

# Early Learning Challenge

## 2016 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT



JUNE 2017





**Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge**  
**Annual Performance Report**  
**CFDA Number: 84.412**

**Wisconsin**

---

2016

Due: February 28, 2017

U.S. Department of Education  
Washington, DC 20202  
OMB Number: 1810-0713  
Expiration Date: October 31, 2019

**Paperwork Burden Statement**

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0713. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 120 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email [ICDocketMgr@ed.gov](mailto:ICDocketMgr@ed.gov) and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0713. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, DC 20202-6200.



## Annual Performance Report Section List

General Information

Executive Summary

A(3) Successful State System

B(1) Developing and Adopting a Common, Statewide TQRIS

B(2) Promoting Participation in the TQRIS

B(3) Rating and Monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs

B(4) Promoting Access to High-Quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs

B(5) Validating the Effectiveness of the State TQRIS

C(1) Early Learning and Development Standards

C(2) Comprehensive Assessment Systems

C(3) Health Promotion

C(4) Engaging and Supporting Families

D(1) Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and 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) Early Learning Data Systems

A(1) Background Data Tables



## Performance Report: Cover Sheet

### General Information

1. PR/Award#: S412A130037

2. Grantee Name Office of the Governor, State of Wisconsin

3. Grantee Address State Capitol, 115 East  
City: Madison  
State: Wisconsin Zip: 53702

4. Project Director Name: Eloise Anderson  
Title: Wisconsin Department of Children and Families

Phone #: (608) 422-7067 Ext.: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax #: (608) 266-6836

Email: Eloise.Anderson@wisconsin.gov

### Reporting Period Information

5. Reporting Period: From: 01/01/2016 To: 12/31/2016

### 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): From: 07/01/2013 To: Until Amended

Approving Federal agency:  ED  HHS  Other Specify other: \_\_\_\_\_

*(Submit current indirect cost rate agreement with this report.)*

## 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.

During 2016, significant progress was made implementing programs and activities funded by the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant in Wisconsin.

In 2016, the RTT-ELC funding continued to help improve the quality of the early care and education by enhancing YoungStar, helping children gain access to high-quality care, and helping child care providers improve the quality of the care they provide. From January 3, 2016 to January 31, 2017, 385 YoungStar rated child care programs increased their star rating.

During 2016, the YoungStar Formal Raters continued to use the software created by Branagh to conduct Environment Rating Scale (ERS) observations. In addition the new progression of family engagement standards went into effect and allowed providers to demonstrate quality in new ways. Also the results from the YoungStar validation study were used to propose refinements to the YoungStar rating scale. Outreach efforts in 2016 continued with the 4-Year-Old Kindergarten (4K) programs as well as Early Head Start and Head Start programs. The new Head Performance Standards and changes to the automated case management system offered new opportunities for collaboration.

Child care programs also had many opportunities to increase their levels of the quality. These opportunities included new resources for providers serving children with disabilities and their families, additional T.E.A.C.H. scholarships, on-site technical assistance, Educational Opportunities Grant, grants to support accreditation, garden micro-grants, and new breast feeding friendly training materials. RTT-ELC funds were also used to acknowledge providers who increased their Star rating through the use of Challenge Awards.

Work was also completed to strengthen the overall system of early care and education in Wisconsin. Many collaborative opportunities for professionals from all sectors of the field early care and education were provided. These include the Tribal-State Relations Workgroup, the Online Professional Development Portfolio, the Professional Development Initiative, and the steering committees for the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards and the Wisconsin Pyramid Model.

Challenges associated with the creation of an integrated early childhood database continued in 2016. The cross-agency team continues to collaborate and work through the tough issues. During 2016 the agencies also had to tackle the challenge a new system of budget and finance tracking. The budget and finance staff at each agency were undertaking a great workload making it difficult for them to keep up with RTT-ELC issues. In addition, a new system of tracking expenses had to be created at The Department of Children and Families (DCF) in order to monitor spending from all three Departments. Staff had to ensure careful monitoring and constant communication around spending issues in order to obtain accurate data.

## 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).

The governance structure established during the first year of the grant continued to be successful in 2016. At the highest level, Wisconsin's grant is overseen by the Secretary of the Department of Children and Families (DCF), the top executive at the lead agency. The Grant Manager oversees the day-to-day grant activities and reports to the Leadership Committee. The Leadership Committee consists of the Administrator from the Division of Early Care and Education at DCF, the Assistant State Superintendent from the Department of Public Instruction (DPI), and the State Health Officer and Administrator from the Division of Public Health at the Department of Health Services. The complexity of the Early Childhood Integrated Data System (ECIDS) requires that a Portfolio Manager, housed at DPI, oversee the projects and activities at each agency that are related to the data systems.

#### The Governor's Early Childhood Advisory Council

The Governor's Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC) continues to play a role in the Wisconsin's RTT-ELC grant activities. The ECAC was instrumental in developing many of the foundational concepts in the state's RTT-ELC grant application and receives periodic updates on grant activities.

#### Public Private Partnership

During 2016, the six coalitions who received funding to be included in the public private partnership worked on their individual work plans and participated in three state-wide meetings. The purpose of the state-wide meetings was to provide professional development and share ideas between the coalitions.

Through the contract with the local communication firm, the CETE (Children's Empowerment Through Education) Network was created, a website was implemented, and communication materials were produced. A brochure explaining the Network and three postcards with messages targeted to the business, the faith, and the law enforcement communities that members of the CETE Network can use to communicate with their communities about the importance of early childhood were created. CETE Networks will be able to mail out or distribute these materials in their communities.

#### Tribal Relations

A core component of our system-building and overall governance efforts has been our project to enhance relations among and within tribal and state agencies and associations. In 2014, the Project Coordinator was hired through an interagency agreement with the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, Inc. (GLITC) to provide the central point for coordination among the eleven Tribal Nations, state staff across multiple departments, and other cross-sector professionals. This position has been vital to the work of this project. Throughout 2015 and 2016, the coordinator has been a key contact in department and cross department state collaborations as well as internal and external collaborations among the Tribal Communities which are described below.

The project also continues the partnership that began in 2015 with the DPI Special Education Team's Disproportionality Network. The "Network" is funded by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act with a focus on equitable referrals, services, and education for children who are racially and

ethnically diverse. The “Network” has an early childhood Tribal Nations component. In 2016, the two projects continued collaboration through RTT Tribal mini-grants and the Network's 90 day planning team to support early childhood projects within the Tribal communities and to bring the Tribal Nations together for inter-agency sharing and leadership development.

The Tribal Liaison leadership group that was created in 2015, continues to bring together the Tribal Liaisons from each of the three state departments. The Tribal Liaison from the Department of Corrections (DOC) began meeting with the Liaison group to explore connections with DOC efforts and early childhood. Changes to the DCF Liaison resulted in this group relooking at their purpose and reaffirming their role:

- Advise and assist in promotion of the collaborative purposes of the RTT initiative
- Participate in Tribal State Work group to share department activities and learn about activities in other departments.
- Represent cross sector nature of early childhood in department Tribal initiatives

The Tribal Liaison group has played an important role in planning for the 2017 leadership conference. They provided insight about the importance of making connections with key leadership within the various Tribal programs who would then become more informed of early childhood issues and bring it forward as they address program issues in their connections to their program leaders processes. The Liaisons also assisted in developing the invitations to their department leadership for the February meeting.

Cross department collaboration continues through meetings of the Tribal-State Connections Workgroup. In 2016, the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council (GLITC ) Honor Our Children program manager joined the other two GLITC members on the Workgroup. Two new Department of Health Services (DHS) Maternal Child Health representatives joined DHS, DPI, DCF including funded project representatives covering the areas of Part C early intervention, Part B early childhood special education, Part B Disproportionality Network, 4-year-old kindergarten, Office of Early Learning, child care, home visiting, the Head Start Collaboration Office, and the Tribal Liaisons. Several related associations also are represented on this Workgroup. Tribal representation also includes a Tribal member who is on the Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC) member. In 2016, the Tribal-State Connections Workgroup adopted the 90 day planning process with three identified goal areas:

- Build an infrastructure among the First Nations, the state departments, and other early childhood organizations that promotes relationships, communication, and collaboration. Sharing program knowledge among the First Nations, the state departments, and other early childhood organizations in order to increase ability for personnel to understand and access programs, services, and contact information.
- Coordinated planning and information sharing planning of events, meetings, and/or project activities.

A major focus of this project has been the systematic approach to gather information and make connections to each of the Tribal Nations. From 2013 through 2016 Tribal Gathering and Listening Sessions as well as Early Childhood Workgroup meetings were a mechanism to share information among the Tribal Nations and also with the state representatives. In 2016, the utilization of 90 day plans and RTT mini-grants supported this work. The use of 90 day plans was adopted from the Menominee Nation and was expanded to the Tribal Nations involved in the RTT project. Meetings of the Tribal Nations were held in January 14, May 10, August 9, and November 3, 2016. The RTT mini-grants were offered to support the early childhood work within each Nation. As planning and funding was developed, they merged into specific projects within each Tribal Nation. The results were 'show-cased' at the Early Childhood Tribal Workgroup on November 3, 2016.

The mini-grants and 90 day plans focused on a variety of activities or priority areas including: 0-3 language immersion school/with parents (Ho-Chunk), Elders teaching Anishinaabe Language ( Bad River), Implementation of Pyramid Model, Child Find events (Lac Coute Orelles), Child Find/

Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards (WMELS) training/Art-Mental Health training for staff/parents (Lac du Flambeau), Child Find, Ages and Stages Questionnaire Third Edition (ASQ-3) and Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Social-Emotional (ASQ:SE) screenings (Menominee), Literacy (Oneida), Mental Health consultant-training/Social Emotional Development parent training, Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards (WMELS) training and coaching support (Red Cliff), and Safe Sleep (St. Croix). These mini-grants have resulted in supporting implementation of native language schools, increased identification and referral of tribal children with suspected developmental delays or disabilities, increased tribal members trained to provide professional development in their communities, and a variety of other outcomes.

This project had a major priority to increase tribal access to the professional development projects connected to RTT. Early in the project, we learned that the Tribal Nations did not perceive many of these professional development projects to be culturally responsive. In response, plans were made to adapt the WI Model Early Learning Standards (WMELS) project's trainer approval process and make the training materials more culturally relevant. In July 2015, the WMELS Leadership Committee approved a proposal to adapt the trainer process and receive recommendations for cultural adaptations to the materials. Through 2015 and into 2016, the Tribal Coordinator and a small group worked on the WMELS revisions and in July the package was approved by the WMELS Leadership Committee. The changes did not alter the basic structure or contents of the WMELS training but provided culturally relevant graphics and substituted some relevant activities. The graphic will be housed at [collaboratingpartners.com](http://collaboratingpartners.com) to provide wider access to photos and other graphics representing Tribal Culture. Eight potential trainers from five Tribal communities began the WMELS trainer approval process. By the end of 2016 Red Cliff will be the first Tribal Community with two fully approved Tribal Trainers. Stockbridge-Munsee will be next with one fully approved trainer.

The WMELS process has been so successful that in 2016 planning began to replicate the process with the Pyramid Model for Social and Emotional Foundations. In late 2016, funding was established including RTT GLITC and RTT Pyramid funds to explore the Pyramid Model Training materials for cultural relevance, adapt the trainer approval process, and promoting the training within the Tribal Communities. Eight Tribal communities are interested in exploring this work.

Through our "listening" and strategic planning, we also learned of the high level of interest in the tribal communities in screening and assessment. In August 2015, the project hosted training with the Brookes Publishing Company and representatives from 10 of the Tribal Nations became trainers for the Ages and Stages screening tool. Some of these Tribal Nations developed screening strategies that were part of their 90 day plans and mini-grants. Within 2016, three communities hosted events in conjunction with the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) training: Keshena Primary School in Menominee has completed one new Child Find and plan another event in several months, The trainer from Stockbridge-Munsee provided ASQ-3/SE2 training to her staff at Head Start and the Health and Wellness Center and will be training a 'class' at University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh. The trainer from Oneida has provided multiple ASQ trainings to the clinic staff and the Head Start staff. The trainer from Lac du Flambeau assisted with the ASQ training to the entire Head Start staff. The trainer from St. Croix also completed several ASQ trainings to Home Visiting staff and staff at their Health and Wellness Center.

Several other professional development areas were identified as having high interest in the Tribal Communities. Topics of interest at the Tribal level include Historical Trauma, Trauma Informed Care, and fatherhood. In 2016, early childhood representatives became part of the WI Indian Education Association and are planning early childhood sessions for their next conference.

Cultural responsiveness, the achievement gap, and equality are important professional development topics to bring to the larger early childhood community and presentations occurred at the Professional



Development Initiative and through trainings sponsored by the Network.

The development of a “scan” to identify the service and professional development linkages and gaps between state and tribal programs for young children and families was identified in the original RTT scope of work. The cataloging of the various programs at the state and within the 11 Tribal Nations continues to be more difficult than anticipated. On the Tribal level, the process was complicated by the multitude of different programs with each of the 11 tribes, the lack of key contact points within tribe, the mobility among employees who would become key contacts, and the creation of a data system that would allow information to be updatable and accessible. On the state level, the process was complicated by the scope and sequence of which programs should be highlighted. In 2016, the concept focused on several specific communication systems:

**The American Indian Studies Listserv**, [Wi-aislist@lists.dpi.wi.gov](mailto:Wi-aislist@lists.dpi.wi.gov), is being promoted as a broad-based way to share information about Tribal education, grants, resources, etc.

**A Tribal early childhood listserv**, [ectribalworkgrp@lists.dpi.wi.gov](mailto:ectribalworkgrp@lists.dpi.wi.gov), was created for communication among all of the people who have been part of the project through Tribal Workgroup meetings, 90 day plans, mini-grants, and the Tribal-State Connections Workgroup.

The website <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/diversity-wi-tribal-nations.php> is being developed and will include more details on 90 day planning, mini-grants, and any other Tribal early childhood information.

The **new Professional Development System** will include the Tribal Nations Initiative as one of the project along with the specific committees.

Each year we have summarized lessons learned strategies. Below are the 2016 strategies identified and used in the 90 day planning process. The 2015 and 2014 strategies follow.

- 2016: Focus on how to raise public awareness to provide leaders with a better understanding of early childhood issues and bring early childhood efforts to the table at multiple levels. Instead of focusing on a central point of coordination, focus on the existing systems to coordinate and build awareness:
  - a. Bring the state departments together to build a cross sector common vision and approach with the Tribal Nations.
  - b. Work with GLITC to establish a structure for communication.
  - c. Build inter-Tribal communication by supporting the creation and expansion of early childhood collaboration workgroups or councils within each of the Tribal Nations.
  - d. Bring together cross sector early childhood stakeholders from each Tribal Nation to share and learn for each other.
  - e. Explore the best approach to bring early childhood to the GLITC board meetings, they meet quarterly and have an annual meeting. Consider if board presentations should be project specific or broad cross sector early childhood focused.
  - f. Explore the best time and format to bring early childhood to the DHS and DCF Tribal Consultation meetings. Consider if the topics should go to GLITC first and if it should be project specific or broad cross sector early childhood
  - g. Bring early childhood topics to the WI Indian Education Association
  - h. Consider how to keep Tribal relations on the forefront with the ECAC
  - i. Consider linkages with the Intertribal Child Care Council (ITCCC) with focus on tribal communities focus on child care and subsidy issues
- 2016: Need to continue to focus and expand professional development efforts to assure that they are culturally responsive.
- 2016: Need to sustain collaborative meetings at the Tribal level, across the Tribes, and among the Tribal Nations and the State departments.
- 2016: Need to continue to develop 'scan' and communication tools such as a Tribal/State early childhood professional listserv.

