Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge Review

Technical Review Form Page

Application # HI-5010

Peer Reviewer: [redacted]
Lead Monitor:
Support Monitor:
Application Status: **Reviewed**
Date/Time: **11/18/2011 - 12:30 AM**

CORE AREAS (A) and (B)

States must address in their application all of the selection criteria in the Core Areas.

A. Successful State Systems

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Demonstrating past commitment to early learning and development	**20**	**16**

The extent to which the State has demonstrated past commitment to and investment in high-quality, accessible Early Learning and Development Programs and services for Children with High Needs, as evidenced by the State's--

(a) Financial investment, from January 2007 to the present, in Early Learning and Development Programs, including the amount of these investments in relation to the size of the State's population of Children with High Needs during this time period;

(b) Increasing, from January 2007 to the present, the number of Children with High Needs participating in Early Learning and Development Programs;

(c) Existing early learning and development legislation, policies, or practices; and

(d) Current status in key areas that form the building blocks for a high quality early learning and development system, including Early Learning and Development Standards, Comprehensive Assessment Systems, health promotion practices, family engagement strategies, the development of Early Childhood Educators, Kindergarten Entry Assessments, and effective data practices.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (A)(1)

(a)The State demonstrates a commitment to and investment in high quality accessible ELD programs and services for children with high needs.Evidence to support this commitment includes, in 2010 the total early childhood expenditures in the State amounted to approximately $200M; of which the State invested a total of $73.3M, or about 37% if all early childhood expenditures. Table (A)(1)-4 provided details related to the type of investment during a five year period. Data was not available in some categories, and narrative contributions of the State did not appear to be matched with Table summaries.(b) Table (A)(1)-3 provides data that addresses the number and percentage of children participating in Early Learning and Development programs, including, children with disabilities, English learners, children residing on Indian lands; migrant children, homeless, children in foster care; and children at-risk of developmental delay as examples. Data is derived from Hawaii Child Count, University of Hawaii Family Homeless Study, Department of Education, and DHS Child welfare Services. Applicant data substantiate its priority for service to a special population of children who are of native ancestry and make up 21.3% of the High Need Children. (c)The State describes a EC reform agenda that is seeking to implement, Early Learning and Development Standards (ELDS) state wide into the early learning and development (ELD) system. The governor has presented an early childhood policy plan that will include the establishment of a Department of Early Childhood to coordinate and integrate activities that are currently the responsibility of different public agencies. One of those agencies is the State Advisory Council (SAC)—the developer of Hawaii's Framework for a Comprehensive Early Childhood System. A strength is the state's position to create an office within state government for Early Childhood programs. This effort is in its design and formation stage and this effects the governance of tasks that are still in draft form. While the DHS is the Lead Agency, the decision-making process appears to be shared by the HSAC and the yet to be established Department of Early Childhood. The complexities of this governance structure, multiple relationships, raise questions as how the RTT-ELC Challenge Grant will be managed and in which department final decisions are made. The state provides adequate evidence of early learning and development legislation, policies and practices—including the creation of the 21 member public-private Hawaii Early Childhood Career Development Coalition formed in 1996, and the 2011 Executive Order establishing the Interdepartmental Council on Early Childhood Education and an Executive Order assigning

the responsibility for Hawaii's early learning system-building efforts to the Hawaii SAC. ELD legislation supports policies and comprehensive practices that cross departments and demonstrates the state's commitment to ELD programs and services for children. The applicant lists the Departments of Education, Human Services, and Health as State government supports to EC issues, as well as the University of Hawaii System.(d) The applicant's Hawaii Early Learning and Development Standards (ELDS)"draft" completed in 2011 by a workgroup of early childhood professionals. The current status of the state in key areas for creating a high quality early learning and development is in draft form. The ELDS draft is pending endorsement by the State SAC. The foundation in which the Hawaii TQRIS will be built is being provided by the Hawaii Early Childhood Accreditation Project (HECAP), this considered as evidence of high quality. HECAP accreditation standards provide researched based guidelines which are significant for validation. Licensed center-based and family child care programs will not be a party until January 2012. An initial assessment of this pilot is scheduled for March 2012, followed by 18 months of field testing quality improvement supports. Hawaii contends that its TQRIS design includes all of the elements of a comprehensive assessment system through which programs are organized into five tiers of quality according to five tiers of quality and supported to advance to higher tiers. The "Table of Contents" to the TQRIS is provided in the Appendices of the application. The State of Hawaii provides an overview of its health promotion, family engagement, professional development, kindergarten assessment and data practices. The status of these building blocks for high quality early learning and development systems is currently non-operational.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Articulating the State's rationale for its early learning and development reform agenda and goals.	20	15

The extent to which the State clearly articulates a comprehensive early learning and development reform agenda that is ambitious yet achievable, builds on the State's progress to date (as demonstrated in selection criterion (A)(1)), is most likely to result in improved school readiness for Children with High Needs, and includes--

(a) Ambitious yet achievable goals for improving program quality, improving outcomes for Children with High Needs statewide, and closing the readiness gap between Children with High Needs and their peers;

(b) An overall summary of the State Plan that clearly articulates how the High-Quality Plans proposed under each selection criterion, when taken together, constitute an effective reform agenda that establishes a clear and credible path toward achieving these goals; and

(c) A specific rationale that justifies the State's choice to address the selected criteria in each Focused Investment Area (C), (D), and (E), including why these selected criteria will best achieve these goals.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (A)(2)

(a) The proposed design of the State of Hawaii's RTT-ELC application and reform agenda appears to be two-fold: (1) to leverage RTT-ELC funding to accelerate the creation of a high quality ELD system, and (2) to focus on supporting children with high needs and their families in Hawaii's rural areas.Goals identified to support this agenda include (1)Culturally responsive and developmentally appropriate programs(2)Develop and implement a state wide tiered quality rating as examples. These goals are ambitious and achievable and will help close the readiness cap.(b) In the first interest area, the State application describes its High Quality State Plan as requiring "vertical" alignment across its "provision for early learning (P-20) beyond kindergarten to grade 12 educational system"; and "horizontal" alignment across the various State and private sectors "where all systems work together to promote the healthy development and well-being of keiki (children) ages 0-5 and their families. Throughout the application, the State of Hawaii frequently refers to strong ethnic diversity and the need to give "priority to evidence-based culturally competent strategies and practices for reaching and engaging rural families and ELD providers in the communities where they live. With all of the factors referred to above, the highlights of the State's reform agenda are as follows: • The application notes the Governor's " Plan for a New Day in Hawaii" as evidence of his commitment to strengthen Hawaii's ELD system—which includes the appointment of a Cabinet-level EC Coordinator within the Governor's Policy Office. The intended change in the perception and value of ELD at an institutional level permeates the application—is a clear strength, yet also presents new challenges relate to managing institutional change. • The Hawaii SAC Framework for a Comprehensive Early Childhood System, Hawaii's "promotes the TQRIS as the foundation of an effective standards-based system". The proposal presents an ambitious plan to launch its efforts on each of the four major Hawaiian Islands in the form of Professional Development • An innovative feature in the application is to start the initiative in four of Hawaii's highest need communities—one on each of the four largest islands. The state selected Foucsed Investment areas based on the fact that rural communities, with high ethnic diversity—including high percentages of Native Hawaiians—report larger readiness gap between new kindergarten students in rural areas compared to over all state figures. There will be challenges associated to starting this initiative in areas that have limited resources. The rationale for selection of these criterion was adequate.For example,Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for children in the rural areas and islands of the state.

	Available	Score
(A)(3) Aligning and coordinating early learning and development across the State	10	5

The extent to which the State has established, or has a High-Quality Plan to establish, strong participation and commitment in the State Plan by Participating State Agencies and other early learning and development stakeholders by--

(a) Demonstrating how the Participating State Agencies and other partners, if any, will identify a governance structure for working together that will facilitate interagency coordination, streamline decision making, effectively allocate resources, and create long-term sustainability and describing--

(1) The organizational structure for managing the grant and how it builds upon existing interagency governance structures such as children's cabinets, councils, and commissions, if any already exist and are effective;

(2) The governance-related roles and responsibilities of the Lead Agency, the State Advisory Council, each Participating State Agency, the State's Interagency Coordinating Council for part C of IDEA, and other partners, if any;

(3) The method and process for making different types of decisions (e.g., policy, operational) and resolving disputes; and

(4) The plan for when and how the State will involve 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 planning and implementation of the activities carried out under the grant;

(b) Demonstrating that the Participating State Agencies are strongly committed to the State Plan, to the governance structure of the grant, and to effective implementation of the State Plan, by including in the MOU or other binding agreement between the State and each Participating State Agency--

(1) Terms and conditions that reflect a strong commitment to the State Plan by each Participating State Agency, including terms and conditions designed to align and leverage the Participating State Agencies' existing funding to support the State Plan;

(2) "Scope-of-work" descriptions that require each Participating State Agency to implement all applicable portions of the State Plan and a description of efforts to maximize the number of Early Learning and Development Programs that become Participating Programs; and

(3) A signature from an authorized representative of each Participating State Agency; and

(c) Demonstrating commitment to the State Plan from a broad group of stakeholders that will assist the State in reaching the ambitious yet achievable goals outlined in response to selection criterion (A)(2)(a), including by obtaining--

(1) Detailed and persuasive letters of intent or support from Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, and, if applicable, local early learning councils; and

(2) Letters of intent or support from such other stakeholders as Early Childhood Educators or their representatives; the State's legislators; local community leaders; State or local school boards; representatives of private and faith-based early learning programs; other State and local leaders (e.g., business, community, tribal, civil rights, education association leaders); adult education and family literacy State and local leaders; family and community organizations (e.g., parent councils, nonprofit organizations, local foundations, tribal organizations, and community-based organizations); libraries and children's museums; health providers; and postsecondary institutions.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (A)(3)

The State of Hawaii presents a single signed and dated Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) and Scopes of Work between five designated participating agencies: Department of Human Services (DHS), Department of Education (DOE), Department of Health (DOH), University of Hawaii (UH), and the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations (DLIR). The MOU certifies and represents an agreement with the Lead Agency to share data, and does not outline additional agreements, to partner responsibly for implementing portions of the State Plan. A chart on page 1 of the application outlines potential MOU agreements within various State Departments; however, there is at this time, no evidence in the proposal of a binding agreement between these agencies to (a) a set of statewide Early Learning and Development Standards; (b) statewide Program Standards; (c) a statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System; and, (d) a statewide workforce knowledge and competency framework and progression of credentials. It is clear that the State is in a phase of transitioning from planning and has not yet fully formed or implemented signed interdepartmental agreements. The Governor's new Early Childhood Coordinator, the lead in developing the RTT-ETC application is not a signature in the any of the references to roles and responsibilities. Two Organizational Charts are provided in the Appendices. One Organizational Chart describes an Office of Early Childhood (OEC) Structure, as a goal that may not be legislated or fully operational until 2015. The Hawaii State Advisory Council does not have the Early Childhood Coordinator, listed as a member, however in the narrative, the State EC Coordinator will lead an Executive Management Team (EMT), composed of the chair of the Hawaii SAC and Cabinet level leaders from participating State agencies. In the first organizational chart, the Lead Agency, DHS, is presented inline with all other departments, including the OEC. The structure, roles and responsibilities of the Excutive Management Team (EMT) appears to be highly participatory and may use a consensus form of management to make decisions and form directions for the RTT-ELC and other EC systems supports. Further detail is needed to understand how decisions within this group are made to

carryout an aligned and coordinated early learning system statewide. In the second organizational chart, the Governor's Coordinator leads the EMT and has additional staffing that will conduct RTT-ELC related tasks. Again, this detail is supportive of oversight and accountability for RTT-ELC funds and activities, however, it is also at a conceptual phase. A strength in the proposal is its description of a decision-making matrix patterned off the Decision Rights and Accountability Sample. However, it is not clear that consensus on the selection of a conflict resolution process has been presented and agreed upon by all levels of the proposed project—interdepartmental, within stakeholders and community partners. The organizational structure is confusing and circuitous. The proposed structure lacks clarity in defining which agency, or individual is the decision maker. (3b) The signature of the Governor of the State of Hawaii is present in the application. Signatures of participating State Agencies, (including a chart denoting corresponding scope of work), are present in the application including the Hawaii Department of Human Services (Lead Agency), and authorized representatives from Participating Agencies, including: Department of Education, Department of Health, University of Hawaii, and the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations. The proposed governance is a weakness in the plan.There appears to be no one final authority. (c1) Fourteen individual Letters of Intent from Early Learning Intermediary Organizations are present to document each member's commitment to develop, design and implement features of the State's quality rating and improvement system (TQRIS) and support the needs of families and children for high-quality child care centers and family child care programs. (c2) Additionally, 60 Letters of Support (p 68 and Appendices) were present in the application, covering a wide span of Early Childhood and community stakeholders required, or suggested in the RTT-ELC application instructions. Overall these letters respresent strong commitment and support from abroad group of stakeholders.

	Available	Score
(A)(4) Developing a budget to implement and sustain the work of this grant.	15	6

The extent to which the State Plan--

(a) Demonstrates how the State will use existing funds that support early learning and development from Federal, State, private, and local sources (e.g., CCDF; Title I and II of ESEA; IDEA; Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Program; State preschool; Head Start Collaboration and State Advisory Council funding; Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program; Title V MCH Block Grant; TANF; Medicaid; child welfare services under Title IV (B) and (E) of the Social Security Act; Statewide Longitudinal Data System; foundation; other private funding sources) for activities and services that help achieve the outcomes in the State Plan, including how the quality set-asides in CCDF will be used;

(b) Describes, in both the budget tables and budget narratives, how the State will effectively and efficiently use funding from this grant to achieve the outcomes in the State Plan, in a manner that--

(1) Is adequate to support the activities described in the State Plan;

(2) Includes costs that are reasonable and necessary in relation to the objectives, design, and significance of the activities described in the State Plan and the number of children to be served; and

(3) Details the amount of funds budgeted for Participating State Agencies, localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, or other partners, and the specific activities to be implemented with these funds consistent with the State Plan, and demonstrates that a significant amount of funding will be devoted to the local implementation of the State Plan; and

(c) Demonstrates that it can be sustained after the grant period ends to ensure that the number and percentage of Children with High Needs served by Early Learning and Development Programs in the State will be maintained or expanded.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (A)(4)

The State of Hawaii is requesting a total of $49, 965,623 in Federal RTT-ELC funds. The proposed Plan describes all elements of the grant requirement and demonstrates how the State will use existing funds that support early learning and development from Federal, State, private, and local sources. The plan offers budget tables, describes grant activities (including the number of children to be served); and details the amount of funds budgeted for Participating State Agencies, localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners Private funders have committed $826,330,and the State General Fund will provide $425,000. The plan offer ideas as to how RTT-ELC efforts can be sustained after the grant period ends. The strengths of the State of Hawaii Budget Plan include: • The State of Hawaii is involved in an Early Childhood Fiscal Mapping Project to identify alternative funding steams to support and sustain RTT-ELC efforts. • The State is actively engaging EC leaders to create synergy around EC initiatives and legislative efforts to reform the State's EC organizational structure and program supports. • Legislative efforts to "Prevent Loss of ECE Access for Late-born Five year-olds" and the Sugar Sweetened Beverage Tax Bill are examples of a highly engaged EC community. Tax revenues for the latter campaign have been earmarked to support and promote EC development.

B. High-Quality, Accountable Programs

	Available	Score

(B)(1) Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	10	4

The extent to which the State and its Participating State Agencies have developed and adopted, or have a High-Quality Plan to develop and adopt, a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System that--

(a) Is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards that include--

(1) Early Learning and Development Standards;

(2) A Comprehensive Assessment System;

(3) Early Childhood Educator qualifications;

(4) Family engagement strategies;

(5) Health promotion practices; and

(6) Effective data practices;

(b) Is clear and has standards that are measurable, meaningfully differentiate program quality levels, and reflect high expectations of program excellence commensurate with nationally recognized standards that lead to improved learning outcomes for children; and

(c) Is linked to the State licensing system for Early Learning and Development Programs.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(1)

The state's narrative provides evidence of a Plan to adopt a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System. The TQRIS is based on statewide set of practices for improving child outcomes. The State will use the Kindergarten Entry Assessment as a tool of measurement. In January 2012, Hawaii will launch its TQRIS as an initial pilot targeting rural communities on four of its islands. These rural communities are described as having relatively few resources and high challenges. The state's rationale for targeting these communities is that the evaluation of the pilot programs will inform and provide a basis for developing effective models that can be replicated in other communities. According to the state, the TQRIS pilot will include a sample of DHS licensed infant/toddler classrooms, preschool classrooms, Head Start and Early Head Start centers, classrooms, Hawaiian language-based centers, and family child care homes. The DHS has been responsible for developing, piloting and refining components of the TQRIS. DHS through its Quality Care Program for Center-based and Home-based Programs (QCP) has lead responsibility for developing definitions for each tier in each standard area. The Hawaii SAC has the responsibility for endorsing the five program standards addressed by the TQRIS, including, Early Childhood Care and Education, Diversity and Inclusion, Program Design and Management, Family Engagement, and Staff Qualification. The strengths and challenges of the pre-pilot plan include: The State provides examples of curriculum-based assessments, standardized tools, and child development screening that are culturally and linguistically appropriate to Hawaii assessors and children. A weakness in the response is the absence of assessment frequency and the provision of a link between the assessment process and instructional improvements to make certain children are on developmentally on track. The State TQRIS Plan in the area of Early Childhood Qualifications employs a Voluntary State Registry that is used to verify credentials and education attainment of center-based DHS licensed program staff. The applicant does not provide information as to how the State standards and TQRIS Plan are aligned to professional development, training, credentialing and certification throughout the EC system. The "voluntary" aspect of the registry is not fully explained. • The State TQRIS Plan in the area of Family Engagement Strategies presents one applicable program example of how family engagement will be promoted in the context of the TQRIS. The Learning to Grow project sponsored by the University of Hawaii Medical Center will offer training workshops for EC educators and family service practitioners. The weakness of this plan is the consideration of bi-directional strategies between families and programs. Within the application, there are few examples of on-going two-way communication with families, or how the TQRIS standards will address strategies to improve parent understanding of quality standards, options and services. • The State TQRIS Plan in the area of Health Promotion state that only DHS-licensed centers or FCC homes will participate in the TQRIS pilot. The applicant lists the alignment with DHS requirements; however, the Plan does not address how programs will implement curricula to support wellness, healthy lifestyles, and culturally responsive health interventions. Given the health related challenges provided in other sections of the application, this is an area in the TQRIS that should be highlighted and articulated. • The State TQRIS Plan in the area of Data Practices reviews the current system and speaks to the TQRIS Plan to enhance its data management system and practices. This section does not address how programs will be supported in using data for planning, evaluating and adapting program practices, and upgrading local systems with confidentiality protocols and improvements in program-level technology (hardware, software, training and technical assistance).The State TQRIS program utilizes a rating system to ensure quality across system elements. Meeting DHS licensing standards is a prerequisite to participate in the TQRIS program.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Promoting participation in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	15	8

The extent to which the State has maximized, or has a High-Quality Plan to maximize, program participation in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by--

(a) Implementing effective policies and practices to reach the goal of having all publicly funded Early Learning and Development Programs participate in such a system, including programs in each of the following categories--

(1) State-funded preschool programs;

(2) Early Head Start and Head Start programs;

(3) Early Learning and Development Programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA;

(4) Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of the ESEA; and

(5) Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program;

(b) Implementing effective policies and practices designed to help more families afford high-quality child care and maintain the supply of high-quality child care in areas with high concentrations of Children with High Needs (e.g., maintaining or increasing subsidy reimbursement rates, taking actions to ensure affordable co-payments, providing incentives to high-quality providers to participate in the subsidy program); and

(c) Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for the numbers and percentages of Early Learning and Development Programs that will participate in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by type of Early Learning and Development Program (as listed in (B)(2)(a)(1) through (5) above).

