

# Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge 2014 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

## Minnesota



JUNE 2015



Race to the Top  
Early Learning Challenge

## Table of Contents

<b>APR Cover Sheet</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Certification</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Successful State Systems</b> .....	<b>8</b>
Governance Structure .....	8
Stakeholder Involvement .....	9
Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders.....	10
Participating State Agencies.....	11
<b>High-Quality, Accountable Programs</b> .....	<b>12</b>
Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application).....	12
Promoting Participation in the TQRIS (Section B(2) of Application) .....	15
Performance Measure (B)(2)(c).....	17
Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application).....	22
Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application).....	24
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) .....	26
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) .....	28
Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application).....	32
<b>Focused Investment Areas: Sections (C), (D), and (E)</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>Promoting Early Learning Outcomes</b> .....	<b>34</b>
Early Learning Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application) .....	34
Comprehensive Assessment Systems (Section C(2) of Application) .....	35
<b>Early Childhood Education Workforce</b> .....	<b>38</b>
Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials (Section D(1) of Application) .....	38
Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities (Section D(2) of Application) .....	40
Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1).....	42
Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2).....	44
<b>Measuring Outcomes and Progress</b> .....	<b>48</b>
Understanding the Status of Children’s Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry (Section E(1) of Application) .....	48
Early Learning Data Systems (Section E(2) of Application) .....	51
<b>Data Tables</b> .....	<b>53</b>
Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age.....	53
Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs .....	54
Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age .....	56

Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity.....	57
Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development.....	58
Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State .....	60
Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State .....	62
<b>Budget and Expenditure Tables .....</b>	<b>64</b>
Budget Summary Table .....	64
Budget Table: Project 1 – Parent Aware, Minnesota's TQRIS .....	66
Budget Table: Project 2 – Scholarships .....	68
Budget Table: Project 3 – Title I PreK Incentives.....	70
Budget Table: Project 4 – Standards .....	72
Budget Table: Project 5 – Assessment .....	74
Budget Table: Project 6 – Workforce Framework.....	76
Budget Table: Project 7 – Great Workforce Supports.....	78
Budget Table: Project 8 – Kindergarten Entrance Assessment.....	80
Budget Table: Project 9 – Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System .....	82
Budget Table: Project 10 – Family, Friend and Neighbor.....	84
Budget Table: Project 11 – Public Private Partnership.....	86
Budget Table: Project 12 – Project Management .....	88

**Note:** All information in this document was prepared and submitted by the **Grantee** as their annual performance report (APR). For reference, the instructions and prompts from the approved APR form are included in italics throughout the document. Check marks in tables indicate the Grantee selected the option. A blank cells in a table indicates that the Grantee did not provide data or did not select the option.



## APR Cover Sheet

### General Information

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

### Reporting Period Information

5. **Reporting Period:** 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2014

### Indirect Cost Information

#### 6. Indirect Costs

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

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s): 07/01/2013 to

Approving Federal agency:  ED  HHS  Other (Please specify):



## Certification

**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))

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program

Yes  No

**To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data.**

**Signed by Authorized Representative**

**Name:** Melvin W. Carter III

**Title:** Director of the Office of Early Learning

## Executive Summary

*For the reporting year, please provide a summary of your State's (1) accomplishments, (2) lessons learned, (3) challenges, and (4) strategies you will implement to address those challenges.*

Minnesota has made great strides in year three of the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge grant to improve outcomes for children through increased access to high-quality services birth to grade three. Success has been driven through cross-agency partnerships between the Minnesota Departments of Education, Health and Human Services and the support of stakeholders, including Minnesota's four Transformation Zones- Itasca County, Northside Achievement Zone of Minneapolis, Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood and White Earth Reservation. Accomplishments in 2014 include developing an award-winning Parent Aware website, increasing Parent Aware availability statewide, publishing the Knowledge and Competency framework, revising the early learning standards, expanding training capacity statewide and piloting an innovative Kindergarten Entry Assessment.

The state has prioritized work into the components of a successful state system, including: High Quality, Accountable Programs; Increased Access to High-Quality; Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children; Great Early Childhood Workforce; and Measuring Outcomes and Progress. Accomplishments are prevalent across components. The executive summary will share accomplishments, challenges and proposed solutions to identified challenges through each of the five components.

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

Minnesota's commitment to high-quality, accountable programs is demonstrated through Parent Aware, the state's voluntary tiered quality rating and improvement system for early care and education programs.

Parent Aware made measurable progress in promoting program participation. As planned, full ratings for programs have expanded from 22 counties and seven tribal communities in 2013 to 45 counties and eight tribal communities in 2014. Quality Coaches and five Parent Aware recruiters were hired to support and recruit programs, respectively. Recruiters are using a community organizing approach and Minnesota is eager to learn the impact of this strategy in 2015, the first year of full implementation.

The state exceeded targets for program participation across most program types, rating 1,892 programs as of December, 2014 or 72 percent of our overall target for Year Three of the grant. Minnesota made significant progress increasing the number of rated non-accredited child care programs. From 2013 to 2014, the number of non-accredited Family Child Care programs increased by 150 percent and the number of rated non-accredited child care centers increased by nearly 100 percent. Most importantly, Minnesota exceeded most targets for increasing the number of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in highly rated early learning programs. Finally, [www.ParentAware.org](http://www.ParentAware.org) launched in August 2014, connecting parents to a database of more than 12,000 licensed programs - highlighting Parent Aware rated sites. The website was recognized for its outstanding contribution to human services program clients at the 2014 Commissioner's Circle of Excellence Awards ceremony.

Child Care Health Consultants (CCHCs), available in the four Transformation Zones to Parent Aware rated early learning programs, also support child care providers' quality. CCHCs assist child care providers and quality coaches with health and safety questions. In 2014, they documented 839 points of contact with providers, 69 on-site visits, 295 telephone calls, and 475 electronic communications. CCHS also provided training to child care staff, parents and children on a variety of important topics such as emergency preparedness, food safety and oral health. The program has to date been most successful in reaching center based programs. Efforts are

underway to increase the number of family child care providers that are aware of and access the services of CCHCs.

### **Increased Access to High Quality**

Minnesota's approach to increasing access to high-quality early childhood education and care programs by children with high needs is two-fold. First, Early Learning Scholarships are provided to families in each of the four Transformation Zones to financially support access to a program participating in Parent Aware. Secondly, Title I Pre-K Incentive grants are provided to school districts who contribute Title I funds to support high quality early childhood programming.

Each of the four Transformation Zones continue implementing the Early Learning Scholarships in their local community. Across the Transformation Zones, 369 children were served with scholarships throughout 2014 and 951 have been served over the period of the grant. Transformation Zones report that they have involved more children in high quality early childhood programs, resulting in promising outcomes. Minnesota continues to work with SRI International to conduct a multi-year evaluation. In fall 2014 child level assessments were conducted on four year olds receiving scholarships, and follow-up assessment are scheduled for spring 2015. Second year evaluation results will be available winter/spring 2015.

Title I Pre-K Incentive grants continue to grow in interest and implementation. Thirty-one school districts are utilizing Title I funds and Title I Pre-K Incentives, an increase from 22 in 2013 and six in 2012. Districts have reported that the grant has improved communication and planning between early childhood and K-12. Sustainability will be a challenge as districts explore how to continue funding their programs at higher levels after the incentive sunsets. One challenge will be competing with other district initiatives for limited space to accommodate increased enrollment. To support districts, Minnesota is increasing communication with grant recipients to share ideas across programs. Minnesota is also targeting Title I Pre-K Incentive grant schools for a Pre-K-Grade three Leadership Institute focused on improving alignment of programs and services between early childhood and K-12.

### **Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children**

Minnesota supports early learning and development outcomes for children by first defining what children are expected to know and do across multiple domains and at different stages of development and then working to have a structure in place to screen and assess individual children and their environments and programs. This is done through the revision of the Early Childhood Indicators of Progress: Minnesota's Early Learning Standards (ECIPs); the comprehensive assessment system; and screening.

A revision process has been completed on two domains of the ECIPs: 1) language, literacy and communication and 2) social and emotional. The revision process was led by two domain specific committees and included extensive reviews by national, state and culturally specific experts. Previously, Minnesota had two versions of the ECIPs- one for birth to age three and one for preschool age. The revision has resulted in one document across age bands so the continuum of learning and development is clear. Moving forward, support documents will be created and a training of trainers will be implemented to help trainers embed the standards in all of their trainings.

The Comprehensive Assessment System works to support an early childhood system of measurement with decision making across settings and points in time. Minnesota's efforts around the development of a Comprehensive Assessment System include helping early childhood programs understand the why, what and

how of assessment and ensuring they have the tools to implement assessments appropriately and use the data in order to adapt their instruction and improve outcomes for children.

In an effort to improve early childhood programs' understanding of the why and what of assessment, Minnesota finalized a common set of 21 assessment definitions to align communication and efforts between early childhood sectors. Minnesota also began the development of an online needs assessment tool to help programs choose which assessment tool is right for their population and program structure.

In 2014, Minnesota also completed work that improves providers' ability to implement assessments. This work includes an effort to improve the availability of training on specific assessment tools. Forty-one trainers were trained throughout the state on six assessment and curriculum tools. Minnesota will continue to expand this effort in 2015 by offering more training of trainers and assessment user groups. Minnesota also completed the content for four training modules on assessment supports, modules include: Authentic Assessment Practices and Supports for Administrators; Embedding Authentic Assessment in Everyday Practice; Using Data to Inform Practice; and Connecting Assessment to Standards and Curriculum.

In similar efforts to improve the use of assessments by early childhood providers', Minnesota has made progress on assisting programs with bridging their student information system with assessment data. The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) is working to expand the project beyond one student information system vendor. Through a contractor, Minnesota conducted interviews with student information system and assessment vendors to identify capabilities, data fields and ability to link systems. Minnesota anticipates releasing an RFP in 2015 to identify vendor(s) to move forward. The RFP stresses the connection between identified/validated early childhood assessment systems and various ways the software vendors could set up their student information systems to be of best use to teachers and administrators. This effort will help programs to have easier access to and a stronger understanding of their assessment data in relation to program information, so they can use data to individualize instruction and policies based on where children are and where they need to go. If national student information system vendors apply and are selected, this will assist other states in better utilizing program and assessment information in real time.

Another component of monitoring children's progress is ensuring children receive developmental and social-emotional screening in order to flag developmental concerns early and refer children to appropriate services. Minnesota is improving the delivery of developmental and social-emotional screening by piloting electronic screening access. In 2014, Minnesota finalized a contract for the use of online versions of the ASQ and ASQ-SE screening tools with twelve pilot programs. The pilot programs represent diversity in geography and program type, including: Head Start, public health, family home visiting and school districts. All four Transformation Zones are participating. Pilot sites have received training on screening and use of select instruments. Efforts are aligned to other state-led early identification initiatives such as Minnesota's Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems grant and Minnesota's implementation of the National Help Me Grow System. After the pilot phase, Minnesota will look to sustain and expand electronic developmental and social-emotional screening efforts statewide in order to increase access to screening and support the coordination of care for young children in Minnesota.

### **Great Early Childhood Workforce**

Minnesota made great efforts to support the early childhood workforce in 2014. One effort was the release of *Minnesota's Knowledge and Competency Framework for Early Childhood Professionals*, which articulates both expectations of what early childhood educators need to know and be able to do. Minnesota also made progress increasing the number of early childhood educators with credentials in the state.



*Minnesota's Knowledge and Competency Framework for Early Childhood Professionals* was released in December of 2014 in three versions: for individuals working in Family Child Care, Preschool-Aged Children in Center and School Programs, and with Infants and Toddlers. The documents which combine Board of Teaching Standards and field developed competencies will be used as a basis for both preservice and inservice education.

Minnesota also launched the development of training on the framework. Implementation of the framework will be promoted in 2015 through messaging, training of trainers and practitioners, and integration into the Career Lattice, programed into Develop, Minnesota's online Quality Improvement and Registry Tool.

In addition, Minnesota continued to develop new, and revise existing credentials and training. This included providing increased access to training aligned with the Knowledge and Competency Framework and Parent Aware. The Minnesota Child Care Credential, offered in four languages, was revised in 2014 to meet all Parent Aware training indicator requirements. Minnesota also completed the development of a 30-hour Minnesota Infant/Toddler Credential. Bilingual/bicultural trainer capacity was increased through learning communities, including 21 trainers representing eight languages.

An eight-hour training for legally non-licensed, or Family, Friend and Neighbor, providers was developed that addresses health and safety, child development and school readiness. During 2014, 80 providers from Hmong, Somali, Latino and Karen groups were provided with information on how to become licensed through New Americans Network. Nineteen new American providers attended at least one event. Of the 80 providers participating in the New American Network, 38 were provided information on becoming licensed (the others were already licensed) and 13 of those went on to participate in the licensing process.

Another Family, Friend and Neighbor project is in place in three of the four Transformation Zones using Early Childhood Family Education parent educators to work with local Family, Friend and Neighbor Providers. Minneapolis decided not to participate in the initiative because of existing work. Participating Transformation Zones each created their own project plan. Each include a home visiting component; including Family, Friend and Neighbor providers in existing parent education activities; and quarterly check-ins with MDE staff. MDE staff have created a toolkit of over 300 existing early childhood resources to be used to guide and support providers. Resources include topics such as: home safety, health and school readiness. Effort was made to include translated materials in Spanish, Somali and Hmong.

These combined efforts, carried out in coordination with other state initiatives, continue progress toward ensuring our youngest learners are in high quality environments with highly skilled adults who teach and care for them.

### **Measuring Outcomes and Progress**

Minnesota is working towards increasing measurement and use of data in order to better understand children's early experiences and answer broad and meaningful questions about outcomes for Minnesota's youngest children. The Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System (ECLDS) and revised Kindergarten Entrance Assessment will enhance the state's ability to answer these questions and improve children's earliest experiences.

Minnesota made progress in the Early Childhood Longitudinal Data system through finalizing data sharing agreements allowing the integration of data from the Minnesota Departments of Education, Health and Human Services. The first loading of data into the ECLDS was completed in late 2014. Significant progress was made in planning for sustainability, including technical meetings centered on long-term planning for Preschool to 20 and Workforce (P20W) integration and stakeholder focus groups regarding communication about the data system.

One measure that has received a lot of attention in Minnesota is school readiness of children as they enter kindergarten. In 2014, Minnesota completed an analysis between a menu of assessment tools and Minnesota's early learning and kindergarten standards. This analysis helped Minnesota determine which assessment tools are best aligned with Minnesota's early learning standards and would help Minnesota measure the school readiness of children.