- 2015: More concerted effort by state agencies to consider how to best coordinate cross sectors.
- 2015: Direct funding of tribal efforts that align with state level projects.
- 2015: Modification of WMELS materials to better reflect cultural practices.
- 2015: Sponsor and host events specific for Tribal participation including ASQ training and WMELS train the trainer.
- 2014: Directly involve tribal leaders in planning and implementation of initiatives.
- 2014: Need for multiple methods for networking with state level partners, including increase collaboration with DPI, DCF, and DHS tribal liaisons.
- 2014: Need for multiple methods for networking among the Tribal Nations, and within each Tribal community; including increasing role of GLITC in early childhood collaboration.
- 2014: Cultural responsive practices needs direct input from the various Tribal Nations beyond the obvious addition of different videos representing the tribal community to existing training modules.

In 2016, sustainability planning began. Sustainability will benefit from the no-cost extension. The no-cost extension approved and it includes sustaining the coordinator role/functions, supporting follow-up for the mini-grants, continuing the various communication structures, and continuing the professional development initiatives.

### **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.

As always, stakeholder engagement is critical to many of Wisconsin's RTT ELC activities and programs.

A few examples include the work of the Inclusion Analyst at DCF. He works with staff from many state agencies and community organizations to plan for the Inclusion Conference and create resources for child care providers.

In addition the Professional Development Supervisor at DCF participates in many stakeholder groups outside of DCF including the Wisconsin Breastfeeding Friendly Coalition, and the Professional Development Initiative.

A third example is the newly created YoungStar Advisory Group. This group was created in order to hear feedback from community partners about draft revisions to YoungStar based on the results of the validation study. The includes members from the state legislature, Wisconsin Early Childhood Association, United Way of Milwaukee, Supporting Families Together association and child care providers.

### **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 2016, a number of federal initiatives were reauthorized that will impact on Wisconsin's early childhood efforts. These federal initiatives include the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA): Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the Child Care Development Block Grant Act (CCDBG), and the Head Start Performance Standards (HSPPS). With these changes, DPI began the

process of exploring needed changes in the two DPI policy documents related to 4-year-old kindergarten (4K): Policy and Information Advisory as well as the Funding Guide. It was anticipated that there will be needed changes especially as related to 4K implementation in community setting. The Policy and Information Advisory has been reviewed and revised by consultants and both DPI and DCF. The Funding Guide is being worked on by consultants from DPI, DCF, as well as the Wisconsin Head Start Collaboration Office. Both documents will still go through the formal approval process before being finalized in 2017.

Staff at DCF have always been working closely to ensure that the state's CCDGB plan is successful and that Head Start Programs are supported in meeting the new requirements around Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) participation from the new Head Start Performance Standards.

**Participating State Agencies**

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

There has been no change to the commitment of the participating state agencies; all state agencies remain fully committed.

## High-Quality, Accountable Programs

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

During this reporting year of RTT-ELC implementation, has the State made progress in **developing or revising** a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards?

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

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

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

- Early Learning and Development Standards
- A Comprehensive Assessment System
- Early Childhood Educator Qualifications
- Family Engagement Strategies
- Health Promotion Practices
- Effective Data Practices

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

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

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.

#### **Additional On-Site Coaching and Mentoring**

In 2016 on-site technical consultation continued to be a major component of the YoungStar system. With research demonstrating the importance of consultation and coaching as necessary for real change to practice, in 2014 the YoungStar Consortium developed a process to give the trained Technical Consultants (TC) a set of protocols for on-site technical consultation related to specific content areas. Once a child care provider has taken a training associated with a particular content area, s/he becomes eligible to apply for additional hours of on-site technical consultation. These on-site hours are in addition to the providers' regular YoungStar consultation hours and focus on the protocols given to the YoungStar TC. These additional on-site hours allow providers the opportunity to apply the content learned in the training to their specific programs, and providers can ask questions and receive support around their specific needs.

The RTT-ELC grant funded additional technical consultation content areas included family engagement, Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards, the Ages & Stages Questionnaire, and the Wisconsin Pyramid Model. In total, 69 programs were supported with 593 hours of Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards implementation support, 50 child care programs were supported with 151 hours in implementation of ASQ, 38 child care programs were supported with 340 hours of Pyramid model support and 220 programs were supported with 966 hours of family engagement technical consultation. In total, 2050 hours of RTT-ELC funded additional technical consultation were provided to 327 child care programs in 2016

#### **Family Engagement Point**

The Family Engagement quality indicator C.5.1-5 was added to the 2016 YoungStar criteria as two optional points. The family engagement criteria consist of five categories with at least three activities in each category, with 42 options in total. Within each of these five categories there are two tiers; Tier A and Tier B. The five categories are: transitioning, family engagement, family communication strategies, family support strategies, and family community connection strategies. A child care program receives one point if five activities from either tier in at least two separate categories are verified and two points if ten activities in at least three separate categories are verified by the technical consultant. As of January 1, 2017, YoungStar participating child care programs are required earn one point to be eligible for a 3 Star rating and two points to be eligible for a 4 or 5 Star rating.

#### **Health and Well-being Point**

The health and well-being and family engagement evaluation criteria of YoungStar served as a guide for the majority of the work in 2016. The YoungStar evaluation criteria reflect national best practice recommendations in the aforementioned areas. During 2016 the YoungStar health and well-being criteria had an increase in the requirement of daily physical activity (3, 4 and 5 Star Programs) from 60 minutes a day to 90 minutes a day starting in 2017. The former "nutrition point", starting in 2017 will now be based on self-assessments which will include the use of garden self-assessment. The YoungStar Family Engagement points were rolled out in 2016 and include health and wellness options that tie neatly into the majority of the 2016 health and wellness projects listed here.

## **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.

### **4K and YoungStar**

#### **Set a Foundation for Bringing More 4K Providers into YoungStar**

Wisconsin's state funded preschool program, four-year-old kindergarten (4K), continues to expand. For the 2016-2017 school year, three new school districts began implementing 4K. Of the state's 411 public elementary schools, there are now only 10 school districts that do not have 4K. According to the 2016 September child count, there are 48,764 4K students enrolled in 4K. There are 212 (unverified) school districts reporting that they are using four-year-old kindergarten community approaches models (4KCA). Districts implementing these 4KCA models contract with child care, Head Start, and/or private schools for on-site implementation of 4K.

Since many of these 4KCA districts provide 4K in child care settings, we continue to promote alignment of policies and practices especially related to YoungStar. In 2016, we added video stories (with one more in the works) about the 4KCA model that highlight partnership with child care and address quality improvement (see <http://dpi.wi.gov/early-childhood/kind/4k/4kca>).

These community models demonstrate the benefits of programs working together and the impact of quality improvement practices. Each year the number of participating school districts and participating community partners change. Data collection related to 4K and 4KCA models has been problematic in the past. Working through the ECIDS project internal and cross department data collection efforts are being identified as something that will improve data collection and allow better research. Within DPI, the RTT Research Analyst working with the internal data teams prepared an Information Technology Project Charter that laid out the data collection changes necessary to our Information Technology System to improve our data collection on 4KCA. The Charter has a place in the priority list and is hoped to move forward within the next year. In 2016, we continued work with DCF to identify schools and child care participating in 4KCA. DCF was able to make some changes in their data collection that allows a better manual comparison of programs than in the past. They also continue to work on this data collection.

Communication and networking continues among the DPI, DCF, Cooperative Education Service Agencies (CESA), school districts, and YoungStar technical consultants and trainers. The Annual State Superintendent's 4 Year-Old Kindergarten Advisory Council on 4K and Community Approaches, held on April 25, 2016, and engaged multiple stakeholders in this alignment work. Two annual events bring school district 4K coordinators and community partners from across the state to network and discuss issues with the state team. The first event was a statewide forum held on March 2-3, 2016. Over 230 people attended the Preserving Early Childhood: Collaborative Leadership Forum to engage in topics ranging from early childhood leadership, WI Model Early Learning Standards, community councils, cultural diversity, and 4K start-up. YoungStar and 4K coordination will be woven into various activities throughout the grant period. The second event, held on October 7, 2016, was a regional meeting with statewide videoconferencing with over 110 people participated in this 4K Networking video conference at 6 different locations across the state.

### **Head Start and YoungStar**

The Head Start Performance Standards were recently updated and were effective beginning November 7, 2016. One of the new standards requires most Head Start programs to participate in their state's QRIS by August 1, 2017. The standard states: "A program, with the exception of American Indian and Alaska Native programs, must participate in its state or local Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS)." The Division of Early Care and Education (DECE) worked collaboratively with the Department of Public Instruction and the Wisconsin Head Start Association to notify the 120 non-participating Head Start sites about this new requirement. We sent letters directly to these sites, along with an easy to complete YoungStar application. As these programs will enter our QRIS at a 5 Star rating, the only requirement was for the sites to complete and submit the application. As of January 1, 2017, we have received more than 40 completed Head Start site applications.

In addition, we partnered with several stakeholders to align the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards with the 2016 Head Start performance standards (which was also a requirement of the new Head Start Performance Standards, 1302.102 (a), 3). In order to meet the standard and support collaboration and transition between early childhood programs, the Wisconsin Alignment was developed with a cross-sector group of professionals including Head Start, YoungStar, and early childhood professional development experts. The alignment document provides educators with strategies to promote individual development with each child and each classroom. As YoungStar specifically looks for curriculum aligned with Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards, this document can be used by Head Start programs to easily transform their Head Start standard-based curriculum to one that meets the intent of the YoungStar rating criteria.

Finally, DCF held several conference calls with Head Start program directors statewide. Directors were able to ask specific questions, learn more about the latest updates to YoungStar, and understand the benefits of participating in a statewide quality rating and improvement system.

### **Licensed Day Camps and YoungStar**

Since 2014, Licensed Day Camps that receive Wisconsin Shares subsidy funding have been required to participate in YoungStar. Their participation and rating is unique to the structure and purpose of day camps and includes: revised rating criteria, condensed mentoring services, and micro-grant materials via an online purchasing portal.

**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.

<b>Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.</b>										
<b>Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS</b>										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	5	1%	21	5%	42	10%	63	16%	100	25%
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	37	27%	54	40%	88	65%	108	80%	136	100%
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	3,858	100%	4,000	100%	4,200	100%	4,500	100%	5,000	100%
Other 1	4,897	77%	5,000	79%	5,100	80%	5,150	81%	5,200	82%
<i>Describe:</i>	All regulated programs									
Other 2										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 3										
<i>Describe:</i>										

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



**Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) - Additional Other rows**

**Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS**

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Other 4										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 5										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 6										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 7										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 8										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 9										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 10										
<i>Describe:</i>										

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

**Actuals: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS**

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	393	5	1%	389	17	4%	391	18	5%	403	23	6%	402	31	8%
<i>Specify:</i>															
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	136	37	27%	127	42	33%	311	45	15%	269	138	51%	262	156	60%
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	3,858	3,858	100%	3,510	3,481	99%	3,290	3,255	99%	3,076	3,076	100%	2,953	2,953	100%
Other 1	6,361	4,897	77%	5,912	4,593	78%	5,459	4,339	79%	5,158	4,077	79%	4,976	3,820	77%
<i>Describe:</i>	All regulated programs														
Other 2															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 3															
<i>Describe:</i>															

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

**Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) - Additional Other rows**

**Actuals: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS**

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%
Other 4															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 5															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 6															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 7															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 8															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 9															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 10															
<i>Describe:</i>															

**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**

Wisconsin has 415 elementary school districts and 402 (97%) of these districts offer 4K (based on funding). 31 child care programs participating in TQRIS with a regulation type of "public school program" had children enrolled that were not in school full-time. There is no currently no way of identifying which child care providers are participating in a 4K Community Approach (4KCA) program because the data is not collected at DCF or DPI. If in the future the data is collected on the name of the child care provider with whom the school district contracts, this information could be matched in the YoungStar Case Management System and programs participating in TQRIS could be identified.

**Early Head Start and Head Start**

The number of Early Head Start (EHS) and Head Start (HS) programs in the state is based on the EHS/HS program list from The Administration of Children and Families (ACF). The number of programs participating in TQRIS was calculated by using the addresses in the ACF program list and matching them to addresses in the YoungStar automated Case Management System (CMS).

In 2016 YoungStar incorporated a feature in CMS that will allow them to "flag" any participating EHS or HS site as such, regardless of Star rating. This feature is will be available in the reporting warehouse sometime in 2017.

**Programs Receiving Child Care and Development (CCDF) Funds**

The number of programs that receive CCDF funds is calculated as a "point-in-time" figure. We can assume the total number of programs that received funds at any point during the last year is higher.

**Other 1: All Regulated Programs**

These data do not include any estimates and are based on the number of active providers according to licensing and actual participation in TQRIS.

**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.

**State-Funded Preschool**

It can be assumed as in previous years that the significantly more 4K and 4KCA programs are participating in TQRIS for the child care portion of the day than is represented in this data.

In order to increase the collaboration between 4K, 4KCA, and YoungStar two annual events are held where strategies and information are shared. Conversations between DPI and DCF have been held around improving data collection efforts and more targeted outreach will possible as data collection is improved.

**Early Head Start and Head Start**

With the new Head Start Performance Standards requiring all programs to participate in their states TQRIS we anticipate that participation rate will be 100% by the end of 2017.

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

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

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

Describe progress made 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.

**Branagh**

The DCF YoungStar team and our contracted vendors renewed our Branagh licenses for the full year in 2016, and made system updates when available in Branagh within one to two business days. In 2016, all Environment Scale Observations were completed in the Branagh Data System, thereby increasing efficiency, accuracy, and clarity for the approximately 220 programs that received one or more observations in 2016.

**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 in your State TQRIS through the following policies and practices? (If yes, please check all that apply.)

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

Describe the progress made in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in your State TQRIS 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.

**Inclusion Training Modules**

In 2016, there was continued progress made toward the development of DCF's on-line inclusion training modules, "Inclusive Practices for Young Children." With the hiring of a new Inclusion Policy Analyst, the modules were given a redesigned framework with the final format consisting of five individual modules. The training series shows the ongoing progression of inclusion, beginning with a wide scope and becoming more and more focused with each subsequent module. The series provides the trainee with information and activities that are intended to understand the Federal and State framework that supports inclusion, as well as asks questions and provides tools for child care programs that are looking to become more inclusive in their practices. The training modules are:

Module 1: Foundations of Inclusion (Federal support for inclusion)

Module 2: Applying what we know (State supports for inclusion)

Module 3: Supporting Inclusion in your Child Care Program - Administrator

Module 4: Supporting Inclusion in your Child Care Program - Staff

Module 5: This is High-Quality Inclusive Child Care for All Children

The first two modules have been completed and the third is almost complete. By the end of 2017, the complete program will be finished and available for training purposes throughout the state. The training modules will be located within the Early Childhood Inclusion web-page that is a part of DCF's YoungStar website.

**Wisconsin Inclusion Committee**

Also in 2016, a Statewide Inclusion Committee was convened with cross-sector leadership coming from DCF, DPI, and DHS, as well as membership from the UW-Madison Waisman Center, Wisconsin Early Childhood Association, United Cerebral Palsy, and other community representatives. The committee's purpose is to bring together the different agencies that house and support children and families to address the expansion of high quality inclusive care and education. The committee is in the process of creating sub-committees that will focus their time and energy on specific inclusion focused projects. The committee is planning for the second Early Childhood Inclusion Institute for November 2017. This institute will provide training and technical assistance providers an opportunity for networking and training around inclusive practices..

