b> Specify: Minnesota Child Care Credential	27*	-	(93*) 73	-	(140*)	-	(140*)	-	(140*)	-
<b>Credential Type 2</b> Specify: MNAEYC Director's Credential	26*	-	(14*) 6	-	(15*)	-	(20*)	-	(25*)	-
<b>Credential Type 3</b> Specify: National Child Development Associate (CDA)	180*	-	(193*) 223	-	(206*)	-	(221*)	-	(236*)	-
<b>Credential Type 4</b> Specify: Certificate or Diploma in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708	81*	-	(87*) 94	-	(93*)	-	(100*)	-	(107*)	-
<b>Credential Type 5</b> Specify: Associate Degree in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708	157*	-	(168*) 159	-	(180*)	-	(192*)	-	(206*)	-
<b>Credential Type 6*</b> Specify: Bachelor degree in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708, 13.1015, 13.1209	0	-	(0) 0	-	(175)	-	(210)	-	(240)	-
<b>Credential Type 7</b> Specify: Teacher licenses of staff working in Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), School Readiness, and Early Childhood Family Education	4,013*	-	(4214*) 4,487	-	(4424*)	-	(4646*)	-	(4878*)	-

\* indicates that the number is not the same as was in the original application. All proposed changes are described below.

Percentages are left blank because Minnesota does not have an accurate count of the number of early childhood educators in the state. The 2011 Child Care Workforce Study estimates the size of the workforce in Minnesota at 31,000 (including all family child care providers and all directors, teachers, assistant teachers, and aides working in non-school-age child care centers). This number does not include Head Start staff and may not fully reflect those working in school-based pre-K programs.

**Cumulative Numbers vs Yearly Gains:** In its original application, Minnesota completed some rows of this table using cumulative data (the total number of EC educators in the state with a particular credential) and other rows using yearly gains data (the number of EC educators who earned a particular credential in a particular year). To achieve consistency and clarity, Minnesota proposes to report only on Yearly Gains rather than on the total number of early childhood educators in the State that hold the Credential. The reasons for this request are:

- This intention of this table is to be a measure of credentials awarded in the prior year, not a measure of the characteristics of the full population of early childhood educators.
- Characteristics of the full population are impacted not only by access to credentialing, but also by movement in and out of the field and movement in and out of Minnesota. While retention of qualified early educators is an important goal, Minnesota is not offering supports for retention at this time.
- Although many educators may already have a degree or credential, it is difficult to determine whether those degrees and credentials were awarded by an institution whose program was aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework at the time that the student attended. Because we have just begun to establish and document alignment between IHE's and the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, degrees and credentials awarded in the past are not applicable.
- The activities in Minnesota's Scope of Work are focused on increasing the number of early childhood educators who receive credentials each year. Thus, the number of credentials awarded each year seems like a more fitting measure of state performance. For example, the Minnesota Scope of Work includes:
  - (Task 7.1.8) Increase access to the Minnesota Child Care Credential
  - (Task 7.1.9) Increase availability of scholarships for early childhood certificates or degrees from MN higher education institutions
- Moreover, Minnesota is not yet able to track population characteristics for a significant portion of the early care and education workforce. As Minnesota increases the technical capacities of the Minnesota Professional Development Registry and encourages increased participation in the Registry across sectors (Task 7.1.10, Task 7.1.11, Task 7.1.12), our ability to produce population-level data will increase. At this time, however, only 7% of the workforce uses the Registry to document their education and credentials, and that documentation does not include evidence of whether or not the degree or credential is aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

**Notes on Credential Type 1:** The original baseline number of zero reflected the fact that the Minnesota Child Care Credential was first offered in 2011 and no students had completed the credential as of Minnesota's submission of the Race to the Top application in autumn of 2011. Minnesota is proposing a revision to the baseline to reflect the number of Minnesota Child Care Credentials that were awarded during all of 2011 (January 1<sup>st</sup> through December 31<sup>st</sup>). The first cohort of 27 students graduated in December 2011.

The original targets provided in the application were cumulative, such that the 2015 target number included all the credentials that had ever been awarded. Minnesota is proposing a revision to the targets to describe annual goals rather than cumulative goals. Thus, each year's target would reflect yearly gains, the number of credentials awarded from January 1<sup>st</sup> of that year to December 31<sup>st</sup> of that year. The goal for increasing the number of credentials

awarded remains the same (in actual numbers) as was originally proposed. For example, the original 2013 target was 260, which assumed 120 MNCCCs would be awarded in 2012 and 140 in 2013. Thus the annual yearly gain for 2013 is 140, which is the target Minnesota is now proposing.

The CCR&R system administers the MNCCC and will provide data each year on the number of practitioners who have earned the credential in the last year. Projected increases are based on anticipated funding that will support 140 students per year. Reaching these targets will require aggressive marketing and recruitment. Minnesota met 78% of its recruitment goal in 2012.

The Minnesota Child Care Credential is aligned with Minnesota's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

**Notes on Credential Type 2:** The original baseline number is the cumulative number of Director's Credentials that had ever been awarded in Minnesota from the time it was first offered through the time of Minnesota's Race to the Top application in the autumn of 2011. The original target numbers for 2012 through 2015 were also cumulative. Minnesota is proposing a revision to these numbers to instead reflect yearly gains. Minnesota proposes revising the baseline number to instead reflect the number of Director's credentials awarded in 2011, as reported by MNAEYC.

The goal for increasing the number of credentials awarded remains the same (in actual numbers) as was originally proposed. For example, the original 2013 target was 82, which assumed 15 Director's Credentials would be awarded in 2013 (in order to move the cumulative number from 57 in 2012 to 82 in 2013). Thus, Minnesota proposes a target of 15 in 2013 to reflect the number of educators receiving a higher credential between January 1<sup>st</sup> and December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2013.

As in the original application, projected increases are based on anticipated funding for additional cohorts. Reaching these targets will require aggressive marketing and recruitment. Minnesota met just 43% of its recruiting goal in 2012, so additional attention will be paid to this recruitment in 2013.

The MnAEYC Director's Credential is aligned with Minnesota's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

**Notes on Credential Type 3:** The original baseline number was intended to be the cumulative number of CDAs that have ever been awarded in Minnesota. However, this number is incorrect. According to the 2011 Minnesota Child Care Workforce Study (a study conducted every 5 years in Minnesota), approximately 2300 early educators in the state have a CDA, not 4429. Regardless of this error, Minnesota is proposing a revision to the baseline number to instead reflect the number of early childhood educators that earned a CDA in 2011, as reported by the Council for Professional Recognition.

Likewise, Minnesota is proposing to also revise the target numbers to reflect yearly gains rather than cumulative numbers of educators holding the credential. The goal for increasing the number of credentials awarded remains the same (as a percentage - 7% per year) as was originally proposed.

In 2012, Minnesota exceeded its target for number of new CDA graduates by 16%.

The Child Development Associate is aligned with Minnesota's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

**Notes on Credential Type 4:** The original baseline numbers provided in the application were yearly gains, not cumulative like the other rows in the original version of this table. Data on certificates and diplomas earned at Minnesota institutions was pulled from the 2009-10 IPEDS Completion Survey Data.

Minnesota is proposing a minor change to the methodology to more clearly articulate which certificate and diploma

types (as characterized by CIP codes) should be included in the data pull from the IPEDS Completion Survey Data. Minnesota proposes including only awards of less than 2 academic years (in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708) from institutions that have documented their alignment with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. This change in methodology, if approved, results in an increase of 5 for the 2011 number.

The goal for increasing the number of credentials awarded remains the same (as a percentage - 7% per year) as was originally proposed. Data for 2012 was pulled from the 2010-2011 IPEDS Completion Survey Data and utilizes the same methodology described above.

**Notes on Credential Type 5:** The original baseline numbers provided in the application were yearly gains, not cumulative like the other rows in the original version of this table. Data on associate's degrees earned at Minnesota institutions was pulled from the 2009-10 IPEDS Completion Survey Data.