In the fall of 2014, Minnesota began implementing a second phase of analysis to determine the alignment of the selected assessment tools to one another by using outside observers to double-code students. Minnesota also worked on a replication of phase one of the study, which determined the alignment of each assessment tool to Minnesota's learning standards. Analysis of these two data sets will be complete in 2015. As in previous years, recruitment is a challenge for the pilot study because of lack of understanding of the new process, unfamiliarity with available tools, and voluntary nature of the study. Another challenge is misconceptions among K-3 professionals on appropriate methods/purpose of early childhood assessment. Minnesota is working with communications experts to increase understanding of appropriate assessment and the study process- these efforts will help increase recruitment.

### **Conclusion**

The state of Minnesota is committed to ensuring that all children get the great start they need to succeed in school and life. The state is actively leveraging Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge grant funds, along with public and private local investments, to expand available support programs and initiatives; build and maintain quality early care and learning environments; and ensure access through robust outreach efforts and supports to families with high needs. Through coordinated efforts among our three core agencies - Education, Health and Human Services - and bipartisan support from leadership across sectors, Minnesota is well positioned to benefit from these investments for years to come.

## Successful State Systems

*Aligning and coordinating early learning and development across the State (Section A(3) of Application)*

---

### 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).*

There has been little change in Minnesota's governance structure since the 2012 APR submission. Below is what was submitted in 2012 and 2013 with the exception of a small update in the Office of Early Learning Leadership Team membership:

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 the early learning and development of children 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 includes the Director of the OEL and agency directors who oversee programs currently housed in the Departments of Education, Human Services and Health. The Leadership Team collectively has responsibility for making recommendations to their respective Commissioners 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.*

Minnesota has leveraged local expertise and leaders to implement the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant and ensure that the products and initiatives from the grant are useful and sustainable for the audiences served.

The implementation of Minnesota's State Plan has been developed in a manner that incorporates multiple feedback loops from participating programs, early childhood educators, funders, and other key stakeholders in the implementation of activities under the grant. All major initiatives in the grant include a cross-sector and agency approach to solicit feedback. These advisory groups are a part of all the components of Minnesota's State Plan, including: Parent Aware (Minnesota's TQRIS), Early Childhood Screening, Early Learning Scholarships, the development of the Early Learning Standards, The Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System, Workforce Development, Comprehensive Assessment System, and the Kindergarten Entry Assessment.

As examples, 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, implementation partners, the Early Learning Council and leaders from each of the four Transformation Zones. 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 includes stakeholders from organizations that primarily collect data that will be included in the system, including cross membership with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System.

Moreover, each Transformation Zone has a leadership body that helps to determine policy decisions for initiatives affecting the Transformation Zone and is actively engaged with implementation decisions regarding many RTT-ELC activities. Minnesota holds quarterly meetings with the Transformation Zones to communicate progress on grant activities, receive feedback on implementation, and work collaboratively to resolve challenges across Transformation Zones and within 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. Both PASR and the Greater Twin Cities United Way have been partners with the state agencies in the implementation of these activities.

State and local Child Care Aware of Minnesota agencies that make up Minnesota's child care resource and referral system have contract responsibilities for recruiting and supporting licensed child care programs in Parent Aware and providing consumer information to parents. Representatives from Child Care Aware of Minnesota also serve on the Comprehensive Assessment System advisory group.

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

The Greater Twin Cities United Way and the McKnight Foundation have continued to sponsor efforts to promote coordination and collaboration with other initiatives occurring in the state of Minnesota, including the federal Promise Neighborhood and I3 grants, the Social Innovation Fund grant, the local STRIVE Initiative, and the Accreditation Facilitation Project. One component of this work is the Learn Together Minnesota website for stakeholders to learn more about and follow the progress of each of these grants over the grant period. They also have partnered with Minnesota Department of Education and the Office of Early Learning to support a statewide Pre-K-Third Grade Leadership Training series.

---

## Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders

---

*Describe any changes or proposed changes to state legislation, budgets, policies, executive orders and the like that had or will have an impact on the RTT-ELC grant. Describe the expected impact and any anticipated changes to the RTT-ELC State Plan as a result.*

In 2013, the Minnesota legislative session increased spending in Early Childhood by approximately \$59.4 million dollars over the next biennium (two year budgeting cycle). The 2014 Minnesota legislative session continued further investment in young children in Minnesota and supports sustainability of efforts associated with Minnesota's Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant. Highlights from the session include:

Increased revenue for Minnesota's Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE) program and new program requirements:

- ECFE is now linked to the general education formula allowance at 2.3 percent, resulting in an increase from \$120 million to \$134.11 million for fiscal year 2015, or an 11.8 percent increase.
- A community needs assessment is now required by programs that identifies new and under served populations and child and family risk factors. Needs identified in the community assessment are used to tailor ECFE programming. Programs submit data to MDE in an annual report that demonstrates the program response to the community needs assessment.

School Readiness, Minnesota's state funded preschool program, aid entitlement increased by \$2million per year beginning in fiscal year 2015.

Increased funding for Early Learning Scholarships and changed program requirements:

- Funding increased by \$4.65 million for fiscal year 2015 and by \$4.884 million in later years.
- The \$5,000 limit on state scholarships is eliminated beginning in FY 2016 and directs the commissioner to establish a target for the average scholarship based on the results of a child care market rate survey.
- Allows school-based and Head Start programs serving children with scholarships to receive direct payment from MDE beginning fiscal year 2017.

Head Start, ECFE and School Readiness have new program requirements to better meet the needs of English Learners:

- Instructs Head Start organizations to submit a plan to MDE for providing proficiency updates to parents.
- Encourages ECFE programs to provide parents with translated information to monitor student progress.
- Requires School Readiness program providers to: assess children's language skills to improve program planning and implementation; communicate with parents; promote kindergarten readiness; and have teachers knowledgeable in native and English language development programs.

---

## Participating State Agencies

---

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

There are no changes in participation and commitment by any of the Participating State Agencies in Minnesota's State Plan.

## High-Quality, Accountable Programs

### Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application)

During the current year, has the State made progress in developing or revising a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards that include—

<b>(1) Early Learning &amp; Development Standards</b>	
Yes or No	No
<b>Early Learning &amp; Development Standards that currently apply to:</b>	
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:	
<i>Center-based</i>	
<i>Family Child Care</i>	

<b>(2) A Comprehensive Assessment System</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>A Comprehensive Assessment System that currently apply to:</b>	
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:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

<b>(3) Early Childhood Educator qualifications</b>	
Yes or No	No
<b>Early Childhood Educator qualifications that currently apply to:</b>	
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:	
<i>Center-based</i>	
<i>Family Child Care</i>	

Developing and Adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS)  
(Continued)

<b>(4) Family engagement strategies</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Family engagement strategies that currently apply to:</b>	
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:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

<b>(5) Health promotion practices</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Health promotion practices that currently apply to:</b>	
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:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

<b>(6) Effective data practices</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Effective data practices that currently apply to:</b>	
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:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓



The State has made progress in ensuring that:	
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	

*Describe progress made during the reporting year in developing or revising a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the four-year grant period.*

Minnesota conducted the first phase of the Parent Aware standards and indicator review process in 2013, and the questions for this table in the 2013 Annual Performance Report were answered consistent with the changes made during the 2013 review process. In many cases we answered the questions "no" because this phase included small changes to the standards and indicators.

In 2014, these small changes made in 2013 were implemented by updated the forms used in the rating process. We answered the questions for this section for this year's Annual Performance Report exactly the same we answered them in the 2013 Annual Performance Report in order to communicate that we continued developing and revising the TQRIS standards by updating the associated forms.

Specifically, we answered "yes" for this question for the following categories: Comprehensive Assessment System, Family Engagement Strategies, Health Promotion Strategies, and Effective Data Practices.

In the Comprehensive Assessment System category, we reformatted and clarified the indicators related to using child assessment.

In the Family Engagement Strategies category, we added new requirements related to contact information for community resources that programs share with families.

In the Health Promotion Strategies category, we added a new requirement related to sharing nutrition guidelines and sample menus with families.

In the Effective Data Practices category, we made small changes to the wording of the indicator on using assessment data to inform instruction.

The second question asks us to identify the types of early learning programs to which our standards now apply. Based on Minnesota's definition of program standards, and our interpretation of this question, we checked all the boxes for all program types because our program standards, taken together, apply to all of the program types included in the check boxes.

In 2014, we also began planning for the next phase of the revision process which, as described in Minnesota's Scope of Work, will be conducted in 2015. The Office of Early Learning Leadership Team developed priorities for the revision process, and criteria for making decisions around changes to the indicators were developed and finalized. A Request for Proposal (RFP) for a vendor to carry out the public input process was also drafted during this period with the RFP to be issued and a vendor contract awarded and completed in 2015.

---

## Promoting Participation in the TQRIS (Section B(2) of Application)

---

*Describe progress made during the reporting year in promoting participation in the TQRIS. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the four-year grant period.*

Minnesota made measurable progress in promoting participation in the TQRIS through three key strategies: increasing market penetration, recruiting targeted programs, and expanding marketing to families.

In 2014, Minnesota continued to increase market penetration for the TQRIS by expanding the availability of full ratings for non-accredited child care programs from 22 counties and seven tribal communities to 45 counties and eight tribal communities as planned in our Scope of Work. Parent Aware continues to be available statewide for all programs eligible for the Accelerated Pathway to Rating. As we expand the availability of the TQRIS, more Quality Coaches were hired and trained to support the increasing number of participating programs. In turn, more Rating staff were hired and trained to process the increasing number of ratings. Staff from MDE and the Child Care Aware of Minnesota Coordinating Office continued to provide technical assistance to programs pursuing the Accelerated Pathway to Rating.

Recruitment of licensed child care programs, both accredited and non-accredited, remained a contract responsibility of Child Care Aware agencies in Minnesota's child care resource and referral system. This system is charged with collaborating with a variety of partners to prioritize the recruitment of programs that serve children receiving child care assistance and coordinate unified messaging to programs on the benefits of participating in Parent Aware. In preparation for expanding statewide in 2015, a new recruitment strategy was employed. Five Parent Aware recruiters were hired to strategically bolster the dissemination of information to early learning and development programs on Parent Aware. Recruiters used community organizing principles and received training on how to reach child care programs in "hard to reach" communities. These positions allowed Quality Coaches to specialize in engaging with programs to improve their quality. This shift is an example of our commitment and ongoing work related to continuous quality improvement in Minnesota's TQRIS. We look forward to learning more about that the impact of the recruiters work during 2015, the first year of statewide implementation.

The Minnesota Department of Education is responsible for recruiting state-funded preschool programs, Early Head Start and Head Start programs, programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619, and charter schools. Recruitment activities include presentation to programs at statewide conferences, visits to local school districts, and one-on-one follow-up.

Parent Aware for School Readiness (PASR), a non-profit business-led organization, collaborated with the Department of Human Services (DHS) and MDE on a major upgrade of Minnesota's online early care and education search tool for parents, which now connects consumers to a database of more than 12,000 programs. Search results feature programs with Parent Aware ratings, helping families easily identify those that are using research-based best practices in school readiness. The tool, found at [www.parentaware.org](http://www.parentaware.org) enables parents to search for programs by location, schedule, quality and types of care as well as access licensing information. Additional features include a more user-friendly search function and improved information resources. During the first four months of operation, there were 57,074 visits to the website by 33,715 unique visitors. During the same period in 2013, there were 20,663 visits by 15,107 unique visitors to the website promoting Parent Aware-rated programs. Users spent an average of 6:04 minutes per visit at the upgraded site, compared to 2:47 minutes the previous year. The website and partner organizations were recently honored by DHS Commissioner

Lucinda Jesson, along with seven other organizations, for their outstanding contributions to human services program clients at the 2014 Commissioner's Circle of Excellence Awards ceremony.

At the beginning of 2015, Minnesota further increased market penetration for the TQRIS by expanding the availability of full ratings for non-accredited child care programs to all 87 counties and 11 Tribal Communities. Efforts to continue recruitment of all program types as well as promotion of the parentaware.org search tool to parents will continue throughout the year.

**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.*

**Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.**

Targets										
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	53	10.00%	158	31.00%	193	38.00%	255	50.00%	560	91.00%
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	23	10.00%	123	43.00%	169	59.00%	212	74.00%	258	90.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	68	58.00%	100	85.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	144	47.00%	174	57.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	23	58.00%	34	62.00%	46	66.00%	62	70.00%	158	92.00%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	203	5.00%	227	8.00%	685	16.00%	866	25.00%	1,212	35.00%
Other 1	110	0.10%	57	0.60%	565	6.00%	1,225	13.00%	1,884	20.00%
Describe:	Licensed centers and licensed family child care programs not receiving CCDF funds.									

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Actuals									
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs									
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	509	53	10.00%	509	138	27.00%	509	464	91.00%
Specify:	School-based preschool programs funded by Minnesota's School Readiness Program								
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	286	23	10.00%	286	229	80.00%	286	258	90.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	118	-	0.00%	118	-	0.00%	118	1	1.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	306	-	0.00%	306	-	0.00%	306	2	1.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	40	23	58.00%	54	37	69.00%	141	138	98.00%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	3,462	203	5.00%	3,462	112	3.00%	3,221	385	12.00%
Other 1	9,422	110	0.10%	9,422	59	0.10%	7,016	219	3.00%
Describe:	Licensed centers and licensed family child care programs not receiving CCDF funds.								
Other 2	509	53	10.00%	509	138	27.00%	509	464	91.00%
Describe:	School-based preschool programs funded by Minnesota's School Readiness Program								

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Actuals						
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs						
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Year 3			Year 4		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	618	548	89.00%			
Specify:	School-based preschool programs funded by Minnesota's School Readiness Program					
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	286	257	90.00%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	118	8	7.00%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	306	29	9.00%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	171	158	92.00%			
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	3,135	531	17.00%			
Other 1	8,235	660	8.00%			
Describe:	Licensed centers and licensed family child care programs not receiving CCDF funds.					
Other 2						
Describe:	School-based preschool programs funded by Minnesota's School Readiness Program					

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

## Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) Data Notes

*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.*

**State-funded preschool:** The 2014 numbers are the number of School Readiness-funded school-based Pre-K sites rated as of December 31, 2014, as verified by both the Develop Database and the records at the Department of Education. In Minnesota, there are additional school-based Pre-K programs operating without state School Readiness funding. These programs are eligible for ratings if they are meeting School Readiness standards. We rated 55 such programs (sites) in 2014. These programs are not included in this count because they do not meet the state definition of “state-funded preschool” as defined in the grant application and in previous APRs.