The Wisconsin Inclusion committee is also working on exploring the use of the Inclusive Classroom Profile within YoungStar participating child care programs. RTT funds were used to support the reliability training of four technical assistance providers on the Inclusive Classroom Profile Tool. These

providers work in teams of two in the Milwaukee and Madison regions. These teams met with the DCF Inclusion Analyst on a regular basis to evaluate the effectiveness of the use of the Inclusive Classroom Profile in Wisconsin. Final recommendations on the use and implementation of this tool will be finished in 2017.

The collaboration of these three departments has also led the co-chairs to readdress the idea of an Interagency Agreement. The goal of this agreement continues to be the creation of consistent messaging to promote and strengthen early intervention and early childhood special education services in natural/least restrictive environments, to increase partnerships with community child care programs, and to strengthen the collaboration between statewide departments to benefit the care and education of all children within our state.

### **2016 Early Childhood Inclusion Institute**

The 2016 Early Childhood Inclusion Institute was held on September 27-28, 2016 in the Wisconsin Dells. Over 200 training and technical assistance providers from the early childhood field, including professionals from Birth to Three, YoungStar Technical Consultants, Cooperative Educational Service Agencies, Child Care Resource & Referrals, Wisconsin Early Childhood Association, various community organizations, and the Departments of Education, Health Services, and Children and Families attended the Institute. The goals of this institute were to develop a common language and understanding of inclusion throughout the regional network of service and technical assistance providers, and support a cohesive system of inclusion services through communication and partnership throughout WI. Camille Catlett was the featured keynote speaker for both days and led a master class on resources for supporting inclusion. The Institute provided opportunities for regional and statewide networking among professionals that support inclusion, as well as, opportunities for individual sessions led by local and statewide inclusive professionals on such topics as Pyramid Model for Social and Emotional Competence, inter-school district collaboration, mindfulness, family engagement, and cross-sector collaboration.

### **Online Inclusion Computer-Based Training**

In July of 2016, filming began on the computer-based inclusion trainings supported through the Milwaukee Early Care Administration (MECA) Special Needs Supports Program. Currently the material is being evaluated by the training team at the Department of Children and Families to determine a work plan with the goal of having four computer-based trainings available by the end of 2017. These trainings will allow child care providers throughout WI to have access to the high quality trainings currently being offered through MECA.

### **Inter-agency Agreement between DCF, DPI, and DHS**

A written agreement was created to support the building of a statewide culture of inclusion of children with disabilities within early childhood settings and was finalized between the Departments of Health Services, Public Instruction, and Children and Families in spring of 2016. The written agreement is designed to create consistent messaging to promote and strengthen early intervention and special education services in the natural and least restrictive environments including increasing partnerships with child care programs.

### **Mini Collaborative Innovation Information Network (CoIIN)**

In 2015 the Wisconsin Department of Health Services received a small grant from Association of Public Health Nutritionists (ASPHN) to participate in a mini Collaborative Innovation Information Network (CoIIN). Our team has members from Wisconsin's Department of Health Services, Department of Public Instruction, Department of Children and Families, Supporting Families Together Association, American Heart Association (AHA) and the Wisconsin Council on Children and Families. Now in the second year of this project, our team is developing, distributing and evaluating Active Early and Healthy Bites Kits. The purpose of the Kits is to facilitate program improvement around physical activity, nutrition and family engagement. Active Early and Healthy Bites are Wisconsin developed

physical activity and nutrition guidebooks for child care providers based on YoungStar and nationally recognized best practices. There are also Active Early and Healthy Bites trainings for child care providers to learn how to put the guidance from the guidebooks into practice. The Active Early and Healthy Bites Kits are a collection of health and wellness resources. Since literacy is not only important but also is an opportunity to instill good habits at a young age the Kits include children's book that integrate movement or feature fruits and vegetables. Physical activity and nutrition equipment such as disc cones for an obstacle course and child sized cooking tools like the "Wavy Chopper" which is designed to help children easily chop foods, were also included. To support early childhood education (ECE) Programs in receiving the 2016 YoungStar family engagement point, the Kits also included items needed to create mini versions of the Active Early and Healthy Bites Kits that families can take home along with other ideas of how to engage families around physical activity and nutrition.

To test and evaluate the Active Early Kit, our team used funding from ASPHN, AHA and Race to the Top, in partnership with two Wisconsin child care resource and referral agencies, Child Care Partnership Resource and Referral and Northwest Connections Family Resource, to provide Active Early Training to 156 ECE providers including two to three hours of follow-up technical consultation and an Active Early Kit to 38 of the participating ECE Programs. The providers who completed the Active Early Training through this partnership also completed a Let's Move Child Care Checklist prior to completing the training. The 38 ECE Programs that complete the follow-up technical consultation and receive an Active Early Kit will complete a post Let's Move Child Care Checklist (LMCC). Many of the 38 ECE Programs include more than one provider that completed the Active Early Training.

To test and evaluate the Healthy Bites Kit, our team used a combination of funding from ASPHN and RTT-ELC, our group was able to provide Healthy Bites technical consultation and a Healthy Bites Kit to four ECE Programs that had already completed the Healthy Bites Training. Both the Active Early and Healthy Bites technical consultation and Kit evaluations are ongoing and will be completed by April of 2017 to shed light on the impacts the trainings, technical consultation and Kits have on program practice and policy. To make this product sustainable and available for ECE Programs in Wisconsin, the next phase of our project will be to develop lending versions of the Kits that will be available around our state for ECE Programs to check out from libraries and child care resource and referral agencies. Our team plans to complete this next phase by the end of 2017.

### **Gardening and Farm to ECE**

Gardening and Farm to ECE are another area of rapidly growing interest among Wisconsin ECE Programs. This is reflected in its inclusion in the YoungStar 2017-2018 health and well-being evaluation criteria. To support ECE Program interest in this area two projects were launched in 2016, Garden Micro Grants and Gardens to Children. Gardens to Children was a Race to the Top funded project that aimed to increase consumption of fruits and vegetables, access to gardens/community gardens and farmers among the families and children that are served by ECE Programs from the federally recognized Tribes of Wisconsin. Nine out of eleven Wisconsin federally recognized Tribes applied and received funding. In spite of a significant funding delay, four of the nine Tribes were able to enhance the quality of their ECE Programs by expanding programming around garden use, access and education. There was a great amount of variance between projects which highlights the broad needs of Wisconsin's Indigenous communities around Farm to ECE expansion. For example, indoor garden equipment was purchased to allow for winter growing at Forest County Potawatomi ECE Programs while the Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa purchased the tools needed to preserve food grown from their gardens for winter consumption at their ECE Programs. The Ho-Chunk Nation used funding to expand their existing ECE and family garden and the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin focused on food service professional development and purchasing the tools needed to prepare fresh fruits and vegetables for toddlers to mitigate choking issues, a common concern and barrier among ECE Providers when it comes to serving fresh fruits and vegetables.

The Garden Micro Grants project was fully funded by Race to the Top. Community GroundWorks (CGW) was selected to be the project administrator. The project aimed to expand the use of gardens



among YoungStar rated ECE Programs. Nearly 300 applications were received from ECE Programs and 90 were awarded a garden micro grant. All awarded ECE Programs also received up to two hours of technical assistance. Participating ECE Programs were selected from all YoungStar regions Wisconsin resulting in state wide distribution of grant money. While this project certainly increased the quality of the awarded ECE Programs it also pushed our project partners to develop the necessary resources to prepare the same ECE Programs to earn the 2017-2018 YoungStar health and well-being self-assessment point. To support ECE Programs in this area, CGW, in partnership with the Department of Health Services (DHS), created the Wisconsin Youth Garden Self-Assessment which is now listed as one of the YoungStar health and well-being self-assessments that can be completed for ECE Programs to earn a point. Additionally CGW, DHS and the University of Wisconsin-Extension partnered to create the "Safety in the Little Gardeners `Garden", a safety guide for ECE Programs and other groups that wish to create youth gardens. Evaluation of the project is currently underway and our team anticipates that it will result in a substantial amount of data that will help guide how to best meet the needs of Wisconsin ECE Programs as gardening and Farm to ECE continue to grow.

### **T.E.A.C.H**

In 2016, 713 Programs were both participating in YoungStar and supporting active T.E.A.C.H. recipients at some time during the year. 294 recipients were funded through Race to the Top in 2016 and 94% of RTT funded students worked in 2 or 3 Star rated programs. These recipients completed 3,018 credits in early education related college courses. Additionally, of those programs supporting a T.E.A.C.H. scholarship recipient, 213 programs increased their educational points in 2016 and 109 programs increased their star level.

### **Challenge Awards**

A Challenge Award is a monetary award given to YoungStar participating child care providers who increase their YoungStar rating. Amounts range from \$300 to \$1300 depending on the size of the program and the number of Stars they increased.

In 2014, RTT-ELC funds were used to give Challenge Awards to 416 providers who increased their YoungStar rating in 2013 for a total of \$326,400. In 2015, Challenge Awards were given to 281 child care providers who increased their YoungStar rating in 2014 for a total of \$219,200.

In 2016 no awards were issued due to complications with the new finance system implemented by the State.

### **Accreditation Support**

YoungStar recognizes accreditation by a number of early childhood organizations as one pathway to a rating. As of December 31, 2016 there were 429 YoungStar participating providers who earned a 4 or 5 Star rating through accreditation. Almost 12 percent of YoungStar participating providers earned a Star rating through accreditation.

The Wisconsin Early Childhood Association (WECA), the state National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) affiliate, was awarded funds to provide scholarships for group child care programs seeking NAEYC accreditation. Programs that successfully complete NAEYC accreditation will be eligible for a 5 Star rating in YoungStar. 16 group child care programs participated in the NAEYC scholarship. All participating programs were provided with an introductory presentation, the materials necessary for self-assessment, mentors familiar with the accreditation process, and connected with WECA on regular basis.

In total, three programs are prepared to apply for candidacy within the first half of 2017, with three additional programs expected to apply in 2017 or early 2018. Three programs continue to work on the self-assessment and 5 programs are in the beginning stages and not ready to commit to the self-assessment. 1 program is concerned that their physical facility will not meet NAEYC standards so they

are exploring other accreditation options. 1 program has experienced large staff turnover and is no longer interested in pursuing accreditation. All programs reported difficulty in recruiting, hiring and retaining qualified staff, as well as, the need to pause the accreditation process at times to focus on their YoungStar rating process.

The Wisconsin Family Child Care Association (WFCCA), the state National Association for Family Child Care (NAFCC), provided seven NAFCC accreditation trainings with a qualified NAFCC certified trainer in the Western, Northern, Northeastern, and Milwaukee YoungStar regions. 17 providers enrolled in the scholarship project with 16 completing the application process. These 16 providers were awarded self-study scholarships and matched with a mentor. To date, 10 family care providers earned NAFCC accreditation through these scholarships.

### **Registry Coupons**

In July 2016, The Registry, Wisconsin's recognition system for Early Care and Education Professionals, was awarded supplemental funding from RTT-ELC to provide free Registry Career Level applications to eligible child care providers and programs with the goal of increasing their YoungStar rating. The reduced application fees were targeted to providers who were participating in YoungStar and did not have a current Registry Career Level.

Registry application coupon codes were created by the Registry and given to YoungStar Technical consultants. The Technical Consultants gave the codes directly to eligible providers. The provider could have used the code on The Registry website or on a written application. The total budget of \$150,000 was meant to support at least 2250 career level applications beginning July 1, 2016 through October 31, 2017. The entirety of funding was used by September 30, 2016 and was utilized by 3,754 distinct individuals during this time frame.

### **Educational Opportunities Grant**

In 2016, RTT-ELC funds were used to provide access to free credit-based instruction for YoungStar participating child care providers who earned 2 and 3 Star ratings. The Educational Opportunities Grant is based on a pilot project done at the Milwaukee Area Technical College in 2014. The grant provides 2 and 3 Star rated YoungStar child care providers with opportunity to complete the Wisconsin Registry approved Preschool, Infant/Toddler, Family Child Care, and Afterschool and Youth Development Credentials, as well as, participate in credit-for-prior learning coursework. All coursework was offered at community settings or technical college sites, during non-traditional times of day, in languages other than English (if applicable), and various formats such as online, hybrid or traditional classroom methods. Academic support such as individual professional development counseling, tutoring, and mentoring were provided at each location. Eight initial contracts were awarded to seven technical colleges and one University of Wisconsin location. Due to remaining funds allotted for this project, three additional technical colleges were awarded subcontracts to provide coursework for this grant.

Through 2016, 1136 students have participated in this grant. Students from all YoungStar regions participated in courses with 56 percent of students identified ages between 25-44. It is notable that the highest level of education for 47 percent of the students was a high school diploma or equivalent. The Wisconsin Early Childhood Association provided 208 hours of professional development support for participating students working at 132 child care programs. In 2016, 273 verified credentials were earned by participating students with a total of 398 verified credential earned by December 31, 2016.

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

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

<b>Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.</b>					
<b>Targets</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS</b>	4,897	5,000	5,100	5,150	5,200
<b>Number of programs in Tier 1</b>	36	36	34	32	30
<b>Number of programs in Tier 2</b>	2,980	3,400	3,000	2,662	2,200
<b>Number of programs in Tier 3</b>	852	1,069	1,426	1,581	2,000
<b>Number of programs in Tier 4</b>	128	165	240	386	420
<b>Number of programs in Tier 5</b>	269	330	400	489	550
<b>Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated</b>					

<b>Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.</b>					
<b>Actuals</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS</b>	4,897	4,593	4,339	4,077	3,820
<b>Number of programs in Tier 1</b>	36	27	14	12	17
<b>Number of programs in Tier 2</b>	2,980	2,621	2,330	2,005	1,730
<b>Number of programs in Tier 3</b>	852	1,228	1,264	1,304	1,273
<b>Number of programs in Tier 4</b>	128	174	187	197	195
<b>Number of programs in Tier 5</b>	269	342	370	387	435
<b>Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated</b>				172	170

**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.

All data are actual data based on YoungStar participation and do not include any estimates.

**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.

As seen in past years, there has been a decrease in the overall number of regulated providers in Wisconsin and nationally. Although the target numbers of providers have not been met for each tier, the proportion of higher rated programs continues to increase at a rate similar or better than the rate suggested by the target numbers.

The percentage of programs in the Tiers 4 and 5 has increased from 13.5% in Year Two to 15% in Year Three and is now 16.5% in Year Four. The target numbers suggest an increase of 1% per year for programs in the Tiers 4 for Year 5. Similarly, the percentage of programs in Tiers 2 and 3 has decreased from 82% in Year Two to 81% in Year Three and is now down to 78% in Year Four.

These trends demonstrate that there is an increasing trend in the number of high quality programs in Wisconsin even given the decreasing number of regulated providers.

We believe that continuing the current programs and initiatives, including efforts spurred by Race to the Top, will continue to have a positive impact on the number of programs in the higher tiers.

**Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Definition of Highest Tiers**

For purposes of Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2), how is the State defining its "highest tiers"?

Highest tiers are defined as tiers 4 and 5.

***DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES, THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK***

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

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

<b>Performance Measure (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.</b>										
<b>Targets: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS</b>										
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool										
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	2,432	15%	5,775	35%	8,250	50%	12,375	75%	16,500	100%
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	6,219	15%	6,913	17%	8,132	20%	9,759	24%	10,572	26%
Other 1	8,325	15%	9,435	17%	11,100	20%	13,332	24%	14,430	26%
<i>Describe:</i>	All regulated programs									
Other 2										
<i>Describe:</i>										

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

**Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) - Additional Other rows**

**Targets: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS**

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Other 3										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 4										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 5										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 6										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 7										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 8										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 9										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 10										
<i>Describe:</i>										

**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.**

In most States, the **Number of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State** for the current reporting year will correspond to the **Total** reported in Table (A)(1)-3a. If not, please explain the reason in the data notes.