Minnesota is proposing a minor change to the methodology to more clearly articulate which associate degree types (as characterized by CIP codes) should be included in the data pull from the IPEDS Completion Survey Data. Minnesota proposes including only associate degrees (in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708) from institutions that have documented their alignment with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. This change in methodology, if approved, results in an increase of 5 for the 2011 number.

The goal for increasing the number of credentials awarded remains the same (as a percentage - 7% per year) as was originally proposed. Data for 2012 was pulled from the 2010-2011 IPEDS Completion Survey Data and utilizes the same methodology described above.

**Notes on Credential Type 6:** Bachelor degree in early childhood education or child development – This row was not included in Minnesota's original application, but Minnesota is proposing adding it to our performance measures to track progress on our goals of (a) aligning the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework with the Board of Teaching Standards, and (b) supporting pursuit of higher education through the provision of scholarships to early childhood educators.

Baseline data was pulled from the 2009-2010 IPEDS Completion Survey and includes only bachelor's degrees (in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1015, 13.1209, 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708) earned from institutions that have documented alignment with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. While currently no institutions of higher education have documented alignment with Minnesota's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, a major increase is projected for 2013 because of an effort to establish alignment between the Core Competencies Framework and the Board of Teaching Standards. Once that alignment is established, then all institutions with a curriculum aligned to the Board of Teaching Standards can be counted here. Data for 2012 was pulled from the 2010-2011 IPEDS Completion Survey Data and uses the same methodology.

**Notes on Credential Type 7:** Teacher licenses of staff working in Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), School Readiness, and Early Childhood Family Education – The original teacher licensure numbers (as submitted in the RTT application) was pulled from STAR (Minnesota Department of Education's data system for teacher licensure and employment) and captures the Count of Active 2010-2011 Licensed Staff for License Codes 180102 (Prekindergarten) and 180402 (Family Ed/Early Childhood Educator).

However, this count did not include Early Childhood Special Education licensure (License Code 190500). This was an oversight. Therefore, Minnesota is proposing a change to the baseline number and to the methodology for calculating future numbers to ensure that all relevant licenses are included. The revised baseline data was pulled from STAR (Minnesota Department of Education's data system for teacher licensure and employment) and captures

the Count of Active 2010-2011 Licensed Staff for License Codes 180102, 190500, and 180402. Data for 2012 was pulled from STAR (Minnesota Department of Education's data system for teacher licensure and employment) and captures the Count of Active 2011-2012 Licensed Staff for License Codes 180102, 190500, and 180402.

Because of the increased emphasis being placed on early childhood education in Minnesota, we project a 5% annual increase in staffing in these areas. Because this number is only available as a cumulative number (rather than a yearly gain), it is not included in Table D2d1.

Describe the State's challenges, lessons learned, and strategies for moving forward on meeting the targets for performance measures (D)(2)(d)(1) and (D)(2)(d)(2).

*To make progress toward our Great Workforce performance measure targets, Minnesota intends to focus on the challenges and strategies described below, building on lessons learned from Year 1 grant implementation:*

*Aligning Higher Education Programs with our Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework*

- *We are engaging instructors from Minnesota's higher education institutions in the writing and implementation of our updated Core Competencies for Early Childhood Professionals. The new Core Competencies will align with our state Board of Teaching standards for early childhood teacher licensure which should ensure that all early childhood programs in our higher education system align with our Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.*

*Low cost training through the Minnesota Child Care Credential*

*Challenges:*

- *Child care providers have been given many choices for improving the quality of their care. RTT-ELC grant funds subsidize 75 percent of the cost of this training and still many providers choose to take specific training to meet the Parent Aware indicators instead of enrolling in the Credential.*
- *Different geographical areas of Minnesota are having more difficulty than others in recruiting providers to participate in the Minnesota Child Care Credential.*

*Lessons learned:*

- *Minnesota has offered a blended version of the MN Child Care Credential, which included face-to-face training and on-line. Participant feedback indicated a preference for face-to-face trainings.*

*Strategies for moving forward:*

- *Improve marketing materials to intentionally show providers how the Minnesota Child Care Credential meets the training requirements for Parent Aware.*
- *Explore holding a cohort with smaller numbers. There is currently one cohort where all classes are being delivered in Spanish.*
- *Revise the content of the credential classes.*

*Minnesota Association for the Education of Young Children (MNAEYC) Director's Credential*

*Challenges:*

- *Marketing efforts were more focused on participation in Parent Aware and other initiatives. Resource limitations inhibited our ability to effectively market the Director's Credential.*
- *A leadership change at MNAEYC contributed to a gap in consistent support for credential promotion.*

*Strategies moving forward*

- *Ensure continued coordinated promotion of the Director's Credential by MNAEYC and the CCR&R network office in order to increase enrollment in the credential classes. We expect this increased enrollment to translate to an increase in credential awards in 2013.*

*National Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential Support*

*Challenges:*

- *Increased demand for financial supports from child care providers to obtain a CDA.*
- *Struggles to receive timely communication from the National Council for Professional Recognition.*

*Lessons learned:*

- *Several providers who received the Minnesota Child Care Credential went on to get their CDA. The Minnesota Child Care Credential can serve as a recruiting tool for the CDA.*

*Strategies moving forward:*

- *Continue to support a new position created at the CCR&R network office to provide direct support and advising for CDA students supported with RTT-ELC grant funds and as described in our Scope of Work.*
- *Encourage CDA recipients to enter a degree program through our higher education system with supports from CCR&R Professional Development Advising and Career Guidance services and the Minnesota Center for Professional Development.*

*Support for Obtaining Associates and Bachelor's Degrees*

*Challenges:*

- *Closure of some programs at the two and four year colleges has led to less availability of classes. This is particularly true in Greater Minnesota.*
- *Low wages in early childhood programs do not provide an incentive to pursue additional education.*

*Lessons Learned:*

- *Intensive marketing and support is needed to encourage additional enrollment in higher education programs.*
- *Marketing focused particularly on T.E.A.C.H scholarships for higher education needs to increase.*
- *Additional one on one support through professional development advising and career guidance services can increase participation in degree programs.*

*Strategies moving forward:*

- *Redesign the T.E.A.C.H scholarships program to prioritize Early Childhood Educators participating in the Parent Aware as described in our RTT-ELC grant and Scope of Work.*
- *Examine ways that the scholarship model can be modified to meet the needs of more prospective students.*

- *Increase marketing of T.E.A.C.H scholarships.*
- *Continue coordination of support for Early Childhood Educators to encourage movement along the professional development continuum.*
- *Build stronger connections between staff at the Departments of Education and Human Services and the staff at higher education institutions to support pathways for students.*

## Kindergarten Entry Assessment

The State has made progress in developing a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that (check all that apply):

- X Is aligned with the State’s Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness;
- X Is valid, reliable, and appropriate for the target population and for the purpose for which it will be used, including for English learners and children with disabilities;
- Is administered beginning no later than the start of school year 2014-2015 to children entering a public school kindergarten; States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation;
- X Is reported to the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and to the early learning data system, if it is separate from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, as permitted under and consistent with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws; and
- X Is funded, in significant part, with Federal or State resources other than those available under this grant, (e.g., with funds available under section 6111 or 6112 of the ESEA).

Describe the domain coverage of the State’s Kindergarten Entry Assessment, validity and reliability efforts regarding the Kindergarten Entry Assessment, and timing of the administration of the Kindergarten Entry Assessment.