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(2)

The applicant describes the role of the Hawaii SAC in coordinating TQRIS efforts statewide and creating a Quality Improvement Workgroup to facilitate the creation of TQRIS components in four settings: (1) DHS licensed programs; (2) DHS licensed-exempt programs (3) home visiting programs; and (4) family-child interaction programs funded through the Native Hawaiian Education Act. The state proposes using RTT-ELC funds to budget a full time TQRIS facilitator and (3) TQRIS specialist. Details regarding the roles and responsibilities of these positions is provided. According to the OEC Organizational Chart, these new positions would report to the Senior Program Manger, a position in the Program Management Team. In the states response they are attempting to show cooperation and particition among the key players. The Plan, however, does not provide sufficient enough detail to understand how TQRIS will be recognized and adopted as a framework for quality improvement across all sectors of the early learning and development system. In each of the categories of programs (e.g., 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 the ESEA; and Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program) the applicant does not provide information as to how the State and program will collaboratively set goals for participation in the TQRIS system; are supported to improve program quality; or, clarification as to how TQRIS levels may support special entry when the standards of categorical programs are aligned with the ELDS and TQRIS system. The Quality Plan identifies the lack of available child care programs in areas outside of urban Honolulu. Unmet need for child care ranges from 54% to 44% in some rural areas. The Quality Plan does not provide estimates of the percent of ELD programs participating in TQRIS, with only Head Start and Programs funded by IDEA Part B, participating in calendar year 2012.The use of effective policies and practices was not apparent. Full program participation will not begin until 2015. The method by which targeted participation in TQRIS by program category is calculated is not provided.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs	15	8

The extent to which the State and its Participating State Agencies have developed and implemented, or have a High-Quality Plan to develop and implement, a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by--

(a) Using a valid and reliable tool for monitoring such programs, having trained monitors whose ratings have an acceptable level of inter-rater reliability, and monitoring and rating the Early Learning and Development Programs with appropriate frequency; and

(b) Providing 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) and making 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.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(3)

The applicant provides a description of its High Quality Rating Plan for licensed centers and Family Child Care(FCC) enrolled in the TQRIS pilot. Protocols to ensure reliability; assignment of assessors and assessor anchors; systematic procedures for training and assessing the reliability of assessors; and frequency of assessments are detailed. The State puts forth ideas on public outreach strategies to be employed during the pilot phase, including internet posting of TQRIS rating and licensing information using two websites, a TQRIS specific website (sponsorship not named) and the Resource and Referral website operated by PATCH. (a)The state will use several assessment tools such as, Classroom Assesment Scoring System, Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised, and Family Childcare Environment Rating Scale. Established procedures will be used for training and assessing the reliability of the QRIS Assessors.(b)Two websites will be used,one will be a TQRIS specific website for parents and providers to look up information on programs and their ratings. A second will be for Resourse and Referral. The overall proposal is heavily invested in inter-departmental supports, yet the State of Hawaii did not expand upon how its Quality Plan would provide a cohesive platform to engage parents in understanding their role in making decisions about how to use the TQRIS and licensing information to make appropriate decisions about finding the right option for their keiki. The State did not detail the strategies that would be employed in its public awareness campaign about what constitutes a high-quality early childhood program—especially missing an opportunity to increase public awareness of program quality efforts that are of critical importance to the Governor's EC reform agenda. The State did not present a timeline to support the public engagement aspects of its TQRIS Quality Plan—starting with a clear vision of its communication and outreach to families with High Needs; referencing the development or use of exiting culturally and linguistically appropriate materials; providing training to EC providers that regularly engage with parents about how to communicate effectively with parents and the local community; and, addressing the unique needs of communicating with parents and ECE providers living in rural Hawaii.

	Available	Score
(B)(4) Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs	20	8

The extent to which the State and its Participating State Agencies have developed and implemented, or have a High-Quality Plan to develop and implement, a system for improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by--

(a) Developing and implementing policies and practices that provide support and incentives for Early Learning and Development Programs to continuously improve (e.g., through training, technical assistance, financial rewards or incentives, higher subsidy reimbursement rates, compensation);

(b) Providing supports to help working families who have Children with High Needs access high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs that meet those needs (e.g., providing full-day, full-year programs; transportation; meals; family support services); and

(c) Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for increasing--

(1) The number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System; and

(2) 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 Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(4)

(a)The State of Hawaii presented a brief overview of two types of incentives for Early Learning and Development programs participating in its TQRIS: quality awards and quality improvement grants based on TQRIS ratings. These incentives will not take effect until September 2015, the last year of RTT-ELC Challenge Grant funding. The State offers some process examples (describing how those programs participating in the post-pilot TQRIS will move, or not move within levels; how programs can apply for improvement funds that will only be available during the last year of the grant). Funds for quality improvement grants will be sought from private foundations. Head Start programs were specifically identified in the Quality Plan as being eligible for support to improve quality through a "coaching" initiative (Quality Improvement Assurance). The Plan includes strategies to expand access to top tier programs for keiki with disabilities. The proposed Quality Plan did not provide a framework to ensure that Hawaii's ELD will have in place foundational measures to support its continuous improvement efforts. Aspects of the continuous improvement efforts are stated; however, the operational aspects of the Plan are disjointed, hierarchical (little evidence of horizontal planning with impacted EC providers); and, lacked specifics as to how incentives and grants will change or alter program options that benefit parental EC choices (e.g., increasing full day services for rural families, assisting working families).(b)Parents and providers will be able use TQRIS specific websites to check on specific programs,and use the Resourse and Referral network. The Plan starts at the end of the RTT-ELC funding, so it is difficult to assess the benefits programs will derive from proposed grants and awards; limited technical assistance (only being offered to Head Start programs via a coaching initiative); and, non-specified connections with other professional development offerings. The Plan did not specify who the responsible agency is for overseeing, managing, and evaluating the quality improvement effort is being subcontracted to outside partners (HAEYC and PATCH). It is not clear which agency, within the State, will be ultimately responsible for this area of the TQRIS. The response lacks depth in addressing the unique needs and features High Needs children described in other sections of the proposal. For example, the State frequently spoke of the need to employ evidence-based and culturally competent strategies to support keiki (children) in meeting benchmarks set in the Hawaii ELDS—specifically matching those benchmarks with the unique strengths and needs of remote rural areas. Aside from the idea of using technology to support internet postings, the applicant did not expand upon other channels of communication that may enhance culturally and linguistically contacts with

parents, providers, educators and the community.

	Available	Score
(B)(5) Validating the effectiveness of the State Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System.	15	10

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to design and implement evaluations--working with an independent evaluator and, when warranted, as part of a cross-State evaluation consortium--of the relationship between the ratings generated by the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System and the learning outcomes of children served by the State's Early Learning and Development Programs by--

(a) Validating, using research-based measures, as described in the State Plan (which also describes the criteria that the State used or will use to determine those measures), whether the tiers in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System accurately reflect differential levels of program quality; and

(b) Assessing, using appropriate research designs and measures of progress (as identified in the State Plan), the extent to which changes in quality ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (B)(5)

The State of Hawaii provides a description of its plan to contract with an experienced evaluator to evaluate the TQRIS pilot project. It is important to note that in previous sections, the applicant has explained that the pilot phase of the RTT-ELC grant will start in 2012 and end in 2014. The process for securing the services of the evaluator was not provided; however, the applicant did refer to the work of "an external evaluator from RAND who was consulted to help guide the focus of the TQRIS pilot". Descriptions of the evaluator's responsibilities were evident. The State of Hawaii's expectations for its TQRIS evaluative process include, (1) evaluative information will guide decisions for taking the TQRIS to scale; (2) during the post-pilot phase, evaluation information will be used to determine the degree to which TQRIS activities result in the desired outcome for keiki, families, programs, and the EC system; and, (3) quantitative and qualitative analysis of data will help the State gain insight into the experiences of those participating in the TQRIS from various perspectives (e.g., program director, day care provider, preschool teacher, parent). The State provides a brief explanation as to possible tools that may be used in the evaluation of the Quality Plan's pilot and post-pilot phases. The weakness in the State's approach to evaluation and validation (Section (B)(4a-b) is that the length of the pilot phase of the RTT-ELC grant prohibits the State's ability to focus on understanding and improving the quality tiers and their relative impact on the quality of ELD programs participants and nonparticipants. In essence, there is little time between Phase I pilot evaluations and Phase 2's implementation process to examine the relationship between program quality ratings and child readiness, learning and developmental outcomes. In the possible research evaluation questions, the applicant did not differentiate between the specific needs of (B)(4a)—which speaks to different levels of program quality, design features, educator/administrator characteristics, etc.; versus (B)(4b)—which should address dimensions of the Hawaii Plan related to measuring positive gains in learning and development; dimensions of learning and development outcomes related to high needs children; and, families (especially cultural and linguistically diverse families) differentially impacted by program quality.

Focused Investment Areas (C), (D), and (E)

Each State must address in its application--
(1) Two or more of the selection criteria in Focused Investment Area (C);
(2) One or more of the selection criteria in Focused Investment Area (D), and
(3) One or more of the selection criteria in Focused Investment Area (E).
The total available points for each Focused Investment Area will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address in that area, so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points.

C. Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children

The total available points that an applicant may receive for selection criteria (C)(1) through (C)(4) is 60. The 60 points will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points. For example, if the applicant chooses to address all four selection criteria under this Focused Investment Area, each criterion will be worth up to 15 points. If the applicant chooses to address two selection criteria, each criterion will be worth up to 30 points.

The applicant must address at least two of the selection criteria within Focused Investment Area (C), which are as follows:

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.	20	15

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to put in place high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards that are used statewide by Early Learning and Development Programs and that--

(a) Includes evidence that the Early Learning and Development Standards are developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate across each age group of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers, and that they cover all Essential Domains of School Readiness;

(b) Includes evidence that the Early Learning and Development Standards are aligned with the State's K-3 academic standards in, at a minimum, early literacy and mathematics;

(c) Includes evidence that the Early Learning and Development Standards are incorporated in Program Standards, curricula and activities, Comprehensive Assessment Systems, the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and professional development activities; and

(d) The State has supports in place to promote understanding of and commitment to the Early Learning and Development Standards across Early Learning and Development Programs.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (C)(1)

The State of Hawaii presents in its narrative and Appendices evidence of draft Early Learning and Development Standards for Infants/Toddlers and Pre-school aged children in centers and family child care environments. The Hawaiian Early Learning Standards are embedded within the state's TQRIS system, and were guided by the Hawaii SAC's Framework for a Comprehensive Early Childhood system. Hawaii's draft ELDS and High Quality Plan will be presented to the Hawaii SAC in November 2011. The draft Hawaii ELDS address five key areas that are researched based: Physical well-being, Health ad Motor Development, Social and Emotional Development, Approaches to Learning, Cognition and General Knowledge, and Communication, Language and Literacy. The State provides evidence that the draft Hawaii ELDS is being aligned with the Hawaii required K-3 Core State Standards that are being phased into the K-12 system supports ELD standards to be incorporated into professional development activities.Provides supports in place to promote understanding and use of the ELD standards.

	Available	Score
(C)(3) Identifying and addressing the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs to improve school readiness.	20	12

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to identify and address the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs by--

(a) Establishing a progression of standards for ensuring children's health and safety; ensuring that health and behavioral screening and follow-up occur; and promoting children's physical, social, and emotional development across the levels of its Program Standards;

(b) Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators who are trained and supported on an on-going basis in meeting the health standards;

(c) Promoting healthy eating habits, improving nutrition, expanding physical activity; and

(d) Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual targets to increase the number of Children with High Needs who--

(1) Are screened using Screening Measures that align with the Medicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment benefit (see section 1905(r)(5) of the Social Security Act) or the well-baby and well-child services available through the Children's Health Insurance Program (42 CFR 457.520), and that, as appropriate, are consistent with the Child Find provisions in IDEA (see sections 612(a)(3) and 635(a)(5) of IDEA);

(2) Are referred for services based on the results of those screenings, and where appropriate, received follow-up; and

(3) Participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well-child care, including the number of children who are up to date in a schedule of well-child care.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (C)(3)

The draft Hawaii Early Learning and Development Standards (ELDS) address five domains, each with a progression of standards developmentally appropriate to four age groups. The first domain, Physical Well-Being, Health and Motor Development are provided as evidence of Hawaii meeting the need to establishing a progression of standards for ensuring children's health and safety; ensuring that health and behavioral screening and follow-up occur; and promoting children's physical, social, and emotional development across the levels of its Program Standards. Additionally, the State of Hawaii's Framework for a Comprehensive Early Childhood System, contains health as a core element with the stated goal of ensuring access to a comprehensive array of health services are available, including prenatal, vision, hearing, nutrition, oral health, behavioral and medical services.

According to the signed MOU, the State Department of Human Services (DHS)—the lead agency partner—administers Hawaii's Medicaid program which includes Early Periodic screening, diagnostic and treatment EPSDT) benefits for low-income families; as well as the Child Care Licensing Program which is responsible for enforcing minimum standards protecting the health, safety, and well-being of keiki enrolled in licensed facilities and registered FCC Homes. The Hawaii Quality Plan meets all other health care requirements outlined in the RTT-ELC core area of identifying and addressing the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs to improve school readiness. The strengths of this area in the Quality Plan, include: • The State of Hawaii's long history of ensuring that keiki have health insurance coverage, a medical home and access to ELD programs that are safe and promote healthy development. • Hawaii's historical use of community-based center to reach rural and isolated communities. The Quality Plan contains the strategy to place four Professional Development Recruitment and Resource Centers (PDRRCs) in areas of Hawaii's greatest need. Local EC educators will gain capacity to promote health and well-being for children at their workplace and across their social and professional network. Hawaii also has a Healthy Child Care program to address health promotion, including a well-used resource—A Practical Guide for Child Care Health Consultants. • Healthy Child Care Hawaii (HCCH) a collaborative effort of the State DOH's Children with Special Health Needs Branch, University of Hawaii School of Medicine and the State DHS have trained 148 health care professionals to serve as child care health consultants to local programs. The Parental Evaluation of Development Status and Ages and Stages Questionaires will be used as screening tool as recommended by Med-QUEST. The State has set reasonable target goals to leverage resources through collaborative efforts of Heathy Child Care Hawaii and the State DOH Department Children with Health Needs Branch incrase the number of children with High Needs participating in health services interventions.

	Available	Score
(C)(4) Engaging and supporting families.	20	9

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to provide culturally and linguistically appropriate information and support to families of Children with High Needs in order to promote school readiness for their children by--

(a) Establishing a progression of culturally and linguistically appropriate standards for family engagement across the levels of its Program Standards, including activities that enhance the capacity of families to support their children's education and development;

(b) Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators trained and supported on an on-going basis to implement the family engagement strategies included in the Program Standards; and

(c) Promoting family support and engagement statewide, including by leveraging other existing resources such as through home visiting programs, other family-serving agencies, and through outreach to family, friend, and neighbor caregivers.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (C)(4)

The State of Hawaii describes its Draft ELDS for keiki (children) ad being guided by key values that reflect evidence-based research findings that "effective programs promote social connections within a family's community and affirm a family's cultural identity while enhancing its abilities to function in a multicultural society". The proposed Quality Plan consists of thoughtful reflections and actions the State has taken to include family engagement in its programs . The applicant refers to several statewide family engagement initiatives, including its family-child interaction learning (FCIL) model, funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Native Hawaiian Education Program, the State Office of Hawaiian Affairs, and local private funds. Elements of the Hawaiian plan include: (1) policies, (2) resources and education, (3) communication, (4) involvement, and (5) outside family support resources. The family engagement theme is also integrated into the tiered rating system and is a based on programs completing the following assessments: Program Administration Scale and the Business Administration Scale for Family Child Care to meet the family engagement standard. The TQRIS goal is that by 2014 at least 90% of all EC educators working in ELD programs will have at a minimum 15 hours, or the credit equivalent of training in establishing and sustaining family engagement. The Quality Plan also includes linkages to several providers of family engagement coursework or training. Consideration is also given to ways in which the Plan engages at-risk families, including teen parents, families of children at-risk for child maltreatment, abuse and neglect; and families needing parenting education. A weakness in the proposed Quality Plan is the absence of discussion as to how the State will use RTT-ELC funds to scale up promising practices that are specifically designed to meet the family engagement needs of programs/providers serving low-income rural areas—particularly noting promising practices that are culturally and linguistically representative of Hawaii's rich ethnic diversity.

D. A Great Early Childhood Education Workforce

The total points that a State may earn for selection criteria (D)(1) and (D)(2) is 40. The 40 points will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points. For example, if the applicant chooses to address both selection criteria under this Focused Investment Area, each criterion will be worth up to 20 points. If the applicant chooses to address one selection criterion, the criterion will be worth up to 40 points.

The applicant must address at least one of the selection criteria within Focused Investment Area (D), which are as follows:

	Available	Score
(D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.	20	12

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to--

(a) Develop a common, statewide Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework designed to promote children's learning and development and improve child outcomes;

(b) Develop a common, statewide progression of credentials and degrees aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework; and

(c) Engage postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers in aligning professional development opportunities with the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (D)(1)

(a)Hawaii Careers with Young Children (HCYC), a foundation partnership funded by Kamehameha Schools, leads and coordinates the development of the Hawaii Notable features in the Hawaiian Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. HCYC is also responsible for the development of the draft Common Core Competencies for Early Care and Education Practitioners, and Career Access and Navigation of Early Care and Education Systems (CANOES)—a career lattice for EC educators. CANOES has six components in development: a website directed to EC educators servicing 0-8 year olds; a progression of degrees and professional development; community-based professional development, recruitment and resource centers, higher education programs; a quality professional development system for improvement and quality assurance; and, a virtual data system for collection of workforce data. (b)The quality plan includes future adoption of the CANOE competencies by the Hawaii SAC, alignment of the competencies with the Hawaii ELDS, as well as alignment of the competencies with the comprehensive assessment system and TQRIS. Hawaii's Quality Plan also includes provisions to develop a statewide progression of credentials and degrees aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.(c) The State's University of Hawaii (UH) system along with other professional development providers spearhead this effort. A wide range of supports, including postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers have worked collaboratively to align professional development opportunities with the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. One of the innovative features in the applicant's professional development design is its Voluntary Hawaii Careers with Young Children Registry. The Registry current lists approximately 6,000 ECE educators working in group child care and infant toddlers, 110 educators working in family-child interaction learning centers, and approximately 510 educators working in family child care. This Registry has the potential of being a springboard for developing EC educator communities of practice.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.	20	12

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to improve the effectiveness and retention of Early Childhood Educators who work with Children with High Needs, with the goal of improving child outcomes by--

(a) Providing and expanding access to effective professional development opportunities that are aligned with the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework;

(b) Implementing policies and incentives (e.g., scholarships, compensation and wage supplements, tiered reimbursement rates, other financial incentives, management opportunities) that promote professional improvement and career advancement along an articulated career pathway that is aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and that are designed to increase retention;

(c) Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention; and

(d) Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for--

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

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

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (D)(2)

The applicant lists and describes training resources, curricula, processes, and materials that contribute to the CANOE professional development framework. Strategies include traditional course work, training and professional development for trainers, professional development, recruitment and resource centers (PDRRC). The PDRRCs represent an innovative approach to providing community-based training in high-risk communities. EC educators are supported in their pursuit of professional development opportunities with scholarships, substitutes, teacher-exchanges, and coaching. The state has set reasonable targeted performance measures to increase the number of ECE Educators receiving credentials aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. It is difficult to determine if the targets are ambitious due to the absence of baseline data, and a lack as to how annual targets were set. The applicant does not address how it will recruit and retain EC professionals who are knowledgeable about Hawaiian culture, language, and representative of the children and families served in EC program settings. This was a re-occurring theme in the Hawaii narrative throughout its application for RTT-ELC funding.