**Actuals: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS**

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# 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	#	%	# 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															
<i>Specify:</i>															
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	16,500	2,432	15%	15,433	2,983	19.3%	15,105	3,172	21%	7,530	5,223	69%	13,130	9,754	74%
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	40,662	6,219	15%	42,831	8,432	19.7%	42,028	9,022	21.5%	42,103	9,687	23%	47,191	10,612	23%
Other 1	55,000	8,325	15%	57,934	11,413	19.7%	56,848	11,825	21.5%	170,193	51,748	30%	173,264	54,378	31,00%
<i>Describe:</i>	All regulated programs														
Other 2															
<i>Describe:</i>															

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



**Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) - Additional Other rows**

**Actuals: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS**

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four			
	# 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	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
Other 3															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 4															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 5															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 6															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 7															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 8															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 9															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 10															
<i>Describe:</i>															

**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.

**Early Head Start/Head Start**

The number of children in Early Head Start(EHS) and Head Start (HS) is based on matching data from the EHS/HS programs on the Administration of Children and Families list to currently rated 4/5 Star programs using the capacity formula of capacity data x 1.3 to determine enrollment.

In Years One and Two this data was based on estimates. We are confident that the data from the last two years more accurately represents enrollment.

**Programs Receiving CCDF Funds**

This number is based on the actual number of children in the Wisconsin Shares Child care Subsidy Program with an open authorization at the time the data report was created. This is a point-in-time value.

**Other 1: All Regulated Programs**

This number is based on the actual regulated capacity for all programs participating in the TQRIS and for all programs at the top tiers of the TQRIS.

**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 targets by the end of the grant period.

The number and percentage of children with high needs attending programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS for all three program types either met or nearly met the targets for Year Four.

We are confident that current programs and initiatives through Race to the Top such as Educational Opportunities Grant and additional on-site technical consultation will continue to support movement of programs to higher tiers and therefore increase the number and percentage of children with high needs who attend programs in the top tiers.

**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.

The Wisconsin Early Child Care Study (WECCS) was undertaken to provide an examination of the validity of YoungStar's rating scale. The study was conducted by Dr. Katherine Magnuson from the University of Wisconsin-Madison Institute for Research and Poverty. The study was designed both to examine whether the rating scale is able to differentiate programs according to their levels of independently observed quality and whether children who attend more highly rated programs gain more in terms of school readiness over the course of the school year than children attending programs rated at lower levels.

The study and initial analysis was completed in 2016. Results indicated that (1) the YoungStar rating level does differentiate among programs of varying observed quality and (2) there was no relationship

between gains in child outcomes and YoungStar rating.

The YoungStar Refinement Advisory Committee was created to provide feedback around recommendations to enhance and/or modify the YoungStar Evaluation Criteria based on the results of the validation study. This Committee met in late 2016 and has been asked to provide their feedback in February of 2017.

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

Select the Focused Investment Areas addressed in your RTT-ELC State Plan:

- (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.

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

## Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

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

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

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

Describe the progress made 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.

#### **Promote the Understanding of and Commitment to the Early Learning and Development Standards**

##### **Project C1/7**

#### **Assuring the State has Early Learning Standards and a System to Increase the Skill and Knowledge Base of the Early Childhood Trainer Community in these Standards**

The Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards (WMELS) were first created in 2003 and are now in their fourth edition. In 2015, the WMELS document and training materials was translated into Spanish. The WMELS is the common framework that specifies developmental expectations for children from birth through entrance to first grade. They reflect attention to all the domains of a child's learning and development. Wisconsin has a robust, cross sector, professional development framework for implementing training on the standards. The system includes a WMELS coordinator, regional coordination, a 15-18 hour training format, and a parent engagement module (officially called a "Training Curriculum"). Participation in this training is a component of the YoungStar Quality Rating System with points generated to increase in rating levels. A process is in place for school districts to align WMELS with literacy and language arts state standards. There are 106 state approved trainers representing a variety of early childhood sectors. A website for trainers and the general community can all be found on <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com>.

In September of 2016, the WMELS Project Coordinator retired from her position that is housed through a contract with the University of Wisconsin at Madison (UW-Madison) Waisman Center. To begin to address the potential of 2017 funding and future sustainability, the coordinator position was merged with UW-Madison Waisman Center RTT Professional Development Project Outreach Assistant position. To support this merger, some functions went to the UW-Madison Waisman Center Project Director and some to the DPI RTT Early Childhood Consultant.

In 2016, the WMELS Leadership Team played an increasing role in decision making. Based on the input from the December 3, 2015 Statewide Community of Practice (CoP) and the and January 2016 Leadership Team meeting, the WMELS overview content and training modules was reviewed and revised. This was to ensure the work force has the resources needed to apply the WMELS (training) with fidelity while meeting the needs of varied audiences. This included updating the standards training

objectives and inserting them into the training plan and setting up a process to approve adaptations to trainer materials. The April 28, 2016 the WMELS Leadership Team reviewed changes to the website related to trainer approval, processes for mentor requirements, and options to address issues about fidelity. The WMELS Project staff have been working with each CoP to explore fidelity and see there if are "adaptions" that should be considered for "standardized" training activities. The October 26, 2016 meeting of the WMELS Leadership Team approved a process to allow "adaptions" to the standard training activities. This process was based on the process piloted for the WMELS Tribal adaptations. It includes trainers submitting proposals to their Regional CoPs, piloting, CoP endorsement, Steering Committee approval, and, if needed Leadership Team approval. This process was put in place and at the October Leadership Team meeting, a proposal from the Milwaukee CoP for an implementation activity was presented. The proposal was especially geared for YoungStar Tier 1 -3 trainers in understanding how to implement concepts through room design and teacher interaction related to the teaching cycle.

Several priority areas were the focus of activity in 2016:

**Increase the number of and support for WMELS trainers.**

Early childhood trainers are an important part of Wisconsin's early childhood system, and through RTT-ELC we were able to increase the skill and knowledge base of our trainer community. While these standards have existed for a number of years, there is an ongoing need to continue to offer training to the field. We need trainers to make this happen. This is especially true in the child care sector as providers participating in the 15-18 hour training assists centers in maintaining or increasing their level in YoungStar.

There are a total of 106 approved WMELS trainers, including five who are associated with large school districts (Milwaukee, Madison, and Kenosha) and nine who are associated with Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESA); 18 agency directors, site coordinators or site managers; and 18 instructors at WI Technical Colleges and five at with the University of Wisconsin sites . The trainer approval process involves submission and approval of an application to the Regional Community of Practice, participating in a minimum of one 15 hour training, working with a mentor, and co-presenting the 15 hour training. Eight new trainers were approved and 11 new trainer candidates were accepted and assigned to mentors. These mentors helped assure consistency and best-practice adoption by new trainers. Mentors may be from agencies that define the role with job descriptions or from other independent trainers. Stipends are available for independent trainers to function in this role, and this year there were five mentor stipends awarded.

Work continues to build on the involvement of the Wisconsin higher education systems in the provision of the WMELS training. Meetings with representatives of the WI Technical College, University of Wisconsin System, and Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities were held in 2015 to begin this dialogue. Personnel changes within the university system and DPI teacher licensing interrupted this process but these meetings resumed in 2016. Each system has different capabilities to build the WMELS training into their course structure, and we began identifying key actions needed. The technical college system has the WMELS built into their common course work now. There is also a vision of how the more independent public and private university system could build the WMELS completion into their programs. A draft document was developed that could be used by the University System to describe how they are implementing the WMELS Training in their course work. This documentation would allow University students to receive YoungStar credit for the WMELS training.

As described in section A, Governance, Tribal, this year continued a major effort to increase the number of Tribal WMELS trainers. The WI Model Early Learning Standards (WMELS) project's

trainer approval process was adapted to be more culturally relevant. Through 2015 and into 2016, the Tribal Coordinator and a small group worked on the WMELS revisions and in July the package was approved by the WMELS Leadership Team. The changes did not alter the basic structure or contents of the WMELS training but provided culturally relevant graphics and substituted some relevant activities. By the end of 2016 Red Cliff will be the first Tribal Community with two fully approved Tribal Trainers. Stockbridge-Munsee will be next with one fully approved trainer. And other Tribal Trainers continue to work through the Trainer approval process.

In 2016, the WMELS Leadership Team also began to consider how to address the linguist needs for Spanish and Hmong Trainers. The process is expected to follow the previous approved process for adaptations for Tribal Trainer Approval and Training adaptations. This will carry over into 2017.

**•Provide support to existing trainers.**

RTT 2016 activities included efforts to support existing trainers involved materials updates and reviews, resources, approval status, and communities of practice.

The state requires WMELS trainers to be part of the WI Registry in order to be considered “approved.” The WI Registry requires a fee for annual renewals, which also adds costs to people willing to become trainers. RTT has allowed the state to cover the cost of these initial memberships and some annual renews. There is also a system in place to process renewals. In 2016, 53 coupons were used for initial or membership renewals for both WMELS and Pyramid Model trainers.

Regional Collaboration Coaches assured that WI Model Early Learning Standards CoP meetings were held in each region. The implementation of WMELS CoP events in each of Wisconsin's six regional communities of practice regions has increased consistency of regional coordination, improved coordination of training delivery, provided networking opportunities, and provided a venue for distributing information, updated material, evidence-based practices, and related resources. The WMELS Coordinator has been able to participate in some of these events which has improved communication between trainers, the WMELS Leadership Team, and state decision makers.

The WMELS Trainer CoP video conference was held December 1, 2016, to share and gather information from trainers. Trainers met as their regional CoP while being linked to the overall video conference. This allowed consistency in the state-wide message while local training implications could be addressed regionally. The video conference provided updates on issues and activities since the 2015 state CoP.

**• WMELS Alignment.**

This year was an important year for furthering efforts to align the WMELS. The existing process to assist districts to align the WMELS and the state literacy and language arts was moved to a different technology format and a facilitator's guide is being developed. The Early Learning Advisory Workgroup began the process to align WMELS with the state math standards. This work is being reviewed by an expanded group of K-12 math specialists. Working with the Wisconsin Head Start Collaboration Office, WMELS were also aligned with the Head Start Framework. The DPI WMELS webpages are being redesigned so that alignment “chapters” can be featured: <http://dpi.wi.gov/early-childhood/alignment-of-early-learning-standards-with-other-standards>.

**• Data collection.**

In 2016, there were 45 full trainings reported throughout the regions. These trainings included 840 participants from a variety of sectors: child care (502), Head Start (47), public schools (73), and others

(217). This data includes online training from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee but does not include trainings provided through our technical colleges or universities nor those provided specifically by school districts such as Milwaukee that provided training to all elementary schools.

The collection of accurate data has been an ongoing challenge with this project. There are several different points of data collection within the cross sectors involved in the project. While approved WMELS trainers are responsible for the provision of data about the number of trainings, the data remains segmented and all trainings are not reported. Work continues with the WI Registry to develop a more effective data reporting system. Common data elements have been determined and changes needed to reporting systems have been identified. One specific barrier has been access to the WI Registry for all approved trainers. The need for some adaptations to the WI Registry Trainer Specialist category have been identified and are nearing completion. This will allow additional trainers to enter data into the WI Registry system.

Until these changes are final, the RTT online survey tool (Qualtrics) is still the basis for reporting, and it includes notification of training, trainer reports, and training evaluation. Quarterly, mid-year, and end of the year data summaries include: WMELS Training Efforts by Region, Participation by Region, and Overall Sector Participation. Data reports are publically available at <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/wmels-training-reports.php>.

### **Implemented Pyramid Model Sites to foster social and emotional development of children.**

The social and emotional domain of WMELS remains a priority focus for the state effort, and the Pyramid Model for Social and Emotional Competence has been the primary focus of professional development in this area. The project has two coordinators; one is from the public education agency and the other from a nonprofit mental health agency. There is a state leadership team that meets quarterly to advise, guide, and support state implementation of the Pyramid Model.

Training efforts continue in these Pyramid Model content and targeted audiences:

- Group Early Care and Education Content: 8 Part Series
- Family Resource/Parent Educators: Parents Interacting with Infants (PIWI), Positive Solutions for Families (PSF)
- Behavior Specialist: Pyramid Model Individualized Interventions (PMII)
- Program-wide implementation Content: Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT) Reliability Training, Team Refresher, Leadership Team Implementation Kick off

In 2016, there were 64 program wide implementing sites from 20 programs/communities in Wisconsin. RTT funding supported external coaching to 8 existing program-wide implementation sites to continue their work. The RTT funds supported the addition for 12 new program-wide implementation sites, with external coaches for these sites, and subsidized registration at the April and November Implementation Academies.

The Pyramid Model Implementation Academies were held in April in Neenah and in November in Waupaca. The April Academy included TPOT reliability training (2 days), Team Implementation Kick Off (2 days), Parents Interacting with Infants (PIWI) training and roll out of the new Positive Solutions for Families training. The November Academy included the TPOT reliability training (2 days), Parents Interacting with Infants (PIWI) training (1 day) and Positive Solutions for Families training (1 day).

Across the state, 37 Pyramid Model content trainings were reported as completed between January 1, 2016 and December 31, 2016. Training content included the group care and education, parent



education, home visiting, and intervention content. There were 842 participants involved in the trainings including group child care (386), Early/Head Start (168), public school (188) higher education students, and others (82).

Wisconsin Pyramid Model Trainers continue to be a vital part of the structure. In 2016, 10 newly approved trainers joined the existing 78 approved trainers.

The 2015 community mini-grants projects continued in the eight funded communities. These mini-grants were designed to increase access to Pyramid Model training, strategies, and/or resources within the receiving communities.

Seeing the success of the 2015 implementation of Pyramid Model CoP within each region, Project Coordinators supported the Regional Collaboration Coaches to continue holding CoP meetings in each region.

The Pyramid Model Leadership Team met quarterly (January 7th, 2016, July 21st, 2016, April 28, 2016 and again on October 27, 2016). The meeting included a review of the study conducted by the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater on the impact of Pyramid Model Implementation on children (including those targeted with problem behaviors). The results are favorable and show significant findings on improvement of behavior and social skills, comprehension skills.

The Pyramid model maintains a strong relationship with Wisconsin's Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) system. The Wisconsin Pyramid Model Training and Coaching coordinator has served on the PBIS state leadership team, and the Wisconsin PBIS coordinator has served on the Pyramid Model Leadership team since 2010. They have presented together at various state leadership conferences, collaboratively developed materials, and cross walked the Pyramid Model and PBIS Benchmarks of Quality. These materials are available on the DPI and [collaboratingpartners.com](http://www.collaboratingpartners.com) websites. (See [http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/documents/pbis\\_goes\\_to\\_preschool.pdf](http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/documents/pbis_goes_to_preschool.pdf) <http://ec.dpi.wi.gov/files/sped/pdf/ecspedldr-pyramid-pbis.pdf>).

**• Focus on cross sector early literacy shifts to math alignment and professional development.**

As the major RTT push on literacy was being completed (see WMELS alignment section above), the cross department Early Literacy Advisory Group (ELAG) changed their name and structure to the Early Learning Advisory Group (ELAG). This supported their new focus on the development of an approach to promote early math concepts. A small group, working with the DPI math consultant, early childhood program support teachers with experience in early math, and ELAG members for other programs began the work to align WMELS with the State Math Standards and Math Practice Standards. As the alignment documents were drafted, several math consultants at the Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA) level agreed to review and finalize the alignment documents. The final version is expected in early in 2017. Professional development efforts for math took on a different format than the previous literacy initiative. This year's efforts have made a connection to the WI Math Association and they have agreed to add a preconference day and conference strand to their May 2017 conference.

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

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

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

Describe the progress made 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.