Additionally, we are increasing the number of local sites eligible to be rated for several reasons. The opportunities provided by Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge grant have assisted Minnesota with better data systems to identify eligible sites and brought about increased state and local funding to expand the number of eligible sites. We have identified the potential total sites by taking the currently rated site number of 548 and added 70 to equal 618. The number 70 is the total remaining school districts who may elected to become rated. These school districts tend to be smaller, so the assumption is that there is one site per district.

Rationale for change in target: Remaining districts have fewer sites and are in less populated areas and have less incentive to participate in the TQIRS. The increase in the percentage of state-funded preschool programs rated in year four is due to the rapid adoption of the TQIRS by school districts at the beginning of the grant.

**Head Start & Early Head Start:** The 2014 numbers are based on the number of Head Start/Early Head Start sites rated as of December 31, 2014, as verified by both the Develop Database and the records at the Department of Education.

Rationale for change in target: Through on going coordination with local agencies remaining Head Start agencies are not anticipated to join the TQIRS. The increase in the percentage of Head Starts rated beginning in year one was due to the rapid adoption of the TQIRS by Head Start agencies.

**Programs funded by IDEA Parts B & C:** For programs funded by IDEA Parts B and C, the total number of programs in the state was pulled from the MDE's ORG data system, which tracks Part C and Preschool Special Education programs that have signed Statements of Assurances for FFY2014. That list of programs was then compared to the list of programs rated in the TQRIS as of December 31, 2014. Unlike all other program types, Early Childhood Special Education programs are rated at the school district level rather than at the site level.

**Programs funded under Title I of ESEA:** The 2014 numbers are based on the number of ELD sites in school districts identified through agency financial reporting systems as using Title I funds for Preschool in SFY2014, and that were also in the TQRIS as of December 31, 2014.

Rationale for change in target: Title I PreK Incentive grants will continue in the fourth year of the grant but not expand. Therefore we anticipate maintaining the current rate of Title I PreK programs participating in TQIRS.

**Programs receiving from CCDF Funds:** The count of programs receiving CCDF funds were pulled from Minnesota's administrative data system (MEC2) for programs paid for service in the month of October 2014. Reporting October service data allows most provider bills to be submitted and paid by the time the counts are pulled for February reporting. The count represents the number of Minnesota and tribally licensed family and

center-based child care providers paid for caring for at least one child aged 0-5 and not yet in Kindergarten, and also rated in the TQRIS as of December 31, 2014.

**Other (Licensed child care centers and family child care providers not receiving CCDF funds):** There are 11,370 licensed child care programs in the state of Minnesota as of December 31, 2014. Of those, 3,135 receive CCDF funding in October, 2014 and 8,235 do not. Of the 8,235 licensed child care programs that do not receive CCDF funds, 660 were rated in the TQRIS as of December 31, 2014.

#### **Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) Target Notes**

*For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established grant targets by the end of the grant period.*

We are proud of our progress in increasing the number and percentage of ELD programs participating in the statewide TQRIS. The total number of rated programs has increased each year of statewide implementation. Year-end totals of rated programs from 2012 to 2014 are 529, 1322, and 1,892 programs respectively. Overall, Minnesota reached 72 percent of its Race to the Top target for total number of rated programs by the end of 2014. Due to a lag in implementation in 2012, we have had less time than originally planned to achieve targets. Specifically, a six month delay in implementation at the onset of the grant resulted in one cohort of rated programs, instead of two in 2012. Targets assumed six cohorts by 2014, however only five have been completed.

Targets were exceeded for state-funded preschool, Early Head Start and Head Start and Programs funded under Title I of ESEA. Targets were not reached for Programs funded by IDEA, Part C; IDEA, Part, B section 619; programs receiving funding from CCDF funds and licensed centers and licensed family child care not receiving CCDF funds. IDEA funded programs are rated at the program level rather than the site level as are other school-based programs. This means that all ECSE staff versus a few staff in one site must meet the training requirements. Through a program self-assessment, many programs identified curriculum and assessment as areas of need and much time has been spent in selecting comprehensive assessments and high-quality curriculum in addition to completing training around curriculum and assessment, which has factored into low participation.

Minnesota made significant progress increasing the number of rated non-accredited child care programs. From 2013 to 2014, the number of non-accredited Family Child Care programs increased by 150 percent and the number of rated non-accredited child care centers increased by nearly 100 percent. Three strategies were implemented in 2014 designed to increase the participation of non-accredited child care, specifically Family Child Care programs. Specialized recruitment positions were put in place statewide within the Child Care Aware system. Recruiters use community organizing principles and receive on-going support and training on how to reach programs serving children of high need. One essential recruitment tool in this work is a ranked list of programs receiving CCDF funds statewide that is distributed to the Child Care Aware system. Both recruiters and coaches use this list to prioritize their activities to ensure that programs that serve children of high need are reached.

A second strategy was engaging the philanthropic community in making strategic investments designed to increase Family Child Care participation in Parent Aware. Late in 2013, the Start Early Funders collaborative requested that DHS publish a brief describing how the private sector might compliment public investments in Parent Aware. As a result, over \$1 million in additional private investment was made in 2014 by non-profits that are leading local initiatives with this aim. These private investments are in addition to those made by Parent Aware for School Readiness and the Greater Twin Cities United Way as a part of Minnesota's RTT-ELC grant application.

A final strategy is our ongoing work to refine our messaging and marketing efforts to ensure we are communicating what really matters to each program type. An essential tool in this process is the Provider Perception Survey conducted by Child Trends as a part of the Race to the Top QRIS validation study. The 2014 survey results suggest that the primary reason for participation in the TQRIS for accredited child care, state-funded preschool and Head Start programs is to be eligible to access Early Learning Scholarships. For non-accredited child care sites, professionalism and professional development are the most highly ranked factors in their decision to participate in Parent Aware. We are eager to learn more about these strategies and develop new ones through another year of implementation.

We continue to recruit IDEA programs through information sharing on our monthly leadership calls, and at our two face-to-face leadership forums in March and October. In addition, information on how to pursue a rating is shared with each Regional Early Childhood Special Education Professional Development Facilitator, the person responsible for coordinating the various professional development activities across their regions. Each Professional Development Facilitator is required to have at least quarterly contact with each ECSE leader in their assigned set of schools.



## Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application)

*Has the State made progress during the reporting year in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS that:*

System for Rating & Monitoring	
Includes information on valid and reliable tools for monitoring such programs	Yes
Has trained monitors whose ratings have an acceptable level of inter-rater reliability	Yes
Monitors and rates Early Learning and Development Programs with appropriate frequency	Yes
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)	Yes
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	Yes

*Describe progress made during the reporting year in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS. 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 2014, Minnesota continues successes from 2013 and also expanded efforts toward validity and reliability rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development programs. We continued to:

- Use the CLASS observation tool, which has been shown to be valid and reliable.
- Monitor the inter-rater reliability of CLASS observers by requiring that 1 in 10 observations be co-coded by and anchor observer.
- Require the pre-service and ongoing training requirements for CLASS observers.
- Require programs to re-rate at least every two years.

We have improved or expanded our efforts by:

- Reaching 100 percent reliability among CLASS observers (meaning that dimensions scores of anchor and observers are within one point of each other in 100 percent of cycles).
- More details on the reliability checks can be found on Minnesota's Race to The Top: Early Learning Challenge Grant GRADS website.
- Continuing to monitor differing opinions on cut-point scores.
- The Center for Early Education and Development, University of Minnesota conducted ten observations in family child care homes to see if it was possible to properly follow the CLASS observation protocol (pre-K CLASS). They concluded 1) it was possible to follow the CLASS pre-K observation protocol with little to no modifications necessary, 2) scores were similar compared to child care centers, and 3) they felt comfortable using that protocol in family child care homes. A majority of the children cared for in the homes were infants and toddlers. Since no data was collected on infants and toddlers in the Parent Aware evaluation, it is not possible to validate the tool in family child care homes.

- Reaching at least 85 percent reliability for each TQRIS rater for full ratings, meaning that the indicator-level rating decisions of anchors and observers exactly match for at least 85 percent of all indicators scored. In 2014, 9.3 percent of full ratings were co-coded and demonstrated exact agreement on 89 percent of indicators. While some raters reached as high as 98 percent reliability, all reached at least 85 percent reliability.

Strategies for improvement in the remainder of the grant period:

- Build inter-rater reliability work-flow features into Develop, the data system that administers Parent Aware ratings. This will make the inter-rater reliability process more efficient and standardized.
- Establish inter-rater reliability for the Accelerated Pathway to Rating. This process has been more challenging to design because the Accelerated Pathway to Rating involves only four indicators and results in either a Four-Star Rating or No Rating. Thus, there is little to no variation in scoring for these ratings.
- Further standardize and improve the reliability of observations and scoring by examining areas of greatest challenge and providing raters and observers with additional training and clearer rules for decision-making.

Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application)

Has the State made progress in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating your State TQRIS through the following policies and practices?

Policies and Practices Supporting Program Quality	
Program and provider training	Yes
Program and provider technical assistance	Yes
Financial rewards or incentives	Yes
Higher, tiered child care subsidy reimbursement rates	Yes
Increased compensation	

Number of tiers/levels in the State TQRIS
4

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

	State-funded preschool programs	Early Head Start	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	Center-based Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	Family Child Care Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program
TQRIS Programs that Moved Up at Least One Level	0	0	0	0	0	14	21
TQRIS Programs that Moved Down at Least One Level	0	0	0	0	0	6	1

**Optional Notes - State TQRIS Tiers/Levels**

Explain missing data. If program movement up or down is not tracked by program type in the TQRIS you can provide the Total Programs that Moved Up and Total Programs that Moved Down in this optional notes box.

The following program types are only eligible for a four-Star Rating and therefore cannot move either up nor down in the TQRIS: State-funded preschool programs, Early Head Start, Head Start, ELD programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA, ELD programs funded under Title I of ESEA. These programs types qualify for a streamlined process to earn a four star rating because they already meet requirements that mirror or exceed those of Parent Aware.

*Has the State made progress in developing high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS in the following areas?*

<b>High-Quality Benchmarks at the Highest Level(s) of the TQRIS</b>	
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. 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.*

None of the boxes above are checked because no changes to the indicators occurred during the past year. However, in 2014 we began the process of planning for the 2015 indicator revision process.

The second phase of the indicator review process will be conducted in 2015. This phase includes a review of the research, incorporating new research into the process including findings from the Parent Aware evaluation. Alignment charts will also be created and used to analyze the relationships between the Parent Aware standards and indicators and standards included in the Federal Head Start Performance Standards, Minnesota's state preschool standards, and national accreditation standards. The emphasis in this phase will be to consider more significant changes to the measures and will include a public input process.

## Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1)

In the table, 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.

### Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.

Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline	Targets				Actuals			
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Total number of programs covered by the TQRIS	1,405	3,996	7,780	10,538	14,112	3,996	6,630	10,188	
Number of Programs in Tier 1	4	40	150	300	450	30	68	227	
Number of Programs in Tier 2	24	70	250	500	750	16	135	268	
Number of Programs in Tier 3	64	90	350	700	1,050	5	26	72	
Number of Programs in Tier 4	301	454	741	1,110	1,450	478	1,093	1,325	

#### Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) Data Notes

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.

The 2014 count of programs covered by the TQRIS is defined as the number of ELD programs (sites) in the state that are currently eligible to participate in Minnesota's TQRIS. That count includes 7,403 licensed family child care providers and 1,422 licensed child care centers in 45 counties, 7 additional accredited licensed family child care providers and 52 accredited child care centers that were eligible for early rating by virtue of accreditation, 286 Head Start/Early Head Start sites, 118 districts funded by IDEA Part C, 306 districts funded by IDEA Part B, 618 state-funded preschool sites, and unknown number of school-based preschool sites that are funded with alternative (non-state) funds. Data on licensed child care providers comes from Minnesota's Licensing Lookup database as of January 6, 2015. Data on accredited child care programs came from the NACCRRAware database in April 2014. The data sources for Head Start/Early Head Start sites, programs funded by IDEA Part C, programs funded by IDEA Part B, and state-funded preschool are explained in the notes to Table B2c.

The 2014 count of rated programs comes from Develop, Minnesota's Quality Improvement and Registry Tool, and includes all programs with an active rating as of December 31, 2014. The total number of Parent Aware rated programs as of December 31, 2014 was 1,892. In other words, Minnesota reached 72 percent of its target of 2,610 rated programs. While the distribution of ratings is not as originally predicted, participation is continuing to increase.

#### Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets by the end of the grant period.

The majority of rated programs are rated at Tier 4, because a large number and percentage of state-funded preschool, Early Head Start and Head Start and accredited child care are rated through an accelerated pathway to the highest rating, Tier 4. Non-accredited child care programs participate in a full rating process leading to a 1, 2, 3 or 4 Tier rating. Ratings of non-accredited child care programs are well distributed across tiers with the exception that fewer programs earn a rating in Tier 3.

To ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the targets for the number of programs in Tier 1 and 2, we will continue to prioritize the recruitment of non-accredited programs (see B(2)(c) for strategies). Recruiters and Quality Coaches will continue to communicate to programs to enter into the TQRIS wherever they are as any rating is a step toward quality. To date this has been a successful strategy as Tier 2 is the most common rating amongst non-accredited child care programs. For Tier 3, we have identified the low number of programs at this Tier as a priority to address through examining the structure of the rating tool in the indicator review process. Specifically, we will be looking for options to modify the Rating Tool so that it assesses quality levels appropriately and determine if there is a problem with the Tier 3 cut point. These modifications will take place after the end of the grant period, in July 2016.

**Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2)**

*In the table, 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.*

**Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2): Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS.**

Targets										
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	2,857	12.00%	7,228	31.00%	8,860	38.00%	11,658	50.00%	25,189	96.00%
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	3,397	24.00%	6,997	50.00%	8,797	62.00%	10,297	73.00%	11,890	95.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	1,253	25.00%	2,507	50.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	2,754	25.00%	4,958	45.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	1,182	53.00%	1,854	57.00%	2,579	61.00%	3,488	66.00%	4,690	71.00%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	4,049	20.00%	4,261	21.00%	4,870	24.00%	6,088	30.00%	8,117	40.00%

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Actuals									
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS									
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	23,317	2,857	12.00%	23,317	7,401	32.00%	26,108	21,489	82.00%
Specify:	School-based preschool programs funded by Minnesota's School Readiness Program								
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	14,096	3,397	24.00%	14,096	11,163	79.00%	12,435	11,747	94.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	5,013	-	0.00%	5,027	-	0.00%	5,162	-	0.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	11,017	-	0.00%	11,102	-	0.00%	10,865	14	0.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	2,246	1,182	53.00%	3,252	1,812	56.00%	4,989	4,936	99.00%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	20,292	4,049	20.00%	20,292	2,395	12.00%	18,152	5,150	28.00%

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Actuals						
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs						
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Year 3			Year 4		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	26,238	24,818	95.00%			
Specify:	School-based preschool programs funded by Minnesota's School Readiness Program					
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	12,435	11,743	94.00%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	5,449	386	7.00%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	11,076	967	9.00%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	10,956	10,150	93.00%			
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	17,233	5,261	31.00%			

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.



### **Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Data Notes**

*Please indicate whether baseline data are actual or estimated; and 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.*

**For state-funded preschool**, the total number of Children with High Needs served comes from the MDE's School Readiness Annual Report 2013-2014 and only includes those children receiving more than 30 hours of service/involvement per year. The number of children who are served in programs/sites that are rated by Parent Aware as of December 31, 2014 uses the same pool of children but includes only those that were served in programs/sites that were rated by Parent Aware as of December 31, 2014. Since state-funded preschool programs are only eligible for four-Star ratings, all rated programs are in the top tiers. In Minnesota, there are additional school-based PreK programs operating without School Readiness funding. These programs are eligible for ratings if they are meeting School Readiness standards. We rated 55 such programs (sites) in 2014. We are not including children served in those programs in this count, in part because we do not have data on whether those children meet the definition of Children with High Needs.

Rationale for change in target: The increase in the number of state-funded preschool students in year four is due to the rapid adoption of the TQIRS by school districts at the beginning of the grant.

**For Early Head Start and Head Start**, the total number of Children with High Needs served comes from data pulled from the Minnesota Head Start Funded Enrollment report for SFY2014 as reported to the MDE 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. Since Head Start programs are only eligible for four-Star ratings, all rated programs are in the top tiers.

Rationale for change in target: The increase in the number of Head Start students in year four is due to the rapid adoption of the TQIRS by Head Start agencies at the beginning of the grant.

**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 of December 1, 2014 as reported to the MDE via the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS) and pulled for the purpose of federal OSEP reporting. Those children served on December 1, 2014 with IEPs or IFSPs located in districts that were rated in the TQRIS as of December 31, 2014 are counted here.

**For programs funded under Title I of ESEA**, the total number of children served per Title I program in SFY2015 was collected from school districts via the same survey used in previous years and follow-up phone calls. All programs responded to the survey. The increase in numbers is attributed to a higher survey response rate, increased program participation (year 1: 6 districts; year 2: 22 districts; year 3: 31 districts), expansion of services within programs and increased funds. All children in Title I programs are considered Children with High Needs. The number of children in the top tiers of the TQRIS was determined by cross-referencing the child counts per site with the list of rated sites as of December 31, 2014.

**For programs receiving CCDF funds**, the count of children receiving CCDF funds was pulled from Minnesota's administrative data system (MEC2) for the children receiving service in month of October 2014. Reporting October service data allows most provider bills to be submitted and paid by the time the counts are pulled for February reporting. The count represents the number of children aged 0-5 and not yet in kindergarten, on whose behalf CCDF funds were paid to licensed child care programs that were rated in the top tiers of the TQRIS as of December 31, 2014.

**Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Target Notes**

*For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established grant targets by the end of the grant period.*

For number of children with high needs enrolled, all children participating in IDEA funded programs (Part C and Part B) are children with disabilities. As a result, as additional programs become rated, the numbers of children participating in top tiers will increase. As a part of the assurances on the Parent Aware application for ECSE programs, they agree to share information about the Parent Aware Rating process with local early care and education programs and include those partners in their curriculum and training opportunities. MDE and DHS continue to work collaboratively on resources for early care and education providers to assist in the differentiation of typical and atypical development, how to make a referral and what to expect after a referral is made.

---

## Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application)

---

*Describe progress made during the reporting year in validating the effectiveness of the TQRIS during the reporting year, including the State's strategies for determining whether TQRIS tiers accurately reflect differential levels of program quality and assessing the extent to which changes in ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness. 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 2014, Minnesota made progress in Goal 1 and Goal 4. As part of Goal 1, Minnesota engaged in an indicator review process, examining the strength of the research basis underpinning each TQRIS indicator and gathering research to inform potential revisions. Minnesota's external evaluator, Child Trends, has also examined the pattern of indicators met by programs and has surveyed ELD programs about their experience with the rating process and their perception of its validity and fairness. The results of these analyses were presented in the Year two Evaluation report (released in April 2014), and in a research memo which was completed in June 2014, but not released publicly. The research memo is being used to inform the Indicator Review process described on page 26.

As part of Goal 4, the external evaluator, Child Trends, examined administrative data and survey data on the quality improvement supports provided to participating ELD programs, including coaching, technical assistance, mini-grants to support purchase and use of curricula and assessment tools, and quality improvement grants awarded to programs upon earning a 1-, 2-, or 3-Star rating. The results of these analyses were presented in the year two Evaluation report (released in April 2014) and in an unpublished research memo which was completed in December 2014. The research memo is being used to inform the ongoing continuous improvement of the Parent Aware coaching model. Also in 2014, Minnesota implemented a new system for documenting coaching and technical assistance via Develop, Minnesota's Quality Improvement and Registry Tool. This new system is producing more reliable data on coaching and technical assistance which will support more robust analyses of the impact of such supports on ratings.

As more programs are rated and re-rated during the grant period, and as more programs, families, and children participate in the evaluation, Minnesota will be able to conduct more advanced analyses and report on these findings in the year four evaluation reports.

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

Select the Focused Investment Areas addressed in your RTT-ELC State Plan. Grantee should complete only those sections that correspond with the focused investment areas outlined in the grantee's RTT-ELC application and State Plan.

### Focused Investment Areas

- (C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.
- (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.
- (D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.
- (D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.
- (E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.
- (E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.

## Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

### Early Learning Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application)

*Has the State made progress in ensuring that it's Early Learning and Development Standards:*

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

*Describe the progress made in the reporting year, including 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. 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 Early Childhood Indicators of Progress (ECIPs) are Minnesota's early learning standards. The standards help us share developmentally appropriate expectations for what children should know and be able to do at certain ages. Minnesota is updating the birth through kindergarten entrance standards in two areas: 1) language, literacy, and communication; and 2) social and emotional development.

In 2014, MDE completed the first round of the new review process for the ECIPs. The process for reviewing the ECIPs thoroughly gathered feedback from stakeholders. The process involved two committees, one for each reviewed domain (language, literacy, communication and social and emotional). Committee members were recruited from across the state and included participants from across early childhood professions and sectors, including higher education. National, state and culturally specific reviewers were involved at different stages. Public input was solicited through four meetings in different parts of the state, as well as a feedback mechanism provided on MDE's website.

The previous ECIPs included two documents, one for infants and toddlers and one for preschool. In response to committee feedback, Minnesota recruited experts in learning and development across age ranges to help combine the ECIPs to one document. The result includes indicators in multiple age bands so that the continuum of learning and development is clear. As a result, the number of indicators has expanded.

To promote the use of the new ECIPs, Minnesota is contracting with the Center for Early Education and Development from the University of Minnesota to develop training for trainers, which will be available spring 2015. This training is designed to help trainers embed the standards in all manner of training they are doing, rather than replace the foundational training that staff experience.

Minnesota has also identified a list of support documents and briefs to create, as well as an innovative search database that will enable a provider/teacher to easily identify a set of indicators by age band(s) or by domain. In 2015, Minnesota will identify authors for our introductory document and briefs and pursue the development of a searchable database.

Spring 2015, Minnesota will begin review of the math and science domains. We anticipate beginning the next domain review in fall 2015.

## Comprehensive Assessment Systems (Section C(2) of Application)

*Has the State made progress in implementing a developmentally appropriate Comprehensive Assessment System working with Early Learning and Development Programs to:*

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

*Describe the progress made during the reporting year. 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 purpose of this initiative is to support a comprehensive early childhood assessment system with decision making across settings (e.g., child, program, state) and across points in time (e.g., infant, toddler, preschool, at kindergarten entry and exit) such that care and education environments are improved and more children exhibit age appropriate knowledge and skills at entry to kindergarten.

To do this, Minnesota has made progress in the following initiatives:

**Common Set of Assessment Definitions:** Early childhood stakeholders across programs and state departments determined a differing understanding of general assessment terms existed. To create consistency across Comprehensive Assessment System initiatives, a cross-sector group developed a common set of assessment definitions which are being embedded into the hybrid assessment modules.

**Quality Assessment User Groups:** Multiple early childhood initiatives require assessment and curriculum training, including Parent Aware, Head Start, School Readiness, etc. Minnesota historically has lacked the cross-sector capacity of local trainers to meet the identified needs of practitioners across child care, Head Start, early childhood special education and school-based programs. This project is working to train trainers and address this immediate need. The 2015 plans are to create quality assessment user groups for ongoing supports for using assessment at the program level by replicating and scaling Minnesota Head Start Association's existing user groups to extend to a wider array of early childhood professionals.

**Online Needs Assessment:** To help programs select assessments that meet their program structure and student population, the MDE will develop a tool to help programs choose appropriate, high-quality assessments. The tool will be available by Fall 2015.

**Hybrid Assessment Modules:** To increase capacity of early care and education professionals to employ evidence-based assessment practices, a series of eight hybrid (in-person/on-line combination) training modules is being developed. Audiences for these modules include early learning administrators, coaches, teachers/providers and early childhood special education teachers. Currently as part of this initiative, there are 52 applicants to become trainers in this content.

**Computerized Learning Plans (Now bridges):** In order to make child assessment data more accessible for making program decisions, the MDE is working to create bridges between student information and student assessment systems to ensure all personnel have access to updated child information when it is needed.

**Electronic Screening Initiative:** There are three intended outcomes of the electronic screening initiative, which improves the delivery of developmental and social-emotional screening. The first outcome is to improve access to screening for families and for screeners through the use of the electronic screening system. Second, to increase the number of children screened, specifically in populations that are currently hard to reach (i.e. homeless, non-English speaking children and families). Finally, to support the coordination of care for young children and collaboration across sectors (districts, clinics, public health, etc.) within pilot communities.

### **Accomplishments**

- **Definitions:** Determined a common set of 21 assessment definitions between early childhood (B-8) sectors to be used for state purposes. Will be shared on the website and integrated into Online Assessment Modules, Online Needs Assessment, and other state initiatives.
- **User Groups:** Trained 41 trainers throughout the state, intentionally focusing on geographic diversity, to train on six assessment and curriculum tools: Desired Results Developmental Profile, Brigance Inventory of Early Development, Teaching Strategies GOLD, Creative Curriculum Infants and Toddlers, Creative Curriculum Family Child Care, and Creative Curriculum Preschool. Approved trainers are publicly searchable on MDE's website. Will continue to expand assessment and curriculum tool Training of Trainer opportunities in 2015.
- **On-line Needs Assessment:** Completed preliminary conversations with Web developers at MDE on structure of tool. Gained feedback from cross-sector stakeholders on content in the on-line system. Online system will be piloted spring 2015 and launched publicly summer 2015.
- **Modules:** Content for four hybrid modules was completed and is currently being transferred to on-line platforms. Those modules include; 1) authentic assessment practices and supports for administrators; 2) embedding authentic assessment in everyday practice; 3) using data to inform practice; and 4) connecting assessment to standards and curriculum. Content for each module includes training of trainer materials for sustainable scale-up efforts in 2015.
- **Bridges:** Revisions to the proposed work for computerized learning plans was approved in 2014. This revision will allow for an increased ability to connect student information system (SIS) with early childhood assessment (SAS) vendors and incorporate similar information into their systems. Student information system (SIS) vendors were interviewed to understand which common elements schools have access to gather information on business rules that would need to be applied to this work. A Request for Proposal is planned for 2015.
- **Electronic Screening Initiative:** Minnesota is making progress in improving the delivery of developmental and social-emotional screening by piloting electronic access to the Ages & Stages Questionnaires, Third Edition (ASQ-3) and Ages & Stages Questionnaires: Social-Emotional (ASQ:SE) screening instruments.

Minnesota contracted with Patient Tools, Inc. to provide electronic access to the screening instruments and an electronic data management system for programs participating in the pilot. The app-based screening and data system includes use of audio versions available in Hmong, Spanish, Somali, and

English languages for the purpose of increasing access to developmental and social-emotional screening for culturally and linguistically diverse populations as well as an option for adults with low-literacy levels.

Twelve pilot site programs have been selected through an application process and have received training on screening. Applicants were reviewed and selected based on diversity of program type and populations served; capacity and readiness to implement an electronic screening system and interest in and capacity to build and strengthen partnerships with other screening programs and service providers in their communities. Three of the four RTT-ELC transformation zones are participating. Minnesota is working with White Earth Reservation to identify a screening program that is interested in participating.

Electronic screening efforts are aligned with other state-led early identification initiatives, including Minnesota's Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems (ECCS) grant and Minnesota's implementation of the National Help Me Grow system.

Finally, Minnesota is in the process of contracting with a Quality Improvement Advisor to provide facilitation of shared learning opportunities and consultation on quality improvement activities for the pilot sites. Pilot activities will continue throughout 2015.

### **Challenges and Strategies to Address**

- Increasing training capacity. MDE needed to address the training gap prior to any implementation work on the user groups. This challenge was addressed by shifting funds to efforts to increase training capacity, but initial work resulted in shifting staff time away from other duties.

MDE and DHS staff worked cooperatively to recruit and provide leadership to training organizations and negotiate cross-sector trainer agreements, qualifications and quality assurance measures to ensure assessment and curriculum training capacity would remain high for in-demand tools. Additionally, once the initial capacity is covered, MDE will continue to increase capacity at a slower, more manageable rate (1-2 instruments per year) based on statewide needs.

- Slower than expected rollout of hybrid modules.

Strategies to address the challenge of delayed modules include offering concurrent training of trainer (TOT) opportunities on the module content rather than sequential offerings. Additional coordination strategies between DHS and MDE staff include the creation of TOT calendar to ensure no overlap on training opportunities and coordinated messaging of all modules via Child Care Aware and the state's registry system.