*Minnesota’s school readiness study was conducted in the Fall of 2012 with plans to conduct KEA 2.0, per the State’s Plan, in Fall 2013. Currently, the MN-Work Sampling System is used for the KEA on a 10% statewide representative sample. This tool has shown predictive validity to third grade test scores (Human Capital Research Collaborative, 2011) and has been used consistently since 2006. The current tool covers the following developmental/learning domains; physical development, language & literacy, personal & social development, mathematical thinking and the arts.*

*Plans have begun to review and possibly revise the KEA process for pilot testing in Fall 2013. The following progress has been made toward this goal:*

- *KEA study was completed (data collection and partial analysis) for 2012. Reports will occur in 2013*
- *Assessment specialist was hired in October 2012*
- *Assessment taskforce was recruited, staffed and convened for their first meeting December 17, 2012*
- *KEA subgroup of taskforce was formed and group charges, purpose and reporting structure created*

- *Communications subgroup of taskforce was formed and group charges, purpose and reporting structure created*
- *Taskforce and subgroups have set up regular meeting schedule*

*Because the KEA 2.0 planning will possibly constitute changes to the study and the way in which data is collected, organized and reported; a series of briefs were conceptualized to provide a background on the history of the study and trends in data through the 2011 study year. All briefs will be completed in 2013 prior to reporting on KEA pilot data.*

Describe the data the State collects or will collect using the Kindergarten Entry Assessment to assess children’s learning and developmental progress as they enter kindergarten.

*Currently, Minnesota collects item level Work Sampling System (WSS) data on approximately 6,000 children (10% representative sample) in the first eight weeks of kindergarten. The data are collected by kindergarten teachers who have been trained on the WSS and agreed to participate in the study. Additional child-level data such as ethnicity, home language, family income, parent education and child gender is collected from families via a survey distributed by classroom teachers.*

*Additional surveys are distributed to teachers and principals to understand their decision to participate, barriers to participation and associated workload and benefits.*

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State’s strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

*The 2011 study will be published in 2013 due to an anomaly in the data which required additional staff time for further analysis.*

## Early Learning Data Systems

The State has made progress in enhancing its existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System or building or enhancing a separate, coordinated, early learning data system that aligns and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and that (check all that apply):

- X Has all of the Essential Data Elements;
- Enables uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating State Agencies and Participating Programs;
  - Facilitates the exchange of data among Participating State Agencies by using standard data structures, data formats, and data definitions such as Common Education Data Standards to ensure interoperability among the various levels and types of data;
  - Generates information that is timely, relevant, accessible, and easy for Early Learning and Development Programs and Early Childhood Educators to use for continuous improvement and decision making; and
  - Meets the Data System Oversight Requirements and complies with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws.

If applicable, describe the State's progress in building or enhancing a Statewide Longitudinal Data System in the State that meets the criteria described above.

*Minnesota has all 10 essential data elements for longitudinal data systems in place as articulated by the Data Quality Campaign. Governance structures are currently being established which will be responsible for setting operational and functional parameters around the Longitudinal Data System. Minnesota's initial plans for the Longitudinal Data System include consideration for the uniform collection and easy entry of the essential data elements by the state agencies and programs that will participate in the System as it is constructed. Planning for the Longitudinal Data System will also include data exchange protocols and reporting mechanisms that will allow for timely and accessible information supporting program improvement and decision making. All data use protocols to be developed will be constructed around the need to keep data safe and ensure appropriate use within the confines of Federal, State, and local privacy laws.*

If applicable, please describe the State's progress in building or enhancing a separate early learning data system that aligns with and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and that meets the criteria described above.

*Minnesota's Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System Governing Body will be formed soon and membership will include representation from the current Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLEDS) as a bridge between the two initiatives.*

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

*At this stage of planning, Minnesota is slightly behind in the establishment of Governance for the Longitudinal Data System. Delays have been due to state hiring processes and labor market challenges for specific staffing needs. However, as positions have gradually been staffed, a kick-off meeting will be convened within the first quarter of 2013 and the project should be able to regain momentum. Since so many other subsequent tasks are linked to the launch of project Governance (e.g., the Research and Data Group for the identification of questions; the initiation of data sharing agreements between state agencies, etc.), staffing milestones reached will result in more rapid progress towards goals into the coming year.*

## **Invitational Priorities**

*Grantee should include a narrative for those invitational priority areas that were addressed in your RTT-ELC application.*

### **Sustaining Program Effects in the Early Elementary Grades. (Invitational Priority 4)**

The State has made progress in (check all that apply):

- Enhancing your current standards for kindergarten through grade 3 to align them with the Early Learning and Development Standards across all Essential Domains of School Readiness;
- Ensuring that transition planning occurs for children moving from Early Learning and Development Programs to elementary schools;
- Promoting health and family engagement, including in the early grades;
- Increasing the percentage of children who are able to read and do mathematics at grade level by the end of the third grade; and
- Leveraging existing Federal, State, and local resources.

Describe the progress made, if applicable.

*These Invitational Priority areas were not included in Minnesota's State Plan.*

### **Encouraging Private-Sector Support (Invitational Priority 5)**

Describe State's progress in engaging the private sector in supporting the implementation of the State Plan, if applicable.

*The state did not begin work on Project 11 in 2012. In 2013, the state is developing a plan to promote public-private partnerships. The plan will include engaging child care providers and business leaders to promote existing providers capacity to develop business plans and increase sustainability.*

### **Additional Information**

Please provide any additional information regarding progress, challenges, and lessons learned that is not addressed elsewhere in this report.

*As described in Minnesota's State Plan, four communities have been designated as Transformation Zones where Minnesota is testing the cumulative impact of the grant activities. These Transformation Zones have been working diligently with the Office of Early Learning to implement many of the activities in the grant. In several initiatives, the Transformation Zones have even been the lead in designing implementation models for their community in a manner that builds off the community's strengths and current successes. Quarterly meetings have been held with state staff and the Transformation Zones to discuss implementation and next steps and develop communities of learning across the Transformation Zones and knowledge sharing with state staff.*

*Minnesota's two main strategies for increase children with high needs' access to high quality Early Learning and Development programs include the Title I PreK Incentives and the Early*

*Learning Scholarships. These two strategies have a primary focus in the Transformation Zones and have been coordinated closely with each of the Zones.*

*Title I PreK Incentives are designed to encourage school districts to use Title I funds to support increased access to ELD programs by Children with High Needs. To date, five school districts have committed additional Title I funds to increasing access to ELD programs and have received approximately \$642,000 of Title I PreK Incentive funds to support this expansion. Districts expanding the use of Title I funds include rural and urban districts. Districts are using the funds to increase the number of children receiving classroom experiences, expanding intensive teaching support for children and creating district early childhood networks to improve services to prekindergarten children.*

*Learning: Some smaller rural districts found it difficult to shift Title I funds to early childhood because of the limited amount of funds in the district and the timing of grant opportunity - after Title I funds had been planned for in districts. (In addition, the Minnesota legislature had shifted payment of general education funds to districts in 2013 to 2014, which made reallocation of funds more difficult for districts.) To address this challenge, Minnesota requested and received federal approval to pursue one-time planning and preparation grants in the amounts of \$20,000 to selected districts to kick-start this work. Expenditures under this grant are limited to teacher professional development, salaries to cover planning time, curriculum and assessment purchases and some capital expenses. The application for these grants in the second year will be available no later than early March 2013.*

*Early Learning Scholarship provide scholarships to families with high needs to access high quality Early Learning and Development Programs participating in Parent Aware. In order to make these scholarships available during the first year of the grant, Minnesota successfully completed many tasks.*

- *Initial planning meetings were held with each Transformation Zone.*
- *Grants are in place with scholarship administrators for each Transformation Zone.*
- *Each of the four Transformation Zones developed a plan for implementing scholarships in their communities and has developed materials for implementation including an application and implementation manual specific to their community needs.*
- *Scholarship applications were made available in the late fall in the Northside Achievement Zone, Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood, and White Earth Reservation, and will soon be available in Itasca County.*
- *Marketing materials were developed in coordination with PASR.*
- *A cross-agency Scholarship Advisory committee was formed to assist in launching the Early Learning Scholarships, and to address future policy barriers.*
- *An evaluator was chosen to evaluate the Early Learning Scholarships and Title I*

*incentives, and initial discussions have begun with the Transformation Zones about the evaluation plans.*

*Another important aspect of Minnesota's State Plan is the reconstitution of the Child Care Health Consultant. MDH Child Care Health Consultant was hired as of July 30, 2012 and attended the National Training Institute for Child Care Health Consultants offered by the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Gillings School of Public Health, from September 11-14 and completed 10 weeks of additional online training. Certification as a Child Care Health Consultant was awarded December 14, 2012. In addition to being the lead Child Care Health Consultant for the state, the staff has been purposefully integrated with groups and committees leading multiple RTT-ELC activities. Request for Proposals for Child Care Health Consultants in the four Transformation Zones were posted in January, 2013.*

## Data Tables:

### **Commitment to early learning and development.**

In the tables that follow, provide updated data on the State's commitment to early learning and development as demonstrated in Section A(1) of the State's RTT-ELC application.