***WISCONSIN DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREAS C(2) OR C(3) IN THEIR  
RTT-ELC APPLICATION  
PAGES 42 of 110 THROUGH 44 of 110 HAVE BEEN DELETED***

## **Engaging and Supporting Families (Section C(4) of Application)**

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

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

Describe the progress made 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.

### **Parent Cafés**

In 2016, 27 Be Strong Families Parent Cafés series were implemented or continued in 11 different counties across Wisconsin: Rock, Lafayette, Monroe, St. Croix, Sawyer, Milwaukee, Racine, Winnebago, Marquette, Fond du Lac, and Brown. Each of the previously listed counties hosted at least one Parent Café series for a total of 70 individual sessions throughout the state. 373 unduplicated adults attended, in which, 31% attended two sessions in the series and 25% attended all three sessions. The average pretest score was 5.46 out of 7 and the average post test score was 5.53 out of 7 for an average increase of .07. The average evaluation score of the Parent Café Sessions was 4.51 out of 5. Throughout 2016, 35 Parents and/ or family members were recruited as parent hosts and 26 parents and/or family members were trained as parent café facilitators. Program to date, 105 Parents Café Sessions were hosted throughout the state with at least three in each YoungStar region.

Community based Parent Café teams worked with local organizations to create plans for program sustainability past 2016. This reduced the amount of RTT-ELC funding that was needed and two counties were able to support an additional fourth series. Teams with remaining funds will continue to support Parent Cafés through the no-cost extension.

In 2015, the Parent Café contract was amended for an additional \$30,387 to include an additional three cafés that focus specifically on families and children with special needs and disabilities. The additional three areas of Lacrosse, Madison, and Marathon completed the first Parent Café series in 2016. To date, six Inclusion Parent Café Sessions were offered, with 41 unduplicated parents/family members and 83 children in attendance.

DCF worked directly with staff from the Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwe School FACE (Family and Child Education) program to provide for two Parent Café series. The café was organized as a potluck style meal with child care provided. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program (TANF) allowed one parent to accumulate 2 hours of work time for attending and one Lac Courte Oreilles Elder donated time to the program. Participants identified between the ages of 15-42, primarily single, with education levels between some high school to associate degree. 30 children were cared for between the ages of three months to 14 years. Most families identified income levels between \$0-20,000 and indicated living in shared/rented housing. One family was identified as experiencing homelessness. The FACE coordinator is currently exploring ways to continue and sustain this program.

### **Cross-Division Family Engagement Workgroup**

The Cross-Division family engagement workgroup within DPI has continued to meet and work to

improve and expand the resources available to families and communities looking for ways to create caring communities for young people. In order to enhance the “Families and Students” tab on the front page of the DPI website, we have begun the process of creating a concise document or infographic which will present the principal ways in which the department reaches out to and encourages family and community engagement. This document will serve as an internal resource for DPI personnel to connect with each other so that the department presents a knowledgeable, coherent approach to family and community engagement to our stakeholders. In addition, we are planning to produce a recorded webinar, or possibly a series of very brief videos, that present and explain DPI's family and community engagement philosophy, approach, and initiatives. This process will build on the revision of the front page “Families and Students” link that the group created in 2016, and will continue the process of aligning approaches and raising the visibility and importance of family engagement within the department, as well as increasing awareness of DPI's engagement practices throughout the state (8.5.1). We have made slow but steady progress on the construction of an on-line “story site” to highlight exemplary strategies for family and community engagement in Wisconsin. After consideration of possible alternatives, we have decided that the site will indeed be hosted by the Wisconsin Early Childhood Collaborating Partners website, and will feature best practices from communities around the state. In 2016 we continued to gather those stories, and created a basic structure for presenting them within the framework of other state and national engagement resources. These stories will be linked to overarching frameworks and other resources, such as the Head Start Family and Community Engagement framework, so that practice and theory will be linked in an easy-to-use format (8.5.7 and 8.6.1 and 8.6.5 and 8.6.7). A related web site will provide information about family engagement professional development opportunities and resources in Wisconsin, this site is being developed in conjunction with the Wisconsin Early Childhood Professional Development Initiative (PDI) (8.5.7). In 2016, we offered (and will continue to offer in 2017) workshops for recruiting and developing parent leaders at professional development opportunities that draw participation from many early childhood sectors, including at the annual Head Start Training Conference in February and the annual “Preserving Early Childhood” conference in March (8.6.1).

### **Parent Ambassador Program**

In 2016, RTT funds were used to support the second year of the Wisconsin “Parent Ambassador” program, a year-long, intensive parent leadership training program for parent leaders who have children served by many early childhood sectors, including Head Start, 4-year-old kindergarten, home visiting, and private child care and education providers. The program was administered through an inter-agency agreement between the DPI and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee's (UW-M) Milwaukee Child Welfare Training Partnership. The nine women who completed the program in December 2016 have developed the substantial leadership skills and they are now strong, confident, knowledgeable advocates for high-quality, universally accessible care and education in their communities and state-wide. As part of their journey, each Parent Ambassador conducted a project in their own community that enhance awareness and support for early childhood. The projects ranged from “Parent Cafes,” which brought together families to learn from and support each other, to community celebrations, which created new networks of collaboration in the community. Although the future of the Parent Ambassador program is not clear, UW-M Milwaukee Child Welfare Training Partnership remains committed to promoting parent leadership. Even more promising is the interest the program has sparked in the home communities of the Parent Ambassador program's graduates. The women who have completed the program have indeed become ambassadors for the type of comprehensive leadership training they have received. Some of their communities are in the process of exploring how to create local, perhaps more modest and less costly, ways to encourage and grow local parent leadership. The localization of this concept would be a very positive contribution to strengthening the voices of families in Wisconsin. (8.6.3)

### **Coordination of Family engagement and Parent Outreach**

Coordination of family engagement and parent outreach efforts proceeded with frequent opportunities

for dialogue among existing systems such as the DCF Family Engagement plan and the DPI K-12 Family/Community Partnership efforts (8.7.1 and 8.7.3). Workshops and conference sessions on family and community engagement were presented at several professional development events that occurred in the winter and spring of 2016, including the annual Wisconsin Head Start Association conference for Head Start directors and personnel; the Preserving Early Childhood conference targeting professionals engaged in 4-year-old kindergarten programs, as well as other sectors of Wisconsin's early childhood care and education; and the Finding Your Way conference, which brought together community-based teams of parents and professionals from a wide variety of sectors to engage in vibrant conversations about what really works in family and community engagement. In 2015, communities who put together cross-sector teams to participate in the Finding Your Way conference received pre-conference mini-grants to assess their current practice and prepare stories and questions to bring to the May event. In 2016, the Finding Your Way conference focused on concrete, evidence-based strategies for family and community engagement, including Parent Cafes, parent leadership programs, and fatherhood initiatives. After the conference, nine more communities received mini-grants to pursue one or more of these activities. In all, the 2015 and 2016 Finding Your Way conferences, both of which focused on engagement, have done much to create a climate of enthusiasm and activism around the importance of fully engaging all of the resources of communities in providing the best possible care and education for young children. (8.7.3, 8.7.5)

## Early Childhood Education Workforce

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

(Section D(1) of Application)

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

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

Describe the progress made 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 Workforce

#### Project D1/9

#### **Promoting and Enhancing Cross Sector Professional Development through System Definition and Alignment, Better Data Reporting, Policy and Practices Creation, and Stakeholder Involvement**

This project area focuses on increasing coordination and alignment across the various sectors of early childhood professional development structures in Wisconsin, including but not limited to: child care, Head Start, four- and five-year-old kindergarten, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B and C, home visiting, and higher education. This project is based on the concept that cross sector professional development will build common knowledge and increase skills while maximizing state resources. This coordination work is overseen and coordinated by the grant-supported Professional Development Coordinator. This position is viewed as an "air traffic controller" for professional development at the state level. The coordinator organizes professional development activities to avoid overlap and conflict, maximize resource usage, and help maximize cross sector efforts.

In September of 2016, the WMELS Project Coordinator retired from her position that is housed through a contract with the University of Wisconsin-Madison Waisman Center. To begin to address the potential of 2017 funding and future sustainability, the coordinator position was merged with University of Wisconsin-Madison Waisman Center RTT Professional Development Project Outreach Assistant position. To support this merger, some functions went to the University of Wisconsin-Madison Waisman Center Project Director and some to the DPI RTT Early Childhood Consultant. The various components of this project are described in more detail below:

#### **Supported Regional Collaboration Coaches in their system coordination roles.**

The WI Early Childhood Collaborating Partners (WECCP) Regional Collaboration Coaches and Networks is a cross department structure supported and aligned with RTT. Regional Collaboration Coaches have been in place since 2004 through braided funding efforts between all three Wisconsin state departments to connect, build, and sustain cross sector systems around state and regional priority areas. Similar to the role that the Professional Development Coordinator plays at a state level, Regional Coordination Coaches provide critical "air traffic control" at a regional level by coordinating system development, trainings, technical assistance opportunities, and other relevant activities in each of six regions across the state and through the corresponding six Regional Action Teams (five regions plus

Milwaukee). Their work increases collaboration, reduces redundancies, identifies gaps for further support, and helps make the system work more efficiently. Through the regional action teams, Collaboration Coaches have enhanced cross sector collaboration in the areas of WI Model Early Learning Standards, Pyramid Model of Social Emotional Competence, Screening and Assessment, Homelessness/Poverty, and other areas.

Coaches network with regional systems through Regional Action Teams. Regional Action Teams are made up of key representatives from the various early childhood sectors, agencies, and/or associations in each region. Each action team received an increased amount of funding through RTT to support their work. Regional mini-grants were one of the strategies used to allow local programs to benefit from the RTT funds and implement local projects that align with the professional development goals. More detailed efforts of the coaches will also be highlighted in the 2016 Professional Development Consolidated Report. Information about the Coaches and Regional Networks is housed on [collaboratingpartners.com](http://www.collaboratingpartners.com). (See <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/about.php>.)

Coaches also coordinate Community of Practice (CoP) meetings in each region to support consistency of regional coordination, improve coordination of training delivery, provide networking opportunities, and share information, updated materials, evidence-based practices, and related resources. By 2016, these CoPs were one-day events with practices meetings for Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards approved trainers in the morning and Pyramid model trainers in the afternoon. Some regions included screening and assessment within their community of practice structure. In 2015, the WMELS/ Professional Development coordinators began to regularly attend the communities of practice, by 2016 there was improved local-regional-state communication structure for WMELS and cross sector professional development efforts. In 2016, the CoPs played a vital role in discussions related to WMELS fidelity since trainers were able to hear from the state coordinator about intent, discuss training goals, share implementation strategies, and have their concerns about fidelity be brought to the WMELS Leadership committee.

### **WI Early Childhood Cross Sector Professional Development Initiative (PDI)**

The WI Early Childhood Cross Sector Professional Development Initiative (PDI) serves as the leadership, advisory, and working roles for the various components of projects defined above. It brings together the representatives from the various sectors of early childhood for regular opportunities to update each other on sector efforts, provide input into professional development activities, and to build collaborative projects and vision. In 2014, the PDI served as the professional development project team of the WI Governor's Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC). As the ECAC project team structure changed, PDI became an important component of the ECAC structure for "stakeholder" activities and recommendations. The PDI was involved in continual examination of the cross sector structure through the Professional Development Snapshot. PDI quarterly meetings were held on January 16, April 27, July 20, and October 26, 2016. Meetings typically included a variety of presentations on early childhood topics, updates by the various sectors, reports from the Collaboration Coaches, and various other topics on improving cross sector work. A facilitator was also contracted to assist leadership and the PDI members to examine their purpose and structure as the group moved into 2017. During 2016, PDI members were involved in development, review, and promotion of the cross sector activities described below.

### **WI Professional Development Systems Portfolio**

The WI Professional Development Systems Portfolio was a concept that began as a written document with intentions of highlighting the efforts to strengthen professional development systems in Wisconsin. The concept grew into an online, interactive portfolio that would also serve as a cross sector multi-level

infrastructure tool to enhance communication and coordination of the professional development system. This online portfolio will not replace other existing tracking systems in Wisconsin; it will be a way to store, track, and evaluate the various projects, committees, leadership, deliverables, documents, work plans, and training/ technical assistance materials. The Project Coordinator is housed at the UW-Madison Waisman Center, and a contract for Portfolio development exists with the University of Wisconsin Information Technology Department (fondly called, UW-DoIt).

This project has had a slow “birth”. Moving from the first vision through development of common language, the online design's paper prototypes were finally showcased at the 4/9/15 PDI meeting. Bi-weekly meeting continued to finalization of the design for the forms, reports, and fillable data that will be accessed through the online modules and to create the process to collect the actual data that will be inputted into the Portfolio. In 2016, work continued on “fine-tuning” the portfolio. The process of inputting began for data in the areas of individuals, organizations, projects, committees, and event. Numerous complications with user access were addressed as the RTT coordinators and PDI members were informed of their ability to “log-in”. The site has now moved into implementation and began to support data input and marketing to stakeholders. The home page, <https://early-childhood-system-portfolio.wisc.edu/>, is open to all users. PDI members and other professional development coordinators/implementers use the log in to access the full system.

### **Professional Development Consolidated Reports (mid-year and end-of-year)**

The Professional Development Report continued as a written format to capture the professional development efforts in specified areas including WI Model Early Learning Standards, Pyramid Model of Social Emotional Competence, and Homelessness/Poverty, Regional Collaboration Coaches and Networks, and many other areas. This end of the year report breaks down each area and includes a description, infrastructure, coordination, and other efforts. The 2016 report will be a summary of the 4 years of these RTT projects.

### **WI Training and Technical Assistance Professional (T-TAP) Competencies, Courses, and Policy**

Efforts continued in 2016 to strengthen the Wisconsin early childhood training and technical assistance systems. The goal is to have statewide policies, competencies, and courses that guide, educate, and track a large segment of the training and technical assistance workforce.

In 2015, the Training and Technical Assistance (T-TAP) Competency Workgroup finalized the Wisconsin Training and Technical Assistance Professional (T-TAP) Competencies for Early Childhood and Related Professionals Working with Adults. This is a guide to the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that training and technical assistance professionals should have in order to provide high quality training, mentoring, coaching, consultation, and counseling to those who work directly with children and families.

In 2016, these competencies were promoted through a basic six-hour Training and Technical Assistance Provider (T/TAP) course which provides detailed guidance on the T-TAP competencies. Two additional six-hour courses were finalized; one for trainers and one for technical assistance. The Core Competencies and the T-TAP Competencies were distributed at the March 2016 Preserving Early Childhood (PEC) conference. The second T/TAP training occurred on June 22-23, 2016. The June training was presented by the "Superfaculty" to a future "faculty" from child care and public school program support teachers. The December 3, 2016 WMELS Statewide Community of Practice meeting included promotion of the Core and T/TAP Competencies. These trainers will be able to provide the training to those in the field who want to be listed as approved at the training and technical assistance levels in the Registry. Plans are being made to host a T/TAP coaches/mentors course at the March 2-3,



2017, PEC conference.

These courses will link to The Registry Professional Development Approval System and the WI Core Competencies. Additional work continued with the Registry to further align the T/TAP competencies with the Registry Trainer and Consultant structure. During 2016, the Registry revived effort to make the Registry more understandable and accepted by teachers in programs beside child care. Discussions are occurring on changes that can be made to the specialist category to be more inclusion of teachers who hold a teachers license from the Department of Public Instruction.