E. Measuring Outcomes and Progress

The total points an applicant may earn for selection criteria (E)(1) and (E)(2) is 40. The 40 points will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points. For example, if the applicant chooses to address both selection criteria under this Focused Investment Area, each criterion will be worth up to 20 points. If the applicant chooses to address one selection criterion, the criterion will be worth up to 40 points.

The applicant must address at least one of the selection criteria within Focused Investment Area (E), which are as follows:

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.	20	10

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to implement, independently or as part of a cross-State consortium, a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that informs instruction and services in the early elementary grades and that--

(a) Is aligned with the State's Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness;

(b) Is valid, reliable, and appropriate for the target population and for the purpose for which it will be used, including for English learners and children with disabilities;

(c) Is administered beginning no later than the start of school year 2014-2015 to children entering a public school kindergarten; States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation;

(d) Is reported to the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and to the early learning data system, if it is separate from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, as permitted under and consistent with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws; and

(e) Is funded, in significant part, with Federal or State resources other than those available under this grant, (e.g., with funds available under section 6111 or 6112 of the ESEA).

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (E)(1)

(a)In its application for RTT-ELC funding, the State of Hawaii has developed Early Learning and Development Standards (ELDS) that address all essential domains of school readiness. The draft Hawaiian high quality plan to develop a new common statewide assessment of school readiness of keiki (children) at entry to kindergarten will be implemented in the fourth year of the proposed RTT-ELC grant (2014-2015). The assessment is also aligned with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), an international benchmark for K-12 standards in English language arts and mathematics and the ELDS. This will be incororated into the early leaning system. The Hawaii State School Readiness Assessment will be used to rate readiness and will be validated by University of Hawaii College of Education.(c) Hawaii's proposed statewide kindergarten entry assessment (KEA) data will be used to revise curriculum to better address identified areas of strength and need, including helping EC educators to be better able to differentiate and individualize instruction for children with diverse abilities and needs. The State provides a summary plan for developing and implementing KEA statewide by 2014-2015.(d) A strength in the proposed plan is the State's prior history in instituting a longitudinal study involving the rate of readiness of classrooms. Since 2004, kindergarten teachers have used the Hawaii State School Readiness Assessment—currently available online.(e) The State is planning to use a combination of Federal and State human and financial resources to implement the statewide kindergarten entry assessment. This response is vague and does not attempt to identify cooperative interdepartmental sources that may integrate the assessment into state funding streams. An overall weakness in the proposed plan is the lack of specificity in describing who will assess children; what are associated professional development supports required to prepare for the 2014 launch; and, how will key stakeholders (e.g. local providers, parents, EC collaboration partners) participate in various stages of KEA planning and implementation.

	Available	Score

(E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.	20	12

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to enhance the State's existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System or to build or enhance a separate, coordinated, early learning data system that aligns and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and that either data system--

(a) Has all of the Essential Data Elements;

(b) Enables uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating State Agencies and Participating Programs;

(c) 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;

(d) 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

(e) Meets the Data System Oversight Requirements and complies with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (E)(2)

The State of Hawaii offers a comprehensive review of its Quality Plan to build and enhance an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services and policies. The strength of the response is the State's history of interdepartmental collaboration and partnering within the Department of Education, University of Hawaii system, and the State Department of Labor and Industrial Relations to create a longitudinal data system (LDS). A noted strength is the articulation of a clear vision and guiding principles for the data system effort: (1) processes and products must be responsive to the needs of stakeholders, and (2) a robust foundation of governance and technology infrastructure is needed to undergrid data-based decision making that may not be with in stakeholder's current awareness as possibilities. Timelines for the launch of the full system in 2014 have been coordinated with the completion of several EC governmental initiatives and efforts, including the readiness of the TQRIS system. An innovative feature of the Quality Plan for data systems is its emphasis on cross-agency coordination and governance—this appears to be a well-thought out process and plan that involves both knowledge of the EC network of programs and partners and a knowledge of real life data system challenges. The design-build features of the process are well stated and inclusive of a wide range of stakeholders—including, practitioners, advocates, administrators, EC community members, K-12, higher education and the workforce sector. The data system has been designed to ensure strict privacy, high data security, and appropriate data use to maintain public and political goodwill on which data sharing depends.

	Available	Score
Total Points Available for Selection Criteria	280	162

Priorities

Competitive Preference Priorities

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Including all Early Learning and Development Programs in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	10	4

Competitive Preference Priority 2 is designed to increase the number of children from birth to kindergarten entry who are participating in programs that are governed by the State's licensing system and quality standards, with the goal that all licensed or State-regulated programs will participate. The State will receive points for this priority based on the extent to which the State has in place, or has a High-Quality Plan to implement no later than June 30, 2015--

(a) A licensing and inspection system that covers all programs that are not otherwise regulated by the State and that regularly care for two or more unrelated children for a fee in a provider setting; provided that if the State exempts programs for reasons other than the number of children cared for, the State may exclude those entities and reviewers will score this priority only on the basis of non-excluded entities; and

(b) A Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System in which all licensed or State-regulated Early Learning and Development Programs participate.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (P)(2)

The plan is a medium quality response and is not yet implemented.The state has a plan to link licensing to TQRIS.However it was unclear how they were going to address this priority.

Priorities

	Available	Yes/No
Competitive Preference Priority 3: Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry	0 or 10	Yes

To meet this priority, the State must, in its application--

(a) Demonstrate that it has already implemented a Kindergarten Entry Assessment that meets selection criterion (E)(1) by indicating that all elements in Status Table (A)(1)-12 are met; or

(b) Address selection criterion (E)(1) and earn a score of at least 70 percent of the maximum points available for that criterion.

Comments on (P)(3)

The applicant earned over 70% of availible points on (E)(1).

Absolute Priority

	Met? Yes/No
Absolute Priority - Promoting School Readiness for Children with High Needs.	Yes

To meet this priority, the State's application must comprehensively and coherently address how the State will build a system that increases the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs so that they enter kindergarten ready to succeed.

The State's application must demonstrate how it will improve the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs by integrating and aligning resources and policies across Participating State Agencies and by designing and implementing a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System. In addition, to achieve the necessary reforms, the State must make strategic improvements in those specific reform areas that will most significantly improve program quality and outcomes for Children with High Needs. Therefore, the State must address those criteria from within each of the Focused Investment Areas (sections (C) Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children, (D) A Great Early Childhood Education Workforce, and (E) Measuring Outcomes and Progress) that it believes will best prepare its Children with High Needs for kindergarten success.

Comments on Absolute Priority

The State demonstrated in its application that it promotes Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children, TQRIS rating system and Workforce Development to support school readniess. The proposed design of the State RTT-ELC application and reform agenda focuses on (1)the creation of a high quality ELD system, and (2) supporting children with high needs and their families in Hawaii.

Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge Review

Technical Review Form Page

Application # HI-5010

Peer Reviewer: [redacted]
Lead Monitor:
Support Monitor:
Application Status: **Reviewed**
Date/Time: **11/17/2011 - 12:37 PM**

CORE AREAS (A) and (B)

States must address in their application all of the selection criteria in the Core Areas.

A. Successful State Systems

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Demonstrating past commitment to early learning and development	20	16

The extent to which the State has demonstrated past commitment to and investment in high-quality, accessible Early Learning and Development Programs and services for Children with High Needs, as evidenced by the State's--

(a) Financial investment, from January 2007 to the present, in Early Learning and Development Programs, including the amount of these investments in relation to the size of the State's population of Children with High Needs during this time period;

(b) Increasing, from January 2007 to the present, the number of Children with High Needs participating in Early Learning and Development Programs;

(c) Existing early learning and development legislation, policies, or practices; and

(d) Current status in key areas that form the building blocks for a high quality early learning and development system, including Early Learning and Development Standards, Comprehensive Assessment Systems, health promotion practices, family engagement strategies, the development of Early Childhood Educators, Kindergarten Entry Assessments, and effective data practices.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (A)(1)

The financial investment from the State has decreased over this time frame, with a large portion of the slack being covered by private and corporate investment. The history of early learning and development legislation, policies, or practices has shown, with little deviation, an increasing commitment to encouraging high standards and developmentally appropriate approaches to early care and education. Thoughtful approaches to family and unique needs of the population have been implemented. The State is aware of the High Needs Child and appears to be using this grant as a means to address those needs through the development of the development four Professional Development, Resource and Recruitment Centers and increasing the Medical Home Health Initiative sites. This is in addition to earlier legislations and policies. The number of High Needs Children in programs in the State has remained the same over the last five years, according to the data on table (A)(1)-5. There is no data for programs funded under Title 1 of ESEA. The State is in the process of developing Early Learning and Development Standards and Comprehensive Assessment Systems. There is a school entry system in use at this point, but not one specific to entry to kindergarten. They have developed systems for identifying and maintaining continuity of health care for infants and young children, but express concern that some children may not be being brought into the system. There are some data systems currently in place, but a state wide system from birth through 20 is in the planning stage. Several ELDP do not have consistently applied data and assessment procedures in place. The overriding consistent thrust of the State toward enacting programs and legislation in the needs of young children and High Needs Children, with the private sector support, are strengths of the proposal. The family centered approach is also to the State's credit. The weaknesses lie in the inconsistently applied data and assessment procedures in several ELDP and incomplete data on tables (A)(1)-2, (A)(1)-3, (A)(1)-4, (A)(1)-5 , (A)(1)-10, and (A)(1)-12. Consequently, this is a medium/high response.

	Available	Score

(A)(2) Articulating the State's rationale for its early learning and development reform agenda and goals.	20	18

The extent to which the State clearly articulates a comprehensive early learning and development reform agenda that is ambitious yet achievable, builds on the State's progress to date (as demonstrated in selection criterion (A)(1)), is most likely to result in improved school readiness for Children with High Needs, and includes--

(a) Ambitious yet achievable goals for improving program quality, improving outcomes for Children with High Needs statewide, and closing the readiness gap between Children with High Needs and their peers;

(b) An overall summary of the State Plan that clearly articulates how the High-Quality Plans proposed under each selection criterion, when taken together, constitute an effective reform agenda that establishes a clear and credible path toward achieving these goals; and

(c) A specific rationale that justifies the State's choice to address the selected criteria in each Focused Investment Area (C), (D), and (E), including why these selected criteria will best achieve these goals.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (A)(2)

The State has ambitious goals which build on previous achievements which makes these goals achievable. These include having an integrated statewide early learning and development system which better meets the needs of Children with High Needs, development and implementation of culturally sensitive and developmentally appropriate standards for programs and practitioners, and implementing a state-wide kindergarten readiness assessment which will be used to improve the system of all children, especially the High Needs Child. The State is clear about the importance for improving outcomes for Children with High Needs statewide, and closing the readiness gap between Children with High Needs and their peers, setting benchmarks which, if met, will allow them to meet these goals. The overall summary of the State Plan clearly articulates that the plans constitute an effective reform agenda that establishes a clear and credible path toward achieving these goals by proposing an integrated early learning and development system into their current system. This includes culturally sensitive and developmentally appropriate standards for programs and practitioners, implementing a state-wide kindergarten readiness assessment, and developing a longitudinal early childhood data system as part of a system already in place. These key goals are supported by objectives clearly come out of a paradigm that values the place of the family, children and culture in effectively promoting Kindergarten readiness in High Needs Children. The State addresses each selected criteria in each Focused Investment Area (C), (D), and (E). The decision to address (C)(1) was chosen because the standards are almost done and the Plan allows for the resources and cross-agency collaboration to infuse them throughout the system. (C)(3) was chosen because of how well it fits with the State's commitment to meeting the needs of all children and the budget crisis has made this difficult. (C)(4) was chosen because the family is a core State value. (D)(1) was chosen because a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework is essential to a professional development system. (D)(2) was chosen the State's current work can be leveraged by the Grant to accelerate system reform. (E)(1) was chosen because current assessment only measures the classroom and not the individual child. To know how well individual children are being served, the State needs to understand children's learning and development status at Kindergarten entry. (E)(2) was chosen because enhancing the State's longitudinal data system is already being addressed and the grant will be used to accelerate the process. The State is clear in making the connection between these Focused Investment Areas and the goals for the Plan. It is also very clear in terms of where the State stands in implementation and how the Grant monies will be used to implement the Plan. The State presents a clear picture of their Plan. It has an ambitious agenda which may prove too much for the time allowed by RTT-ELC. It addresses each element required by the core areas and the selected criteria from each Focused Investment area. This is a high quality response.

	Available	Score
(A)(3) Aligning and coordinating early learning and development across the State	10	3

The extent to which the State has established, or has a High-Quality Plan to establish, strong participation and commitment in the State Plan by Participating State Agencies and other early learning and development stakeholders by--

(a) Demonstrating how the Participating State Agencies and other partners, if any, will identify a governance structure for working together that will facilitate interagency coordination, streamline decision making, effectively allocate resources, and create long-term sustainability and describing--

(1) The organizational structure for managing the grant and how it builds upon existing interagency governance structures such as children's cabinets, councils, and commissions, if any already exist and are effective;

(2) The governance-related roles and responsibilities of the Lead Agency, the State Advisory Council, each Participating State Agency, the State's Interagency Coordinating Council for part C of IDEA, and other partners, if any;

(3) The method and process for making different types of decisions (e.g., policy, operational) and resolving disputes; and

(4) The plan for when and how the State will involve 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 planning and implementation of the activities carried out under the grant;

(b) Demonstrating that the Participating State Agencies are strongly committed to the State Plan, to the governance structure of the grant, and to effective implementation of the State Plan, by including in the MOU or other binding agreement between the State and each Participating State Agency--

(1) Terms and conditions that reflect a strong commitment to the State Plan by each Participating State Agency, including terms and conditions designed to align and leverage the Participating State Agencies' existing funding to support the State Plan;

(2) "Scope-of-work" descriptions that require each Participating State Agency to implement all applicable portions of the State Plan and a description of efforts to maximize the number of Early Learning and Development Programs that become Participating Programs; and

(3) A signature from an authorized representative of each Participating State Agency; and

(c) Demonstrating commitment to the State Plan from a broad group of stakeholders that will assist the State in reaching the ambitious yet achievable goals outlined in response to selection criterion (A)(2)(a), including by obtaining--

(1) Detailed and persuasive letters of intent or support from Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, and, if applicable, local early learning councils; and

(2) Letters of intent or support from such other stakeholders as Early Childhood Educators or their representatives; the State's legislators; local community leaders; State or local school boards; representatives of private and faith-based early learning programs; other State and local leaders (e.g., business, community, tribal, civil rights, education association leaders); adult education and family literacy State and local leaders; family and community organizations (e.g., parent councils, nonprofit organizations, local foundations, tribal organizations, and community-based organizations); libraries and children's museums; health providers; and postsecondary institutions.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (A)(3)

The State plans to create an Office of Early Childhood who will lead an Executive Management Team who will oversee the Grant. The Lead Agency will be DHS. The roles of each agency is identified. The processes that will be used in dispute management are identified. The Governor wants a Department of Early Childhood and is using the opportunity to implement this Grant by creating an Office of Early Childhood who will administer the Grant. By the end 2015, it is anticipated that the Office of Early Childhood will become The Department of Early Childhood. This is planned to take place at the same time the Plan is being implemented, which could prove problematic. The organizational structure for managing the grant and how it builds upon existing interagency governance structures is described in the narrative and to some extent in the Participating State Agency Scope of Work. The governance-related roles and responsibilities of the Lead Agency, the State Advisory Council, and each Participating State Agency are clearly described. The State's Interagency Coordinating Council for part C of IDEA, and other partners, is not. The method and process for making decisions using the Balance Scorecard approach is discussed, as well as the method for resolving disputes. The Executive Management Team will ultimately make all cross agencies decisions. Discussion for 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 is included, but vague. The proposal states that a "wide net" will be cast seeking participation but not a clear plan for how this will be done or how the stakeholders will be involved. Parents do not appear to enter into the decision making process at the state level. The State and its Participating State Agencies are committed to the State Plan. The MOUs have terms and conditions that reflect a strong commitment to the State Plan by each Participating State Agency. Funding is not discussed at this point. "Scope-of-work" descriptions are included showing how each Participating State Agency will implement all applicable portions of the State Plan. These appear reasonable. There is a signature from an authorized representative of each Participating State Agency. There is a broad group of stakeholders that will assist the State in reaching its goals. This includes detailed and persuasive letters of intent or support from Early Learning Intermediary Organizations and local early learning councils. There are also letters of intent or support from other stakeholders. That the Office of Early Childhood will not be implemented until the Grant is approved is a weakness of the proposal. This means time spent putting it in place before other work can be done. The place of other stakeholders such as individual early childhood care providers and parents of all children, High Needs and otherwise, is not well defined, another weakness. The specificity of the organizational tools to be used for decision making and dealing with disputes is a strength. Consequently, this is a medium, low response and a partially implemented plan.

	Available	Score
(A)(4) Developing a budget to implement and sustain the work of this grant.	15	5

The extent to which the State Plan--

(a) Demonstrates how the State will use existing funds that support early learning and development from Federal, State, private, and local sources (e.g., CCDF; Title I and II of ESEA; IDEA; Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Program; State preschool; Head Start Collaboration and State Advisory Council funding; Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program; Title V MCH Block Grant; TANF; Medicaid; child welfare services under Title IV (B) and (E) of the Social Security Act; Statewide Longitudinal Data System; foundation; other private funding sources) for activities and services that help achieve the outcomes in the State Plan, including how the quality set-asides in CCDF will be used;

(b) Describes, in both the budget tables and budget narratives, how the State will effectively and efficiently use funding from this grant to achieve the outcomes in the State Plan, in a manner that--

(1) Is adequate to support the activities described in the State Plan;

(2) Includes costs that are reasonable and necessary in relation to the objectives, design, and significance of the activities described in the State Plan and the number of children to be served; and

(3) Details the amount of funds budgeted for Participating State Agencies, localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, or other partners, and the specific activities to be implemented with these funds consistent with the State Plan, and demonstrates that a significant amount of funding will be devoted to the local implementation of the State Plan; and

(c) Demonstrates that it can be sustained after the grant period ends to ensure that the number and percentage of Children with High Needs served by Early Learning and Development Programs in the State will be maintained or expanded.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (A)(4)
The State will use existing funds that support early learning and development of 23M from State, certain Federal and private fund commitments. There are other Federal, State, and private sources but those funds cannot be determined after 2012. Quality set-asides in CCDF in the amount of 14M will be used toward developing and infusing Hawaii ELDS and Family Engagement Standards, workforce development efforts, coordinating system building efforts, and developing TQRIS. While the set asides are discussed, Chart (A)(4) shows no monies set aside after 2014. This is a weakness of the response. The monies that do appear on the chart appear to be planned for use in a manner appropriate for the proposed plan. After the first year, the budget costs are an estimation. The narrative for the budget tables adequately links expenditures to the itemized amount. For the most part, both the budget tables and budget narratives describes how the State will use funding from this grant to achieve the outcomes in the State Plan. However, the allocation of funds is unclear in how it relates to specific objectives and activities. This is especially true of the four Professional Development, Resource and Recruitment Centers and Medical Home Health Initiative sites. The State details the amount of funds budgeted for Participating State Agencies. There are no funds specifically budgeted for localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, or other partners. Based on the amount of funding the State is contributing to the Plan, it is not certain that there will be enough funds to sustain the Professional Development, Resource and Recruitment Centers or increase in Medical Home Health Initiative sites. These two projects are strong components of addressing High Needs Children and closing the kindergarten readiness gap. All other aspects of the Plan should be sustainable after 2015. There is some funding coming from the State and private sources, with the majority of the non-grant funding coming from leveraged Federal sources. The budget does not address funding to localities and is underfunding two projects which are strengths to the High Needs Children aspect of RTT-ELC. This is a medium low response.