- Data on the status of children at kindergarten entry (across Essential Domains of School Readiness, if available), including data on the readiness gap between Children with High Needs and their peers.
- Data on program quality across different types of Early Learning and Development Programs.
- The number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program.
- Data on funding for early learning and development in the State.
- Data on the number and percentage of Children with High Needs from special populations in the State.
- Data on the current status of the State's early learning and development standards.
- Data on the Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State.

**Table 1: Children from Low-Income families, by age**

*In the table below, provide data for the current and previous grant years on the number and percentage of children from Low-Income families in the State, by age. [Low-Income is defined as having an income of up to 200% of the Federal poverty rate.]*

<b>Table 1: Children from Low-Income families, by age (Application Table (A)(1)-1). Provide the number of low-income families in the State and the number of children from low-income families as a percentage of all children in the state.</b>										
	<b>2011</b>		<b>2012</b>		<b>2013</b>		<b>2014</b>		<b>2015</b>	
	<b>Number of children from Low-Income families in the State</b>	<b>Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State</b>	<b># of low-income children in the state</b>	<b># of low-income children as a % of all children in the state</b>	<b># of low-income children in the state</b>	<b># of low-income children as a % of all children in the state</b>	<b># of low-income children in the state</b>	<b># of low-income children as a % of all children in the state</b>	<b># of low-income children in the state</b>	<b># of low-income children as a % of all children in the state</b>
<b>Infants under age 1</b>	24,274	35.2%	23,369	34.3%						
<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	48,908	34.4%	50,137	35.6%						
<b>Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry</b>	69,293	32.0%	71,494	33.4%						
<b>Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families.</b>	142,553	33.4%	145,000	34.3%						

**Table 2: Special populations of Children with High Needs**

*In the table below, provide data for the current and previous grant years on the number and percentage of Children with High Needs from special populations in the State.*

<b>Table 2: Special populations of Children (from birth to kindergarten entry) with High Needs. (Application Table (A)(1)-2).</b>										
	<b>2011</b>		<b>2012</b>		<b>2013</b>		<b>2014</b>		<b>2015</b>	
<b>Special populations: Children who . . .</b>	<b>Number of children in the State who...</b>	<b>Percentage of children in the State who...</b>	<b># of children in the State who...</b>	<b>% of children in the State who...</b>	<b># of children in the State who...</b>	<b>% of children in the State who...</b>	<b># of children in the State who...</b>	<b>% of children in the State who...</b>	<b># of children in the State who...</b>	<b>% of children in the State who...</b>
<b>Have disabilities or developmental delays</b>	16,162	3.81%	16,129	3.77%						
<b>Are English learners</b>	35,642	8.3%	38,160	11.9%						
<b>Reside on “Indian Lands”</b>	3,695	0.9%	4,238	1%						
<b>Are migrant</b>	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available						
<b>Are Homeless</b>	17,680	4.1%	17,680	4.1%						
<b>Are in Foster Care*</b>	2990	0.5%								
<p>Notes: Throughout this document, children prior to “Kindergarten entry” are defined through those ages 0-5 (including 5-year-olds). “Children who are English learners” were defined as children in families whose household head spoke another language other than English in the home and spoke English less than “very well.” “Indian Lands” include the following Reservations and Off-Reservation Trust Land located within Minnesota: Bois Forte, Fond du Lac, Grand Portage, Leech Lake, Lower Sioux, Mille Lacs, Chippewa, Prairie Island, Red Lake, Sandy Lake, Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux, Upper Sioux, and White Earth.</p>										

**Table 2: Special populations of Children (from birth to kindergarten entry) with High Needs. (Application Table (A)(1)-2).**

	2011		2012		2013		2014		2015	
Special populations: Children who . ..	Number of children in the State who...	Percentage of children in the State who...	# of children in the State who...	% of children in the State who...	# of children in the State who...	% of children in the State who...	# of children in the State who...	% of children in the State who...	# of children in the State who...	% of children in the State who...

For purposes of this report, children with disabilities or developmental delays are defined as children birth through kindergarten entry that have an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) or an Individual Education Plan (IEP).

For purposes of this report, children who are English learners are children birth through kindergarten entry that has home languages other than English. Limited English Proficiency Kindergarten Enrollment SFY2012 multiplied by 5

Reside on “Indian Lands”- Minnesota State Demographic Center, 2010 Census

For purposes of this report, children who are migrant are children birth through kindergarten entry who meets the definition of “migratory child” in ESEA section 1309(2).

Foster care data from Minnesota Department of Human Services and Minnesota Foster Care Report

Card: <https://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfserver/Public/DHS-5408D-ENG> , p. 58 Children in Out of Home Care by Age. \*2012 numbers will be available late July 2013.

**Table 3: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age**

*In the table below, provide data for the current and previous grant years on the number of Children with High Needs in the State who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs, by age.*

**Table 3: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age (Application Table (A)(1)-3).**

*Note: A grand total is not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs.*

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age																			
	2011				2012				2013				2014				2015			
	Infants < 1	Toddlers ages 1 - 2	Children ages 3 to K-entry	Total	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.
<b>State-funded preschool</b> <i>Specify: School Readiness Program</i>	0	0	24,790	24,790	0	0	24,736	24,736												
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start</b>	0	1,639 (combined 0-2)	12,446	14,085	0	2,157 (combined 0-2)	12,831	14,988												

**Table 3: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age (Application Table (A)(1)-3).**

*Note: A grand total is not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs.*

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age																			
	2011				2012				2013				2014				2015			
	Infants < 1	Toddlers ages 1 - 2	Children ages 3 to K-entry	Total	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b>	597	4480	11,085	16,162																
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b>	0	0	2,246	2,246	0	0	3,252	3,252												
<b>Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program</b>	1,419	7,734	11,139	20,292	1,698	6,923	11,070	19,691												

**Table 3: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age (Application Table (A)(1)-3).**

*Note: A grand total is not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs.*

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age																			
	2011				2012				2013				2014				2015			
	Infants < 1	Toddlers ages 1 - 2	Children ages 3 to K-entry	Total	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.
<b>Other</b> Early Childhood Mental Health Infrastructure Grant	9	75	355	439	0	0	0	0												
<b>Other</b> Early Childhood Screening	0	0	63,940	63,940	0	0	60,981	60,981												
<b>Other</b> Early Childhood Family Education (Parent Education Program)	22,765	29,788	25,905	78,458	23,223	31,168	27,906	82,297												
<b>State-funded preschool:</b> <i>School Readiness Program Data Source and Year: Annual Data Program Report, early Learning Data System 2010</i>																				
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start:</b> <i>Data Source and Year: funded enrollment: Allocation chart 2010; Includes children participating in Migrant</i>																				

**Table 3: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age (Application Table (A)(1)-3).**

*Note: A grand total is not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs.*

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age																			
	2011				2012				2013				2014				2015			
	Infants < 1	Toddlers ages 1 - 2	Children ages 3 to K-entry	Total	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.
<i>Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.</i>																				
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619:</b> <i>Data Source and Year: MN Automated Reporting System (MARSS); 2 Dec 1, 2010/ 12/1/2011; 2012 Data not yet available</i>																				
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA:</b> <i>Data Source and Year: Consolidated state performance report 2010</i>																				
<b>Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:</b> <i>Data Source and Year: Minnesota Electronic Child Care System (MEC2), SFY2011 (avg monthly), includes only children funded through Child Care Assistance</i>																				
<b>Other</b> <i>The Early Childhood Mental Health Infrastructure Grant included in Minnesota's RTT-ELC application was phased out and is no longer serving young children. This grant provided young children's mental health services on clinical services for uninsured/underinsured. Data Source and Year: Early Childhood Mental Health Infrastructure Grant data- Sept 8, 2011</i>																				
<b>Other</b> <i>Early Childhood Screening: Data Source and Year: Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS) 2010 MDE est that 0.05% of children were screened more than 30 days after Kindergarten entry</i>																				
<b>Other</b> <i>Early Childhood Family Education (Parent Education Program): Data Source and Year: Number of Children in classes, Early Learning Data Systems Annual Report SFY 2010. High Need children are in families with incomes under \$40,000. NOTE: 18,957 are in mixed age classrooms.</i>																				