## Early Childhood Education Workforce

---

### Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials (Section D(1) of Application)

---

*Has the State made progress in developing:*

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

*Describe the progress made during the reporting year, including progress in engaging postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers in aligning professional development opportunities with the State Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.*

Early childhood educators need to be equipped with knowledge, competencies, tools and confidence to effectively work with children and families. People working with young children must be well grounded in child development educational theories, and demonstrate skills needed for work as articulated by the field. *Minnesota's Knowledge and Competency Framework for Early Childhood Professionals* articulates both expectations of what early childhood educators need to know and what they need to be able to do.

On December 1, 2014, the revised framework documents were posted on MDE's website (<http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/EdExc/EarlyChildRes/index.html>). These documents combine the Board of Teaching Standards (BOT) and field developed competencies to describe what adults working with young children need to know and be able to do. This unique combination responds to concerns of employers that people entering the field with two or four year degrees do not have the practical skills needed and those entering through in-service don't have the theory that is essential. By combining BOT standards and competencies, we marry theory to skills in the three documents:

- Minnesota's Knowledge and Competency Framework for Early Childhood Professionals: Working in Family Child Care - 12/1/14
- Minnesota's Knowledge and Competency Framework for Early Childhood Professionals: Working with Preschool-Aged Children in Center and School Programs - 12/1/14
- Minnesota's Knowledge and Competency Framework for Early Childhood Professionals: Working with Infants and Toddlers - 12/1/14

Each of the documents articulates competencies at three levels - Explores, Implements and Designs and Leads. As the levels were developed, verbs from Bloom's Taxonomy were identified and used consistently to better differentiate between levels. The levels align horizontally to show a progression of skills that is not dependent on the educational level but rather on the competence they are able to demonstrate.

Elements that make the documents unique include:

- The integration of the Board of Teaching Standards and the competencies
- Identification of dispositions important for early childhood educators. Advisory group members discussed dispositions with their constituents comprising trainers, staff members, directors associations, Family Child Care and a large urban Head Start staff-including bus monitors and drivers. Their conversations were examined for themes.
- Collaborative work with Minnesota Association for Infant & Early Childhood Mental Health (MnAIECMH) resulting in the guiding principles of these documents and those of the MnAIECMH endorsement are closely aligned.
- Foundational skills teachers need to support the development of home language as emphasized in the groundbreaking legislation known as Learning for English Academic Proficiency and Success Act (LEAPS)

Minnesota will use the documents as the basis for both preservice and inservice education. In addition, early childhood teachers/providers can use them to map their own professional development.

Staff at MDE are working with instructors at institutions of higher education to embed the new framework in their course work. School-based preschool programs will be encouraged to use the framework to articulate training needed by individuals and groups of staff and to identify training to meet these needs.

The Department of Human Services will be involved in the promotion and implementation of these documents in several ways.

- In partnership with DHS and MDE, Child Care Aware is developing messaging for child care providers about the release of the new Knowledge and Competency Framework and plans for implementation.
- DHS is developing training in FY15 for trainers and practitioners. Each training will have its own content specific to those audiences. One statewide training will be delivered to trainers in the spring of 2015. Additional opportunities for trainers will be available as needed. Training for practitioners will be available through the Child Care Aware system starting in FY16.
- DHS will print copies of the new documents so they can be available for training participants.
- The new framework categories will be programmed into Develop, Minnesota's online Quality Improvement and Registry Tool, and replace the existing categories already in the system. Because we need to align this work with the transition to end the use of the previous MnStreams data system at Child Care Aware, this work will likely not happen until sometime in 2016.
- The new framework will be used as part of the training approval process through the Minnesota Center for Professional Development. Implementation timelines have yet to be determined but will likely happen after changes have been made in Develop and trainers have been trained on the new content.
- The new framework will be embedded into the Career Lattice and career guidance tools at the Minnesota Center for Professional Development.

Companion guides are in process or being written which will provide in plain language key concepts, some examples of strategies and stories of how competencies are demonstrated in various settings.

**Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities  
(Section D(2) of Application)**

*Has the State 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:*

<b>Supporting Early Childhood Educators</b>	
Providing and expanding access to effective professional development opportunities that are aligned with your State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework	Yes
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:	Yes
<i>Scholarships</i>	Yes
<i>Compensation and wage supplements</i>	Yes
<i>Tiered reimbursement rates</i>	Yes
<i>Other financial incentives</i>	
<i>Management opportunities</i>	
Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention	
Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for:	Yes
<i>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</i>	Yes
<i>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</i>	Yes

*Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.*

Minnesota is dedicated to improving the effectiveness and retention of Early Childhood Educators who work with children with high needs. Two key strategies to support Early Childhood Educator development and advancement are, first, to develop new or revise existing credentials and training. Secondly, Minnesota provides increased supports to educators to access training and education aligned with Minnesota's Knowledge and Competency Framework and Parent Aware. All efforts will continue through the end of the grant period.

In 2014, Minnesota made progress in developing new or revising existing credentials and training in the following ways:

- Completed the development of a 30-hour Minnesota Infant/Toddler Credential which partially meets the training indicators required for Star Levels in Parent Aware. The credential will also meet some or all of training requirements for child care program license renewal, the national Child Development Associate credential (CDA), and the Minnesota Infant and Early Childhood Mental Health Endorsement, Level 1.

- Launched the development of training on the new Knowledge and Competency Framework for trainers as well as early childhood providers.
- Revised the Minnesota Child Care Credential to meet all Parent Aware training indicator requirements. The Credential is now offered in English, Spanish, Somali and Hmong.

In 2015, Minnesota will continue to make progress in developing new or revising existing credentials and training by developing additional curriculum to provide intermediate and advanced training that will meet all Parent Aware training indicator requirements. Development is expected to be completed June 30, 2015 with statewide access to training events beginning in late summer of 2015.

In 2014, Minnesota made progress to provide increased supports to access training and education in the following ways:

- Continued provision of Parent Aware Quality Coaches and CLASS Coaches -- 578 child care providers participated in Parent Aware Full Rating Process in 2014. Each provider received coaching and/or technical assistance as part of their participation.
- Continued to increase bilingual/bicultural trainer capacity through trainer learning communities. Twenty-one trainers representing eight language communities participated in 2014.
- Identified qualifications and launched an approval process for Parent Aware Quality Coaches and CLASS Coaches in Develop, Minnesota's Quality Improvement and Registry Tool. Child care providers who access this approved coaching can now meet specific licensing training hours and Parent Aware training requirements.
- One hundred eighteen early childhood professionals were awarded REETAIN grants that recognize educational attainment and years of service in the field.
- One hundred two students were awarded T.E.A.C.H. grants to help cover the costs of tuition and books for pursuit of early childhood related degrees.

In 2015, Minnesota will continue to make progress to provide increased supports to access training and education by:

- Continuing to provide low cost training to providers that meets training indicators required for Parent Aware
- Continuing to provide scholarships for training associated with the attainment of the Child Development Associate Credential.
- Continuing the TEACH scholarship program for early childhood educators pursuing higher education.
- Delivery of courses associated with the new Minnesota Infant Toddler Credential.
- Training additional bi-lingual and bi-cultural trainers so they can deliver content that meets training indicators for Parent Aware.
- Delivering training content to trainers and providers on the new Knowledge and Competency Framework that was released in 2014.

## Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1)

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

### 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.

	Baseline	Targets				Actuals			
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Total number of “aligned” institutions and providers	16	25	35	45	51	16	16	50	
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an “aligned” institution or provider	471	555	809	883	954	555	726	947	

#### Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1) Data Notes

**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. Now that the Knowledge and Competency Framework has been aligned with the Board of Teaching standards, we can conclude that any institution or provider that uses the Board of Teaching standards is aligned with the Knowledge and Competency Framework. While all IHEs are expected to align their coursework with the Board of Teaching standards, we are aware that this may not be happening consistently. A survey of institutes of higher education showed that 94 percent of higher education institutions reported using the Board of Teaching standards to develop learning objectives for their courses. There are 27 two-year institutions and 23 four-year institutions currently offering degrees or credentials in early childhood care and education. Thus, we estimate that 47 institutions of higher education (and three professional development providers) are offering coursework that is aligned with the Knowledge and Competency Framework.

**Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an “aligned” institution or provider:** The 2014 total reflects the sum of the actual numbers in the 2014 column of Table D2d2 for Credential Types 1 through 6.

#### Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1) Target Notes

*For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets by the end of the grant period.*

In 2015 Minnesota is working on a plan to implement the revised Knowledge and Competency Framework. Strategies for implementation include the following:

- Consultation with institutions of higher education on the content in the new Framework, its alignment with the Board of Teaching standards and ways the Framework can be used for curriculum development.
- Development of training on the new Framework for trainers and practitioners.

- Alignment of the new Framework with our Professional Development Registry and Minnesota's Career Lattice.
- Promotion of the new Framework to early childhood practitioners, trainers, and institutions of higher education.

## Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2)

In the tables below, indicate State progress toward meeting ambitious yet achievable targets for 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)(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.

Targets										
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	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									
	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minnesota Child Care Credential	27		93		140		140		140	
MNAEYC Director's Credential	26		14		15		20		25	
National Child Development Associate (CDA)	180		193		206		221		300	
Certificate or Diploma in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708	81		87		93		100		150	
Associate Degree in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708	157		168		180		192		275	
Bachelor degree in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708, 13.1015, 13.1209	0		0		175		210		240	
Teacher licenses of staff working in Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), School Readiness, and Early Childhood Family Education	4,013		4,214		4,424		4,646		4,878	

Actuals										
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	<i>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</i>									
Progression: High to Low / Low to High	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minnesota Child Care Credential	27		73		62		0			
MNAEYC Director's Credential	26		6		11		13			
National Child Development Associate (CDA)	180		223		351		357			
Certificate or Diploma in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708	81		94		108		195			
Associate Degree in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708	157		159		194		275			
Bachelor degree in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708, 13.1015, 13.1209	0		0		0		107			
Teacher licenses of staff working in Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), School Readiness, and Early Childhood Family Education	4,013		4,487		6,013		5,954			

### Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2) Data Notes

*Please describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information.*

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:** To achieve consistency and clarity, Minnesota reports only on Yearly Gains (newly awarded credentials) rather than on the total number of early childhood educators in the state that hold the credential.

**Notes on Credential Type 1:** Data comes from the Minnesota Professional Development Registry. The Minnesota Child Care Credential is aligned with Minnesota's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

No one was awarded the Child Care Credential in 2014. However, in 2014 nine cohorts were started statewide, including two in Spanish, one in Somali, two online and an additional four face-to face cohorts. Overall, this includes 82 family child care programs and 39 center-based programs, for a total of 121 programs served. We could expect at least 100 students receive their MN Child Care Credentials in 2015. We could expect at least 100 students receiving their MN Child Care Credentials in 2015.



**Notes on Credential Type 2:** Data comes from MnAEYC administrative records. The MnAEYC Director's Credential is aligned with Minnesota's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

**Notes on Credential Type 3:** Data on new CDAs (not renewals) awarded to Minnesota practitioners comes from the National Council for Professional Recognition. The Child Development Associate is aligned with Minnesota's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Rationale for change in target: RTT-ELC funding for CDA Scholarship that help Early Childhood Educators complete a CDA has increased over the grant period and will remain level in 2015. However, some additional requirements for receiving a CDA scholarship are under consideration that may reduce the numbers of applicants slightly from the 2014 Actual. These requirements will lead to more accountability for the use of these scholarships. Thus the revised 2015 target is higher than the original target for this year, but somewhat lower than the 2014 actual.

**Notes on Credential Type 4, 5, and 6:** Data on certificates and diplomas earned at Minnesota institutions was pulled from the 2012-13 IPEDS Completion Survey Data. Minnesota counts certificates, diplomas, and degrees in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210 (Early Childhood Education and Teaching), 19.0706 (Child Development), 19.0709 (Child Care Provider/Assistant), 19.0708 (Child Care and Support Services Management). To determine which institutions offer degrees and credential that are aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, a survey was administered to Institutes of Higher Education that offer such degrees and credentials. Because the response rate to the survey was low, we are unable to say with certainty which Institutes of Higher Education are aligned. Because the survey found that 94 percent of higher education institutions reported using the Board of Teaching standards to develop learning objectives for their courses, we estimated that 94 percent of degrees and credential awarded are awarded by institutions that are aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

**Rationale for change in target for Credential Type 4:** There was a substantial jump in Actuals from 2013-14 from 108 to 195. One reason may be the RTT-ELC funding for TEACH Scholarships that helps Early Childhood Educators complete these certificates and diplomas. These funds have increased over the grant period and will remain level in in 2015. Because it is difficult to predict the number of scholarship recipients who will complete a certificate or degree in Year Four, Minnesota desires to revise its Year 4 Target to be higher than originally proposed, yet not as ambitious as the 2014 actual.

Rationale for change in target for Credential Type 5: RTT-ELC funding for TEACH Scholarship help Early Childhood Educators complete an Associate Degree. These supports have increased over the grant period and will remain level in 2015 so a revised 2015 target that is the same as the actual in 2014 is reasonable to expect.

**Notes on Credential Type 7:** Data was pulled from STAR (MDE's data system for teacher licensure and employment) and captures the Count of Active 2013-2014 Licensed Staff for License Codes 180102, 190500, and 180402.

#### **Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2) Target Notes**

*For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets by the end of the grant period.*

- Content for the Minnesota Child Care Credential was revised in 2014. Delivery of the new content began in summer 2014. Students complete the credential in a cohort model and completion takes between nine-13 months depending on delivery method. We anticipate an increase in numbers in 2015 as the current group of students completes their studies. Currently there are nine cohorts of Minnesota Child

Care Credential students statewide, including two in Spanish, one in Somali, two online through Eager-to-Learn, and an additional four face-to face cohorts. Overall, this includes 82 family child care programs and 39 center-based programs, for a total of 121 programs served.

- Director's Credential classes are delivered on-line and in classroom settings in a cohort model. There are currently several cohorts underway and we expect additional credentials to be issued in 2015.
- The TEACH Early Childhood Scholarship program has seen an increase in awards in 2014. Contracts are awarded to students annually. As most students are taking courses part time there is some turnaround time required before we see completion of degrees. However, we do anticipate the increased scholarship numbers to result in an increase in Bachelor degrees in 2015 and beyond.