B. High-Quality, Accountable Programs

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	10	7

The extent to which the State and its Participating State Agencies have developed and adopted, or have a High-Quality Plan to develop and adopt, a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System that--

(a) Is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards that include--

(1) Early Learning and Development Standards;

(2) A Comprehensive Assessment System;

(3) Early Childhood Educator qualifications;

(4) Family engagement strategies;

(5) Health promotion practices; and

(6) Effective data practices;

(b) Is clear and has standards that are measurable, meaningfully differentiate program quality levels, and reflect high expectations of program excellence commensurate with nationally recognized standards that lead to improved learning outcomes for children; and

(c) Is linked to the State licensing system for Early Learning and Development Programs.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(1)

The State has developed plans for a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System, and is preparing to pilot it, using programs in high needs areas of the State. Once the pilot is completed, the tiers will be assigned. The TQRIS is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards that include Early Learning and Development Standards, a Comprehensive Assessment System, and Early Childhood Educator qualifications based on DHS licensing. Family engagement strategies and health promotion practices listed are those already in place in programs or required for licensure. By basing the TQRIS on the expansion of the current Quality Care Programs' system, the TQRIS will utilize the same data practices. This includes automation for data calculations, utilities for data annotation, data validation, and a tracking platform for logging, archiving and progress monitoring. The QCP's system will be modified to include all systems operated by DHS, the Registry, the coaching affiliates, and the P-3 system, and program assessments. This will be used to develop quality improvement plans. It is not clear how this system will be used to help High Needs Children. The plan for developing the Tiers within the TQRIS is clear. Table 2. Proposed Evidence and Measures Required for QIrS for Infant/Toddler Center Based Programs, Table 3. Proposed Evidence and Measures Required for QIrS for Preschool Center Based Programs, and Table 4. Proposed Evidence and Measures Required for QIrS Level for Family Child Care Homes include requirements that are measurable. These tiered Program Standards differentiate program quality levels and reflect increased expectations of program excellence. Narrative states that the TQRIS requires all participating programs to be licensed, strongly linking it to the State licensing system for Early Learning and Development Programs. This is not supported by other documentation, like the four QIrS tables. This is a medium quality response which is partially implemented.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Promoting participation in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	15	5

The extent to which the State has maximized, or has a High-Quality Plan to maximize, program participation in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by--

(a) Implementing effective policies and practices to reach the goal of having all publicly funded Early Learning and Development Programs participate in such a system, including programs in each of the following categories--

(1) State-funded preschool programs;

(2) Early Head Start and Head Start programs;

(3) Early Learning and Development Programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA;

(4) Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of the ESEA; and

(5) Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program;

(b) Implementing effective policies and practices designed to help more families afford high-quality child care and maintain the supply of high-quality child care in areas with high concentrations of Children with High Needs (e.g., maintaining or increasing subsidy reimbursement rates, taking actions to ensure affordable co-payments, providing incentives to high-quality providers to participate in the subsidy program); and

(c) Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for the numbers and percentages of Early Learning and Development Programs that will participate in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by type of Early Learning and Development Program (as listed in (B)(2)(a)(1) through (5) above).

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(2)

The State is in the process of implementing effective policies and practices to reach the goal of having all Early Learning and Development Programs in the State participate in the TQRIS. However, not all of these programs will be reached. This is a weakness in the Plan. The family-child interaction learning programs (FCIL) will be participating in the TQRIS. Their involvement is anticipated but not yet solidified. It is not clear how many will be involved, and chart (B)(2)(c) does not show involvement at any point. State-funded preschool programs, the few that there are, will be part of the field test of TQRIS in 2012. Early Head Start and Head Start programs will be 100% involved by 2015. Part B of IDEA will have 19% of their programs included by 2015 and programs that are part C of IDEA will be invited to participate. These, mostly High Needs, children are dually enrolled in FCIL programs and are expected to be part of TQRIS through the FCIL. However, chart (B)(2)(c) does not show involvement in TQRIS. Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of the ESEA do not typically serve children prior to entering kindergarten. The few that do provide a summer camp transitioning

children who have not attended preschool to Kindergarten. These programs are not identified as being part of TQRIS. Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program will be included in TQRIS. A special component for license exempt care providers is being developed. 12 of these homes are expected to be part of the 2012 pilot. By 2015, 244 providers are expected to be included, including the license exempt care providers . The plan does not directly provide monetary support or other incentives to help families afford high-quality child care. This is a weakness of the response. In the remote areas of the State, there are not enough programs available for the needs of the children, so the Plan has centered more on increasing the availability of an educated workforce from the targeted population to help in increasing programs and retaining teachers. This will be done through the four Professional Development, Resource and Recruitment Centers that will be funded through this grant. Start-up monies for the Centers are not part of the plan. The goals are achievable, and at 100%, the Head Start goals are ambitious. However, the plan does not include having all publicly funded Early Learning and Development Programs participate in the TQRIS. In addition, table (B)(2)(c) does not match with the narrative where the state-funded preschools and programs that are part of the FCIL group are concerned. This would make the goals less than ambitious. To be ambitious, goals should be set for these learning and development programs as well. This is medium low quality plan which is minimally implemented.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs	15	7

The extent to which the State and its Participating State Agencies have developed and implemented, or have a High-Quality Plan to develop and implement, a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by--

(a) Using a valid and reliable tool for monitoring such programs, having trained monitors whose ratings have an acceptable level of inter-rater reliability, and monitoring and rating the Early Learning and Development Programs with appropriate frequency; and

(b) Providing 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) and making 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.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(3)

Tentative tiers evaluating the various types of ELDP in the State have been developed. The TQRIS includes well known, reliable and validated assessment tools such as ITERS-R, ECERS-R, PAS and FCCERS-R. These are integrated into the rating scales for each type of ELDP in the state that is covered by the Plan. Monitors are in the process of being trained. Trainings are being conducted by one of the assessments' authors. Inter-rater reliability will be on-going. Eighty percent agreement is the lowest accepted for a rater to be considered reliable and this will be checked every ten visits. This is an appropriate frequency. There is no indication as to how often the Programs will be evaluated. During the piloting stage of TQRIS, parents will be part of focus groups that will provide insight into the strategies which are most effective for them. Those strategies will be implemented once 25% of the ELDP involved in the system are at level 3 or higher. Since many of the families are located in rural areas and there is a large population of varied cultures, involving the parents in determining how to best inform them is a savvy decision. At least two already existing websites will be utilized. The intent of providing this information to parents is to help them make informed decisions as they choose programs for the unique needs of their children. This is a medium-quality plan which is partially implemented.

	Available	Score
(B)(4) Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs	20	8

The extent to which the State and its Participating State Agencies have developed and implemented, or have a High-Quality Plan to develop and implement, a system for improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by--

(a) Developing and implementing policies and practices that provide support and incentives for Early Learning and Development Programs to continuously improve (e.g., through training, technical assistance, financial rewards or incentives, higher subsidy reimbursement rates, compensation);

(b) Providing supports to help working families who have Children with High Needs access high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs that meet those needs (e.g., providing full-day, full-year programs; transportation; meals; family support services); and

(c) Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for increasing--

(1) The number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System; and

(2) 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 Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(4)

The State's plan is to have 100% of Head Start programs in the TQRIS by 2015 and to provide supports and training for FFNs. This will cover many of the High Needs Children from low income families. Once the Grant is awarded the State will then look at all revenue currently being used to meet the needs of children, public and private, and assess how the monies can most effectively be used to reach the High Needs Children. This is not currently being done and through the grant, all participating agencies will work together yearly as they do their budgets. This new policy will be a way to help the ELDP continue to improve by getting money to where it is most needed when it is needed. The State's Plan does not discuss providing supports to help working families who have Children with High Needs access high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs that meet those needs. The Plan discusses the process and supports that will be available to help programs progress through the tiers. Much of this process is a continuation and modification of the Quality Improvement Assurance Project. Other components, such as the HAEYC and PATCH will continue to contribute to helping programs improve. Public-private partnerships have been part of this process. The number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs is primarily driven by raising the quality of the programs available to children. High Needs Children will be targeted through initiatives and supports already in place. These include the Expanding Opportunities Initiative and support from ZERO TO THREE. The TQRIS will allow connections to be made between existing programs to meet the distinct needs of children through dual enrollment. This will begin with the field test of TQRIS and by 2015 will have at least 378 High Needs children specifically served through dual enrollment. The incomplete graphs (B)(4)(c)(1) and (B)(4)(c)(2) are weaknesses in this section. Without the baseline data it is not possible to determine whether the targets for increasing programs or increasing the number of children in the high quality programs are achievable, much less ambitious. This is a medium quality response which is partially implemented.

	Available	Score
(B)(5) Validating the effectiveness of the State Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System.	**15**	**9**

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to design and implement evaluations--working with an independent evaluator and, when warranted, as part of a cross-State evaluation consortium--of the relationship between the ratings generated by the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System and the learning outcomes of children served by the State's Early Learning and Development Programs by--

(a) Validating, using research-based measures, as described in the State Plan (which also describes the criteria that the State used or will use to determine those measures), whether the tiers in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System accurately reflect differential levels of program quality; and

(b) Assessing, using appropriate research designs and measures of progress (as identified in the State Plan), the extent to which changes in quality ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (B)(5)

An external evaluator was hired to determine the focus of the TQRIS pilot. An experienced evaluator will be used in deciding how to evaluate the TQRIS pilot and will construct the evaluation design. The pilot will serve as a feedback mechanism on a variety of issues including the effectiveness of TQRIS assessment in measuring quality and how well the criteria for each tier represent different levels of quality. This means that the many of the ratings may well change based on this input. Despite the fluidity of the tiers right now, this should actually result in a stronger tier system later. Because ELDP which already use a variety of standardized assessments for children will be part of the pilot, the data from these assessments can be put into TQRIS and will give preliminary data linking quality of program to readiness. This will inform the changes that will be made to TQRIS because of using the pilot to build reliability and validity into its system. The Plan to design and implement evaluations is more a statement of intention with some elements of a plan in place, making it a low medium low quality response. It is partially implemented.

Focused Investment Areas (C), (D), and (E)

Each State must address in its application--
(1) Two or more of the selection criteria in Focused Investment Area (C);
(2) One or more of the selection criteria in Focused Investment Area (D); and
(3) One or more of the selection criteria in Focused Investment Area (E).
The total available points for each Focused Investment Area will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address in that area, so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points.

C. Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children

The total available points that an applicant may receive for selection criteria (C)(1) through (C)(4) is 60.

The 60 points will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points. For example, if the applicant chooses to address all four selection criteria under this Focused Investment Area, each criterion will be worth up to 15 points. If the applicant chooses to address two selection criteria, each criterion will be worth up to 30 points.

The applicant must address at least two of the selection criteria within Focused Investment Area (C), which are as follows.

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.	20	10

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to put in place high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards that are used statewide by Early Learning and Development Programs and that--

(a) Includes evidence that the Early Learning and Development Standards are developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate across each age group of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers, and that they cover all Essential Domains of School Readiness;

(b) Includes evidence that the Early Learning and Development Standards are aligned with the State's K-3 academic standards in, at a minimum, early literacy and mathematics;

(c) Includes evidence that the Early Learning and Development Standards are incorporated in Program Standards, curricula and activities, Comprehensive Assessment Systems, the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and professional development activities; and

(d) The State has supports in place to promote understanding of and commitment to the Early Learning and Development Standards across Early Learning and Development Programs.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (C)(1)

The State has a set of Early Learning and Development Standards currently in place. The State plans to use this document for guiding the development of the TQRIS. An ELDS has been developed for four age groups, starting at birth and ending at kindergarten entry. The standards are arranged by five major domains and cover the Essential Domains of School Readiness as they pertain to the age group for whom each ELDS was developed. A table of contents was provided for one of the ELDS. The contents appear to be developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate, but that is extrapolating from an incomplete source. The ELDS will be brought into alignment with Common Core State Standards. Early literacy and mathematics, among a multitude of other standards, are in the process of being aligned with the State's K-3 academic standards. This updated ELDS will include a focus on High Needs Children with disabilities. In addition, the ELDS addresses dispositions such as self-regulation which have been shown to increase a child's likeliness to succeed in school. This is an area of strength. Table (C)(1)-1 shows that the Early Learning and Development Standards are scheduled to be incorporated in Program Standards, TQRIS, and professional development activities. It does not show the ELDS being incorporated into curricula and activities or the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. The action plan shows the development of supports to promote understanding of and commitment to the Early Learning and Development Standards across Early Learning and Development Programs. The plans include sustaining the supports after 2015. Much of the development of the ELDS comes out of revising previous standards that have been used by the State. The focus on children with disabilities is a strength of the Plan. So is expanding the Standards to include dispositions. This is a medium quality response which is partially implemented.

	Available	Score
(C)(3) Identifying and addressing the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs to improve school readiness.	20	7

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to identify and address the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs by--

(a) Establishing a progression of standards for ensuring children's health and safety; ensuring that health and behavioral screening and follow-up occur; and promoting children's physical, social, and emotional development across the levels of its Program Standards;

(b) Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators who are trained and supported on an on-going basis in meeting the health standards;

(c) Promoting healthy eating habits, improving nutrition, expanding physical activity; and

(d) Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual targets to increase the number of Children with High Needs who--

(1) Are screened using Screening Measures that align with the Medicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment benefit (see section 1905(r)(5) of the Social Security Act) or the well-baby and well-child services

available through the Children's Health Insurance Program (42 CFR 457.520), and that, as appropriate, are consistent with the Child Find provisions in IDEA (see sections 612(a)(3) and 635(a)(5) of IDEA);

(2) Are referred for services based on the results of those screenings, and where appropriate, received follow-up; and

(3) Participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well-child care, including the number of children who are up to date in a schedule of well-child care.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (C)(3)

The current draft of the State's ELDS contains a progression of standards in motor development, physical development, health and personal care, and safety. The Framework for a Comprehensive Early Childhood System is used by the State Advisory Council to guide policy and contains standards similar to the ELDS. Currently the State screens newborns. In 2012, the State DOH home visiting programs will start up an in-hospital early identification and intervention program. Newborns will be screened, assessed and referred for further assistance. This data will be used within TQRIS. Private foundations are working on screening and treating children within the Autism spectrum. The family-centered medical homes screen, intervene and provide treatment for children with developmental delays. The Healthy Child Care Hawaii program developed a guide for health promotion in ELDP in the State. Combined with the Plan to increase and support the family-centered medical homes through the Grant, this is an area of strength. The State does not have existing numbers and percentages of Early Childhood Educators who receive training and support in meeting the health standards. The State does identify how this is currently done and how the Grant will help increase the numbers of those children being served. They have a target of training 1000 ELD practitioners and 250 family and community members by 2015. The lack of baseline data as well as the lack of a plan for deriving this information are weaknesses. The State already has some programs and initiatives in place to promote healthy eating habits, improving nutrition and expanding physical activity. It does not specify the role the Plan will play in identifying and addressing those needs. This is a weakness in the Plan. Children who qualify at 300% federal poverty income level have access to full medical assistance, including screening. 27% of the State's children receive standardized screening for development of behavioral problems. The Plan proposes to increase the rate of children who are screened, which is anticipated to enhance the State's ability to leverage federal Medicaid monies, but does not clearly state how it will do this. There is a Legislative Task Force exploring how to best use existing resources to increase the number of Children with High Needs who are referred for service or follow-up based on screenings. The Head Start model is suggested as a possible way to do this through ELDP. That there is not yet an articulated way to do this is a weakness of the Plan. The Plan does have four strategies for helping all children participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well-child care. The family-centered medical homes concept is an important part of these strategies and is a strength of the proposal. However, the data on table (C)(3)(d)(3) is incomplete. This is a medium quality response that is partially implemented.

	Available	Score
(C)(4) Engaging and supporting families.	**20**	**12**

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to provide culturally and linguistically appropriate information and support to families of Children with High Needs in order to promote school readiness for their children by--

(a) Establishing a progression of culturally and linguistically appropriate standards for family engagement across the levels of its Program Standards, including activities that enhance the capacity of families to support their children's education and development;

(b) Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators trained and supported on an on-going basis to implement the family engagement strategies included in the Program Standards; and

(c) Promoting family support and engagement statewide, including by leveraging other existing resources such as through home visiting programs, other family-serving agencies, and through outreach to family, friend, and neighbor caregivers.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (C)(4)

The Tiered Family Engagement Standards are based on the PAS and BAS scales. They include policies, resources, education, communication, involvement and outside family support resources. Each of the five levels are described. In addition, the TQRIS will address family engagement, diversity and inclusion. There are several programs in place, some private, which enhance the capacity of parents to support their child's education and development. These include Family-Child Interactive Learning Programs. The availability and accessibility of family engagement professional development will be tracked through the TQRIS. Gaps identified will result in the professional development providers being encouraged to fill them in with their training. The timeline for implementation shows that all programs for children with high needs will have been trained by the end of 2015 and that FES training activities will be sustained beyond the end of the grant. By 2014, at 90% of all ELD practitioners will have at least 15 hours of training in establishing and sustaining family engagement. This is substantial. All coaching will adhere to the Strengthening Families Approach and Protective Factors Framework. Six programs/projects were identified as providing this professional development. The implementation of the High Quality Workforce and Professional Development Plan, part of the State's overall Plan, provides guidelines which

will help in the development of family sensitive curriculum in teacher preparation programs. Practitioners will be informed about public and private resources for families. They are expected to help the families of the children they teach find programs and services the families/children need. Nine resources for supporting families are listed. These include state and private resources. One of the private resources is Keiki Steps. This is a grassroots program effecting 6500 children involving parents and children is combined teaching of development and parental roles in a culturally responsive manner. This is a high quality response which is minimally implemented.

D. A Great Early Childhood Education Workforce

The total points that a State may earn for selection criteria (D)(1) and (D)(2) is 40. The 40 points will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points. For example, if the applicant chooses to address both selection criteria under this Focused Investment Area, each criterion will be worth up to 20 points. If the applicant chooses to address one selection criterion, the criterion will be worth up to 40 points.