**Table 4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development**

*In the table below, provide data on the funding for Early Learning and Development in the State.*

*Note: For States that have a biennial State budget, please complete for all fiscal years for which State funds have been appropriated. We are not asking for forecasting, but for actual allocations. Therefore, States that do not have biennial budgets need not complete for years for which appropriations do not yet exist.*

<b>Table 4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development (Application Table (A)(1)-4).</b>					
<b>Type of investment</b>	<b>Funding for each Fiscal Year</b>				
	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>
<b>Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start</b>	20,100,000	20,100,000	20,100,000		
<b>State-funded preschool</b> <i>Specify: School Readiness Program</i>	9,792,000	9,958,393	10,095,000		
<b>State contributions to IDEA Part C *</b>	30,163,979	30,163,979	30,163,979		
<b>State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry*</b>	124,568,148	124,568,148	124,568,148		
<b>Total State contributions to CCDF</b> <i>Includes only state spending on Child Care Assistance Program</i>	80,990,440	93,987,000	77,846,747		
<b>State match to CCDF</b> <i>Exceeded/Met/Not Met (if exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded)</i> <i>All CCDF match funds are from Minnesota's general fund. Calculated based on FFY match requirement. Equals total state contribution less match requirement amount. Dollar values include state Maintenance of Effort amount. State match to CCDF is included in Total state Contributions (above row)</i>	Exceeded 52,710,490	Exceeded 64,402,563	Exceeded 49,653,920		
<b>TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs</b>	55,041,000	44,083,000	62,086,000		

**Table 4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development (Application Table (A)(1)-4).**

Type of investment	Funding for each Fiscal Year				
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
<b>Other State contributions</b> Early Child Mental Health Infrastructure Grant <i>Specify: Young children’s mental health services or clinical services for the uninsured/underinsured</i> <i>Young children’s mental services was a 3-year grant; here funding is evenly divided across years (2009-2011)</i>	426,456	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Other State contributions</b> <i>Specify: Early Childhood Family Education</i>	21,177,000	22,636,263	22,639,000		
<b>Other State contributions</b> <i>Specify: Early Childhood Screening</i>	3,434,000	3,513,640	3,617,000		
<b>Other State contributions</b> <i>Specify: TANF expenditures on Home Visiting</i>	8,451,503	8,557,000	8,557,000		
<b>Total State contributions:</b>	406,855,016	421,969,986	409,326,794		

Based on State Fiscal Year (SFY). Minnesota’s SFY runs July 1-June 30.

Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start: Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

Total State contributions to CCDF: Total State contributions to CCDF must include Maintenance of Effort (MOE), State Match, and any State contributions exceeding State MOE or Match.

TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs: Includes TANF transfers to CCDF as well as direct TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs.

\*2012 and 2013 Numbers for State contributions to IDEA Part C and State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry are estimates.

**Table 5: Data on the Current status of the State’s Early Learning and Development Standards**

*In the table below, update the data provided in the State’s application regarding the current status of Early Learning and Development Standards.*

**Table 5: Current status of the State’s Early Learning and Development Standards (Application Table (A)(1)-6)**

*Please place an “X” in the boxes to indicate where the State’s Early Learning and Development Standards address the different age groups by Essential Domain of School Readiness*

Essential Domains of School Readiness	Age Groups		
	Infants	Toddlers	Preschoolers
Language and literacy development	X	X	X
Cognition and general knowledge (including early math and early scientific development)	X	X	X
Approaches toward learning	X	X	X
Physical well-being and motor development	X	X	X
Social and emotional development	X	X	X

**Table 6: Data on the Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State**

Table 6: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State (Application Table (A)(1)-7).					
Please place an "X" in the boxes to indicate where an element of a Comprehensive Assessment System is currently required.					
Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
State-funded preschool <i>Specify:</i>	X	X	X		
Early Head Start and Head Start*	X	X	X	X	
Programs funded under IDEA Part C	X	X			
Programs funded under IDEA Part B, section 619	X	X	Continue to scale-up using <i>Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool</i> - third cohort includes additional 13 sites in 2012	Continue to scale-up using <i>Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool</i>	
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	X	X			

**Table 6: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State (Application Table (A)(1)-7).**

*Please place an “X” in the boxes to indicate where an element of a Comprehensive Assessment System is currently required.*

Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
<b>Programs receiving CCDF funds</b>	X Programs receiving CCDF funds are required to have training which includes awareness about screening	X MN licensing regulations for child care centers (not family child care) require that a child’s intellectual, physical, social and emotional development be reported during parent conferences. There is no reference to formative assessment.	X Programs participating in Parent Aware QRIS in Tier 2 must complete an environment self-assessment based on the Environment Rating Scales (ITERS/ECERS/FCCERS ) and develop goals for areas where improvement is needed	X All child care centers (not family child care) participating in Parent Aware QRIS must have preschool and toddler classrooms observed and must receive a CLASS score of 2.5 or higher in the Instructional Support category of the CLASS to achieve 3 stars	

**Table 6: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State (Application Table (A)(1)-7).**

*Please place an “X” in the boxes to indicate where an element of a Comprehensive Assessment System is currently required.*

Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
<b>Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements</b> <i>Specify by tier (add rows if needed):</i>	X  Tier 1  All must provide parents with information on screening	X  Tier 1  All FC providers & lead teachers have at least 2 hours training on authentic observation  Tier 2 requires that families are given summary of child’s observation records  Tiers 3 & 4  Conduct assessment using an approved tool with all children at least twice per year in at least the following domains: social-emotional, language and literacy, mathematical thinking and physical development; and all lead teachers/providers have completed 8 hours of training on authentic child assessment,	X  Tier 2  All providers must complete an environment self-assessment based on the Environment Rating Scales (ITERS/ECERS/FCCERS ) and develop goals for areas where improvement is needed	X  Tier 3 & 4  Centers only  All preschool and toddler classrooms must receive a CLASS score of 2.5 or higher in the Instructional Support category of the CLASS to achieve 3 stars.	

**Table 6: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State (Application Table (A)(1)-7).**

*Please place an “X” in the boxes to indicate where an element of a Comprehensive Assessment System is currently required.*

Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
		<p>(cont' from previous page) OR</p> <p>Conducts assessment using an approved tool with all children at least once per year in two or more domains, and all lead teachers/providers have completed at least 8 hours of training on authentic child assessment.</p> <p>(If program is using an approved assessment tool with some but not all age groups, partial credit is given.)</p> <p>Provides families with child assessment results, and if a child has an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) OR</p> <p>Individual Family Services Plan (IFSP), shares assessment results with team with family's permission. For a child with a special need who is receiving specialty services (for example, physical or occupational therapy), shares assessment results with service providers with family's permission.</p>			

**Table 6: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State (Application Table (A)(1)-7).**

*Please place an “X” in the boxes to indicate where an element of a Comprehensive Assessment System is currently required.*

Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
State licensing requirements		X MN licensing regulations for child care centers (not family child care) require that a child’s intellectual, physical, social and emotional development be reported during parent conferences. There is no reference to formative assessment.			
Other <i>Describe:</i>	X Nurse Family Partnership Home Visiting Program (developmental and social-emotional screening)				

*\* Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.*

## Additional Performance Measures Tables

Update any additional performance measure, if applicable.