The printed version in English and Spanish are now available and online: [http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/documents/WI\\_TTAP\\_Competenciesfinal5\\_1\\_15.pdf](http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/documents/WI_TTAP_Competenciesfinal5_1_15.pdf)

### **Inventory of Practice**

As the PDI began to review needs assessments and inventories of practices, there was a decision to explore the development of a document that more shows how best practices “look” at the most basic level. This "inventory of practices" would be an extension of the WMELS foundation, provide a foundation of best practices, and more detailed practices/needs assessment in domain specific areas. The inventory would help teachers see overlapping key practices for the 5 WMELS domains and would give administrators a simple guide for observation. It would also provide a second level of resources to show more detailed guidance for best practices within each domain, A small group has been meeting to create the vision and do concept planning for what will be promoted as a blueprint best practices in WMELS implementation. At the end of 2016, this effort began to partner with a secondary DPI funding source to align it with the DPI WISELearn Resources that will be a collection of quality resources for teachers: <http://dpi.wi.gov/wiselearn/classroom-resources>. The early childhood WISELearn resource curation will take place in 2017.

### **Career Pathways, Articulation, and Credit for Prior Learning**

In 2016, this project continued to address the articulation of degrees and coursework between two- and four-year Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) as well as addressing the need for credit for prior learning. This is addressing primarily the needs of the child care workforce in obtaining degrees and licenses to teach in four-year-old kindergarten, Head Start, and other settings that require a bachelor's degree and/or Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction teaching license. The effort continued a 2015 work plan that included an articulation summit and mini-grants to IHEs. Primary responsibility and funding was through the Wisconsin Early Childhood Association. RTT contributed to the mini-grants and staff for the efforts. The May 25-26, 2016 Intersecting Interests Conference's first day focused on higher education and the second day was on communities of practice. The conference was a success with over 120 participants taking part in the focus on communities of practice and professional development pathways. A number of changes occurred in the IHE system representatives as representatives retired or moved into other positions and this slowed their work on addressing alignment, pathways, and a broader array of areas of interest. This positions are now filled and work with begin again in full. Mini-grant funding will end but the work will continue through the IHE alignment committee and as the Technical College begins a process to revise their early childhood curriculum.

### **Frame a Cross Sector, Comprehensive, and Consistent Approach to Learning Standards Domain Content**

This project was aligned with other RTT Projects (Tribal, B1, C1, C4) to frame a cross sector, comprehensive, and consistent approach to the professional development content and approaches

including: early learning, classroom environment, inclusive practices for children with disabilities, homelessness, dual language learners, and screening/assessment. The PDI cross sector content scan was the original framework for this project, and it became the foundation for the design of the cross sector system portfolio described above. The 2016 activities and efforts are summarized below:

**Inclusion:** The inclusion workgroup in RTT Project B has become the lead on this area with the DCF RTT Inclusion/Special Needs Analyst as the lead coordinator. The staffing has changed but the work has continued with new personnel. IDEA Part B 619 (DPI) and Part C (DHS) personnel play an active role. Part B 619 has designated the Preschool Options Coordinator as one of the co-leads for the workgroup. The September 27-28, 2016 Inclusion Institute was a huge success with over 200 participants receiving resources and inspiration from Camille Catlett and attending a wide variety of content and networking sessions (see DCF project B report).

**Homelessness:** In conjunction with the McKinney-Vento Education for Homeless Children and Youth, 3 new webinars were conducted and are now available for viewing on the WECCP website. The topics cover strategies for serving homeless families; new federal guidelines for serving homeless families enrolled in child care under the Child Care and Development Block Grant renewal and the importance of early identification of homeless families with young children. During the school year, five bi-monthly email blasts, highlighting resources and news related to serving homeless families with young children were posted to the WECCP website and delivered to approximately 1200 individuals per occurrence. The email blast recipients were from cross sector interests, including school district liaisons, Early Childhood Special Educators, Birth to Three, Child Care, Head Start and Early Head Start, among others. These resources are also posted on the Wisconsin Early Childhood Collaborating Partners Braided Funding Initiative's website <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/diversity-homelessness.php>. Collaboration Coaches attended the McKinney-Vento Grant Funded districts meeting in an effort to strengthen relationships between the coaches and the district liaisons. A presentation to the northern region was conducted via teleconference and three workshops were conducted at various statewide professional conferences (Wisconsin Head Start Association, Preserving Early Childhood and Fulfilling the Promise).

**Dual Language Learners:** The Early Dual Language Learners (DLL) Initiative is being implemented with WIDA and has included a statewide needs assessment, translations of WMELS materials, improved coordination of best practices, and development of professional development resources. The cross sector group, Early Dual Language Learners Initiative (EDILLI), continues to provide a structure to plan, advise, and evaluate the work. A smaller group of Coordinators meet to monitor progress, organize next steps, and find new ways of building a system of supports for DLL work. On October 4, 2016, the full EDILLI group reconvened to review the work that has occurred over the last year and plan for next steps related to the larger group work and the extension of the WIDA contract into 2017.

Beginning in 2015 and throughout 2016, the focus was on the development of a cadre of personnel trained in DLL that would be accessible to provide training in the various early childhood sectors. The structure for creating the cadre included a seven session online module that began in October 2015. The cadre capstone training was April 4-5, 2016. Each of these trainers is committed to do at least two trainings. There were 30 cadre applications that were approved and participated. In addition to their two trainings, fourteen (14) of the trainers agreed to be on the state list as available DLL trainer.

The 2016 DLL Institutes were held on April 19-20 and May 17-19. They target a broad cross sector audiences with content from the WIDA Early Years materials. Approximately 65 people attended the April Institute and 54 people attended the May Institute and included representatives from the DLL Cadre, school districts, child care resource and referral, and Head Start.

Within the DPI, Title 3 English Language Learner (ELL) consultants have become very involved in the DLL efforts and are making linkages to CESA and school district personnel who work in the area of English language learners. Building on their google professional learning community (PLC), they have include DLL into the messages shared through this community: <https://plus.google.com/u/0/communities/112187251944843845766?cfem=1>

Resources are located on collaboratingpartners.com and include tip sheets, links to WIDA Early Years materials, Spanish translations of the WMELS and trainer materials, as well as a list of available DLL Cadre trainers: <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/diversity-dual-language-learners.php>.

**Screening and Assessment:** Consistent strategies, content, and professional development related to screening and assessment is another focus of this work. The project was specifically coordinated by the DPI funded Early Childhood Response to Intervention (RtI) Coordinator with supplemental funds from RTT. In 2016 the Coordinator retired and a new Coordinator resumed the work.

This project also builds on the work of the cross department Healthy Children Project Team. In 2014, the Healthy Children Project Team served as the screening and assessment project team of the WI Governor's Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC). As the ECAC project team structure changed, the Healthy Children Committee became an important component of the ECAC structure for “stakeholder” activities and recommendations. The [Comprehensive and Aligned System for Early Childhood Screening and Assessment: Wisconsin's Blueprint 3rd Ed](#) was finalized in 2016. This revision expanded on the initial vision for a system from birth to 3 grade with comprehensive schedule of the necessary areas for screening and assessment and included guiding principles, critical time periods, recommendations for selection of general developmental screening and assessment tools, guidance for community programs, the RtI model for academic and behavioral, culturally responsive practices, and more. Using the Early Childhood Integrated Data System (ECIDS) decision making process as a model, throughout 2016, various steps were taken to obtain “buy-in” and market the blueprint with the state departments. The committee was pleased that the final approved version included logos from DPI, DCF, DHS, the Wisconsin Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, the University of Wisconsin-Madison Waisman Center, Prevent Blindness Wisconsin, and the Wisconsin Dental Association. It is posted at: [http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/documents/Healthy\\_Children\\_Blueprint\\_9\\_28\\_16\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/documents/Healthy_Children_Blueprint_9_28_16_FINAL.pdf)

A second focus for the Healthy Children Committees 2016 work was the creation of online professional development module on the foundation of assessment. A workgroup developed this module that includes materials related to: the 5 purposes of assessment, the teaching cycle, principles of ongoing assessment, engaging families, getting started in assessment, administrative support in assessment, and comprehensive screening & assessment systems. It can be found at: <http://www.wiecpdonline.com/screeningassessment.html>

On October 10, 2016, the full Healthy Children Committee reconvened to review progress and define next steps. Marketing of the Blueprint is high priority, the professional development will continue and two new workgroups will be formed to explore developmental screening and family engagement in the screening process.

The connection to the state's RtI Center has played an important role in the comprehensive nature of the philosophy, the alignment with school district practices, and the potentials for sustainability. Linking this work with the DPI funded RtI Coordinator was helpful in aligning and marketing early childhood screening and assessment with the DPI school based RtI and assessment team work. In 2016, early childhood RtI guide “Putting the Puzzle Pieces Together: Planning for, and Implementing, a Multi-tiered System of Supports in Pre-K Settings” was updated: <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/>

[documents/PuttingthePuzzlePiecesTogether6\\_16.pdf](#). The RTT coordinator has worked with the RtI center to develop an early childhood alignment for Using the School-wide Implementation Review (SIR) in early childhood settings. This self-assessment was piloted in March and April 2016 in two communities. The RtI center staff played a crucial role in implementing the pilots. The process was well received by the communities. In June 2016, the final revisions were approved on the self-assessment and can be found on the RtI Center's Early Childhood webpage at: <http://www.wisconsinrticenter.org/educators/rti-in-action/earlychildhood.html>. An RtI Center representative attended an early childhood networking session at the Regional RtI Technical Assistance meeting. Plans are in place for the RtI newsletter and website to include early childhood specific articles. The DPI Office of Early Learning Consultant role with the DPI strategic assessment internal workgroup is beginning to bring early childhood screening and assessment concepts to the table in the development of the DPI policies and practices on assessment.

A preconference event will occur at the PEC conference (2/28/17 - 3/2/17) to focus on the demonstration communities and other screening and assessment strategies. Communities that participated in the May 15, 2015 meeting are advising on the conference sessions and three of them will be show cased for their community wide ASQ and data alignment efforts. Other sessions will focus on the screening and assessment "Blueprint", creating screening and assessment systems with a child care center, how select assessment tools impact on classroom practices, RtI and early childhood, and several other topics.

**Kindergarten Entrance Assessment (KEA):** The RtI Coordinator took the lead on this project and worked with a small workgroup of stakeholders representing several sectors. Wisconsin is not technically a KEA state but in our final RTT grant application we committed to exploring KEA for Wisconsin. The KEA report was finalized in 2016; it has shared with key stakeholders and is available at: <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/documents/ExploringOptionsforKEAfinal.pdf>.

The overall concept of KEA being an ongoing process, beginning at birth and continuing through the educational process is reflected in the [Comprehensive and Aligned System for Early Childhood Screening and Assessment: Wisconsin's Blueprint 3rd Ed](#) that was finalized in 2016 (see above).

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

(Section D(2) of Application)

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

- Providing and expanding access to effective professional development opportunities that are aligned with your State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework;
- 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
  - Scholarships
  - Compensation and wage supplements,
  - Tiered reimbursement rates,
  - Other financial incentives
  - Management opportunities
- Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention
- Setting 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; and
  - Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Describe the progress made 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.

***WISCONSIN DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREAS D(2) OR E(1) IN THEIR  
RTT-ELC APPLICATION  
PAGES 56 of 110 THROUGH 60 of 110 HAVE BEEN DELETED***

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

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

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

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.

### Early Childhood Integrated Data System (ECIDS)

At the portfolio management level, progress has been made on several items which were initiated in 2015. The WI ECIDS Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan has gone into internal agency approval processes and three items within that plan, have made forward strides: The WI ECIDS Website, The WI ECIDS Fact Sheet and plans for a WI ECIDS Quarterly Newsletter. The WI ECIDS Sustainability Plan framework has been clarified via help from a team member webinar recorded in cooperation with our federal technical assistants. This webinar is available for viewing by all interested in Wisconsin's plan framework. The WI ECIDS Sustainability Plan is in progress and will be finalized by third quarter of 2017. Application for a one-year no-cost extension to Project 10 was granted and planning commenced for 2017.

#### ECIDS Technical Solution Work Group:

The build of the technical solution commenced in early 2016 with the establishment and set up of the Knowledge Base Development Environment. In May, the Knowledge Base Build Data Use Agreement (DUA) was signed. The signing of the DUA allowed the three agencies to share data and to commence the actual build and testing of the Knowledge Base. The model used in WI is the hybrid federated model. Program data stays back in each of the agency's systems (is not brought together and centrally stored), while the three agencies centrally store matched identities containing just those data elements needed to perform the matching. Longitudinal Information of Family Touch Points (LIFT) (DCF), Customer Hub (DHS), and WISEdash (DPI) send the Knowledge Base a Golden Record on a regular schedule which is matched to produce a Knowledge Base ID. Agency ID's are not shared between agencies. Later in the process Research ID's will be created before fulfilling research requests to further anonymize the data.

As of December 31, 2016, the cross-agency work group was close to completion and production installation of the Knowledge Base (KB) Matching Solution. The actual production installation was delayed, due to several technical challenges and some timing issues which needed to be worked through

with the Department of Administration Division of Enterprise Technology (DOA DET). DOA DET houses the servers and provides security and other services to the three agencies sharing the data within the Knowledge Base. The production implementation of the KB is a major milestone and will occur in the early first quarter of 2017.

Improvements for 2017 are currently being discussed and prioritized. These will include the automated portion of the Long-Term Data Request Process: The File Manager Tool. This will also include work on a Portal and may include other improvements currently under discussion.

#### **ECIDS Data Governance Work Group:**

The KB DUA was approved in May of 2016 by all three agencies' legal staff. General work has occurred on ECIDS policy and procedures. A general framework was established for the ECIDS policies, procedures and agreements. An ECIDS Project Product Approval Process was clarified and approved by the ECIDS Management Committee (EMC) by fall of 2016. A Master Agreement draft is circulating for comments/approval in early 2017. This Master Agreement represents the highest level of agreement between the three agencies and is designed to take effect after the RTT grant has expired. It will replace our current Data Governance Charter. Also in process and to be completed in early 2017 are the Data Privacy Policy and the Technical Infrastructure Policy. Data Governance will be involved in DUAs for any questions agency researchers may submit to the ECIDS. All Data Governance products are designed to be sustainable beyond the RTT Grant years.

#### **ECIDS Research Work Group:**

In 2016, the research work group refined the three analytical questions which will be used to pilot the technical solution and the interim data request process. At the end of 2016, the data requests were in the approval process at the three agencies, the DUAs were in process. The KB technical solution needs to be in place to move into next steps. The next steps, after data requests and DUAs are approved, is to complete the data request process by using the KB for matching, gathering and sharing the data with the researchers/analysts proposing the questions. The researchers/analysts will then analyze and report on the results.

#### **ECIDS Data Request Process Work Group:**

An Interim Data Request Process was completed by a cross-agency team by end of October, 2016. This is in place and will be used until the Long-Term Data Request Process can be finalized and put into production.

During the first four months of 2016, a prototype was developed by the technology work group, which will automate part of the Data Request Process and be a significant improvement over the Interim Process currently being used. This prototype (the File Manager Tool) was demonstrated and well-received by team members. Suggestions for improvement were captured. The completion of the Long-Term Data Request Process, which includes the File Manager Tool, is a key deliverable for 2017.

### **Department of Children and Families**

#### **Project Management**

Project 10 Management responsibilities included organizing meetings with key stakeholders (data users, subject area experts, policy leaders and others) on a regular basis, and acting as the key point of contact for DCF on ECIDS projects. DCF members of the RTT-ECIDS workgroups met monthly to share work accomplishments for data governance, research development and technological solutions. The DCF ECIDS Management team met monthly to keep ECIDS projects within DCF and projects associated with the other partner agencies moving forward. This team also met quarterly with a Steering Committee which included DCF Division Administrators or their representatives to oversee and provide direction for DCF involvement in ECIDS.