The applicant must address at least one of the selection criteria within Focused Investment Area (D), which are as follows:

	Available	Score
(D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.	20	6

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to--

(a) Develop a common, statewide Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework designed to promote children's learning and development and improve child outcomes;

(b) Develop a common, statewide progression of credentials and degrees aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework; and

(c) Engage postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers in aligning professional development opportunities with the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (D)(1)

The Hawaii Careers With Young Children is leading the development of the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. They have already implemented a registry. They also developed Career Access and Navigation of Early Childhood Systems - CANOES, a system much like the proposed TQRIS but smaller in scale. They are developing Common Core Competencies which encompasses all existing ones in the State. The CANOES Common Core Competencies will be built into the WKCF. There appears to be a statewide progression of credentials and degrees in the appendix. It is not currently aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. This is supposed to be in process. The postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers have been involved in either developing or providing feedback for the Common Core Competencies, the Career Framework and Lattice and Practitioner Registry. It is not clear whether they will continue to be involved as these components are used to develop the WKCF. While quite a bit of the ground work has been laid for beginning work on the WKCF, the ambiguity of how this is to be done and the lack of addressing the elements outlined in the definition of WKCF is a major problem in this selection criteria, resulting in medium, low quality response. This is partially implemented.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.	20	7

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to improve the effectiveness and retention of Early Childhood Educators who work with Children with High Needs, with the goal of improving child outcomes by--

(a) Providing and expanding access to effective professional development opportunities that are aligned with the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework;

(b) Implementing policies and incentives (e.g., scholarships, compensation and wage supplements, tiered reimbursement rates, other financial incentives, management opportunities) that promote professional improvement and career advancement along an articulated career pathway that is aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and that are designed to increase retention;

(c) Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention; and

(d) Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for--

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

that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework; and

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

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (D)(2)

The four Professional Development Recruitment and Resource Centers incorporated into the State's Plan will assess recruitment and professional development needs in their communities and partner with other programs to meet those needs. This is expected to increase the numbers of professionals in the areas where they are needed. It is hoped that capacity and quality of current centers, especially those in high needs areas, will increase. The same is true of the number of practitioners obtaining higher degrees. The hope is that the operating costs for these centers will be minimized by others helping to fund them. Minimum number of teacher training sessions which are to be done through these centers has been specified. These centers are to be placed in areas of high need. The TQRIS incorporates six levels of the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework into staffing requirements of the State. This is a substantial portion of the system. There are already some incentives for improvement for practitioners. Some come in the form of tuition relief and scholarships. Others come in the form of coaching support. The PDRRC will maintain a pool of substitutes which will free practitioners to attend trainings. A wage supplement is mentioned in table (D)(4)-1, but not explained in the narrative. In terms of providing incentives for practitioners, this is not adequate to cover what is expected of them as they advance through the tiers. There is no mention of increased pay for advancement. It is likely that those who gain higher education will seek higher paying jobs elsewhere, which will make the retention problem in the State worse. The current registry is available to the public, but does not capture information from all providers. CANOES will capture more (but not all) of that information and make it available to the public. It is not certain from the response that the TQRIS is integrating the CANOES data base with its own. Earlier narrative did say that the TQRIS will build upon CANOES. There is no mention as to how the general public will be directed to the information. There is a newsletter, PATCH, which is available to EC professionals, but not generally available to the public at large. The data from Table (D)(2)(d)(1) show increasing numbers of postgraduate institutions who have aligned their curriculum with WKCF and a corresponding increase in EC educators who have been credentialed by these institutions. There is no narrative to accompany this table. The State does not have baseline data but has set ambitious goals for moving up the progression of credentials over the years. Starting with no data, it is questionable whether its projected 50% movement is achievable by 2015. There is no narrative to accompany this table. This is important because there is no discussion within the (D)(2) of how the baseline data will be collected. The Professional Development Recruitment and Resource Centers and current work by CANOES is a strength in this section. The incomplete data table with lack of narrative, vague references to how the public at large will be led to information about ELDP and practitioners, and lack of effective incentives for practitioners to encourage movement up the levels all weaken the response. This is a medium quality response which is partially implemented.

E. Measuring Outcomes and Progress

The total points an applicant may earn for selection criteria (E)(1) and (E)(2) is 40. The 40 points will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points. For example, if the applicant chooses to address both selection criteria under this Focused Investment Area, each criterion will be worth up to 20 points. If the applicant chooses to address one selection criterion, the criterion will be worth up to 40 points.

The applicant must address at least one of the selection criteria within Focused Investment Area (E), which are as follows:

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.	20	7

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to implement, independently or as part of a cross-State consortium, a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that informs instruction and services in the early elementary grades and that--

(a) Is aligned with the State's Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness;

(b) Is valid, reliable, and appropriate for the target population and for the purpose for which it will be used, including for English learners and children with disabilities;

(c) Is administered beginning no later than the start of school year 2014-2015 to children entering a public school kindergarten; States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation;

(d) Is reported to the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and to the early learning data system, if it is separate from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, as permitted under and consistent with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws; and

(e) Is funded, in significant part, with Federal or State resources other than those available under this grant, (e.g., with funds available under section 6111 or 6112 of the ESEA).

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (E)(1)

The State will be developing a new common statewide kindergarten entry assessment which is scheduled to begin during the 2014 -2015 school year. It will be aligned with the ELDS and with the Common Core Standards. These standards will be/are aligned with all Essential Domains of School Readiness. The data from this assessment will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of ELDP and to help inform classroom instruction. It is expected that this will allow for greater individualization, thus making developmentally appropriate choices for children with diverse abilities and needs. The current State School Readiness Assessment has been in place since 2004 and has been validated. Since it only rates readiness at the classroom level, it is necessary to develop a Kindergarten Entry Assessment to gather data for individual children. Discussion as to how this KEA will be validated or checked for reliability as well as discussion as to how it will be used, especially for High Needs Children, is limited to a statement that this was done for the SSRA and it will be established through academic studies. The State will begin implementation during the 2014 -2015 school year. This will form the basis for broader statewide implementation. The data from the KEA will be reported to the State DOE data system and will ultimately be integrated with other State agency data. There is no mention in the narrative as to whether this will be done as permitted under and consistent with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws. RTT-ELC will be used to fund the development and piloting of the KEA. While some Federal and State resources will be used, it is not clear whether these will be a significant part of the funding. (E)(1) had some strengths, like the plans to implement a KEA, a solid base for developing it and an appropriate deadline for implementation. There are parts of the discussion which were minimally addressed, such as establishing validation and reliability for the KEA. This is a medium low quality response which has been partially implemented.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.	20	14

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to enhance the State's existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System or to build or enhance a separate, coordinated, early learning data system that aligns and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and that either data system--

(a) Has all of the Essential Data Elements;

(b) Enables uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating State Agencies and Participating Programs;

(c) 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;

(d) 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

(e) Meets the Data System Oversight Requirements and complies with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (E)(2)

Much of the TQRIS is already implemented as separate databases or as ongoing data integration projects. Those parts which are not in place are being implemented. Only one component, program level data on structure, quality etc , is in the planning stage and is discussed in Chart (E)(2)-2. All essential data elements are in the Plan. TQRIS enables uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating State Agencies and Participating Programs. A procedure for deciding upon and inserting new data elements will be developed. Directors from all Participating State Agencies are part of the Executive Committee. Representatives from the PSA sit on the subcommittees to ensure cross-agency coordination. The adoption of standard data structures, data formats, and data definitions will be done through these subcommittees. The State will use a "design build" process which will involve the data system users in all stages of system development so that their needs will be met. There is a feedback component, helping make the information relevant and accessible to stakeholders. All of this will be done the first half of the Grant period, with the feedback component remaining in place. The second half of the Grant period will involve coaches who supply support for the system users. The system will allow parents/families to access information that will allow them to choose programs that are best for their children. In 2015, a Data Governance and Access Committee will oversee the interagency data sharing and reporting. A MOU has been made detailing how the Committee works. The clinical health data will be kept in another system in order to be able to comply with the Affordable Care Act 2014. This was a medium high quality response which is partially implemented.

	Available	Score
Total Points Available for Selection Criteria	**280**	**141**

Priorities

Competitive Preference Priorities

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Including all Early Learning and Development Programs in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	10	5

Competitive Preference Priority 2 is designed to increase the number of children from birth to kindergarten entry who are participating in programs that are governed by the State's licensing system and quality standards, with the goal that all licensed or State-regulated programs will participate. The State will receive points for this priority based on the extent to which the State has in place, or has a High-Quality Plan to implement no later than June 30, 2015--

(a) A licensing and inspection system that covers all programs that are not otherwise regulated by the State and that regularly care for two or more unrelated children for a fee in a provider setting; provided that if the State exempts programs for reasons other than the number of children cared for, the State may exclude those entities and reviewers will score this priority only on the basis of non-excluded entities; and

(b) A Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System in which all licensed or State-regulated Early Learning and Development Programs participate.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (P)(2)

The State will have both (a) and (b) in place by June 30, 2015. The State's plan for(b) is ambiguous since Early Learning and Development Programs funded under section 619 of part C of IDEA have a choice to be included in the TQRIS.

Priorities

	Available	Yes/No
Competitive Preference Priority 3: Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry	0 or 10	No

To meet this priority, the State must, in its application--

(a) Demonstrate that it has already implemented a Kindergarten Entry Assessment that meets selection criterion (E)(1) by indicating that all elements in Status Table (A)(1)-12 are met; or

(b) Address selection criterion (E)(1) and earn a score of at least 70 percent of the maximum points available for that criterion.

Comments on (P)(3)

a) The State has not yet implemented a Kindergarten Entry Assessment. b)The lack of implementation of an otherwise high quality response earned a score of 60% of the maximum points available

Absolute Priority

	Met? Yes/No
Absolute Priority - Promoting School Readiness for Children with High Needs.	Yes

To meet this priority, the State's application must comprehensively and coherently address how the State will build a system that increases the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs so that they enter kindergarten ready to succeed.

The State's application must demonstrate how it will improve the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs by integrating and aligning resources and policies across Participating State Agencies and by designing and implementing a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System. In addition, to achieve the necessary reforms, the State must make strategic improvements in those specific reform areas that will most significantly improve program quality and outcomes for Children with High Needs. Therefore, the State must address those criteria from within each of the Focused Investment Areas (sections (C) Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children, (D) A Great Early Childhood Education Workforce, and (E) Measuring Outcomes and Progress) that it believes will best prepare its Children with High Needs for kindergarten success.

Comments on Absolute Priority
The State is implementing a statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System which incorporates the distinct needs of young children. Data collected will include information which will both inform the quality of ELDP and help make program and individual changes form children. The emphasis on continuity of screening and resulting intervention as well as the integration of the family into the systems support the claim that this Plan is intended to significantly improve program quality and outcomes for Children with High Needs. The workforce development includes training on working with these children which will occur on a yearly basis. The four Professional Development Recruitment and Resource Centers are strong components of the development of a great early childhood education workforce, encouraging recruitment, retention and training of practitioners. The State does have a plan in place for measuring outcomes and progress for preparing High Needs Children for kindergarten success.

Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge Review

Technical Review Form Page

Application # HI-5010

Peer Reviewer: [redacted]
Lead Monitor:
Support Monitor:
Application Status: **Reviewed**
Date/Time: **11/17/2011 - 10:53 AM**

CORE AREAS (A) and (B)

States must address in their application all of the selection criteria in the Core Areas.

A. Successful State Systems

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Demonstrating past commitment to early learning and development	20	16

The extent to which the State has demonstrated past commitment to and investment in high-quality, accessible Early Learning and Development Programs and services for Children with High Needs, as evidenced by the State's--

(a) Financial investment, from January 2007 to the present, in Early Learning and Development Programs, including the amount of these investments in relation to the size of the State's population of Children with High Needs during this time period;

(b) Increasing, from January 2007 to the present, the number of Children with High Needs participating in Early Learning and Development Programs;

(c) Existing early learning and development legislation, policies, or practices; and

(d) Current status in key areas that form the building blocks for a high quality early learning and development system, including Early Learning and Development Standards, Comprehensive Assessment Systems, health promotion practices, family engagement strategies, the development of Early Childhood Educators, Kindergarten Entry Assessments, and effective data practices.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (A)(1)

The state has demonstrated its past commitment to and investment in high-quality, accessible Early Learning and Development Programs and services for Children with High Needs to some extent but it appears that budget cuts forced funding reductions; particularly notable in 2010 which is a weakness. --The CCDF match was exceeded for each of the five years though funds were reduced in 2010. The supplemental funding to Head Start / Early Head Start was maintained in 2010 from the previous year. The state funded preschool was increased from 2009 - 2010 by more than $300K. One of the most notable reductions is in the DOH Home Visiting Program and Preschool Open Doors subsidies. --Though funding was reduced, it appears that the services to children with high needs are relatively maintained; however, the number of Children with High Needs participating in Early Learning and Development Programs did not increase which is considered a weakness. The availability of other funding from outside sources likely contributed to the maintenance of services. The state enjoys contributions from local foundations, W.K. Kellogg Foundation for Hawaii's P-3 initiative and an endowment from Princess Bernice Pauahi Paki Bishop for the Kamehameha Schools. --Hawaii's past and present legislation policies, and practices are evidence of strong dedication and commitment to early learning and development. Hawaii was a leader in establishing Healthy Start funding that was later modeled in other states throughout the country. The Early Childhood Master Plan of 1996 was the foundation for the Good beginnings Alliance, a cabinet level statewide nonprofit coordinating agency. In 2002, a definition of school readiness was adopted into law. Act 151, SLH 2005 created an Early Childhood Task Force to create a framework to increase access to ECE, improve programs, support PD of the ECE workforce, address compensation issues, inform parents and ensure inter-agency coordination. The Early Learning Task Force was created in 2006 to develop a statewide plan featuring cross-sector and interdepartmental collaboration and PD of practitioners among other issues. --The Early Childhood Education Professional Development System of 1996 provided oversight to the professional development efforts, workforce quality standards and a practitioner registry. This effort led to the development of common core competencies for ECE practitioners, promoting coordination for institutions offering ECE degrees, a website to provide guidance for practitioners and the piloting of a training quality assurance and improvement system. Most notably, the Governor designated the Hawaii Early Learning Council as the State Advisory Council

(SAC) on Early Learning and Development Programs. Hawaii was successful in its RTT for K-12 which included a plan to increase quality preschool access for keiki (keiki is Hawaiian for children which is used exclusively in the application) with High Needs including full preschool tuition subsidies to keiki with high needs in two demonstration Zones of School Innovation. --The state provides evidence of work in key areas that form the building blocks for a high quality early learning and development system. The state plans to build on the foundation developed with the Hawaii Early Childhood Accreditation Project as the beginnings of formal assessments via Tiered Quality Rating Improvement System (TQRIS). Health promotion practices include health insurance since 1974 for families up to 300% of the FPL, newborn screenings, attention to oral health (though few details were provided for this element) and social/emotional development supports. The practitioner core competencies address family engagement within the relationships competency. The Early Learning Development Standards provide attention to cultural responsiveness and key values acknowledging family engagement. The state has a history of support for the ECE workforce and through private funding, developed and implemented a system to bring existing components together into a formal system. The state has been providing school readiness assessments since 2004-2005. Efforts to build a longitudinal data system was funded from the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund under America Competes Act, it committed to the inclusion of the early childhood data integration as well. Several of the charts were incomplete or missing data, making it difficult to evaluate. Overall, it is evident that Hawaii has a history of commitment to its youngest citizens.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Articulating the State's rationale for its early learning and development reform agenda and goals.	20	16

The extent to which the State clearly articulates a comprehensive early learning and development reform agenda that is ambitious yet achievable, builds on the State's progress to date (as demonstrated in selection criterion (A)(1)), is most likely to result in improved school readiness for Children with High Needs, and includes--

(a) Ambitious yet achievable goals for improving program quality, improving outcomes for Children with High Needs statewide, and closing the readiness gap between Children with High Needs and their peers;

(b) An overall summary of the State Plan that clearly articulates how the High-Quality Plans proposed under each selection criterion, when taken together, constitute an effective reform agenda that establishes a clear and credible path toward achieving these goals; and

(c) A specific rationale that justifies the State's choice to address the selected criteria in each Focused Investment Area (C), (D), and (E), including why these selected criteria will best achieve these goals.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (A)(2)

The state has articulated a comprehensive early learning and development reform agenda that is somewhat ambitious, builds on the progress to date but does not sufficiently increase the participation of licensed child care centers participating in TQRIS. The goal for licensed care by the end of the funding period is 10% participation which is considered a weakness. --The state has outlined a plan defining an overall aspirational goal, strategic goals and objectives for accomplishing the work. The plan addresses five areas of reform to include: enhancing integration and coordination of programs, policies and services through the establishment of a new State Department of Early Childhood; design and implement a Tiered Quality Rating Improvement System (TQRIS); improve early learning outcomes by focusing on children with high needs; enhance the size and quality of the ECE workforce and measuring outcomes and progress through the longitudinal data system and kindergarten entry screening. --The state provided sufficient rationale that justifies the State's choice to address the selected criteria. They plan to focus their efforts on rural communities recognizing the geographic challenges of meeting the needs of keiki on four islands by establishing hubs of service on each island. Further, they justify this focus based on the socioeconomic indicators of high poverty levels, poor educational attainment and transportation challenges to major population centers. --The state identifies one objective to increase the quality of early learning and development programs through enrollment in the TQRIS focusing primarily on Head Start and Early Head Start programs. Considering that Head Start and Early Head Start standards are already higher than licensing standards, it is not clear why the target appears to be more focused on this segment of care and considerably low targets for licensed care providers since they serve Children with High Needs through their state funded preschool dollars which is a weakness in the model. The state provided no justification as to why the low targets for licensed child care participation, which is considered a weakness. --It appears that the majority of care funded through CCDF is through relative or licensed exempt providers, twice as much as center-based care. The state proposes to design TQRIS to be inclusive of family, friend and neighbor (FFN) care. As of 2009, no other state has included this segment of care in their quality rating system according to NCCIC. This is an innovative undertaking considering that the state is in the beginning stages of piloting a TQRIS in 2012. There are no specific details as to how FFN care will be integrated into the TQRIS with the exception of the mention of differential subsidy payment rates, which is considered a weakness. --The state has provided a rationale justifying their choice to address the selected criteria in each focused investment area. They explained why the selected criteria will best achieve these goals based on their assessment of existing systems and their goals for achieving their overall outcomes for system changes to improve results for Hawaii's children.

	Available	Score
(A)(3) Aligning and coordinating early learning and development across the State	10	8

The extent to which the State has established, or has a High-Quality Plan to establish, strong participation and commitment in the State Plan by Participating State Agencies and other early learning and development stakeholders by--

(a) Demonstrating how the Participating State Agencies and other partners, if any, will identify a governance structure for working together that will facilitate interagency coordination, streamline decision making, effectively allocate resources, and create long-term sustainability and describing--

(1) The organizational structure for managing the grant and how it builds upon existing interagency governance structures such as children's cabinets, councils, and commissions, if any already exist and are effective;

(2) The governance-related roles and responsibilities of the Lead Agency, the State Advisory Council, each Participating State Agency, the State's Interagency Coordinating Council for part C of IDEA, and other partners, if any;

(3) The method and process for making different types of decisions (e.g., policy, operational) and resolving disputes; and

(4) The plan for when and how the State will involve 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 planning and implementation of the activities carried out under the grant;

(b) Demonstrating that the Participating State Agencies are strongly committed to the State Plan, to the governance structure of the grant, and to effective implementation of the State Plan, by including in the MOU or other binding agreement between the State and each Participating State Agency--

(1) Terms and conditions that reflect a strong commitment to the State Plan by each Participating State Agency, including terms and conditions designed to align and leverage the Participating State Agencies' existing funding to support the State Plan;

(2) "Scope-of-work" descriptions that require each Participating State Agency to implement all applicable portions of the State Plan and a description of efforts to maximize the number of Early Learning and Development Programs that become Participating Programs; and

(3) A signature from an authorized representative of each Participating State Agency; and

(c) Demonstrating commitment to the State Plan from a broad group of stakeholders that will assist the State in reaching the ambitious yet achievable goals outlined in response to selection criterion (A)(2)(a), including by obtaining--

(1) Detailed and persuasive letters of intent or support from Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, and, if applicable, local early learning councils; and

(2) Letters of intent or support from such other stakeholders as Early Childhood Educators or their representatives; the State's legislators; local community leaders; State or local school boards; representatives of private and faith-based early learning programs; other State and local leaders (e.g., business, community, tribal, civil rights, education association leaders); adult education and family literacy State and local leaders; family and community organizations (e.g., parent councils, nonprofit organizations, local foundations, tribal organizations, and community-based organizations); libraries and children's museums; health providers; and postsecondary institutions.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (A)(3)

The state has partially implemented this criteria and has presented a plan to establish strong participation and commitment in the state plan by participating agencies and stakeholders; however, there was no organizational chart to depicting the organizational management flow which is considered a weakness. --An MOU is included between the Department of Human Services serving as the lead agency and the Departments of Education, Labor and Industrial Relations, Health and the University of Hawaii. Specific roles and responsibilities are defined for all agencies. Exhibit 1 further defines the scope of work for the participating state agencies in relation to the criteria. An executed MOU for data sharing is also included. The plans are for the grant to be managed by an interim Office of Early Childhood within the Office of the Governor. A state early childhood coordinator will convene an Executive Management Team with the chair of the state's advisory council and cabinet level leaders from state agencies. They will oversee the total project. Interdepartmental workgroups with agency liaisons will oversee the work in various agencies. They will use tools such as the Balanced Scorecard to manage project work. These processes and strategies are considered strengths. The following represents the scope of work for each agency: --The DHS will be the lead agency responsible for the TQRIS, early learning standards, professional development, collaborating on the longitudinal data system and managing contracts. They have outlined a process for decision-making and conflict resolution that appears to be appropriate for the project. --DOH will train professionals on medical home models, conduct promotion activities on early health and development, family engagement and collaboration. --DOE will develop a new kindergarten entry assessment, expand its longitudinal data system to include ECE, develop and model early learning in the RTT Zones of School Innovation. --University of Hawaii will incorporate ECE into longitudinal data system they are developing through P-20. --The state has developed a plan of action for how they will engage the broader early childhood community if they receive the grant. Annually, they will host a Governor's conference on ECE, provide a website and routine

information dissemination. --Hawaii has demonstrated commitment to the State Plan from a broad group of stakeholders that will assist the state in reaching its goals. The state has done a commendable job of soliciting involvement and feedback via letters of support from the stakeholder community. In addition to the letters of support listed in the grant, an additional 60 letters were included in the application. Most of the letters explained that particular agency or organization's role in Early Learning and Development in Hawaii, a standard paragraph citing the purpose of the RTT funding used consistently in the letters and their willingness to be partners. There was evidence that they engaged the stakeholder community in August to solicit their involvement in the development of the grant response. This is considered a strength of the state's application.