*Additional Performance Measures are not applicable to Minnesota*

Performance Measures – Other (if applicable)					
<i>[Insert title here]</i>					
<b>Project Goals/Desired Outcomes:</b>					
<b>Narrative:</b> <i>[Briefly describe...]</i>					
<b>Annual Targets for Key Performance Measures:</b>					
<b>Performance Measures for (other):</b>					
<i>[Customize performance measure tables as appropriate]</i>					
	Baseline (from Application)	2012 (Target)  Actual	2013 (Target)  Actual	2014 (Target)  Actual	2015 (Target)  Actual

## Budget Information

Please describe what activities and mechanisms (e.g., contracts, MOUs, etc.) the State is using to distribute funds from the RTT-ELC budget to local programs, early learning intermediary organizations, participating programs, individuals (including scholars), and other partners.

*The Governor designated the Department of Education as the lead agency for coordination of the State Plan, through the OEL. Commissioners from the three state agencies comprising the Children's Cabinet have each signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), delineating roles and responsibilities under the State Plan. Based on the MOUs and the Statement of Work, the Department of Education has entered into interagency agreements with the Departments of Human Services and Health in order to distribute funds to each agency in order to complete the work for which it is responsible.*

*For work that is not being performed by state staff, each state agency either contracts or subgrants the funds using federal and state procurement regulations.*

Please describe the entities (or types of individuals) to whom the State is distributing RTT-ELC funds through subgranting.

*In the first year of the grant, the sub-grantees include:*

- *Two Early Learning Scholarships Administrators –*
  - *A Tribal Nation*
  - *A local CCR&R*
- *Five Title I PreK Incentives Grants*
  - *Independent School Districts*
- *Parent Aware recruitment and supports*
  - *19 regional CCR&R sites*
  - *Five CCR&R district sites*
  - *One statewide CCR&R network office, Child Care Aware of MN*
- *Additional Parent Aware quality rating staff, delivery of Parent Aware-required on-line training, on-line training platform enhancements, and delivery of low-cost training for the Minnesota Child Care Credential*
  - *Child Care Aware of MN*
- *Parent Aware on-site CLASS observations for 3 and 4-star rated programs and observations for the Parent Aware evaluation*
  - *Center for Early Education & Development, University of Minnesota*
- *Low-cost TQRIS training and CLASS coaching for child care centers participating in Parent Aware*
  - *Six CCR&R district sites*
- *Coaching on serving children with special needs*
  - *Center for Inclusive Child Care, Concordia University*
- *Professional development Registry staffing support and technology improvements*
  - *MN Center for Professional Development , Metropolitan State University*

Please provide a brief summary of any substantive changes that were made to the State RTT-ELC budget within the past year.

*In the first year of the grant, there has not been any substantive changes to the RTT-ELC budget except for some delays in activities which has resulted in less spending in the first year of the grant than was originally anticipated. In most cases the delay in spending means more spending will occur in the other years of the grant, but not an actual change in the overall budget.*

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

*There are currently no substantive changes anticipated for the upcoming year of the grant except for the possible additional expenditures of funds that were not spent in Year 1 of the grant.*

## Budget and Expenditure Tables

**Budget and Expenditure Table 1: Overall Budget and Expenditure Summary by Budget Category--Include budget and expenditure totals for each budget category for Grant Year 1.**

<b>Budget Table 1: Overall Budget Summary by Budget Category for Grant Year 1</b>		
<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>
1. Personnel	368,170	208,154
2. Fringe Benefits	124,008	56,233
3. Travel	12,471	1,665
4. Equipment	3,400	0
5. Supplies	20,733	1,176
6. Contractual	2,184,550	0
7. Training Stipends	15,000	1,000
8. Other	86,504	16,197
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	2,814,876	284,425
10. Indirect Costs*	211,517	55,861
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	1,412,253	317,763
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	0	18,087
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>4,438,646</b>	<b>676,136</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	13,998,915	13,670,383
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>18,437,561</b>	<b>14,346,519</b>
<p><u>Line 6:</u> Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.</p> <p><u>Line 10:</u> If the State Plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.</p> <p><u>Line 11:</u> Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.</p> <p><u>Line 12:</u> The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.</p> <p><u>Line 13:</u> This is the total funding requested under this grant.</p> <p><u>Line 14:</u> Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.</p>		

**Budget and Expenditure Table 2: by Project -- The State must complete a Budget and Expenditure Table for each project for Grant Year 1.**

<b>Budget Table 2: Project 1 B1, 2, 3 &amp; 5 Parent Aware TQRIS</b>		
<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>
1. Personnel	60,839	29,216
2. Fringe Benefits	19,347	6,039
3. Travel	4,135	0
4. Equipment	1,700	0
5. Supplies	2,500	0
6. Contractual	120,500	0
7. Training Stipends	0	0
8. Other	1,796	0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	210,817	35,255
10. Indirect Costs*	38,274	8,391
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	0	0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	0	0
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>249,091</b>	<b>43,646</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	4,410,457	4,369,924
<b>15. Total Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>4,659, 548</b>	<b>4,413,570</b>
<p><u>Line 6:</u> Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.</p> <p><u>Line 10:</u> If the State Plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.</p> <p><u>Line 11:</u> Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.</p> <p><u>Line 12:</u> The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.</p> <p><u>Line 13:</u> This is the total funding requested under this grant.</p> <p><u>Line 14:</u> Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.</p>		

**Budget Table 2: Project 2**  
***B4 Access School Readiness Scholarships***

Budget Categories	Budget	Expenditures
1. Personnel	38,982	31,594
2. Fringe Benefits	9,366	7,166
3. Travel	2,468	339
4. Equipment	0	0
5. Supplies	0	0
6. Contractual	0	0
7. Training Stipends	0	0
8. Other	6,677	2,903
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	57,493	42,002
10. Indirect Costs*	11,958	8,193
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	716,883	269,669
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	0	0
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>786,335</b>	<b>319,864</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	470,000	474,529*
<b>15. Total Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>1,256,335</b>	<b>319,864</b>

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State Plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

\*Funding from other sources includes a new State funded Early Learning Scholarships program which were not included in the State's Plan.

**Budget Table 2: Project 3**  
**B4 Access Title I PreK Incentive Grants**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>
1. Personnel	24,026	9,342
2. Fringe Benefits	4,775	1,780
3. Travel	2,468	688
4. Equipment	0	0
5. Supplies	0	0
6. Contractual	250,000	0
7. Training Stipends	0	0
8. Other	2,671	527
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	283,940	12,337
10. Indirect Costs*	12,259	2,134
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	645,370	48,094
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	0	0
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>941,569</b>	<b>62,565</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	646,370	48,094
<b>15. Total Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>1,586,939</b>	<b>110,659</b>

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State Plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Budget Table 2: Project 4**  
**CI Standards**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>
1. Personnel	0	0
2. Fringe Benefits	0	0
3. Travel	0	0
4. Equipment	0	0
5. Supplies	0	0
6. Contractual	25,500	0
7. Training Stipends	0	1,000
8. Other	0	0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	25,500	1,000
10. Indirect Costs*	5,304	208
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	0	0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	0	0
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>30,804</b>	<b>1,208</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	69,882	374,630
<b>15. Total Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>100,686</b>	<b>375,838</b>

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State Plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Budget Table 2: Project 5**  
**C2 Comprehensive Assessment**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>
1. Personnel	37,451	16,327
2. Fringe Benefits	19,856	3,858
3. Travel	2,468	0
4. Equipment	0	0
5. Supplies	0	43
6. Contractual	491,000	0
7. Training Stipends	15,000	0
8. Other	5,608	551
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	571,384	20,779
10. Indirect Costs*	32,320	3,453
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	0	0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	0	0
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>603,704</b>	<b>24,232</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	4,728,206	4,728,206
<b>15. Total Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>5,331,910</b>	<b>4,752,438</b>
<p><u>Line 6:</u> Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.</p> <p><u>Line 10:</u> If the State Plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.</p> <p><u>Line 11:</u> Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.</p> <p><u>Line 12:</u> The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.</p> <p><u>Line 13:</u> This is the total funding requested under this grant.</p> <p><u>Line 14:</u> Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.</p>		