## Measuring Outcomes and Progress

### Understanding the Status of Children’s Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry (Section E(1) of Application)

*Has the State made progress in developing a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that:*

Kindergarten Entry Assessment	
Is aligned with the State's Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness	Yes
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	Yes
Is administered beginning no later than the start of the school year in the third year of the grant to children entering a public school kindergarten (e.g., the 2014-2015 school year for Round 1 grantee states, the 2015-2016 school year for Round 2 grantees). States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation	Yes
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	Yes
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)	Yes

*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.*

#### **Overview of Design of Minnesota's KEA, including timing of administration**

The School Readiness Study 2.0 (Minnesota's KEA) is designed to explore and continually refine a menu of assessment tools that align with the Early Childhood Indicators of Progress and the kindergarten academic standards with the plan that districts or schools will choose one tool from the menu to implement. Each tool was tested using the following steps and procedures; (1) Intended claims and psychometric properties of each tool using selected Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (1999), (2) data integrity analysis, (3) descriptive analysis of each measure, (4) measurement quality evidence and alignment procedures specific to each assessment tool. Steps two to four are completed by collecting data on Minnesota's population of kindergarten students.

In 2014, Minnesota analyzed those results and implemented the second phase of data collection, seeing how well the menu of assessment tools aligns to one another by double-coding students on multiple assessments. By aligning multi-domain assessments to what is currently the yardstick of children's knowledge at the end of the school year, we hope to lessen the burden of multiple tests placed on districts while providing them a choice from a menu of tools.

Teachers administer their school's chosen kindergarten assessment tool based on the publisher recommendations, typically within the first eight weeks of the school year. The pilot of Minnesota's KEA is at the school, not district, level.

### **Domain Coverage**

Minnesota has chosen to pilot assessment tools that meet the National Research Council criteria for high-quality early childhood assessment, including multi-domain. Through our pilot design, we have excelled in determining the alignment of the menu of assessments to the standards, but not only having theoretical alignment by also analysis as described in the validity and reliability section.

### **Validity and Reliability**

Assessment tools that underwent review and analysis in phase one included the; Beginning Kindergarten Assessment (2013) and Social Skills Improvement System (2008), Brigance Inventory of Early Development 2nd edition (2010), Desired Results Developmental Profile - School Readiness (2012), Early Learning Scale - Kindergarten (2012), Teaching Strategies Gold 2nd edition (2013) and the Work Sampling System - Minnesota Adapted version (2006).

Technical reviews were conducted to gather evidence of each instrument's primary claims and technical adequacy. The evidence provided across tools was inconsistent and often claims were made with little to no evidentiary support.

The following tools exhibited acceptable internal consistency (>.8) across each measure at the domain level: Work Sampling System, Teaching Strategies Gold and Desired Results Developmental Profile. The Beginning Kindergarten Assessment and Early Learning Scale internal consistency results ranged from .5 to .91 depending on domain and data collection point measured. Correlational analysis was conducted on the Brigance and resulted in large effect sizes among the domains within the instrument. Confirmatory factor analysis on all tools resulted in reasonable to good fit based on absolute and relative fit indices (RMSEA, CFI, TLI)1.

Three tools remain on the menu as a result of this analysis: Desired Results Developmental Profile - School Readiness (2012), Teaching Strategies Gold 2nd edition (2013) and the Work Sampling System - Minnesota Adapted version (2006). Other tools may choose to apply to be piloted at a later date.

Beginning in 2015, tools will be piloted and added to the menu on a periodic basis and based on state needs. All reports resulting from the KEA beginning in 2016 will report the status of children's learning and development according to the early learning standards rather than any assessment tool. Through this process, we'll be able to determine the equivalence of tools and will have comparable scores among tools to report on the standards.

### **Longitudinal Data System**

Data from Minnesota's Kindergarten Entry Assessment is reported to the Statewide Longitudinal Data System.

### **Funding**

Minnesota's Kindergarten Entry Assessment is funded by state funds, and the pilot is supported by this grant.

*Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.*

General progress described above. Below are specific accomplishments, challenges and strategies to address challenges from 2014:

### **Accomplishments**

- Successfully completed analysis of alignment between menu of assessment tools and Minnesota's early learning and kindergarten standards
- Implemented the phase 2 study design, using a cadre of early education professionals to assess students in classrooms, ultimately double-coding students on assessment tools to determine the alignment of a menu of tools to one another.
- Began replication of phase 1 (assessment-standards alignment) pilot with a new tool in 2014, the Formative Assessment System for Teachers. Depending on the results of the review and analysis, this tool will be moved to phase in Fall 2015 for possible inclusion on the menu in Fall 2016.
- Awarded contract for fall 2014 analysis, to be completed in 2015.

### **Challenges and Strategies to Address**

- Recruitment for fall 2014 pilot study was approximately half of target.

Strategy: In order to compensate for low numbers, Minnesota is implementing a spring 2015 cohort to continue concurrent data collection on assessment tools to determine alignment of tools to one another. The spring cohort will include public preschool programs, Head Starts and early childhood special education.

- Misconceptions among K-3 professionals on the appropriate methods/purposes of early childhood assessment.

Strategy: Professional Development is now a required component of the KEA. The comprehensive assessment system (CAS) will provide low-cost training supports to schools who adopt one of the appropriate tools from the menu. Additional supports/PD modules (via the CAS) are being developed for administrators to help them better understand the appropriate uses of early learning data.

- Misunderstanding among the public on the KEA revision.

Strategies: Working to update state website to have clearer information on the KEA revision. Working with Minnesota Department of Education's communications team to develop palatable infographics to explain what the KEA is and is not. Continuing to present study design and results at conferences and events with local and national leaders. Working to embed KEA information in established state initiatives.

## Early Learning Data Systems (Section E(2) of Application)

*Has the State 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:*

Early Learning Data Systems	
Has all of the Essential Data Elements	Yes
Enables uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating State Agencies and Participating Programs	Yes
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	
Meets the Data System Oversight Requirements and complies with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws	Yes

*Describe the progress made during the reporting year, including 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. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.*

The Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System (EC LDS/ECIDS) was created in an effort to streamline data elements across agencies into a usable warehouse. 2014 was a productive year for ECLDS/ECIDS including finalizing data sharing agreements, progress loading data, sustainability planning and stakeholder engagement.

### Accomplishments

- Foremost, Minnesota finalized all data sharing agreements needed in order to fully move forward in integrating data from all three state agencies, Education, Health, and Human Services. Once these agreements were in place, by April, 2014, we were able to make significant progress, successfully loading K-12 Enrollment, K-12 Assessment, Kindergarten Entry Assessment, Birth Records, and Child Care Assistance Program data by November, 2014.
- During the summer months additional new activities took place related to planning for sustainability and creating good feedback loops with stakeholders in Minnesota that informed how we communicate about the EC LDS - both now while it is under development and once it is launched. In addition to the cross-team participation that we already have with our Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS/SLEDS) project and the EC LDS/ECIDS, we began technical meetings centered around long-term planning for P20W integration of our systems. This has included updates to project plans well beyond the current grant period (up to seven years out) and identification of time-points for integration opportunities whether related to data sharing agreement revisions or funding requests to our Legislature.

- Minnesota identified stakeholders and convened stakeholder focus groups in four locations. These focus groups were intended to gather information from partners and the public on how best to communicate about the EC LDS/ECIDS and their preferences for particular features for the system. Focus groups were followed by an online survey for individuals who were unable to attend focus groups. Information gathered from these efforts has been critical to the creation of the first public-use summary communication document approved and finalized through our governance process this fall. This information piece is providing content for our Web interface design as well as other communication efforts.

### **Challenges and Strategies to Address**

- First, like most states, Minnesota started the development of its EC LDS/ECIDS behind schedule.

Minnesota is now on schedule on almost all milestones due to careful planning on both the operations and technical side. Specifically, aligning project plans along high-level milestones, meeting bi-weekly - as well as the willingness of staff involved at all levels to meet more frequently or in sub-committees. During the months of 2014 when policy research questions were consolidated, Research and Data Committee members met more often than the monthly commitment they initially agreed to in order to move things along more quickly.

- Begun the work of creating analytics from data that have been loaded into the system to-date.

This is relatively intensive work being done by a sub-committee for approximately three months. If this process works well, we will use it again for the next phase of analytics development. We anticipate recommendations for our Web interface layout, colors, logo and first charts and graphs to go before our governing body by spring. In addition, we have been pleased by the ongoing proposals for new data source contributions by our state partner agencies. In 2014 we have received commitments for TANF and SNAP data from our Department of Human Services, and a variety of smaller but highly valued data sources from the Department of Education including Early Childhood Special Education Outcomes and ACCESS (for English learners), among others. We attribute this to growing enthusiasm around the enhanced ability of Minnesota to measure more on the status of young children.

- Lengthy number of research questions

Minnesota inherited 78 questions upon project launch, including duplication and nuanced overlaps across questions. Because the list had been developed by multiple agencies, stakeholders, and two Governor's Early Learning Councils, we had an obligation to address each question and document all changes. The Research and Data Committee members created a list that could be addressed in phases and in a systematic fashion.

## 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. Tables A(1) -1 through 3 should be updated with current data. Tables 4 and 5 should provide data for the reporting year as well as previous years of the grant. Tables 6 and 7 may be updated only where significant changes have occurred (if no changes have occurred, you should note that fact).

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income <sup>1</sup> families, by age		
	Number of children from Low-Income families in the State	Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State
Infants under age 1	19,255	31.6%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	47,775	35.0%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	74,349	35.5%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	141,379	34.8%

<sup>1</sup> Low-Income is defined as having an income of up to 200% of the Federal poverty rate.

#### Data Table (A)(1)-1 Data Notes

Indicate the data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

\*ACS Data from previous year was used to estimate current year. ACS Public Use Microdata Sample DataSets used: 2011, 2012, 2013 (accessed through Data Ferrett). Universe: ((AGEP in (00)) OR (AGEP between 01 and 05)) AND (((ST in (27))))). Weight used: PWGTP. POVPIP Income to poverty ratio recoded.



Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs

Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs		
Special Populations: Children who...	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...
Have disabilities or developmental delays <sup>1</sup>	16,129	4.0%
Are English learners <sup>2</sup>	39,285	10.0%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	2,768	0.0%
Are migrant <sup>3</sup>		
Are homeless <sup>4</sup>	6,970	1.7%
Are in foster care	2,973	0.0%

<sup>1</sup>For purposes of this Annual Performance 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).

<sup>2</sup>For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are English learners are children birth through kindergarten entry who have home languages other than English.

<sup>3</sup>For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are migrant are children birth through kindergarten entry who meet the definition of "migratory child" in ESEA section 1309(2).

<sup>4</sup>The term "homeless children" has the meaning given the term "homeless children and youths" in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (425 U.S.C. 11434a(2)).

**Data Table (A)(1)-2 Data Notes**

Indicate the data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

For children who are homeless, the data is estimated from the Consolidated State Performance Report: Parts I and II for State Formula Grant Programs under Elementary and Secondary Education Act 2013-14.

For children who reside on "Indian Lands", Census data was pulled from American Community Survey Table SO101 Age and Sex, 2009-13. Format does not allow for percentage to be less than one percent. The actual percentage is .68.

Migrant data for children birth to five is not available.

At the start of the Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge grant, MDE accessed homeless data from Wilder Research, an independent non-profit research organization, because there was a focus on children birth to five in their periodic reports on homelessness that have since been discontinued. For this Annual Performance Report, Minnesota has requested to change the homelessness data source to the number report to USDE for the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and this request was approved.

The McKinney-Vento estimates are lower than Wilder Research data for the following reasons:

1. Counts children in public schools identified as meeting statutory definitions of being homeless and highly mobile per ESEA. Children in private schools or unenrolled are not reported.
2. Counts children identified as homeless during the school year. If children are homeless during the summer, the family may not prioritize connecting to identify their status.
3. Throughout the year, families may not self-identify to schools regarding all the challenges they are facing or may not consider themselves homeless even though they may meet the technical definition.

Birth to five estimate built from MARSS enrollment records, kindergarten ELL served

Foster care data from Minnesota Department of Human Services and Minnesota Foster Care Report Card. Children in Out of home Care by Age and Gender. Format does not allow for percentage to be less than one. The actual percentage is 0.73.

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

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

Table (A)(1)-3a: Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	-	-	26,238	26,238
Specify:	ELS Annual Reports SFY14			
Data Source and Year:				
<b>Early Head Start &amp; Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	2,103	-	12,569	14,672
Data Source and Year:	SFY2014 Approved Enrollment Chart. Toddler counts included in infants.			
<b>Programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619</b>	733	4,716	11,051	16,500
Data Source and Year:	12/1/14 OSEP reporting			
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b>	-	594	4,057	4,651
Data Source and Year:	12/1/14 OSEP reporting			
<b>Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program</b>	1,638	6,262	9,740	17,639
Data Source and Year:	SFY 14 monthly average children served based on payments issued during SFY14 with annual unduplicated age data applied. Source: Administrative data from the eligibility and payment system, MEC2.			
<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.				

**Data Table (A)(1)-3a Data Notes**

Enter text here to clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

Counts of children in care with a program receiving CCDF funds is restricted to children participating in the Child Care Assistance Program, the program through which Minnesota's administers the CCDF subsidy program. Minnesota does not have access to counts of all children in care with these programs.

Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity

Note: Totals are not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs.

Table (A)(1)-3b: Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Hispanic Children	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Non-Hispanic Black or African American Children	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Non-Hispanic White Children
State-funded preschool	2,115	432	1,276	2,023	58	1,041	19,217
Specify:	ELS Annual Reports, SFY14						
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	3,999	1,557	754	3,810	53	1,304	8,034
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	527	156	236	443	4	237	3,846
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	1,135	253	466	973	6	531	7,687
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA							
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	1,132	331	465	7,178	8	1,295	6,631

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

**Data Table (A)(1)-3b Data Notes**

Enter text here to clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

Early Head Start and Head Start data is pulled from the 2013-14 Program Information Report.

CCDF: SFY 14 monthly average children served based on payments issued during SFY14 with annual unduplicated age data applied to restrict to age 0-5 (and not yet in K), annual unduplicated race data for all ages applied. **Race data is unknown for 600 children served in SFY14.**

IDEA Part C & Part B: 12/1/14 OSEP reporting

Administrative data from the eligibility and payment system, MEC2. Counts of children in care with a program receiving CCDF funds is restricted to children participating in the Child Care Assistance Program, the program through which Minnesota's administers the CCDF subsidy program. Minnesota does not have access to counts of all children in care with these programs. Race information is unavailable for 807 children per month.