#### **Research**

The RTT-ELC DCF Research Analyst analyzed DCF stakeholder research priorities to ensure that our research priorities were focused and aligned with DCF's mission. Previously as part of RTT-ELC, stakeholders were brought together to generate research questions that were important to improving policies and subsequent outcomes for children and families. The Research Analyst grouped these

questions by theme to produce a schematic summarizing Wisconsin's ECIDS research themes. A document was produced that illustrated three key themes of interest to stakeholders that appeared throughout stakeholder questions: child and family participant characteristics, programs and services utilized by children and families, and outcomes associated with participation in those programs. The questions (over four hundred were generated) were then grouped by which data system could be used to answer each question.

In addition, the RTT-ELC Research Analyst identified a new research question for DCF from these four hundred questions based on previous work that had been done to rank the questions by priority. The question selected addressed DCF's key policy question, "Are children, birth to 5, on track to succeed when they enter school and beyond?" The research question examines third grade reading outcomes for children who received the Wisconsin Shares child care subsidy versus children who were eligible for the subsidy but did not receive Wisconsin Shares. A sub-analysis will also be conducted to examine outcomes for children enrolled in center-based versus family childcare. An analytic plan proposing this research question was written in 2016 and submitted to the DCF ECIDS Management Committee for internal approval. It was also approved by cross-agency representatives. DCF then submitted a data request to DPI for the data needed to address this research question. Data will be analyzed in 2017. The RTT-ELC DCF Research Analyst is also leading the development of an ECIDS "distinct count" data system, now called Wisconsin LEADS (Leadership in Early childhood Analytics for Data-driven Systems) that will provide an unduplicated count of children served by selected DCF, DHS, and DPI programs. This system will contribute to addressing one of the original ECIDS policy questions, "Which children and families are and are not being served by which programs/services?" Finally, the RTT-ELC DCF Research Analyst continues to serve on the ECIDS Research Workgroup which meets monthly. The primary responsibilities of the Research Analyst are to participate in discussions and decisions related to ECIDS research and to provide a communication link between the researchers from the partner agencies (DPI and DHS) and the DCF Management team.

## **Technical**

### **LIFT Data Warehouse**

The objective of the Longitudinal Information for Family Touchpoints (LIFT) data warehouse project is to merge person and participation information from DCF data warehouses to provide an overview of participation across DCF programs. LIFT includes participation data for Wisconsin Shares (child care subsidy), Wisconsin Works (welfare to work program), Initial Assessment (child protective services), and out-of-home care (child protective services). Testing for LIFT 1.0 was completed in March 2016. The LIFT 1.0 Dashboard was released in April 2016.

In May 2016, DCF purchased a license for software to replace our internal process for matching and to provide enhanced matching of person information from DCF data sources. This enhanced matching program was incorporated into LIFT 1.1. The application was installed and configured in a preproduction environment and implemented to production in the second release (LIFT 1.1) in October 2016. Five reports were developed in LIFT 1.1 during 2016 including four reports specific to participation of high-need populations of children (e.g., children who are teen parents) in YoungStar, Wisconsin's Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS).

The next iteration of LIFT, LIFT 2.0, will incorporate Child Support data into the LIFT data warehouse. Project planning was completed for LIFT 2.0 in September 2016. Requirements gathering was completed in November 2016. Detailed design, construction, testing, and production will be completed in 2017.

A sustainability plan for maintaining LIFT following RTT-ELC is currently being developed and will be completed in early 2017.

### **LIFT Workgroups**

Two workgroups have been created to support LIFT, a Reports Workgroup and a Research Workgroup. The Reports Workgroup is responsible for assisting in prioritizing LIFT report requests, testing newly developed reports, and completing user acceptance testing for new iterations of LIFT. The



Research Workgroup is responsible for identifying priorities for conducting research using LIFT data and for assisting in demonstrating the utility of LIFT for DCF research and policy staff.

## **WI LEADS**

DCF began work on Wisconsin LEADS, a new data system that will provide a distinct or unduplicated count of children participating in selected DCF, DHS, and DPI programs. The DCF IT Project Manager for LIFT and LEADS and the RTT-ELC Research Analyst developed an Options Paper that described four possible options for spending the remaining funds dedicated to the distinct count project. The Options Paper was presented in December 2016 to DCF, DHS, and DPI leadership. All parties agreed to pursue the option to build an unduplicated count that will include data on programs from each agency. All phases of WI LEADS will be completed in 2017 with an estimated release date of November 2017.

## **Data Governance**

Four DCF internal data governance policies were approved and published. (1) Data Steward Roles and Responsibilities, (2) Data Governance: Training Requirements, (3) Data Governance: Management of Outside Entity Data Requests, and (4) Data Governance: Data Sharing Agreements.

An internal data governance tracking database has been created and internal goals for completion of data request have been established. A DCF data governance council has been formed that meets quarterly and first met in Spring of 2016. This council discusses data governance issues common across all DCF divisions. A training plan has been approved and training is being developed for the following 4 groups:

- **Data Steward Training (required):** A DCF data steward's main responsibility is to ensure that the Department's data assets are used appropriately and to their fullest capacity. As such, all data stewards will meet with the Bureau of Performance Management (BPM) during which time they will be briefed about their data steward responsibilities and the necessary tools to perform these duties. BPM will schedule this training session within 30 days of a staff member being assigned to the data steward role. Data stewards are also required to take the Analytic Staff training (#2 below).
- **Analytical Staff Training (required):** This one-time, 45 minute training session will be offered several times a year in a seminar format for staff identified by their Divisions as having an analytic role at DCF. This training may also be scheduled for individual section meetings as requested. Completion of this training should occur within 3 months of an analytic staff member beginning with DCF or assuming analytic responsibilities. In consultation with their Division Administrator, data stewards will identify staff who should participate in the analytical staff training. Training opportunities will be posted on Learn@DCF. If this training opportunity is not offered at least quarterly, the acceptable window for taking this training will extend to 6 months of an analytic staff member beginning with DCF or assuming analytic responsibilities.
- **DCF Manager Training (required):** All DCF managers will be required to review a short, online training about DCF Data Governance Policies. New and existing managers will have 3 months to complete the DCF Managers Data Governance Training. The training will be posted on Learn@DCF.
- **All DCF Staff Training (optional):** All DCF staff will be offered a short, online training about DCF Data Governance Policies. Division Administrators should encourage staff to complete this training. A similar training will be offered during New Employee Orientation. The training will be posted on Learn@DCF.

## **Department of Health Services (DHS) Integrated Data System Build, Data Governance, Analytic Agenda and Cross-Agency Collaboration**

During 2016, the Department of Health Services (DHS) continued to achieve several project milestones and made dramatic progress towards fulfilling our RTT ECIDS goals and objectives. Specific accomplishments, including inter-agency data system projects and activities related to the ECIDS, are

described below.

### ***Cross-agency Work Group Participation***

DHS informatics and program staffs continued to collaborate on ECIDS efforts -participating in numerous cross-agency workgroups throughout the year and engaging in and completing copious follow-up tasks to move collective efforts forward and to achieve project milestones. These collaborative cross-agency groups included:

- ECIDS Data Governance Work Group
- ECIDS Research Work Group
- ECIDS Technical Solution Work Group
- ECIDS Stakeholder Engagement Work Group
- ECIDS Sustainability Work Group
- ECIDS All-Work-Group
- ECIDS Liaison/Project Managers

Key accomplishments for the year included:

- ✓ Identification and approval of additional Research questions.
- ✓ Completion of a cross-agency Master Data Sharing Agreement to streamline interagency data exchanges.
- ✓ Consensus on a technical solution for the ECIDS known as the Knowledge Base.
- ✓ Successful transmission of a DHS data extract to the ECIDS Knowledge Base (in the Test Environment).

### ***Internal DHS Analytic Agenda, Data Governance and Data System Activities***

During 2016, we were fortunate that key staffing remained predominantly stable. A replacement for our Research Analyst was filled quickly, with the former staff able to work closely with the staff newly assigned to this role and to provide ongoing assistance through the end of the year. This stability allowed us to make significant progress on our Analytic Agenda and Governance processes, which resulted in new analytic agenda practices that now integrate with our Data Governance Board. We also endeavored to align DHS internal processes with cross-agency ECIDS processes in order to streamline data requests for inter-agency analytic agenda questions.

Considerable time was spent by the Research Analyst interviewing DHS program area stakeholders to identify business needs and document Use Cases for the ECIDS, the Customer Hub and for a related Client Health Profile focusing on child health. The Research Analyst also expended considerable time and energy on the DCF Distinct Count effort to address an analytic question.

Internal progress was also made hardening Governance processes and procedures for data requests supporting the Analytic Agenda, in particular. In addition, processes surrounding the Division of Public Health (DPH) Data Governance board became operational after completing the on-boarding process for all DPH programs in 2016.

In terms of DHS Customer Hub development progress, 2016 saw demographic data from six program area data systems regularly feeding the Hub as proposed in our initial and supplemental RTT grant proposals. Additional refinements enhanced Customer Hub functionality. Two complete batches of Customer Hub `Golden Records' (made up of the most accurate/most recent demographic data from the six program area data systems) were extracted and submitted to the ECIDS Knowledge Base integrated data system that DPI has been developing and preparations were made for automated feeds to the Knowledge Base once that system is ready to receive them.

In addition, we initiated several data management and system security reviews and identified a number of enhancements, updates and tools that will make this system more secure and robust going forward. We began planning for those enhancements along with planning for adding data and datasets to the Customer Hub and planning for the Client Health Profile work to be completed in 2017.

Key accomplishments for the year included:

- ✓ Improved internal data governance processes.
- ✓ An updated internal Analytic Agenda.
- ✓ Obtained Office of Legal Counsel determination on whether data received from other data sources could be utilized to validate demographic information that the Division of Public Health uses.
- ✓ Documented business needs and Use Cases for the Customer Hub & Client Health Profile.
- ✓ Successful 'Go Live' deployment of the Customer Hub integrated data system into the Production environment by the identified due date.
- ✓ Planning for additional data sets to link to the Customer Hub.
- ✓ Planning for additional data elements to add to the Customer Hub.
- ✓ Ongoing stakeholder communications and engagement.
- ✓ Sustainability Planning.

## 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).

<b>Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income<sup>1</sup> families, by age</b>		
	<b>Number of children from Low-Income families in the State</b>	<b>Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State</b>
<b>Infants under age 1</b>	41,011	10%
<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	41,011	10%
<b>Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry</b>	94,326	23%
<b>Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families</b>	176,350	43%

<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

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

410,114 young children (under 6) in the state of Wisconsin as indicated by the National Center for Children in Poverty report last updated on April 6,2016.

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

The State should use these data to guide its thinking about where specific activities may be required to address special populations' unique 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>	15,440	3.8%
Are English learners <sup>2</sup>	1,527	0.4%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	2,952	0.7%
Are migrant <sup>3</sup>	33	0%
Are homeless <sup>4</sup>	469	0.1%
Are in foster care	2,417	0.6%
Other 1 as identified by the State	70	0.01%
<i>Describe:</i>	Are refugees	
Other 2 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		

<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**

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

410,114 young children (under 6) in the state of Wisconsin as indicated by the National Center for Children in Poverty report last updated on April 6,2016.

**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.

<b>Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age</b>				
<b>Type of Early Learning and Development Program</b>	<b>Infants under age 1</b>	<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	<b>Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	0	0	6,697	6,697
<i>Specify:</i>	State-funded preschool			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	ISES 2015-16 Count Day Data			
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	1,469	3,451	14,052	18,972
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Office of Head Start Program Information Report (PIR) 2016			
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b>	693	5,760	14,678	21,131
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	ISES 2015-16 Count Day Data and Birth to 3 Program Oct. 1 Child Count Report			
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b>	0	0	9,299	9,299
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	ISES 2015-16 Count Day Data			
<b>Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program</b>	8,059	11,932	9,679	29,661
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Child Care Universe in Webl (Wisconsin State Administrative Data).			
<b>Other 1</b>	1,336	1,040	219	2,595
<i>Specify:</i>	Home Visiting			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	SPHERE Database			
<b>Other 2</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>	Medicaid Therapy Services			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Medicaid Universe Database			
<b>Other 3</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>	Children's LTS Waivers (non-autism)			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Children's Long Term Waiver Database			
<b>Other 4</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>	Children's LTS Waivers (autism)			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Children's Long Term Waiver Database			
<b>Other 5</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				

**Table (A)(1)-3a - Additional Other rows**

<b>Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age</b>				
<b>Type of Early Learning and Development Program</b>	<b>Infants under age 1</b>	<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	<b>Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Other 6</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 7</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 8</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				

<sup>1</sup> Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

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

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

Data for Medicaid Therapy Services and Children's LTS Waivers (non-autism and autism) are no longer available.

**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.

Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Hispanic Children	Number of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Black or African American	Number of Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Number of Non-Hispanic White Children
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	8,701	637	2,665	8,010	61	2,726	41,741
<i>Specify:</i>	State-Funded Preschool						
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	3,769	1,368	701	5,000	10	1,314	6,147
<b>Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C</b>	950	126	174	660	16	103	4,311
<b>Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619</b>	1,959	240	415	1,296	17	610	10,140
<b>Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b>	5,454	503	1,171	5,936	42	1,375	23,370
<b>Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program</b>	5,737	765	686	18,655	73		13,367
<b>Other 1</b>	475	106	64	334	1	147	719
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting						
<b>Other 2</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.							



**Table (A)(1)-3b - Additional Other rows**

**Number of Children**

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Hispanic Children	Number of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Black or African American	Number of Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Number of Non-Hispanic White Children
<b>Other 3</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<b>Other 4</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<b>Other 5</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<b>Other 6</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<b>Other 7</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<b>Other 8</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							

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

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

Data is not collected on children of two or more races for children receiving CCDF funds.

Because of changes to the reporting tables in the EHS/HS PIR numbers may have significantly changed from last year.

**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.

Funding for each Fiscal Year					
Type of investment	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
<b>Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	\$5,775,000	\$5,775,000	\$6,200,000	\$6,200,000	\$6,200,000
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	\$148,350,000	\$162,350,000	\$169,000,000	\$180,240,000	\$189,600,000
<i>Specify:</i>	State School Aid Appropriation and 4K start up grants				
<b>State contributions to IDEA Part C</b>	\$20,968,343	\$23,158,380	\$21,256,965	\$21,082,198	\$21,624,000
<b>State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry</b>	\$14,914,061	\$14,866,070	\$15,165,582	\$14,824,522	\$14,327,240
<b>Total State contributions to CCDF<sup>2</sup></b>	\$28,849,400	\$28,849,400	\$28,849,400	\$28,849,400	\$28,849,400
<b>State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met</b>	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>					
<b>TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs<sup>3</sup></b>	\$217,030,087	\$161,334,925	\$170,666,677	\$174,263,010	\$175,521,190
<b>Other State contributions 1</b>	\$3,881,300	\$4,032,234	\$3,221,996		
<i>Specify:</i>	School Based Services				
<b>Other State contributions 2</b>	\$9,778,200	\$11,062,453	\$11,211,677	\$8,198,332	\$8,112,488
<i>Specify:</i>	MA Therapies				
<b>Other State contributions 3</b>	\$1,985,030			\$2,143,089	\$2,165,112
<i>Specify:</i>	CLTS Waivers				
<b>Other State contributions 4</b>	\$781,158	\$1,148,552	\$985,700	\$1,571,400	\$1,797,700
<i>Specify:</i>	Home Visiting				
<b>Other State contributions 5</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Other State contributions 6</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					

**Table (A)(1)-4 - Additional Other rows**

**Funding for each Fiscal Year**

Type of investment	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
<b>Other State contributions 7</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Other State contributions 8</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Total State contributions:</b>	<b>\$452,312,579</b>	<b>\$412,577,014</b>	<b>\$426,557,997</b>	<b>\$437,368,951</b>	<b>\$448,197,130</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.