**Budget Table 2: Project 6  
Workforce Framework**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>
1. Personnel	0	0
2. Fringe Benefits	0	0
3. Travel	0	0
4. Equipment	0	0
5. Supplies	0	0
6. Contractual	60,000	0
7. Training Stipends	0	0
8. Other	0	0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	60,000	0
10. Indirect Costs*	5,200	0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	0	0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	0	0
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>65,200</b>	<b>0</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	50,000	50,000
<b>15. Total Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>115,200</b>	<b>50,000</b>

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State Plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Budget Table 2: Project 7  
D2 Workforce Support**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>
1. Personnel	0	0
2. Fringe Benefits	0	0
3. Travel	0	0
4. Equipment	0	0
5. Supplies	0	0
6. Contractual	413,000	0
7. Training Stipends	0	0
8. Other	0	0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	413,000	0
10. Indirect Costs*	2,600	0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	0	0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	0	0
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>415,600</b>	<b>0</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	3,195,000	3,195,000
<b>15. Total Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>3,610,600</b>	<b>3,195,000</b>

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State Plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Budget Table 2: Project 8  
E1 Kindergarten Entry**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>
1. Personnel	0	0
2. Fringe Benefits	0	0
3. Travel	0	0
4. Equipment	0	0
5. Supplies	0	0
6. Contractual	0	0
7. Training Stipends	0	0
8. Other	0	0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	0	0
10. Indirect Costs*	0	0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	0	0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	0	0
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	281,000	281,000
<b>15. Total Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>281,000</b>	<b>281,000</b>

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State Plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Budget Table 2: Project 9**  
***E2 Data System***

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>
1. Personnel	139,153	66,346
2. Fringe Benefits	51,646	19,000
3. Travel	532	142
4. Equipment	1,700	0
5. Supplies	8,273	414
6. Contractual	743,000	0
7. Training Stipends	0	0
8. Other	58,076	3,559
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	1,002,381	89,461
10. Indirect Costs*	70,568	17,680
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	0	0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	0	0
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>1,072,948</b>	<b>107,141</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	100,000	100,000
<b>15. Total Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>1,172,948</b>	<b>207,141</b>

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State Plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Budget Table 2: Project 10**  
***P2 FFN Support***

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>
1. Personnel	0	0
2. Fringe Benefits	0	0
3. Travel	0	0
4. Equipment	0	0
5. Supplies	0	0
6. Contractual	31,550	0
7. Training Stipends	0	0
8. Other	0	0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	31,550	0
10. Indirect Costs*	5,200	0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	0	0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	0	0
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>36,750</b>	<b>0</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	49,000	49,000
<b>15. Total Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>85,750</b>	<b>49,000</b>

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State Plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Budget Table 2: Project 11**  
***P5 Public-Private Partnership***

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>
1. Personnel	0	0
2. Fringe Benefits	0	0
3. Travel	0	0
4. Equipment	0	0
5. Supplies	0	0
6. Contractual	50,000	0
7. Training Stipends	0	0
8. Other	0	0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	50,000	0
10. Indirect Costs*	5,200	0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	0	0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	0	0
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>55,200</b>	<b>0</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	0	0
<b>15. Total Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>55,200</b>	<b>0</b>

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State Plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Budget Table 2: Project 12**  
**Project Support Management**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>
1. Personnel	67,718	55,329
2. Fringe Benefits	19,018	18,390
3. Travel	400	496
4. Equipment	0	0
5. Supplies	10,000	719
6. Contractual	0	0
7. Training Stipends	0	0
8. Other	11,677	8,657
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	108,812	83,591
10. Indirect Costs*	22,633	15,802
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	50,000	0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	0	0
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>181,445</b>	<b>99,393</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	0	0
<b>15. Total Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>181,445</b>	<b>99,393</b>

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State Plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Budget Table 2: Project 13**  
**TA**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Expenditures</b>
1. Personnel	0	0
2. Fringe Benefits	0	0
3. Travel	0	13,384
4. Equipment	0	0
5. Supplies	0	0
6. Contractual	0	0
7. Training Stipends	0	1,570
8. Other	0	0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	0	14,954
10. Indirect Costs*	0	3,133
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	0	0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	400,000	0
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>0</b>	<b>18,087</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	0	0
<b>15. Total Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>400,000</b>	<b>18,087</b>

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State Plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

## DEFINITIONS

*Note: All definitions below are taken from the notice.*

Children with High Needs means children from birth through kindergarten entry who are from Low-Income families or otherwise in need of special assistance and support, including children who have disabilities or developmental delays; who are English learners; who reside on “Indian lands” as that term is defined by section 8013(6) of the ESEA; who are migrant, homeless, or in foster care; and other children as identified by the State.

Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) means voluntary, common standards for a key set of education data elements (*e.g.*, demographics, program participation, transition, course information) at the early learning, K-12, and postsecondary levels developed through a national collaborative effort being led by the National Center for Education Statistics. CEDS focus on standard definitions, code sets, and technical specifications of a subset of key data elements and are designed to increase data interoperability, portability, and comparability across Early Learning and Development Programs and agencies, States, local educational agencies, and postsecondary institutions.

Comprehensive Assessment System means a coordinated and comprehensive system of multiple assessments, each of which is valid and reliable for its specified purpose and for the population with which it will be used, that organizes information about the process and context of young children’s learning and development in order to help Early Childhood Educators make informed instructional and programmatic decisions and that conforms to the recommendations of the National Research Council reports on early childhood.

A Comprehensive Assessment System includes, at a minimum--

- (a) Screening Measures;
- (b) Formative Assessments;
- (c) Measures of Environmental Quality; and
- (d) Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions.

Data System Oversight Requirements means policies for ensuring the quality, privacy, and integrity of data contained in a data system, including--

(a) A data governance policy that identifies the elements that are collected and maintained; provides for training on internal controls to system users; establishes who will have access to the data in the system and how the data may be used; sets appropriate internal controls to restrict access to only authorized users; sets criteria for determining the legitimacy of data requests; establishes processes that verify the accuracy, completeness, and age of the data elements maintained in the system; sets procedures for determining the sensitivity of each inventoried element and the risk of harm if those data were improperly disclosed; and establishes procedures for disclosure review and auditing; and

(b) A transparency policy that informs the public, including families, Early Childhood Educators, and programs, of the existence of data systems that house personally identifiable information, explains what data elements are included in such a system, enables parental consent to disclose personally identifiable information as appropriate, and describes allowable and potential uses of the data.

Early Childhood Educator means any professional working in an Early Learning and Development Program, including but not limited to center-based and family child care providers; infant

and toddler specialists; early intervention specialists and early childhood special educators; home visitors; related services providers; administrators such as directors, supervisors, and other early learning and development leaders; Head Start teachers; Early Head Start teachers; preschool and other teachers; teacher assistants; family service staff; and health coordinators.

Early Learning and Development Program means any (a) State-licensed or State-regulated program or provider, regardless of setting or funding source, that provides early care and education for children from birth to kindergarten entry, including, but not limited to, any program operated by a child care center or in a family child care home; (b) preschool program funded by the Federal Government or State or local educational agencies (including any IDEA-funded program); (c) Early Head Start and Head Start program; and (d) a non-relative child care provider who is not otherwise regulated by the State and who regularly cares for two or more unrelated children for a fee in a provider setting. A State should include in this definition other programs that may deliver early learning and development services in a child's home, such as the Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting; Early Head Start; and part C of IDEA<sup>1</sup>.

Early Learning and Development Standards means a set of expectations, guidelines, or developmental milestones that--

- (a) Describe what all children from birth to kindergarten entry should know and be able to do and their disposition toward learning;
- (b) Are appropriate for each age group (*e.g.*, infants, toddlers, and preschoolers); for English learners; and for children with disabilities or developmental delays;
- (c) Cover all Essential Domains of School Readiness; and
- (d) Are universally designed and developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate.