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

*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 (A)(1)-4: Funding for each Fiscal Year</b>					
<b>Type of investment</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>
<b>Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start &amp; Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	\$20,100,000	\$20,100,000	\$20,100,000	\$20,100,000	<b>\$20,100,000</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	\$9,792,000	\$9,958,393	\$10,095,000	\$11,962,000	
Specify:	School Readiness Program				
<b>State contributions to IDEA, Part C</b>	\$30,163,979	\$30,163,979	\$30,163,979	\$30,163,979	<b>\$30,163,979</b>
<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	\$124,568,148	<b>\$124,568,148</b>
<b>Total State contributions to CCDF<sup>2</sup></b>	\$80,990,440	\$93,987,000	\$82,426,900	\$98,051,468	<b>\$130,774,407</b>
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>	\$52,710,490	\$64,402,563	\$53,008,044	\$68,579,217	<b>\$101,302,156</b>
<b>TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs<sup>3</sup></b>	\$55,041,000	\$44,083,000	\$62,086,000	\$48,099,000	<b>\$48,451,000</b>
<b>Other State contributions 1</b>	\$426,456				
Specify:	Early Child Mental Health Infrastructure Grant				
<b>Other State contributions 2</b>	\$21,177,000	\$22,636,263	\$22,797,000	\$26,651,000	<b>\$27,512,000</b>
Specify:	Early Childhood Family Education				
<b>Other State contributions 3</b>	\$3,434,000	\$3,513,640	\$3,330,000	\$3,330,000	
Specify:	Early Childhood Screening				
<b>Other State contributions 4</b>	\$8,451,503	\$8,557,000	\$8,557,000	\$8,557,000	<b>\$8,557,000</b>
Specify:	TANF expenditures on Home Visiting				
<b>Other State contributions 5</b>		\$402,500	\$552,786	\$1,000,000	
Specify:	Private Funding: Marketing of Parent Aware (Parent Aware for School Readiness)				
<b>Other State contributions 6</b>		\$400,509	\$420,337	\$25,000	
Specify:	Private Funding: TQIRS Evaluation (Parent Aware for School Readiness/Greater Twin Cities United Way)				
<b>Other State contributions 7</b>		\$713,970	\$751,630	\$529,865	
Specify:	Private Funding: Quality Improvement (Greater Twin Cities United Way)				
<b>Other State contributions 8</b>		\$540,000	\$4,125,000	\$5,125,000	
Specify:	Private Funding: Minnesota Reading Corps				
<b>Total State contributions:</b>	<b>\$354,144,526</b>	<b>\$359,624,402</b>	<b>\$366,517,780</b>	<b>\$378,162,460</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.  
<sup>2</sup> Total State contributions to CCDF must include Maintenance of Effort (MOE), State Match, and any State contributions exceeding State MOE or Match.  
<sup>3</sup> Include TANF transfers to CCDF as well as direct TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs.

#### Data Table (A)(1)-4 Data Notes

*Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data, including the State's fiscal year end date.*

Minnesota has a biennial budget and state fiscal years run from July 1 of the preceding year to June 30 of the current year.

Baseline and Year One state contributions are reported from Minnesota's Statewide Integrated Financial Tools (SWIFT).

Year two and Year Three state contributions are reported from Minnesota Management and Budget's General Fund Balance Analysis 2013 End of 2013 Legislative Session as of June 25, 2013.

Private funding for Years One and Two are reported by each funder.

CCDF and TANF sections completed and updated with November 2014 Forecast.

**Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State**

*Note: Totals are not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs. However, the current year should match the program totals reported in Table (A)(1)-3a.*

<b>Table (A)(1)-5: Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Type of Early Learning and Development Program</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b> (annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)	24,790	24,736	26,108	26,238
Specify:	State-funded Preschool			
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>2</sup></b> (funded enrollment)	14,085	14,988	14,220	14,672
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b> (annual December 1 count)	16,162	16,129	16,027	16,500
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b> (total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report )	2,246	3,252	4,651	4,651
<b>Programs receiving CCDF funds</b> (average monthly served)	20,292	19,691	18,566	17,639
<sup>1</sup> Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.				
<sup>2</sup> Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.				

**Data Table (A)(1)-5 Data Notes**

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed. Include current year if data are available.

State-funded preschool counts are from the Early Learning Services School Readiness Annual Report 2013-14.

Early Head Start and Head Start counts are from the 2013-14 Program Information Report.

IDEA Part C & Part B: 12/1/14 OSEP reporting

CCDF: Counts of children aged birth to five and not yet in kindergarten in care with a program receiving CCDF funds is restricted to children participating in the Child Care Assistance Program, the program through which Minnesota's administers the CCDF subsidy program. Minnesota does not have access to counts of all children in care with these programs. SFY 14 monthly average children served based on payments issued during SFY14 with annual unduplicated age data applied.

Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards

Check marks indicate the State's Early Learning and Development Standards address the different age groups by Essential Domain of School Readiness.

Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards			
Essential Domains of School Readiness	Age Groups		
	Infants	Toddlers	Preschoolers
Language and literacy development	✓	✓	✓
Cognition and general knowledge (including early math and early scientific development)	✓	✓	✓
Approaches toward learning	✓	✓	✓
Physical well-being and motor development	✓	✓	✓
Social and emotional development	✓	✓	✓

**Data Table (A)(1)-6 Data Notes**

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.



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

Check marks indicate where an element of a Comprehensive Assessment System is currently required.

Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State					
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	✓	✓			
Specify:					
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	✓	✓			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	✓	✓			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓	✓			
Programs receiving CCDF funds	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier)	✓				
Tier 1					
Tier 2	✓	✓	✓		
Tier 3	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Tier 4	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Tier 5					
State licensing requirements			✓		
Other 1	✓				
Describe:	Nurse Family Partnership Home Visiting Program (developmental and social-emotional screening)				
<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.					

**Data Table (A)(1)-7 Data Notes**

Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data, if necessary.

**Screening Measures**

Programs receiving CCDF funds are required to have training which includes awareness about screening.

The current Quality Rating and Improvement System requires that all programs must provide parents with information on screening - Tier 1 and above.

State-funded preschool requires all children to receive early childhood screening within the first 90 days of attendance.

## **Formative Assessments**

For programs receiving CCDF funds, Minnesota licensing regulations for child care centers (not family child care) require that a child's intellectual, physical, and social and emotional development be reported during parent conferences. There is no reference to formative assessment.

For the current Quality Rating and Improvement system, Tier 1, all FC providers and 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 and 4 - assessments are conducted using an approved tool at least twice per year in at least the following domains: social-emotional, language and literacy, mathematical thinking and physical development; all lead teachers/providers must complete eight hours of training on authentic child assessment OR

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 eight hours of training on authentic child assessment.

(If program is using an approved assessment tool with some but not all age groups, partial credit is given.)

Provides families with child assessment results, and if a child has an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) OR

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.

Minnesota 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.

State-funded preschools require that each child's cognitive skills be assessed with a comprehensive child assessment instrument upon entry and before the child leaves the program.

## **Measures of Environmental Quality**

For programs funded under IDEA Part B, section 619, continue to scale-up using Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool.

For programs receiving CCDF funds and participating in the current 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.

State-funded preschools, at this point-in-time, do not require an assessment of the teaching/classroom environment.

## **Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions**

For programs funded under IDEA Part B, section 619, continue to scale-up using Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool.

For programs receiving CCDF funds and participating in the current Quality Rating and Improvement system, fully-rated centers only: all preschool and preschool/toddler classrooms must receive a CLASS score of two or higher in the Instructional Support category of the CLASS to achieve three stars, and 2.5 or higher to achieve four stars. Fully-rated centers also receive points for their CLASS scores that help them earn three stars or higher.

## Budget and Expenditure Tables

### Budget and Expenditure Table 1: Overall Budget and Expenditure Summary by Budget Category

Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous budget period and for the current reporting period.

#### Budget Summary Table

Budget Summary Table					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$208,154.00	\$865,524.00	\$1,216,798.82	\$0.00	\$2,290,476.82
2. Fringe Benefits	\$56,233.00	\$244,348.00	\$264,539.81	\$0.00	\$565,120.81
3. Travel	\$1,665.00	\$8,398.00	\$8,220.49	\$0.00	\$18,283.49
4. Equipment	\$414.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$414.00
5. Supplies	\$762.00	\$22,434.00	\$17,906.13	\$0.00	\$41,102.13
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$1,579,302.00	\$3,439,374.19	\$0.00	\$5,018,676.19
7. Training Stipends	\$1,000.00	\$1,359.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,359.00
8. Other	\$16,197.00	\$52,242.00	\$79,490.73	\$0.00	\$147,929.73
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$284,425.00	\$2,773,607.00	\$5,026,330.17	\$0.00	\$8,084,362.17
10. Indirect Costs	\$55,861.00	\$307,949.46	\$449,624.83	\$0.00	\$813,435.29
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$317,763.00	\$4,923,176.00	\$5,764,487.94	\$0.00	\$11,005,426.94
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$9,625.00	\$38,006.00	\$270,145.99	\$0.00	\$317,776.99
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$667,674.00	\$8,042,738.46	\$11,510,588.93	\$0.00	\$20,221,001.39
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$13,665,854.00	\$15,631,024.00	\$13,606,703.51	\$0.00	\$42,903,581.51
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$14,333,528.00</b>	<b>\$23,673,762.46</b>	<b>\$25,117,292.44</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$63,124,582.90</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

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 Summary Table Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

Minnesota's overall budget expenditures for the grant in year three were more than double expenditures in year two. This increase represents a substantial amount of work that was completed in year three. Additionally, on top of current expenditures, Minnesota has another \$12 million encumbered in the current fiscal year in grants and contracts with various organizations to complete work outlined in our Statement of Work.

The largest discrepancies in the year three expenditures when compared to budget are the contract and grant lines. The main factors contributing to the lower expenditures in contracts include work still being delayed from original proposed timelines and the invoicing of contracts usually occurring in the second half of the state fiscal year (July 1 - June 30). The discrepancy in the budget line for grants is due to the continued lower than expected take up rate of Title I Pre-K Incentives. The factors are discussed more in the narratives for the related projects.

**Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes**

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

Minnesota is currently reviewing this budget information across each project along with identified budget needs in various projects. This analysis will lead to a request for a budget amendment and identify the need for no-cost extensions for various activities associated with the grant.

Budget Table: Project 1 – Parent Aware, Minnesota's TQRIS

Budget Table: Project 1					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$29,216.00	\$251,075.00	\$524,665.32	\$0.00	\$804,956.32
2. Fringe Benefits	\$6,039.00	\$59,518.00	\$85,483.25	\$0.00	\$151,040.25
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$2,210.00	\$2,974.61	\$0.00	\$5,184.61
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$18,669.00	\$4,313.69	\$0.00	\$22,982.69
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$277,694.00	\$1,343,383.10	\$0.00	\$1,621,077.10
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$524.00	\$9,289.52	\$0.00	\$9,813.52
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$35,255.00	\$609,690.00	\$1,970,109.49	\$0.00	\$2,615,054.49
10. Indirect Costs	\$8,391.00	\$92,431.00	\$151,814.73	\$0.00	\$252,636.73
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$8,807.00	\$61,113.72	\$0.00	\$69,920.72
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)</b>	<b>\$43,646.00</b>	<b>\$710,928.00</b>	<b>\$2,183,037.94</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$2,937,611.94</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$4,369,924.00	\$4,631,862.00	\$4,054,865.00	\$0.00	\$13,056,651.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)</b>	<b>\$4,413,570.00</b>	<b>\$5,342,790.00</b>	<b>\$6,237,902.94</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$15,994,262.94</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 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.

**Project 1 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

The lower expenditures than budgeted for the Parent Aware Project remain reflective of two primary factors: (1) There is a lag in project contractor expenditures at the end of the grant reporting year because of Department of Human Services practice to award most contracts on a state fiscal year basis (July 1 - June 30). More specifically, the 2014 calendar year expenditures do not reflect state fiscal year second quarter expenditures. These will be reflected as expended in early 2015 by DHS with a subsequent request to the MDE for reimbursement. (2) Lower than anticipated participation of child care programs in Parent Aware resulted underspending of contractor funds for quality improvement supports and for on site observations.

**Project 1 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

At the start of the final budget year of the RTT-ELC grant, Minnesota will request some modifications to this project budget's personnel and contractor line items.

## Budget Table: Project 2 – Scholarships

Budget Table: Project 2					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$31,594.00	\$57,415.00	\$35,212.25	\$0.00	\$124,221.25
2. Fringe Benefits	\$7,166.00	\$17,940.00	\$14,769.33	\$0.00	\$39,875.33
3. Travel	\$339.00	\$689.00	\$35.39	\$0.00	\$1,063.39
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$791.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$791.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$2,903.00	\$7,031.00	\$5,358.43	\$0.00	\$15,292.43
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$42,002.00	\$83,866.00	\$55,375.40	\$0.00	\$181,243.40
10. Indirect Costs	\$8,193.00	\$17,990.00	\$11,518.07	\$0.00	\$37,701.07
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$269,669.00	\$2,752,053.00	\$4,347,686.40	\$0.00	\$7,369,408.40
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$319,864.00	\$2,853,909.00	\$4,414,579.87	\$0.00	\$7,588,352.87
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$470,000.00	\$470,000.00	\$470,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,410,000.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$789,864.00</b>	<b>\$3,323,909.00</b>	<b>\$4,884,579.87</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$8,998,352.87</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

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.

**Project 2 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

The expenditures for the scholarship project is very close to budget projections. We did have turnover in the position funded by the Scholarship project and that has caused slightly lower expenses in the salary, fringe, travel and indirect. The grants to local communities are just slightly under budget but by less than 10 percent. The grants for the scholarships are fully executed for the full amount in the budget, and the Transformation Zones have been working to project the expenditures for scholarships as closely as possible.

**Project 2 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

The position under this project has been refilled in the 2015 calendar year and we expect an increase in those budget lines. Additionally, the grants to local communities are projecting to be able to expend the 2015 budgeted amount and the all the funds that have carry forward from the last two year. Minnesota will seek a budget amendment to carry forward these funds to ensure children continue to access their scholarships through the end of the grant period.