	Available	Score
(A)(4) Developing a budget to implement and sustain the work of this grant.	15	4

The extent to which the State Plan--

(a) Demonstrates how the State will use existing funds that support early learning and development from Federal, State, private, and local sources (e.g., CCDF; Title I and II of ESEA; IDEA; Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Program; State preschool; Head Start Collaboration and State Advisory Council funding; Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program; Title V MCH Block Grant; TANF; Medicaid; child welfare services under Title IV (B) and (E) of the Social Security Act; Statewide Longitudinal Data System; foundation; other private funding sources) for activities and services that help achieve the outcomes in the State Plan, including how the quality set-asides in CCDF will be used;

(b) Describes, in both the budget tables and budget narratives, how the State will effectively and efficiently use funding from this grant to achieve the outcomes in the State Plan, in a manner that--

(1) Is adequate to support the activities described in the State Plan;

(2) Includes costs that are reasonable and necessary in relation to the objectives, design, and significance of the activities described in the State Plan and the number of children to be served; and

(3) Details the amount of funds budgeted for Participating State Agencies, localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, or other partners, and the specific activities to be implemented with these funds consistent with the State Plan, and demonstrates that a significant amount of funding will be devoted to the local implementation of the State Plan; and

(c) Demonstrates that it can be sustained after the grant period ends to ensure that the number and percentage of Children with High Needs served by Early Learning and Development Programs in the State will be maintained or expanded.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (A)(4)

The state presents a plan for budget development to implement and sustain the work. The state provides a summary of existing resources to support Early Learning and Development program efforts. The state is committing additional funds to the effort as follows: $826,330 of private funds in 2012; $387,330 of private funds in 2013 and $387,330 in 2014 towards system building using the CCDF quality set-aside funds. Each agency budget reflects the amount of existing funding they will devote to the RTT-ELC effort totaling $22,774,482 over the grant period. The chart on existing other Federal, State and Private Funds to be used is incomplete which is considered a weakness. --The budget outlined for how the RTT-ELC funds will be used to support the activities is not sufficiently detailed and is thereby considered a weakness. For example, system coordination and oversight is listed under the Office of Early Childhood. Personnel and fringe costs exceed $6M over the grant period; yet there is little explanation in the narrative as to the positions covered and their roles. System coordination and oversight is also the role of the Department of Human Services. Salaries and fringes for DHS total more than $9.5M. The narrative mentions 76 new hires for contract management, monitoring and administrative functions. The funds seem to be heavily weighted in state level administration without clear delineations of positions, numbers of positions, roles, salaries and how these are mission critical to support and advance an ambitious reform agenda. Considering the bulk of the funds are maintained in the state agencies, it is not clear on how these funds are targeted to be used and how this strategy will enable the state to succeed. --The sustainability of the projects after the funding ends is unclear which is a weakness. The applicant states that the Executive Management Team will be responsive for ensuring sustainability after the project ends but there are no specific references to how that will occur. Further, a fiscal mapping study underway by The Finance Project is referenced as a tool to help them consider sustainability.

B. High-Quality, Accountable Programs

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	10	4

The extent to which the State and its Participating State Agencies have developed and adopted, or have a High-Quality Plan to develop and adopt, a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System that--

(a) Is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards that include--

(1) Early Learning and Development Standards;

(2) A Comprehensive Assessment System;

(3) Early Childhood Educator qualifications;

(4) Family engagement strategies;

(5) Health promotion practices; and

(6) Effective data practices;

(b) Is clear and has standards that are measurable, meaningfully differentiate program quality levels, and reflect high expectations of program excellence commensurate with nationally recognized standards that lead to improved learning outcomes for children; and

(c) Is linked to the State licensing system for Early Learning and Development Programs.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(1)

The state has not implemented a TQRIS and has proposed plan but lacks depth to adopt a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS). Hawaii is planning to pilot a TQRIS in 2012 but current efforts lack a statewide set of tiered Program Standards that encompass all of the necessary elements. In response, the state plans to use RTT-ELC funding to fill those gaps. For example, the Early Learning and Development Standards have been developed but are not yet published. The comprehensive assessment system is in the planning stage but the state has identified reliable assessment instruments. Hawaii plans to pilot the system in January 2012 but considering the amount of work to be accomplished in a very short time period, this does not appear realistic which is a weakness in the plan. --Early childhood educator qualifications will be collected and maintained utilizing the Hawaii Voluntary Registry to collect information and data on the workforce. There is no reference to ensuring that the registry complies with The National Registry Alliance standards and data protocols for verification. However, funds from RTT-ELC are intended to further develop the Registry for the TQRIS. The state defines a plan to incorporate some of the necessary elements into the TQRIS but not all are referenced which is considered a weakness. The data systems are planned to be linked. The TQRIS data system is an expansion of the one used for the Quality Care Program. It will link to licensing and subsidy distributions which is considered a strength; the Registry administered by the Resource & Referral (R&R) agency; local Association for the Education of Young Children (AEYC) that will provide coaching; Preschool-3rd grade (P-3) system for student assessment and longitudinal data; and the state university system who will be doing the program assessments. --Each of the quality elements addressed include: Early Childhood Care and Education (child/teacher interactions, curriculum, child assessment, mental health, environment); Family Partnerships (policies, resources & education, communicate, involvement, outside family support resources); Diversity and Inclusion (materials, activities, child/teacher interactions, staff training, family involvement); Staff Qualifications (teacher qualifications, director qualifications, individual professional development opportunities); Program Design and Management (classroom size and ratios, staff compensation, self-assessment mechanisms, staff development plan and policies and procedures). The table provided in the appendix provides an overview of each of the quality elements and which assessments and measures are associated with each of the quality elements. The TQRIS plan for Infant/Toddler Center-based Programs and Preschool Center-Based Programs are appropriate for their age groups and proposes appropriate measures. --The TQRIS as outlined in the appendix reflects five levels. Supporting evidence for each of the levels is included along with minimum required scores on the assessments planned to include the following instruments: ITERS-R, ECERS-R, FCCERS-R, CLASS, PAS, and BAS. National AEYC (NAEYC) accreditation for centers and National Association of Family Child Care Homes (NAFCC) accreditation is also required for Level 5. Early learning standards are in development that are expected to be integrated into the TQRIS. Staff qualifications at each level appear to be linked to the Registry with the expectations outlined and coordinate with educational credentials. It is not clear, however, what the key is for the staff credentials and the expectations for each level based on the abbreviations in the table, which is considered a weakness. --The link to the state licensing system for the TQRIS was not clearly defined, which is considered a weakness. There were only three sentences referencing the connections to licensing which made this criterion difficult to evaluate.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Promoting participation in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	15	5

The extent to which the State has maximized, or has a High-Quality Plan to maximize, program participation in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by--

(a) Implementing effective policies and practices to reach the goal of having all publicly funded Early Learning and Development Programs participate in such a system, including programs in each of the following categories--

(1) State-funded preschool programs;

(2) Early Head Start and Head Start programs;

(3) Early Learning and Development Programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA;

(4) Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of the ESEA; and

(5) Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program;

(b) Implementing effective policies and practices designed to help more families afford high-quality child care and maintain the supply of high-quality child care in areas with high concentrations of Children with High Needs (e.g., maintaining or increasing subsidy reimbursement rates, taking actions to ensure affordable co-payments, providing incentives to high-quality providers to participate in the subsidy program); and

(c) Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for the numbers and percentages of Early Learning and Development Programs that will participate in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by type of Early Learning and Development Program (as listed in (B)(2)(a)(1) through (5) above).

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(2)

The state has not implemented and presents a plan to maximize program participation in the state's TQRIS. The state outlines a minimal plan to address each of the funding streams and how these programs will be integrated into the TQRIS. The state does not have a universal prekindergarten program but has some funding to provide preschool experiences for Children with High Needs. Private preschools are planned for the TQRIS pilot in 2012. Head Start and Early Head Start programs will be engaged in the TQRIS pilot. Dual enrollments are planned for children with disabilities so that they have access to TQRIS programs. The only group referenced in the CCDF program is the Family Friend and Neighbor (FFN) care where the majority of the children are served. They plan to develop a model of TQRIS for this targeted group. As this segment is license-exempt, it is not clear how this will be woven into a formal TQRIS that builds on the licensing system which is a weakness; however, they are planning to tie the rating in with a tiered subsidy reimbursement by 2014 which is a strength. Licensed family child care homes will be included in the state's pilot in 2012. --Access to high-quality care is an acknowledged problem in Hawaii. Capacity issues are outlined, e.g. providing care outside of the urban areas of Oahu as much of the state is rural. Funding from the existing RTT provides additional subsidies for preschool children in the zones of innovation schools. It was not clear how the activities funded by RTT-ELC would address this critical issue with the exception of distance and online learning opportunities for practitioners to improve their knowledge and skills which is considered a weakness. --Targets listed for engagement in the TQRIS appear to be achievable but not ambitious; it is not clear how many programs receiving CCDF funds would participate as there were no baseline data to determine this aspect, which is considered a weakness. The focus appears to be primarily on Head Start and Early Head Start programs which could provide valuable data on TQRIS adoption but these programs are already expected to function at higher level considering the mandated performance standards. This is a weakness when evaluating the overall system without the participation of higher numbers of private and licensed preschools.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs	**15**	**7**

The extent to which the State and its Participating State Agencies have developed and implemented, or have a High-Quality Plan to develop and implement, a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by--

(a) Using a valid and reliable tool for monitoring such programs, having trained monitors whose ratings have an acceptable level of inter-rater reliability, and monitoring and rating the Early Learning and Development Programs with appropriate frequency; and

(b) Providing 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) and making 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.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(3)

The state has not implemented the rating and monitoring system but has a plan to develop and implement a system of rating and monitoring the Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the TQRIS. --The tools to be used in the TQRIS are: ERS (ECERS-R, FCCERS-R and ITERS-R); PAS and BAS, and the CLASS. These are reliable and valid instruments for measuring environmental quality, program and business administrative practices and adult/child interactions. They have outlined a procedure for ensuring assessors are trained and reliable. The frequency of monitoring refers only to the pilot and they make no reference to full implementation, which is considered a weakness. They are also planning to provide training on the assessments which is a strength. A baseline will be established in the pilot within six weeks on all programs using the rating scales. If the program is accredited by NAEYC or NAFCC, the CLASS and PAS/BAS will be used in addition to the ERS. Less clear are the procedures that will be followed for the FFN care as it is not yet developed which could

be considered a weakness. --Parent focus groups are planned to elicit parent feedback about strategies most beneficial in communicating the TQRIS information. Getting the perspectives of parents and using the results to frame a public education strategy is a strength of the plan. The Resource & Referral (R&R) agency will inform parents seeking care as to the rating and two websites will be established that will provide information for parents.

	Available	Score
(B)(4) Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs	20	5

The extent to which the State and its Participating State Agencies have developed and implemented, or have a High-Quality Plan to develop and implement, a system for improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by--

(a) Developing and implementing policies and practices that provide support and incentives for Early Learning and Development Programs to continuously improve (e.g., through training, technical assistance, financial rewards or incentives, higher subsidy reimbursement rates, compensation);

(b) Providing supports to help working families who have Children with High Needs access high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs that meet those needs (e.g., providing full-day, full-year programs; transportation; meals; family support services); and

(c) Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for increasing--

(1) The number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System; and

(2) 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 Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(4)

The state has not implemented but presents a plan for developing and implementing a system to improve the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the TQRIS. --The state plans two types of incentives in the pilot to include quality awards and quality improvement awards. Awards will be made based on the level achieved, the size of the program and the number of keiki subsidized by DHS. Quality improvement grants will be made to support program efforts to advance their ratings. This is considered a strength as these funds are to be used to address the deficiencies and weaknesses identified in the assessments. Considering the high number of children served in FFN, the state does not identify the incentives it will use in developing this segment of the provider population as it is not identified in the table (B)(4)(c)(2) which is considered a weakness. --Addressing the criterion for providing supports to help working families who have Children with High Needs access high quality Early Learning and Development Programs did not appear to be innovative beyond current practice with the exception outreach training for Family, Friend and Neighbor (FFN) care and developing an inspection system to verify health and safety elements of FFN. Considering the number of children served in FFN, any efforts to impact the quality of these environments is commendable and considered a strength. --The criterion related to setting ambitious yet achievable targets for the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS appears to be reasonable and achievable though the total number of programs in TQRIS by the end of calendar year 2015 is 159. The state distributes those programs with approximately 50% in Tiers 1 and 2. The remaining 50% are distributed between Tiers 3,4, and 5. Table A(1)3 shows that there are presently approximately 16,000 children served in some type of out of home care. The total number of children anticipated to be served in the top tiers is less than 2,500. This appears to be a weakness in that the numbers of children benefiting from the best quality programs are relatively small.

	Available	Score
(B)(5) Validating the effectiveness of the State Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System.	15	10

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to design and implement evaluations--working with an independent evaluator and, when warranted, as part of a cross-State evaluation consortium--of the relationship between the ratings generated by the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System and the learning outcomes of children served by the State's Early Learning and Development Programs by--

(a) Validating, using research-based measures, as described in the State Plan (which also describes the criteria that the State used or will use to determine those measures), whether the tiers in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System accurately reflect differential levels of program quality; and

(b) Assessing, using appropriate research designs and measures of progress (as identified in the State Plan), the extent to which changes in quality ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (B)(5)

The state plans to the design an evaluation working with an independent evaluator for this purpose. The state outlines a set of questions to be answered in the evaluation of the TQRIS such as: What are the important influences (resources versus barriers) on the movement of programs through the TQRIS levels?; What is the length of time it takes for different types of programs to move through the levels? How effective are the TQRIS assessment measures in measuring quality? among other questions. A full evaluation plan/design is not provided which is considered a weakness. --Quantitative analysis will be conducted on the TQRIS elements to include quality assessment results; quality improvement plans, frequency and intensity of coaching support provided to programs; frequency and intensity of support for quality coaches, and types of financial support received by programs. --The state outlines the tools to be used to measure progress for children and how these may be considered in linking child outcomes to quality rating assessments: These include the Social Skills Rating Scale (SSRS), Work Sampling System (WSS), Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) and Teaching Strategies GOLD which are reliable instruments. Hawaii plans to use a combination of data collected by P-3 and linking DHS data to understand the impact of the system changes on keiki outcomes. The plan does not specify that how the analysis will be conducted; for example, how the state will utilize aggregated data vs. individual child data to determine system impacts. This is considered a weakness in the evaluation plan.

Focused Investment Areas (C), (D), and (E)

Each State must address in its application–

(1) Two or more of the selection criteria in Focused Investment Area (C);

(2) One or more of the selection criteria in Focused Investment Area (D); and

(3) One or more of the selection criteria in Focused Investment Area (E).

The total available points for each Focused Investment Area will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address in that area, so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points.

C. Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children

The total available points that an applicant may receive for selection criteria (C)(1) through (C)(4) is 60. The 60 points will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points. For example, if the applicant chooses to address all four selection criteria under this Focused Investment Area, each criterion will be worth up to 15 points. If the applicant chooses to address two selection criteria, each criterion will be worth up to 30 points.

The applicant must address at least two of the selection criteria within Focused Investment Area (C), which are as follows:

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.	20	14

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to put in place high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards that are used statewide by Early Learning and Development Programs and that--

(a) Includes evidence that the Early Learning and Development Standards are developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate across each age group of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers, and that they cover all Essential Domains of School Readiness;

(b) Includes evidence that the Early Learning and Development Standards are aligned with the State's K-3 academic standards in, at a minimum, early literacy and mathematics;

(c) Includes evidence that the Early Learning and Development Standards are incorporated in Program Standards, curricula and activities, Comprehensive Assessment Systems, the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and professional development activities; and

(d) The State has supports in place to promote understanding of and commitment to the Early Learning and Development Standards across Early Learning and Development Programs.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (C)(1)

The state has partially implemented and has a plan to put in place high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards (ELDS) to be used statewide. The standards address the key areas of development, e.g. physical well-being, health and motor development; social and emotional development; approaches to learning; cognition and general knowledge and communication, language and literacy. Sub-domains address specific skills for what children should know and be able to do. Each goal is accompanied by sets of standards and strategies. The standards address children from birth to kindergarten entry. They are subdivided into separate sets for each of four age groups: 0-18 months, 18 - 36 months, 36-60 months and 60 months to kindergarten. --The draft ELDS was not included in the appendix but the table of contents for the standards was included. There is evidence from the table of contents that the standards address Family, Community and Culture and the acknowledgments page thanked the reviewers for considering the cultural and linguistic appropriateness. However, since the full standards were not available for review, the reviewer was unable to evaluate this criterion. --The draft statewide standards

are aligned with the K-3 academic standards. The K-2 Common Core State Standards are being phased in this school year into the K-12 system and the ELDS will be brought into alignment with those standards. The ELDS contains strong domains for early literacy and math. This is a strength of the standards as reported but the reviewer could not evaluate this criterion without access to the draft standards. --The ELDS have not been completed and adopted but the state provides a detailed action plan for how the standards all be finalized, practitioner will receive training and how they will be integrated into the data system. The plan appears reasonable and achievable which is a strength. --The state has developed steps for promoting understanding and commitment to the standards. Their strategies include informing families, collaborations with Hawaii AEYC to disseminate information and promote the ELDS; collaboration with Hawaii Careers for Young Children; utilizing the hubs to develop and implement a training schedule on the ELDS; and publicizing and responding to requests for training and technical assistance, which is considered a strength.