Early Learning Intermediary Organization means a national, statewide, regional, or community-based organization that represents one or more networks of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State and that has influence or authority over them. Such Early Learning Intermediary Organizations include, but are not limited to, Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies; State Head Start Associations; Family Child Care Associations; State affiliates of the National Association for the Education of Young Children; State affiliates of the Council for Exceptional Children's Division of Early Childhood; statewide or regional union affiliates that represent Early Childhood Educators; affiliates of the National Migrant and Seasonal Head Start Association; the National Tribal, American Indian, and Alaskan Native Head Start Association; and the National Indian Child Care Association.

Essential Data Elements means the critical child, program, and workforce data elements of a coordinated early learning data system, including--

- (a) A unique statewide child identifier or another highly accurate, proven method to link data on that child, including Kindergarten Entry Assessment data, to and from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and the coordinated early learning data system (if applicable);
- (b) A unique statewide Early Childhood Educator identifier;

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: Such home-based programs and services will most likely not participate in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System unless the State has developed a set of Tiered Program Standards specifically for home-based programs and services.

- (c) A unique program site identifier;
- (d) Child and family demographic information;
- (e) Early Childhood Educator demographic information, including data on educational attainment and State credential or licenses held, as well as professional development information;
- (f) Program-level data on the program's structure, quality, child suspension and expulsion rates, staff retention, staff compensation, work environment, and all applicable data reported as part of the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System; and
- (g) Child-level program participation and attendance data.

Essential Domains of School Readiness means the domains of language and literacy development, cognition and general knowledge (including early mathematics and early scientific development), approaches toward learning, physical well-being and motor development (including adaptive skills), and social and emotional development.

Formative Assessment (also known as a classroom-based or ongoing assessment) means assessment questions, tools, and processes--

- (a) That are--
  - (1) Specifically designed to monitor children's progress in meeting the Early Learning and Development Standards;
  - (2) Valid and reliable for their intended purposes and their target populations;
  - (3) Linked directly to the curriculum; and
- (b) The results of which are used to guide and improve instructional practices.

High-Quality Plan means any plan developed by the State to address a selection criterion or priority in the notice that is feasible and has a high probability of successful implementation and at a minimum includes--

- (a) The key goals;
- (b) The key activities to be undertaken; the rationale for the activities; and, if applicable, where in the State the activities will be initially implemented, and where and how they will be scaled up over time to eventually achieve statewide implementation;
- (c) A realistic timeline, including key milestones, for implementing each key activity;
- (d) The party or parties responsible for implementing each activity and other key personnel assigned to each activity;
- (e) Appropriate financial resources to support successful implementation of the plan;
- (f) The information requested as supporting evidence, if any, together with any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers in judging the credibility of the plan;

- (g) The information requested in the performance measures, where applicable;
- (h) How the State will address the needs of the different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, if applicable; and
- (i) How the State will meet the needs of Children with High Needs, as well as the unique needs of special populations of Children with High Needs.

Kindergarten Entry Assessment means an assessment that--

- (a) Is administered to children during the first few months of their admission into kindergarten;
- (b) Covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness;
- (c) Is used in conformance with the recommendations of the National Research Council<sup>2</sup> reports on early childhood; and
- (d) Is valid and reliable for its intended purposes and for the target populations and aligned to the Early Learning and Development Standards. Results of the assessment should be used to inform efforts to close the school readiness gap at kindergarten entry and to inform instruction in the early elementary school grades. This assessment should not be used to prevent children's entry into kindergarten.

Lead Agency means the State-level agency designated by the Governor for the administration of the RTT-ELC grant; this agency is the fiscal agent for the grant. The Lead Agency must be one of the Participating State Agencies.

Low-Income means having an income of up to 200 percent of the Federal poverty rate.

Measures of Environmental Quality means valid and reliable indicators of the overall quality of the early learning environment.

Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions means the measures obtained through valid and reliable processes for observing how teachers and caregivers interact with children, where such processes are designed to promote child learning and to identify strengths and areas for improvement for early learning professionals.

Participating State Agency means a State agency that administers public funds related to early learning and development and is participating in the State Plan. The following State agencies are required Participating State Agencies: the agencies that administer or supervise the administration of CCDF, the section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA programs, State-funded preschool, home visiting, Title I of ESEA, the Head Start State Collaboration Grant, and the Title V Maternal and Child Care Block Grant, as well as the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care, the State's Child Care Licensing Agency, and the State Education Agency. Other State agencies, such as the agencies that administer or supervise the administration of Child Welfare, Mental Health, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention, the Child and Adult Care Food

---

<sup>2</sup> National Research Council. (2008). Early Childhood Assessment: Why, What, and How. Committee on Developmental Outcomes and Assessments for Young Children, C.E. Snow and S.B. Van Hemel, Editors. Board on Children, Youth, and Families, Board on Testing and Assessment, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.  
[http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=12446](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12446)

Program, and the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA) may be Participating State Agencies if they elect to participate in the State Plan.

Participating Program means an Early Learning and Development Program that elects to carry out activities described in the State Plan.

Program Standards means the standards that serve as the basis for a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System and define differentiated levels of quality for Early Learning and Development Programs. Program Standards are expressed, at a minimum, by the extent to which--

(a) Early Learning and Development Standards are implemented through evidence-based activities, interventions, or curricula that are appropriate for each age group of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers;

(b) Comprehensive Assessment Systems are used routinely and appropriately to improve instruction and enhance program quality by providing robust and coherent evidence of--

(1) Children's learning and development outcomes; and

(2) program performance;

(c) A qualified workforce improves young children's health, social, emotional, and educational outcomes;

(d) Strategies are successfully used to engage families in supporting their children's development and learning. These strategies may include, but are not limited to, parent access to the program, ongoing two-way communication with families, parent education in child development, outreach to fathers and other family members, training and support for families as children move to preschool and kindergarten, social networks of support, intergenerational activities, linkages with community supports and adult and family literacy programs, parent involvement in decision making, and parent leadership development;

(e) Health promotion practices include health and safety requirements; developmental, behavioral, and sensory screening, referral, and follow up; and the promotion of physical activity, healthy eating habits, oral health and behavioral health, and health literacy among parents; and

(f) Effective data practices include gathering Essential Data Elements and entering them into the State's Statewide Longitudinal Data System or other early learning data system, using these data to guide instruction and program improvement, and making this information readily available to families.

Screening Measures means age and developmentally appropriate, valid, and reliable instruments that are used to identify children who may need follow-up services to address developmental, learning, or health needs in, at a minimum, the areas of physical health, behavioral health, oral health, child development, vision, and hearing.

State means any of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

State Plan means the plan submitted as part of the State's RTT-ELC application.

Statewide Longitudinal Data System means the State's longitudinal education data system that collects and maintains detailed, high-quality, student- and staff-level data that are linked across entities and that over time provide a complete academic and performance history for each student. The Statewide Longitudinal Data System is typically housed within the State educational agency but includes or can be connected to early childhood, postsecondary, and labor data.

Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System means the system through which the State uses a set of progressively higher Program Standards to evaluate the quality of an Early Learning and Development Program and to support program improvement. A Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System consists of four components: (a) tiered Program Standards with multiple rating categories that clearly and meaningfully differentiate program quality levels; (b) monitoring to evaluate program quality based on the Program Standards; (c) supports to help programs meet progressively higher standards (*e.g.*, through training, technical assistance, financial support); and (d) program quality ratings that are publically available; and includes a process for validating the system.

Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework means a set of expectations that describes what Early Childhood Educators (including those working with children with disabilities and English learners) should know and be able to do. The Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, at a minimum, (a) is evidence-based; (b) incorporates knowledge and application of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards, the Comprehensive Assessment Systems, child development, health, and culturally and linguistically appropriate strategies for working with families; (c) includes knowledge of early mathematics and literacy development and effective instructional practices to support mathematics and literacy development in young children; (d) incorporates effective use of data to guide instruction and program improvement; (e) includes effective behavior management strategies that promote positive social emotional development and reduce challenging behaviors; and (f) incorporates feedback from experts at the State's postsecondary institutions and other early learning and development experts and Early Childhood Educators.