Budget Table: Project 3 – Title I PreK Incentives

Budget Table: Project 3					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$9,342.00	\$60,260.00	\$27,166.63	\$0.00	\$96,768.63
2. Fringe Benefits				\$1,780.00	\$12,439.00
3. Travel	\$688.00	\$1,758.00	\$109.98	\$0.00	\$2,555.98
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$181,931.00	\$207,500.79	\$0.00	\$389,431.79
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$1,200.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,200.00
8. Other	\$527.00	\$5,115.00	\$9,552.67	\$0.00	\$15,194.67
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$12,337.00	\$262,703.00	\$261,080.97	\$0.00	\$536,120.97
10. Indirect Costs	\$2,134.00	\$27,594.00	\$16,344.66	\$0.00	\$46,072.66
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$48,094.00	\$2,162,316.00	\$1,268,632.51	\$0.00	\$3,479,042.51
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$62,565.00	\$2,452,613.00	\$1,546,058.14	\$0.00	\$4,061,236.14
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$48,094.00	\$2,162,316.00	\$1,268,632.51	\$0.00	\$3,479,042.51
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$110,659.00</b>	<b>\$4,614,929.00</b>	<b>\$2,814,690.65</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$7,540,278.65</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 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.

**Project 3 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

Although the interest in Title I Pre-K Incentives continues to grow, school districts ability to fully access available grants funds are restricted by their ability to expand their Pre-K programs both with additional local funding and restrictions on available space. Thus, we see a continued lower expenditure rate of grants fund under the Title I Pre-K Incentive budget. The salary is also lower than budget this year due to a salary correction that redirected some salaries from the 2013 calendar year to the Project Management budget instead of the Title I Pre-K budget.

**Project 3 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

Minnesota is reviewing the under expenditure in grant funds under this budget and determining the amount needed to maintain schools for one more calendar year and expects to redirect remaining funds to other projects.

Budget Table: Project 4 – Standards

Budget Table: Project 4					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$12,680.00	\$50,070.62	\$0.00	\$62,750.62
7. Training Stipends	\$1,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$41.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$41.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$1,000.00	\$12,721.00	\$50,070.62	\$0.00	\$63,791.62
10. Indirect Costs	\$208.00	\$2,538.00	\$6,814.52	\$0.00	\$9,560.52
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$1,208.00	\$15,259.00	\$56,885.14	\$0.00	\$73,352.14
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$374,630.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$374,630.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$375,838.00</b>	<b>\$15,259.00</b>	<b>\$56,885.14</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$447,982.14</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 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.

**Project 4 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

Expenditures for the standards budget are lower than budgeted due to a delay in deliverables from a contractor. Minnesota has been working diligently with the contractor on their timeline and ensuring deliverables are completed by the end of the grant period.

**Project 4 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

Minnesota will request a carry forward of the funds in the contractual line in order to support the contractors ability to finalize deliverables by the end of the grant period. Additionally, Minnesota is reviewing the standards project for some additional work to be completed by the end of the grant period and will be requesting an amendment to support that work.

Budget Table: Project 5 – Assessment

Budget Table: Project 5					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$16,327.00	\$74,565.00	\$75,881.66	\$0.00	\$166,773.66
2. Fringe Benefits				\$3,858.00	\$21,555.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$1,170.00	\$95.04	\$0.00	\$1,265.04
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$43.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$43.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$61,506.00	\$127,350.26	\$0.00	\$188,856.26
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$551.00	\$8,223.00	\$11,146.88	\$0.00	\$19,920.88
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$20,779.00	\$167,019.00	\$236,988.96	\$0.00	\$424,786.96
10. Indirect Costs	\$3,453.00	\$32,801.00	\$34,543.12	\$0.00	\$70,797.12
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$24,232.00	\$199,820.00	\$271,532.08	\$0.00	\$495,584.08
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$4,728,206.00	\$4,641,846.00	\$4,728,206.00	\$0.00	\$14,098,258.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$4,752,438.00	\$4,841,666.00	\$4,999,738.08	\$0.00	\$14,593,842.08

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 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.

**Project 5 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

Expenditures for the Assessment budget are also lower than budgeted in the contract line due to two factors: 1) Delays in deliverables from a contractor. Minnesota has been working diligently with the contractor on their timeline and ensuring deliverables are completed by the end of the grant period. 2) Delayed invoicing from contractors for the training of trainers. Contractors will be requesting a full payment of the contract at the end of the contract period.

**Project 5 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

The analysis Minnesota did of gaps in early childhood providers understanding and use of assessments lead to Minnesota requesting the redirection of some grant funds to the training of trainers on various assessment tools. Minnesota is planning to expand these efforts, and will be putting forth a budget amendment to for additional funds for this activity.

Budget Table: Project 6 – Workforce Framework

Budget Table: Project 6					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$22,402.00	\$28,920.98	\$0.00	\$51,322.98
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$4,741.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$420.51	\$0.00	\$420.51
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$1,598.00	\$3,448.64	\$0.00	\$5,046.64
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$28,741.00	\$43,971.68	\$0.00	\$72,712.68
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$5,979.00	\$9,146.13	\$0.00	\$15,125.13
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$34,720.00	\$53,117.81	\$0.00	\$87,837.81
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$0.00	\$150,000.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$50,000.00</b>	<b>\$84,720.00</b>	<b>\$103,117.81</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$237,837.81</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 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.

**Project 6 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

Expenditures for this project met budget projections in all categories except contractual. Minnesota determined current staff could manage the original work intended for a contractor and will seek a budget amendment to carry forward those contractual funds and be redirected to salary and fringe for the current staff working on this project.

**Project 6 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

Minnesota will seek a budget amendment to carry forward remaining funds and redirect them to salary and fringe to maintain the current staff working on this project and ensure all activities are completed by the end of the grant period.



Budget Table: Project 7 – Great Workforce Supports

Budget Table: Project 7					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$11,798.79	\$0.00	\$11,798.79
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$42.33	\$0.00	\$42.33
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$832,786.00	\$1,138,309.41	\$0.00	\$1,971,095.41
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$827.17	\$0.00	\$827.17
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$832,786.00	\$1,153,629.91	\$0.00	\$1,986,415.91
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,186.69	\$0.00	\$3,186.69
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$832,786.00	\$1,156,816.60	\$0.00	\$1,989,602.60
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$3,195,000.00	\$3,195,000.00	\$2,655,000.00	\$0.00	\$9,045,000.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$3,195,000.00</b>	<b>\$4,027,786.00</b>	<b>\$3,811,816.60</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$11,034,602.60</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 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.

**Project 7 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

The lower expenditures than budgeted for the Great Workforce Supports Project are reflective of several factors: (1) A delayed start in some activities in 2012 also extended into 2013 and 2014; (2) There is a lag in project contractor expenditures at the end of the grant reporting year because of DHS practice to award most contracts on a state fiscal year basis (July 1 - June 30). More specifically, the 2014 calendar year expenditures do not reflect state fiscal year second quarter expenditures. These will be reflected as expended in early 2015 by DHS with a subsequent request to MDE for reimbursement.

**Project 7 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

At the start of the final budget year of the RTT-ELC grant, Minnesota will request some modifications to this project budget as well a request for a no-cost extension to complete project activities in 2016.

**Budget Table: Project 8 – Kindergarten Entrance Assessment**

<b>Budget Table: Project 8</b>					
<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$12,871.00	\$24,562.35	\$0.00	<b>\$37,433.35</b>
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	<b>\$3,107.00</b>
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$41.00	\$77.52	\$0.00	<b>\$118.52</b>
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,318.20	\$0.00	<b>\$4,318.20</b>
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$87,023.67	\$0.00	<b>\$87,023.67</b>
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
8. Other	\$0.00	\$1,333.00	\$4,295.45	\$0.00	<b>\$5,628.45</b>
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$17,352.00	\$125,695.24	\$0.00	<b>\$143,047.24</b>
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$3,552.00	\$20,098.04	\$0.00	<b>\$23,650.04</b>
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$20,904.00	\$145,793.28	\$0.00	<b>\$166,697.28</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$281,000.00	\$281,000.00	\$281,000.00	\$0.00	<b>\$843,000.00</b>
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$281,000.00</b>	<b>\$301,904.00</b>	<b>\$426,793.28</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$1,009,697.28</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 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.

**Project 8 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

Expenditures for the KEA budget met the expected budget in all lines except contractual. The contract line was over expended for the 2014 calendar year due to the timing of deliverables anticipated in calendar year 2013 being delayed and received in the 2014 calendar year.

**Project 8 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

Minnesota has now completed two years piloting the new state KEA. Minnesota is currently reviewing and making plans for additional work that will be completed in the final year of the grant and will be requesting a budget amendment to redirect funds appropriately as plans are finalized.

Budget Table: Project 9 – Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System

Budget Table: Project 9					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$66,346.00	\$298,583.00	\$334,621.37	\$0.00	\$699,550.37
2. Fringe Benefits				\$19,000.00	\$95,984.00
3. Travel	\$142.00	\$1,354.00	\$3,445.34	\$0.00	\$4,941.34
4. Equipment	\$414.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$414.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$1,559.00	\$6,647.29	\$0.00	\$8,206.29
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$211,205.00	\$473,736.34	\$0.00	\$684,941.34
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$159.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$159.00
8. Other	\$3,559.00	\$17,098.00	\$26,109.84	\$0.00	\$46,766.84
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$89,461.00	\$625,942.00	\$928,974.09	\$0.00	\$1,644,377.09
10. Indirect Costs	\$17,680.00	\$96,727.00	\$154,611.34	\$0.00	\$269,018.34
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$177,187.94	\$0.00	\$177,187.94
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$107,141.00	\$722,669.00	\$1,260,773.37	\$0.00	\$2,090,583.37
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$100,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$0.00	\$300,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$207,141.00	\$872,669.00	\$1,310,773.37	\$0.00	\$2,390,583.37

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 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.

### **Project 9 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

The overall budget reported for ECLDS is lower than expected primarily in the contracts line and slightly in the salary and fringe lines. The main factor contributing to these lower expenses was the time needed to finalize data sharing agreements and make governance decisions which delayed actual work on the development of the data system and the analytics. The data sharing agreements and many of the research questions were finalized in the second half of year three, and work on the system is ramping up quickly. Another factor causing delayed billing is the centralizing of Minnesota's IT services which has created a delay in the billing process for services rendered. Approximately \$2.3 million is currently encumbered in the current fiscal year for this project in contracts with vendors developing the ECLDS.

Another discrepancy in the budget and expenditures is due to a decision to support the reporting of data by local early childhood program through grants to programs instead of the original plan for contracts with vendors of data systems.

### **Project 9 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

Minnesota's IT division has entered into contracts with vendors to launch the ECLDS by the end of 2015. Additional enhancements to the system and the data analytics are planned, and a no cost extension will be requested. A budget amendment for the carryforward of unspent funds will be requested to support the finalization of the project and to appropriately reflect the grants to local early childhood programs.

Budget Table: Project 10 – Family, Friend and Neighbor

Budget Table: Project 10					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$1,035.00	\$754.16	\$0.00	\$1,789.16
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$1,500.00	\$7,000.00	\$0.00	\$8,500.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$2,535.00	\$7,754.16	\$0.00	\$10,289.16
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$558.46	\$1,612.86	\$0.00	\$2,171.32
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)</b>	\$0.00	\$3,093.46	\$9,367.02	\$0.00	\$12,460.48
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$49,000.00	\$49,000.00	\$49,000.00	\$0.00	\$147,000.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)</b>	<b>\$49,000.00</b>	<b>\$52,093.46</b>	<b>\$58,367.02</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$159,460.48</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

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.

**Project 10 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

The FFN budget continues to be lower than anticipated because much of the work that has been done by the Early Childhood Family Education programs in our three participating Transformation Zones have been seamlessly incorporated into the programs. Instead the anticipated grant funds for each school district, the schools have requested small stipends to pay for a portion of staff time and incentives to provide to the Family, Friend and Neighbor providers they are working with. The incentives have included child safety products like outlet protectors and choke tubes to use in the providers' homes and represent the over expending in the supplies line. Additionally, the decision to provide school districts with stipends instead of grants has created the discrepancy in the expenditures for contracts. MDE staff have compiled a toolkit of resources under this project to be used with FFN providers as well as others who work with children. A dissemination plan for the toolkit is being coordinated.

**Project 10 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

Minnesota will continue to support this work with Family, Friend and Neighbor providers through the end of the grant, but the savings realized by the grants will be used to offset additional costs in other projects. These changes will be reflected in Minnesota's budget amendment.



**Budget Table: Project 11 – Public Private Partnership**

Budget Table: Project 11					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 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.

**Project 11 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

The expenditures for the Public Private Partnership budget have not occurred due negotiations with the vendor on the terms of the contract and internal processes to amend interagency agreements between MDE and DHS to make the funds available to the Department of Human Services to finalize the contract.

**Project 11 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

Final preparations are underway to execute a vendor contract between the Minnesota and First Children's Finance to meet the goals in support of public-private partnerships. Minnesota will be asking for a no-cost extension in order to ensure the contractor can complete all the work required under this project.

## Budget Table: Project 12 – Project Management

Budget Table: Project 12					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$55,329.00	\$88,353.00	\$153,969.47	\$0.00	\$297,651.47
2. Fringe Benefits				\$18,390.00	\$29,064.00
3. Travel	\$496.00	\$1,176.00	\$1,019.77	\$0.00	\$2,691.77
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$719.00	\$380.00	\$1,872.79	\$0.00	\$2,971.79
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$8,657.00	\$11,279.00	\$9,462.13	\$0.00	\$29,398.13
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$83,591.00	\$130,252.00	\$192,679.65	\$0.00	\$406,522.65
10. Indirect Costs	\$15,802.00	\$27,779.00	\$39,934.67	\$0.00	\$83,515.67
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$87,055.31	\$0.00	\$87,055.31
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$9,625.00	\$38,006.00	\$92,958.05	\$0.00	\$140,589.05
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)</b>	<b>\$109,018.00</b>	<b>\$196,037.00</b>	<b>\$412,627.68</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$717,682.68</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)</b>	<b>\$109,018.00</b>	<b>\$196,037.00</b>	<b>\$412,627.68</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$717,682.68</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

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.

**Project 12 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

Expenditures for the Project Management project were fairly on target with the original budgeted for the 2014 calendar year. The main discrepancy was in the salary line and was due to a correction of salaries paid in calendar year 2013 to the Title I Pre-K Incentive budget and being redirected to the Project Management budget during the 2014 calendar year. Additionally, there was lower expenditures for grants due to the rate at which the grantees have submitted invoices.

**Project 12 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

The only anticipated change to the Project Management budget will be possible additional expenditures to support the management of the grant through a no-cost extension. Minnesota will analyze the overall management needs of the grant when planning for a no-cost extension request.