	Available	Score
(C)(3) Identifying and addressing the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs to improve school readiness.	**20**	**14**

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to identify and address the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs by--

(a) Establishing a progression of standards for ensuring children's health and safety; ensuring that health and behavioral screening and follow-up occur; and promoting children's physical, social, and emotional development across the levels of its Program Standards;

(b) Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators who are trained and supported on an on-going basis in meeting the health standards;

(c) Promoting healthy eating habits, improving nutrition, expanding physical activity; and

(d) Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual targets to increase the number of Children with High Needs who--

(1) Are screened using Screening Measures that align with the Medicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment benefit (see section 1905(r)(5) of the Social Security Act) or the well-baby and well-child services available through the Children's Health Insurance Program (42 CFR 457.520), and that, as appropriate, are consistent with the Child Find provisions in IDEA (see sections 612(a)(3) and 635(a)(5) of IDEA);

(2) Are referred for services based on the results of those screenings, and where appropriate, received follow-up; and

(3) Participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well-child care, including the number of children who are up to date in a schedule of well-child care.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (C)(3)

The state has made some progress in identifying and addressing the health, behavioral and developmental needs of Children with High Needs and has partially implemented these criteria. The ELDS address child health and safety to include motor development, physical development, health and personal care and safety with progression of standards for children from birth to five. Child health is also addressed in the NAEYC accreditation process which has been widely supported in Hawaii. DHS also funds Healthy Child Care Hawaii to train providers on health, safety, and meeting the standards. Child health consultants will be provided professional development. Professional development will include a component on the Attachment and Biobehavioral CatchUp (ABC), an in-home model for training of caregivers 0-3. --Hawaii states they will train 1,000 early childhood educators but they do not have a plan or baseline data on how this will occur which is considered a weakness. --The state promotes healthy eating habits, improving nutrition and expanding activity through their hot topics training for practitioners and consultants. The Healthy Hawaii initiative will be working with practitioners to support physical activities and nutrition standards. DHS will also conduct pilot training in preschools to support the "I'm Moving, I'm Learning" curriculum. Hawaii describes the programs it has in place regarding promoting healthy eating habits, improving nutrition, or expanding physical activity but they do not describe how these funds will enhance their efforts. --The state administers the Medicaid program through Med-QUEST Division. This division recommends the use of either the Parental Evaluation of Development Status (PEDS) or Ages and Stages Questionnaires (ASQ). Hawaii's plan proposes to increase the screening rate of keiki, ages 2-5 which they believe will significantly enhance the State's ability to leverage federal Medicaid dollars. --Hawaii has achieved high rates of new born hearing (98%) and metabolic (99%) screening. In 2012, they will begin an in-hospital early identification and intervention program. Newborns will be screened and referred to home visiting programs as required by Healthy Families America model. The longitudinal data system will be able to track interventions an outcomes beginning at birth.This is considered a strength. --A legislative task force on screening was convened in 2007 and 2008 to examine data and recommend screening procedures to enhance identification, referral, intervention and treatment. However, it is not clear how this has resulted in increased screenings and follow-up care which is a weakness. While the state touts the screening and referral process used in Early Head Start and Head Start programs, they did not respond to how children are referred for services based on the results of those screenings. They did report that there are some projects in rural immunities funded by a private foundation to increase early screening and treatment rates in low-income communities. --The state outlines some good strategies for increasing the number of children that participate in ongoing health care as a part of a schedule of well child care. Hawaii has a high rate of insurance coverage but they do not believe that families are accessing the health care benefits for which they are entitled to the extent that they could.

	Available	Score
(C)(4) Engaging and supporting families.	20	15

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to provide culturally and linguistically appropriate information and support to families of Children with High Needs in order to promote school readiness for their children by--

(a) Establishing a progression of culturally and linguistically appropriate standards for family engagement across the levels of its Program Standards, including activities that enhance the capacity of families to support their children's education and development;

(b) Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators trained and supported on an on-going basis to implement the family engagement strategies included in the Program Standards; and

(c) Promoting family support and engagement statewide, including by leveraging other existing resources such as through home visiting programs, other family-serving agencies, and through outreach to family, friend, and neighbor caregivers.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (C)(4)

The state has made some progress in providing culturally and linguistically appropriate information and support to families of Children with High Needs in order to promote school readiness for their children and has partially implemented these criteria. --The ELDS are guided by three key values reflecting research findings to include: families and communities are the primary caregivers and educators of keiki; keiki develop and learn set in the convert of family and comity where they are safe and valued, their physical needs are met, and they feel psychologically secure and intellectually challenged; and keiki are capable, competent and valued. These values are embedded in the standards for TQRIS with family engagement as one of the five proposed standards area. --The state plans to increase the number and percentage of early childhood educators trained and supported on an ongoing basis to implement the family engagement strategies included in the program standards. Their goal is that 90% of all practitioners working in programs will have at least 15 hours or the credit equivalent of training in establishing and sustaining family engagement. The registry will serve to track those who have attended training and professional development opportunities offered; higher education will provide courses that support family engagement through community colleges and universities; the R&R agency will provide training on family relationships, responding to family needs and diversity and the Hawaii Early Childhood Accreditation Project provides professional development opportunities for practitioners in family involvement and engagement. Other training opportunities and venues were also provided by the state. This integration of training is a strength. --The state plans to promote family support and engagement statewide and leveraging other resources though the teen parent child care initiative; Neighborhood Place; Home Visiting Family Support Programs; Early Head Start and Head Start; and several other venues named. However, there was no reference to how this would be integrated into the FFN which is considered a weakness.

D. A Great Early Childhood Education Workforce

The total points that a State may earn for selection criteria (D)(1) and (D)(2) is 40. The 40 points will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points. For example, if the applicant chooses to address both selection criteria under this Focused Investment Area, each criterion will be worth up to 20 points. If the applicant chooses to address one selection criterion, the criterion will be worth up to 40 points.

The applicant must address at least one of the selection criteria within Focused Investment Area (D), which are as follows:

	Available	Score
(D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.	20	8

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to--

(a) Develop a common, statewide Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework designed to promote children's learning and development and improve child outcomes;

(b) Develop a common, statewide progression of credentials and degrees aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework; and

(c) Engage postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers in aligning professional development opportunities with the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (D)(1)

The state has partially implemented the criteria for workforce knowledge, a competency framework, and the progression of credentials. --The common core competencies for what practitioners should know and be able to do included in the appendix were in draft and were insufficient. For example, only one competency is provided for child growth and development with a definition and rationale. However, it fails to identify what teachers should know and be able to do with regard to the competency area. There are no tiers or levels to indicate progression of knowledge, skills and attitudes which is considered a weakness. --The goal for the state is to further develop the competencies to align with the career lattice which was included. The lattice identifies the education levels required for positions in the field, which is a strength. However, this cannot be fully aligned with the core competencies until those are further developed which is considered a weakness. --The applicant states that all primary public and private providers of early childhood professional development, including community-based organizations and institutions of higher education have been involved in developing feedback on major workforce tools, which is a strength. They will use this foundation to further develop their system and align with the framework but it is not clear whether there are plans to continue their involvement, which is a weakness.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.	20	12

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to improve the effectiveness and retention of Early Childhood Educators who work with Children with High Needs, with the goal of improving child outcomes by--

(a) Providing and expanding access to effective professional development opportunities that are aligned with the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework;

(b) Implementing policies and incentives (e.g., scholarships, compensation and wage supplements, tiered reimbursement rates, other financial incentives, management opportunities) that promote professional improvement and career advancement along an articulated career pathway that is aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and that are designed to increase retention;

(c) Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention; and

(d) Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for--

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

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

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (D)(2)

The state has partially implemented the criteria in supporting early childhood educators to improve their knowledge, skills and abilities and presents an adequate plan to address this area. --Since the knowledge and competency frameworks are not fully developed, it is not fully aligned at this time which is a weakness. The Hawaii Association for the Education of Young Children, through PATCH (R&R agency) and Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems collaborate together to provide a venue for dissemination of professional development activities. --Careers Access and Navigation of Early Care and Education Systems (CANOES) Training Quality Improvement and Assurance System (QIAS) is designed to improve the quality of training through approval of trainers and training. While these efforts are worthwhile, there does not appear to be plans to standardize training to build on prior learning and ensure implementation is building into the framework which is considered a weakness. --The TQRIS plans to provide financial supports through their quality improvement awards and quality awards though it does not appear that specific setasides for scholarships and professional developments will be incorporated into the structure. The Hawaii Careers for Young Children (HCYC) developed an Excel spreadsheet of scholarship opportunities in the early childhood field. However, it does not appear that career advising and scholarship awards directly are provided under RTT which is a weakness. Wage and retention strategies are not discussed in the plan. --The Registry is intended to collect data so that reporting is enabled on the development, advancement and retention of the early childhood workforce. The Training Tracks newsletter is one way that they will report on the aggregated early childhood professional development data; the newsletter is distributed to practitioners, foster parents, state licensing units and other interested individuals which is considered a strength. --The state provides tables reflecting how they will increase the number of Early Childhood Educators receiving credentials aligned with the frameworks. By the end of 2015, it is expected that 100 early childhood educators will be credentialed through an aligned postsecondary institution. The state also provides details on the plans to establish the four hubs and how these will support the goals of the practitioners. This is a strength. However, the state does not provide specific details or baseline data on how this will occur which is considered a weakness.

E. Measuring Outcomes and Progress

The total points an applicant may earn for selection criteria (E)(1) and (E)(2) is 40. The 40 points will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points. For example, if the applicant chooses to address both selection criteria under this Focused Investment Area, each criterion will be worth up to 20 points. If the applicant chooses to address one selection criterion, the criterion will be worth up to 40 points.

The applicant must address at least one of the selection criteria within Focused Investment Area (E), which are as follows:

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.	20	12

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to implement, independently or as part of a cross-State consortium, a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that informs instruction and services in the early elementary grades and that--

(a) Is aligned with the State's Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness;

(b) Is valid, reliable, and appropriate for the target population and for the purpose for which it will be used, including for English learners and children with disabilities;

(c) Is administered beginning no later than the start of school year 2014-2015 to children entering a public school kindergarten; States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation;

(d) Is reported to the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and to the early learning data system, if it is separate from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, as permitted under and consistent with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws; and

(e) Is funded, in significant part, with Federal or State resources other than those available under this grant, (e.g., with funds available under section 6111 or 6112 of the ESEA).

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (E)(1)

The state has partially implemented a kindergarten entry assessment to understand the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry. --The instrument that has been used, the Hawaii State School Readiness Assessment (HSSRA) provides classroom level assessment as opposed to individual child assessment. The kindergarten teacher observes the class as a whole and assesses on 24 skills and characteristics using a five-point scale with 1 indicating almost none of the students consistently display the skill or characteristic and 5 that almost all of the students consistently do so. The 24 items cover five domains of school readiness. --The existing tool was validated by Dr. Mary E. Brandt of the State DOE and Dr. Donna Grace at the University of Hawaii College of Education. The results are tracked longitudinally in the DOE system but this validation is for the classroom level assessment rather than the individual child level assessment which is a weakness. --The plans are to develop a new assessment and implement it by 2014-15. Since the ELDS are not yet developed and released, the kindergarten entry assessment is not yet selected. The plan does not address how the kindergarten entry assessment will address English learners and children with disabilities or how the results will be used to guide and inform instruction which is a weakness. The state does indicate that other funds will be used to support the ongoing implementation of this assessment which is considered a weakness. --The plan states that the data will be collected and reported to the State DOE data system. Hawaii is in the process of integrating the DOE system with other State agency data systems to create a statewide longitudinal data system to include kindergarten readiness assessment data. --The applicant states that they will use a combination of Federal and State human and financial resources other than this grant to implement and sustain the new data system.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.	20	12

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to enhance the State's existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System or to build or enhance a separate, coordinated, early learning data system that aligns and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and that either data system--

(a) Has all of the Essential Data Elements;

(b) Enables uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating State Agencies and Participating Programs;

(c) 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;

(d) 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

(e) Meets the Data System Oversight Requirements and complies with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (E)(2)

The state partially met the criteria for building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services and policies and presents an adequate plan for continuing these efforts. --Though the current system does not contain all of the essential data elements, the state provides a table that describes the status on each element and the plans towards compliance, which appears to be appropriate. --The system will enable uniform data collection and entry through the use of a single identifier to link existing information across datasets and agencies. The "meta-ID" will be housed in the P-20 LDS for matching purposes which is considered a strength because it will allow the exchange of data among participating agencies. --The subcommittee on Data Quality, Assurance and Validation will ensure the exchange of data among participating state agencies using standard data structure and formats. A design build process will be used to ensure that reports and analyses generated by the data system based on the research agenda are timely relevant, accessible and utilized. --Governance policies for data already resides in the P-20 Longitudinal Data System but a separate data structure will be created for the DEC data system after it is launched. The MOU signed by the agencies address the policies for how data will be used meeting the requirements of Federal, State and local privacy laws.

	Available	Score
Total Points Available for Selection Criteria	**280**	**162**

Priorities

Competitive Preference Priorities

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Including all Early Learning and Development Programs in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	**10**	**0**

Competitive Preference Priority 2 is designed to increase the number of children from birth to kindergarten entry who are participating in programs that are governed by the State's licensing system and quality standards, with the goal that all licensed or State-regulated programs will participate. The State will receive points for this priority based on the extent to which the State has in place, or has a High-Quality Plan to implement no later than June 30, 2015--

(a) A licensing and inspection system that covers all programs that are not otherwise regulated by the State and that regularly care for two or more unrelated children for a fee in a provider setting; provided that if the State exempts programs for reasons other than the number of children cared for, the State may exclude those entities and reviewers will score this priority only on the basis of non-excluded entities; and

(b) A Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System in which all licensed or State-regulated Early Learning and Development Programs participate.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (P)(2)

The state does not license or regulate care when two or more unrelated children are in care -- which is considered License-exempt Family, Friend and Neighbor (FFN) care. The requirements for FFN is background screenings if subsidies are received. Family child care (FFC) homes may be licensed or registered and child care centers are licensed. The state does not plan to require licensure of FFN but states that subsidies could be used to encourage providers to become licensed FCC. The threshold for licensure or registration of family child care homes based on the number of children is not disclosed in the plan. --The planned TQRIS will be available to all programs but participation is voluntary which does not indicate that all licensed or state-regulated programs will participate.

Priorities

	Available	Yes/No
Competitive Preference Priority 3: Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry	**0 or 10**	**Yes**

To meet this priority, the State must, in its application--

(a) Demonstrate that it has already implemented a Kindergarten Entry Assessment that meets selection criterion (E)(1) by indicating that all elements in Status Table (A)(1)-12 are met; or

(b) Address selection criterion (E)(1) and earn a score of at least 70 percent of the maximum points available for that criterion.

Comments on (P)(3)

The state has indicated that it has met all of the criteria reflected on Table (A)(1)-12 though the data are collected at the classroom level rather than the individual child level. This can be a weakness when using assessment for the purpose of informing instruction for individual children. The state did not score 70% on criterion (E)(1).

Absolute Priority

	Met? Yes/No
Absolute Priority - Promoting School Readiness for Children with High Needs.	**Yes**

To meet this priority, the State's application must comprehensively and coherently address how the State will build a system that increases the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs so that they enter kindergarten ready to succeed.

The State's application must demonstrate how it will improve the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs by integrating and aligning resources and policies across Participating State Agencies and by designing and implementing a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System. In addition, to achieve the necessary reforms, the State must make strategic improvements in those specific reform areas that will most significantly improve program quality and outcomes for Children with High Needs. Therefore, the State must address those criteria from within each of the Focused Investment Areas (sections (C) Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children, (D) A Great Early Childhood Education Workforce, and (E) Measuring Outcomes and Progress) that it believes will best prepare its Children with High Needs for kindergarten success.

Comments on Absolute Priority

Hawaii has met the absolute priority criteria for promoting school readiness for children with high needs. The state has outlined a system that includes all agencies in the plan. The commitment of the Governor to establish an Office of Early Childhood indicates strong political support. The state is in the beginning stages of TQRIS and is on the threshold of launching the new Early Learning Development Standards. These efforts will continue to strengthen the state's early childhood system. Establishing good data systems and identifying a new tool for kindergarten entry will aid in using the data to both analyze and evaluate from a policy level as well as provide guidance to inform instruction at the classroom level. Further development of the core competencies will strengthen the alignment of standards. If fully implemented, the plan has the potential to positively impact the school readiness outcomes of its keiki.

Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge Review

Technical Review Form Page

Application # HI-5010

Peer Reviewer: [redacted]
Lead Monitor:
Support Monitor:
Application Status: **Reviewed**
Date/Time: **11/17/2011 - 6:20 PM**

CORE AREAS (A) and (B)

States must address in their application all of the selection criteria in the Core Areas.

A. Successful State Systems

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Demonstrating past commitment to early learning and development	20	19

The extent to which the State has demonstrated past commitment to and investment in high-quality, accessible Early Learning and Development Programs and services for Children with High Needs, as evidenced by the State's--

(a) Financial investment, from January 2007 to the present, in Early Learning and Development Programs, including the amount of these investments in relation to the size of the State's population of Children with High Needs during this time period;

(b) Increasing, from January 2007 to the present, the number of Children with High Needs participating in Early Learning and Development Programs;

(c) Existing early learning and development legislation, policies, or practices; and

(d) Current status in key areas that form the building blocks for a high quality early learning and development system, including Early Learning and Development Standards, Comprehensive Assessment Systems, health promotion practices, family engagement strategies, the development of Early Childhood Educators, Kindergarten Entry Assessments, and effective data practices.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (A)(1)

In presenting the funding allocations over the past five years, Hawaii discusses in detail the appropriations that it has made to early childhood and why and where there were cutbacks in funding. Hawaii has indicated that the budget crisis of 2009 was a factor in the reduction of funding in most of its Early Childhood Development Programs. Hawaii has provided evidence that from January 2007 to the present there has been an increase in the number of Children with High Needs participating in Early Learning and Development Programs. Results from Table (A)(1)-5 show that State-funded preschool increased 84%, Early Head Start and Head Start increased 4%, Enhanced Healthy Start (a Department of Human Services) increased 52%, Kamehameha Schools programs (private funding) increased 68% and Family Child Interaction Learning Programs increased 10%. These increases are significant. Hawaii's funding has increased for most of these programs from 2007 to 2009. When the state was faced with a budget crisis, Hawaii maintained the funding, with little fluctuations in the total number of early childhood program slots. This is a strength of Hawaii's commitment to serve young children with high needs. A noteworthy strength is Hawaii's partnership with the Kamehameha Schools programs, a private source of funding that provided tuition subsidy in 2010, the year following Hawaii's budget crisis. This funding allowed for a 22% increase in participation over 2009 in KS Preschools. This clearly provides evidence regarding Hawaii's commitment and efforts to serve its young children. In offering information regarding the current status of key areas that form the building blocks for high quality early development system, Hawaii has identified that there is much work to be completed in early childhood and that systems need to be developed in professional development, kindergarten entry and effective data practices. Hawaii indicates that the Early Childhood Learning Development standards are being developed; however, there is no evidence, other than the appendix with the title page and the table of contents for these standards. Hawaii does not provide any examples of written or drafted standards or examples by age range in the narrative. Therefore it cannot be determined what Hawaii's current status is at this time in the development of its standards. The table of contents does indicate that standards are written or will be written by age group (infant, toddler, preschooler) and that all essential domains will be included. Hawaii is currently developing its five-tiered system and the Early Learning and Development. The TQRIS system will be built in the winter of 2012 and piloted in the spring. Evidence is presented in the appendix and in Part B,