We are unable to determine how School-Based services was collected initially or what program it refers to so we are unable to determine spending in 2016.

**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>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 One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b> <i>(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)</i>	46,914	48,590	47,844	56,008	60,662
<i>Specify:</i>	2014-15 school year				
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>2</sup></b> <i>(funded enrollment)</i>	19,302	19,920	15,869	15,440	18,972
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b> <i>(annual December 1 count)</i>	22,458	0	21,906	15,440	21,131
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b> <i>(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report )</i>	79,443	46,996	51,158	51,158	51,158
<b>Programs receiving CCDF funds</b> <i>(average monthly served)</i>	51,776	47,803	46,315	33,615	47,191
<b>Other 1</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 2</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 3</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 4</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 5</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 6</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 7</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 8</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					

<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.

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

Please place an "X" in the boxes to indicate where the State's Early Learning and Development Standards address the different age groups by Essential Domain of School Readiness.

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

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

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

No changes occurred in 2015.

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

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

Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
State-funded preschool					X
<i>Specify:</i>					
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	X	X	X	X	
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	X	X		X	
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	X	X			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	X	X			
Programs receiving CCDF funds	X	X	X		
Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier)	X	X	X		
Tier 1					
Tier 2	X	X	X		
Tier 3	X	X	X		
Tier 4	X	X	X	X	
Tier 5	X	X	X	X	
State licensing requirements	X	X	X	X	X
Other 1	X		X	X	
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting				
Other 2					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 3					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 4					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 5					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.					

**Table (A)(1)-7 - Additional Other rows**

Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
<b>Other 6</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 7</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 8</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					

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

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

There were no changes in 2016.



## Budget and Expenditures

### 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.

All ten projects are moving forward with spending as expected and there are no current concerns about our ability to complete the grant activities and spend the remaining funds.

Just before the fourth quarter of 2015 the entire state of Wisconsin made a change in accounting systems. The new system has resulted in a change to the way spending is tracked and reported. Delays in accounting were and remain significant while new tracking systems and reports are put in place. Therefore, budget figures reported often do not reflect actual spending. Currently a very significant delay can exist between spending, accounting, and reporting. In addition a number of RTT ELC projects are administered by state agencies other than DCF and invoicing periods can vary, adding to the delay between spending and accounting.

### Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2017 budget that was submitted as part of the no cost extension process. For the most part we were able to anticipate funds that would not be spent in 2016 and allocate them to projects in 2017 as part of the no cost extension process in 2016.

If there are underspent amounts from salary or related costs in 2016 that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2017 they will be used to expand or strengthen activities in the same project. If necessary, the team will solicit approval through the established budget amendment process for any changes to fund allocation.

## **Project Budget 1**

**Project Name: Overall Grants Management**

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Spending on projects related to tribal communities and the public private partnerships were both well underway at the end of 2016.  
Some funds in this project are being impacted by accounting delays described in the summary section.

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

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2017 budget.

## Project Budget 2

**Project Name:** YoungStar Training and Technical Assistance

---

### Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

All funds in this project are either spent or obligated in contracts for activities implemented in 2016 or planned for 2017.  
There was some staff turnover that delayed spending in salary and related budget lines in 2016 for this project.  
Some funds in this project are being impacted by accounting delays described in the summary section.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2017 budget.  
The underspent funds related to staff turnover will be reallocated to strengthen activities in the same project and will be described in the established budget amendment process.

### **Project Budget 3**

**Project Name:** Increase YoungStar Participation

---

#### **Project Budget Narrative**

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

All funds in this project are either spent or obligated in contracts for activities implemented in 2016 or planned for 2017.  
Some funds in this project are being impacted by accounting delays described in the summary section.

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

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

As per the no cost extension application funds from this project have been moved to a different project for 2017.

## **Project Budget 4**

**Project Name:** Increase YoungStar Participation of High Needs Children

### **Project Budget Narrative**

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

All funds in this project were obligated in contracts and spent by the end of 2016.

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

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

This project was completed in 2016.

## Project Budget 5

**Project Name:** Increase Quality of YoungStar Program via Scholarships, Training and Bonuses

---

### Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

All funds in this project are either spent or obligated in contracts for activities implemented in 2016 or planned for 2017.  
There was some staff turnover that delayed spending in salary and related budget lines in 2016 for this project.  
Some funds in this project are being impacted by accounting delays described in the summary section.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2017 budget.  
The underspent funds related to staff turnover will be reallocated to strengthen activities in the same project and will be described in the established budget amendment process.

**Project Budget 6**

**Project Name:** YoungStar Validation Study

---

**Project Budget Narrative**

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

All funds originally allocated in this project were spent in 2016.

**Project Budget Explanation of Changes**

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Some funds were added to this project as part of the no cost extension application. No additional changes for 2017 are expected.

## **Project Budget 7**

**Project Name:** Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

All funds in this project are either spent or obligated in contracts for activities implemented in 2016 or planned for 2017.  
Some funds in this project are being impacted by accounting delays described in the summary section.

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

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2017 budget.



## **Project Budget 8**

**Project Name:** Family Engagement

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

All funds in this project are either spent or obligated in contracts for activities implemented in 2016 or planned for 2017.  
Some funds in this project are being impacted by accounting delays described in the summary section.

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

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2017 budget.

## **Project Budget 9**

**Project Name: Professional Development**

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

All funds in this project are either spent or obligated in contracts for activities implemented in 2016 or planned for 2017.  
Some funds in this project are being impacted by accounting delays described in the summary section.

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

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2017 budget.

## **Project Budget 10**

**Project Name:** Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

All funds in this project are either spent or obligated in contracts for activities implemented in 2016 or planned for 2017.  
There was some staff turnover that delayed spending in salary and related budget lines in 2016 for this project.  
Some funds in this project are being impacted by accounting delays described in the summary section.

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

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2017 budget.  
The underspent funds related to staff turnover will be reallocated to strengthen activities in the same project and will be described in the established budget amendment process.

**Project Budget 11**

**Project Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

***WISCONSIN'S RTT-ELC APPLICATION INCLUDED 10 PROJECTS.  
PAGES 92-110 HAVE BEEN DELETED.***

### RTT-ELC Summary of Actual Expenditures

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$140,392.00	\$393,386.00	\$504,967.00	\$355,333.00	\$1,394,078.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$64,614.00	\$194,192.00	\$213,473.00	\$128,985.00	\$601,264.00
3. Travel	\$7,348.00	\$13,262.00	\$14,131.00	\$18,602.00	\$53,343.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$348,425.00	\$9,956.00	\$358,381.00
5. Supplies	\$78,040.00	\$253,817.00	\$283,849.00	\$149,730.00	\$765,436.00
6. Contractual	\$440,876.00	\$3,086,063.00	\$4,530,071.00	\$3,995,728.00	\$12,052,738.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$684.00	\$0.00	\$684.00
8. Other	\$1,661.00	\$4,703.00	\$27,175.00	\$88,563.00	\$122,102.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$732,931.00	\$3,945,423.00	\$5,922,775.00	\$4,746,897.00	\$15,348,026.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$2,137.00	\$5,571.00	\$29,245.00	\$89,101.00	\$126,054.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$1,290,935.00	\$1,961,272.00	\$1,497,153.00	\$924,843.00	\$5,674,203.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$1,226.00	\$12,854.00	\$46,050.00	\$27,776.00	\$87,906.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$2,027,229.00	\$5,925,120.00	\$7,495,223.00	\$5,788,617.00	\$21,236,189.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,023,665.00	\$1,167,914.00	\$560,941.00	\$0.00	\$2,752,520.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$3,050,894.00	\$7,093,034.00	\$8,056,164.00	\$5,788,617.00	\$23,988,709.00

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.

**Actual Expenditures for Grant Management**

<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	\$65,034.00	\$86,244.00	\$93,663.00	\$44,900.00	\$289,841.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$26,101.00	\$43,231.00	\$42,177.00	\$19,381.00	\$130,890.00
3. Travel	\$1,706.00	\$1,701.00	\$3,249.00	\$4,563.00	\$11,219.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$24,479.00	\$37,908.00	\$42,476.00	\$23,619.00	\$128,482.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$3,169.00	\$132,691.00	\$437,864.00	\$573,724.00
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)	\$117,320.00	\$172,253.00	\$314,256.00	\$530,327.00	\$1,134,156.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$173.00	\$302.00	\$2,775.00	\$6,403.00	\$9,653.00
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	\$1,226.00	\$12,854.00	\$46,050.00	\$27,776.00	\$87,906.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$118,719.00	\$185,409.00	\$363,081.00	\$564,506.00	\$1,231,715.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$16,857.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$16,857.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$135,576.00	\$185,409.00	\$363,081.00	\$564,506.00	\$1,248,572.00

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.

**Actual Expenditures for Project 1 - B(1)**

<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	\$14,942.00	\$71,953.00	\$51,202.00	\$49,626.00	\$187,723.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$5,997.00	\$36,068.00	\$14,694.00	\$21,421.00	\$78,180.00
3. Travel	\$1,138.00	\$2,223.00	\$461.00	\$3,083.00	\$6,905.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$11,141.00	\$61,523.00	\$39,128.00	\$25,857.00	\$137,649.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$21,817.00	\$32,134.00	\$43,768.00	\$97,719.00
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)	\$33,218.00	\$193,584.00	\$137,619.00	\$143,755.00	\$508,176.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$80.00	\$475.00	\$219.00	\$0.00	\$774.00
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
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$33,298.00	\$194,059.00	\$137,838.00	\$143,755.00	\$508,950.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$384,396.00	\$344,145.00	\$287,563.00	\$0.00	\$1,016,104.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$417,694.00	\$538,204.00	\$425,401.00	\$143,755.00	\$1,525,054.00

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.

**Actual Expenditures for Project 3 - B(2)**

<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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$4,703.00	\$8,441.00	\$2,748.00	\$15,892.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$4,703.00	\$8,441.00	\$2,748.00	\$15,892.00
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
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$4,703.00	\$8,441.00	\$2,748.00	\$15,892.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$4,703.00	\$8,441.00	\$2,748.00	\$15,892.00

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.



**Actual Expenditures for Project 4 - B(3)**

<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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$1,598.00	\$235,821.00	\$166,242.00	\$274,888.00	\$678,549.00
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)	\$1,598.00	\$235,821.00	\$166,242.00	\$274,888.00	\$678,549.00
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
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$1,598.00	\$235,821.00	\$166,242.00	\$274,888.00	\$678,549.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,598.00	\$235,821.00	\$166,242.00	\$274,888.00	\$678,549.00

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.

**Actual Expenditures for Project 5 - B(4)**

<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	\$40,250.00	\$102,821.00	\$69,103.00	\$127,890.00	\$340,064.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$16,154.00	\$51,540.00	\$29,938.00	\$39,561.00	\$137,193.00
3. Travel	\$2,612.00	\$5,171.00	\$2,303.00	\$3,817.00	\$13,903.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$21,208.00	\$64,307.00	\$42,262.00	\$51,306.00	\$179,083.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$735,840.00	\$1,555,307.00	\$1,544,151.00	\$3,835,298.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$684.00	\$0.00	\$684.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$80,224.00	\$959,679.00	\$1,699,597.00	\$1,766,725.00	\$4,506,225.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$151.00	\$505.00	\$219.00	\$0.00	\$875.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$1,290,935.00	\$1,961,272.00	\$1,489,153.00	\$694,954.00	\$5,436,314.00
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)	\$1,371,310.00	\$2,921,456.00	\$3,188,969.00	\$2,461,679.00	\$9,943,414.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,371,310.00	\$2,921,456.00	\$3,188,969.00	\$2,461,679.00	\$9,943,414.00

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.

**Actual Expenditures for Project 6 - B(5)**

<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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$517,642.00	\$107,358.00	\$50,000.00	\$675,000.00
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	\$517,642.00	\$107,358.00	\$50,000.00	\$675,000.00
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
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$517,642.00	\$107,358.00	\$50,000.00	\$675,000.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$35,919.00	\$539,391.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$575,310.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$35,919.00	\$1,057,033.00	\$107,358.00	\$50,000.00	\$1,250,310.00

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.

**Actual Expenditures for Project 7 - C(1)**

<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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$653.00	\$0.00	\$653.00
6. Contractual	\$11,605.00	\$147,523.00	\$203,267.00	\$111,350.00	\$473,745.00
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)	\$11,605.00	\$147,523.00	\$203,920.00	\$111,350.00	\$474,398.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$1,728.00	\$5,500.00	\$0.00	\$7,228.00
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
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$11,605.00	\$149,251.00	\$209,420.00	\$111,350.00	\$481,626.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$244,560.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$244,560.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$256,165.00	\$149,251.00	\$209,420.00	\$111,350.00	\$726,186.00

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.

**Actual Expenditures for Project 8 - C(4)**

<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	\$20,166.00	\$55,165.00	\$72,327.00	\$8,572.00	\$156,230.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$16,362.00	\$29,033.00	\$36,049.00	\$3,483.00	\$84,927.00
3. Travel	\$1,757.00	\$3,712.00	\$1,028.00	\$0.00	\$6,497.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$21,212.00	\$37,470.00	\$48,140.00	\$0.00	\$106,822.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$12,527.00	\$97,300.00	\$241,195.00	\$351,022.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$17,637.00	\$70,263.00	\$87,900.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$59,497.00	\$137,907.00	\$272,481.00	\$323,513.00	\$793,398.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$120.00	\$661.00	\$3,967.00	\$0.00	\$4,748.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$169,864.00	\$169,864.00
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)	\$59,617.00	\$138,568.00	\$276,448.00	\$493,377.00	\$968,010.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$59,617.00	\$138,568.00	\$276,448.00	\$493,377.00	\$968,010.00

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.

**Actual Expenditures for Task 9 - D(2)**

<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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$2,495.00	\$0.00	\$2,495.00
6. Contractual	\$65,482.00	\$115,853.00	\$208,211.00	\$46,583.00	\$436,129.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,239.00	\$14,239.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$65,482.00	\$115,853.00	\$210,706.00	\$60,822.00	\$452,863.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,550.00	\$0.00	\$3,550.00
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
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$65,482.00	\$115,853.00	\$214,256.00	\$60,822.00	\$456,413.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$72,748.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$72,748.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$138,230.00	\$115,853.00	\$214,256.00	\$60,822.00	\$529,161.00

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.

**Actual Expenditures for Task 10 - E(2)**

<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	\$77,203.00	\$218,672.00	\$124,345.00	\$420,220.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$34,320.00	\$90,615.00	\$45,139.00	\$170,074.00
3. Travel	\$135.00	\$455.00	\$7,090.00	\$7,139.00	\$14,819.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$348,425.00	\$9,956.00	\$358,381.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$52,609.00	\$108,695.00	\$48,948.00	\$210,252.00
6. Contractual	\$362,191.00	\$1,295,871.00	\$2,027,561.00	\$1,245,929.00	\$4,931,552.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$1,661.00	\$0.00	\$1,097.00	\$1,313.00	\$4,071.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$363,987.00	\$1,460,458.00	\$2,802,155.00	\$1,482,769.00	\$6,109,369.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$1,613.00	\$1,900.00	\$13,015.00	\$82,698.00	\$99,226.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$8,000.00	\$60,025.00	\$68,025.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$365,600.00	\$1,462,358.00	\$2,823,170.00	\$1,625,492.00	\$6,276,620.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$269,185.00	\$284,378.00	\$273,378.00	\$0.00	\$826,941.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$634,785.00	\$1,746,736.00	\$3,096,548.00	\$1,625,492.00	\$7,103,561.00

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.