Hawaii indicates that various components of the system are being developed, piloted and refined. The documentation presented in the appendix, indicates that there are many components to the system that are in place while others are clearly in draft form. Hawaii indicates that there are many progressive health care practices in the state that include medical, dental, social-emotional, and mental health. Health insurance is available for children Birth to 5 for families at the 300% poverty level. Hawaii includes family engagement strategies in its TQRIS design. Hawaii has discussed that family engagement is highly linked to cultural and linguistic backgrounds as the population in Hawaii is diverse. Hawaii considers the family background as important in considering how families are approached. Family engagement strategies currently required in each identified Early Childhood Development Program are presented. Hawaii indicates that it has been building a strong system of support for a knowledgeable, competent and effective early childhood education workforce. It has established the Hawaii Careers with Young Children, a system-building collaborative that has been supported with funding from Kamehameha Schools in an effort to implement a plan that bring existing components together into the coordinated Career Access and Navigation of Early Childhood Systems (CANOES) which was established in August 2011. Hawaii has in place and has been using the Hawaii State School Readiness Assessment to rate the readiness level of kindergarten classes. There is no clear discussion if this is a rating for classrooms or individual children with data aggregated and reported by class. Hawaii indicates that it will build on this system to develop a kindergarten assessment for individual students. Hawaii describes that there is no current data-sharing system in place. A recent submission of a grant in 2009 helped Hawaii to focus on the importance of data sharing. Hawaii indicates that it is exploring where a potential data source for longitudinal tracking might be housed. The response to this section indicates that Hawaii is committed to its high needs children and that they have, if not systems in place, a beginning foundation for more activities proposed in this application. Response to this section indicates that Hawaii is strong in its commitment to early childhood. Hawaii's plans to build a high quality system to support quality and outcomes of early childhood are under development. • Workforce credentialing and alignment to a competency framework is aligned with the CDA, community colleges and an associate's degree in education. All other post secondary institutions are 'not available.' • There is a draft of the TQRIS in place; however, Hawaii did not provide much discussion of this system or much evidence regarding their progress. Hawaii outlines how family engagement strategies are aligned with the Tiers 2+ for each category or type of program (Table A 1-9). Hawaii has proposed developing 'hubs' of professional development resource centers for its rural communities. This is a bold and exciting concept that could conceivably become a national model.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Articulating the State's rationale for its early learning and development reform agenda and goals.	20	18

The extent to which the State clearly articulates a comprehensive early learning and development reform agenda that is ambitious yet achievable, builds on the State's progress to date (as demonstrated in selection criterion (A)(1)), is most likely to result in improved school readiness for Children with High Needs, and includes–

(a) Ambitious yet achievable goals for improving program quality, improving outcomes for Children with High Needs statewide, and closing the readiness gap between Children with High Needs and their peers;

(b) An overall summary of the State Plan that clearly articulates how the High-Quality Plans proposed under each selection criterion, when taken together, constitute an effective reform agenda that establishes a clear and credible path toward achieving these goals; and

(c) A specific rationale that justifies the State's choice to address the selected criteria in each Focused Investment Area (C), (D), and (E), including why these selected criteria will best achieve these goals.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (A)(2)

Hawaii has presented ambitious goals that will support the professional development and the learning outcomes of the high needs children in rural communities. Given the brief discussions and the lack of evidence presented in the appendices to substantiate the progress in the development and implementation of the TQRIS, the ELDS, and the professional development system, it is uncertain that Hawaii will meet these goals within the timeframe presented in the High Quality Plans. Hawaii indicates that it will implement the six recommendations of the "Governor's Guide to Supporting a Comprehensive High-Quality Early Childhood State System" and that the state has already made progress on each of these six recommendations. Hawaii indicates that the integration of these six recommendations into the system will improve school readiness and close the gap between children with high needs and their peers. Hawaii does not discuss closing the readiness gap in-depth. Hawaii does indicate that the plan has incorporated these six key actions in its Goals and High Quality Plans. The rationale for selection of the criteria for this grant is that because the Hawaii Early Learning Development is in the final stage of approval by the Hawaii SAC (State Advisory Council) and there is a need for resources to infuse them through cross-agency collaboration. Additionally, Hawaii indicates that the state wants to maximize consistency and aid transition to kindergarten, the state has a philosophical commitment to young children, areas of and there is a need to integrate the various components that are under development (as described in A1). This rationale is appropriate to the work ahead of Hawaii. Hawaii indicates that in selecting C1, there is a need for resources and cross-agency collaboration to 'infuse' the ELD system. This approach is appropriate as Hawaii is nearing completion of the ELD system. The rationale for selecting C4 is to highlight the program to the rural community, a focus of the Hawaii application. The rationale for D1 is that Hawaii needs to develop a comprehensive and coordinated professional development system. This is appropriate as the hub system is the overall focus of the project. The rationale for the selection of D2 is to leverage an accelerated system reform for professional development. Again, appropriate as Hawaii focuses on the professional development system. The rationale for E1 is to assess the readiness to determine kindergarten readiness. The rationale for E2 is to establish P-20 partnerships for the longitudinal data system.

	Available	Score
(A)(3) Aligning and coordinating early learning and development across the State	10	7

The extent to which the State has established, or has a High-Quality Plan to establish, strong participation and commitment in the State Plan by Participating State Agencies and other early learning and development stakeholders by--

(a) Demonstrating how the Participating State Agencies and other partners, if any, will identify a governance structure for working together that will facilitate interagency coordination, streamline decision making, effectively allocate resources, and create long-term sustainability and describing--

(1) The organizational structure for managing the grant and how it builds upon existing interagency governance structures such as children's cabinets, councils, and commissions, if any already exist and are effective;

(2) The governance-related roles and responsibilities of the Lead Agency, the State Advisory Council, each Participating State Agency, the State's Interagency Coordinating Council for part C of IDEA, and other partners, if any;

(3) The method and process for making different types of decisions (e.g., policy, operational) and resolving disputes; and

(4) The plan for when and how the State will involve 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 planning and implementation of the activities carried out under the grant;

(b) Demonstrating that the Participating State Agencies are strongly committed to the State Plan, to the governance structure of the grant, and to effective implementation of the State Plan, by including in the MOU or other binding agreement between the State and each Participating State Agency--

(1) Terms and conditions that reflect a strong commitment to the State Plan by each Participating State Agency, including terms and conditions designed to align and leverage the Participating State Agencies' existing funding to support the State Plan;

(2) "Scope-of-work" descriptions that require each Participating State Agency to implement all applicable portions of the State Plan and a description of efforts to maximize the number of Early Learning and Development Programs that become Participating Programs; and

(3) A signature from an authorized representative of each Participating State Agency; and

(c) Demonstrating commitment to the State Plan from a broad group of stakeholders that will assist the State in reaching the ambitious yet achievable goals outlined in response to selection criterion (A)(2)(a), including by obtaining--

(1) Detailed and persuasive letters of intent or support from Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, and, if applicable, local early learning councils; and

(2) Letters of intent or support from such other stakeholders as Early Childhood Educators or their representatives; the State's legislators; local community leaders; State or local school boards; representatives of private and faith-based early learning programs; other State and local leaders (e.g., business, community, tribal, civil rights, education association leaders); adult education and family literacy State and local leaders; family and community organizations (e.g., parent councils, nonprofit organizations, local foundations, tribal organizations, and community-based organizations); libraries and children's museums; health providers; and postsecondary institutions.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (A)(3)

Hawaii has presented a clear list of departments/ agencies/ offices and post-secondary institutions that will take on the governance, management and work that is expected to be completed by 2015. The collaboration is strong and Hawaii has made a substantial effort to see that every agency has a balance of work in which it takes leadership. Hawaii will establish an Early Childhood Executive Committee to oversee the work. Not discussed is the inclusion in this committee of other stakeholders of early childhood that are already working in the system or have demonstrated interest in the past such as the private sector and philanthropic support. Throughout this application, Hawaii has presented evidence that there is a strong relationship with these individual groups. Exclusion of these valued partners is a weakness in the governance and management of the goals and High Quality Work Plan of this application. Hawaii clearly outlines the roles and responsibilities that will govern and manage the various components of the grant to build their early childhood system. Each participating departments has an clearly stated and identified role to meet the goals and High Quality Plan presented in this grant. The state agencies are collaborating with the University of Hawaii as part of the planning and development team. This is a strength of the application. Hawaii indicates that the Executive Management Team (EMT) will be the oversight committee. The primary role of this committee is to make strategic system-level policy decisions that cut across all participating State agencies to ensure alignment and coordination of project initiatives. Several tools for this

committee are currently being considered to help in the decision-making process. These tools and strategies include: using the Strategic Project Oversight Committee model will be used to oversee the grant activities and the Balanced Scorecard approach to monitoring project and manage the project's activities. Additionally, there will be a decision making matrix and the use of an effective conflict resolution strategies. This committee is not yet established but will be comprised of a high level special executive leadership group. There is a conceptual framework in place for the method and process for decision-making. It is not made clear in this section why the EMT is not already established since Hawaii has begun work in several areas that pertain to this grant. Hawaii has set an Early Childhood Executive Committee to oversee the completion of its plan and includes all departments as well as the University. It is unclear why several sectors are not included on this oversight committee. These sectors are: private, as private funders are a major resource and supporter of early childhood; businesses who have a vested interest in quality child care; and, local care givers, particularly from the FFNs. DHS (Department of Human Services) will take the lead on the fiscal processes of the grant. Hawaii has presented two MOU's for this project. The first, is a single MOU that outlines the general agreements undertaken by the State Agencies. The second, is also a single MOU that presents the agreements to roles, assigned tasks, and legal authority of the Longitudinal Data System. All State Agencies have signed off and dated this MOU. There is a detailed 'scope-of-work' and plan from each participating departments. A 'scope of work' that includes roles and responsibilities has been clearly outlined. All signatures and MOUs have been submitted. State Agencies also signed off on a detailed State Plan that identifies each State Agency's roles and responsibilities. The work appears to be evenly distributed across the State Agencies. The State Plan describes the expected participation. This plan / scope of work, is a strength of Hawaii's plan as all State Agencies and the University of Hawaii have active roles, with varying responsibilities, for each goal/ component of the plan. A total of 72 letters of intent and/or support have been submitted.26% of these letters are from the Early Learning and Intermediary Organizations. These organizations have a wide range of commitment in Early Childhood Learning and Development and have identified their commitment and support of the project such as implementation of the TQRIS and ELDS). The remaining 74% of the letters are from Congressional, State and County Leaders, 14%, Educational and Comprehensive Health Partners, 33%, Private Foundations,10%, Post Secondary Institutions, 7%, Native Hawaiian Focused Trusts and Organizations, 8%, Business, 7%, and Unions, 4%. Each letter is detailed in its description of its support and how the organization may contribute to the overall project and/ or individual tasks. Hawaii has evidence of a wide range of support from a network of both public and private organizations. Hawaii has provided significant evidence of collaborating State Agencies and a far-reaching community of organizations that support this project. This presentation is a strength of this application.

	Available	Score
(A)(4) Developing a budget to implement and sustain the work of this grant.	15	8

The extent to which the State Plan--

(a) Demonstrates how the State will use existing funds that support early learning and development from Federal, State, private, and local sources (e.g., CCDF; Title I and II of ESEA; IDEA; Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Program; State preschool; Head Start Collaboration and State Advisory Council funding; Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program; Title V MCH Block Grant; TANF; Medicaid; child welfare services under Title IV (B) and (E) of the Social Security Act; Statewide Longitudinal Data System; foundation; other private funding sources) for activities and services that help achieve the outcomes in the State Plan, including how the quality set-asides in CCDF will be used;

(b) Describes, in both the budget tables and budget narratives, how the State will effectively and efficiently use funding from this grant to achieve the outcomes in the State Plan, in a manner that--

(1) Is adequate to support the activities described in the State Plan;

(2) Includes costs that are reasonable and necessary in relation to the objectives, design, and significance of the activities described in the State Plan and the number of children to be served; and

(3) Details the amount of funds budgeted for Participating State Agencies, localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, or other partners, and the specific activities to be implemented with these funds consistent with the State Plan, and demonstrates that a significant amount of funding will be devoted to the local implementation of the State Plan; and

(c) Demonstrates that it can be sustained after the grant period ends to ensure that the number and percentage of Children with High Needs served by Early Learning and Development Programs in the State will be maintained or expanded.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (A)(4)

Hawaii has presented a good system for leveraging funds during the grant period. Hawaii has identified that more than half of the requested Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge funds will be met through the State funds. It has not identified which state funds, but the amount has been designated. Money was not allocated for the four Hubs and the medical homes. These two projects are the central focus of the grant in reaching high needs children. It is unclear if the state funds have been committed or if the state funds will be allocated if the grant is awarded. Additionally, the funds available to sustain the project will be drawn from a proposed bill on Sugar Sweetened Beverage Tax Bill. The status of this Bill has not been discussed and difficult to ascertain if such funding is designated for this project and sustaining of the system to maintain high quality early childhood centers and outcomes for the children of Hawaii. Otherwise, the budget presented is straightforward and has appropriate distribution of funds. The Table (A)(4)-1 is not completed and it is difficult to determine how each fiscal year's

funding will be determined at the federal level 2013-2015, state level 2013-2015, and private 2015.

B. High-Quality, Accountable Programs

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	10	2

The extent to which the State and its Participating State Agencies have developed and adopted, or have a High-Quality Plan to develop and adopt, a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System that--

(a) Is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards that include--

(1) Early Learning and Development Standards;

(2) A Comprehensive Assessment System;

(3) Early Childhood Educator qualifications;

(4) Family engagement strategies;

(5) Health promotion practices; and

(6) Effective data practices;

(b) Is clear and has standards that are measurable, meaningfully differentiate program quality levels, and reflect high expectations of program excellence commensurate with nationally recognized standards that lead to improved learning outcomes for children; and

(c) Is linked to the State licensing system for Early Learning and Development Programs.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(1)

Hawaii has indicated that the Department of Human Services is in the process of developing, piloting, and refining components of the TQRIS. Currently, the TQRIS presented in the appendix reflects an early draft. There two pages of the TQRIS for each age/ center type. Included are Infants/ Toddlers, Pre-School Center-based Programs, and Family Child Care Homes. While this document indicates Hawaii is moving forward on developing its TQRIS, there is a lack of depth to the overall plan. Hawaii's narrative on B (1)(a)(1)is confusing as Hawaii discusses the five program standard areas to be addressed in the TQRIS. These are: Early Childhood Care and Education, Diversity and Inclusion,Program Design and Management, Family Engagement, and Staff Qualifications. Each of these five standard areas are described. However, none address how the Early Learning Development Standards will be addressed. Hawaii's discussion of the Comprehensive Assessment System identifies only Measures of Environmental Quality. Given the discussion and a review of the present format of the TQRIS document in the appendix, Hawaii is not including other measures in the Comprehensive Assessment System, such as screening measures, formative assessments, and measures of adult-child interactions. Hawaii has in place a voluntary registry for Early Childhood Educator Qualifications. This will be linked to the TQRIS data system being developed. Hawaii does not provide any information on how the early childhood educator qualifications will be addressed in the TQRIS. This is a major weakness in the overall plan to develop the TQRIS in Hawaii. Family Engagement Strategies are presented in C4. A review of these standards outlined indicate that there are five levels and that at each level there is an identified strategy (i.e. Level 1: Parent Handbook). The current discussion indicates that Hawaii will focus on the Family, Friend and Neighbor care providers and strategies that will engage families. Several of these strategies are identified including brochures, booklets, and newsletters. There is not an in-depth presentation of how family engagement strategies will be included in the TQRIS. Health promotion practices are not included in the TQRIS, but are in place through the current DHS licensing verification visits. This is not comprehensive enough and its separation from the TQRIS system weakens the overall plan and future implementation. The TQRIS data system is currently being developed and is an expansion of the current Quality Care Program. This system will include a link to the DHS for licensing, registry, local AEYC for coaching, student assessment data and longitudinal data, and the state university that will be conducting the program assessments. Hawaii discusses the five standards and how they will be measured. Hawaii does not include a plan to develop and implement measurable ELDS according to the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge definition. The TQRIS system will be linked to the Department of Health and Department of Human Services. The DHS is the state licensing agency and all Hawaii requires all ELDS to be licensed. No additional information is available from Hawaii that is directly linked to the Early Learning and Development Programs. The state requires all participating programs to be licensed. As the data tracking system is developed, Hawaii indicates that this will be used to monitor the Early Learning and Development Programs. This discussion does not provide enough detail to determine Hawaii's efforts to monitor its licensed programs. Hawaii provides a full discussion of how the standards will be measured in their TQRIS. Using the tools they have identified and will develop, Hawaii will develop a range of scores to commensurate to each rating level of the TQRIS. The is an appropriate approach to establishing measurable and meaningfully levels of quality. Hawaii has not provided enough evidence regarding the extent of its work on the Early Learning and Development Standards. There are gaps in the plan of developing a TQRIS, such as a misinterpretation of the ELDS and a Comprehensive Assessment System. Other components are under development (as noted by Hawaii in other sections of the application). The narrative indicates that Hawaii does not have a clear understanding of the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge definitions that must be met in the TQRIS. The evidence presented offers little confidence that

it will be ready to pilot in the spring of 2012.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Promoting participation in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	15	6

The extent to which the State has maximized, or has a High-Quality Plan to maximize, program participation in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by--

(a) Implementing effective policies and practices to reach the goal of having all publicly funded Early Learning and Development Programs participate in such a system, including programs in each of the following categories--

(1) State-funded preschool programs;

(2) Early Head Start and Head Start programs;

(3) Early Learning and Development Programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA;

(4) Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of the ESEA; and

(5) Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program;

(b) Implementing effective policies and practices designed to help more families afford high-quality child care and maintain the supply of high-quality child care in areas with high concentrations of Children with High Needs (e.g., maintaining or increasing subsidy reimbursement rates, taking actions to ensure affordable co-payments, providing incentives to high-quality providers to participate in the subsidy program); and

(c) Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for the numbers and percentages of Early Learning and Development Programs that will participate in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by type of Early Learning and Development Program (as listed in (B)(2)(a)(1) through (5) above).

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(2)

Hawaii plans to create a Quality Improvement Workgroup. This Workgroup is charged with facilitating the creation of the TQRIS for the four early childhood settings: DHS-licensed program, DHS licensed exempt program, home visiting programs and family-child interactions. The Workgroup will coordinate meetings and offer technical assistance to State agency representatives charged with TQRIS development. The development of the infrastructure of this Workgroup and its activities are described in detail. This is a strength of the plan to promote the TQRIS. Hawaii indicates that the State-funded preschool provides tuition, but does not indicate if all State-funded systems are already required to participate. Early Head start incentives include technical assistance and other resources from Hawaii Association for the Education of Young Children. Hawaii indicates that Head Start programs will be encouraged to participate. Hawaii does not indicate how the technical assistance is an incentive to the Head Start programs. IDEA Part C and B will to be connected to the TQRIS. CCDF program that serve the FFN will be tied to a subsidy reimbursement plan. Hawaii is lacking in a clear and detailed plan to increase participation in the TQRIS. This may be due to the lack of definition of the TQRIS and how it will operate and what data it will capture from the programs. Hawaii has described how it intends to explore ways in which more families can access high-quality child care. Hawaii has included in its description a number of possibilities and subsidizing programs for child care and preschool tuition is described. Hawaii indicates that it is exploring options including the use of Title 1 funds. All options offered will require time and commitment from a number of other sources. This is a weak area for Hawaii as it does not have a solid and workable plan in place to secure high quality slots for children. Hawaii has identified a number of children that will participate in high quality TQRIS centers. How these numbers and percentages were determined was not discussed. It is also not clear if IDEA part C will be participating in the TQRIS. A discussion of the decision-making process is helpful to determine how Hawaii is addressing the current gaps in services delivered and how the hubs will be considered in the TQRIS. Hawaii has set ambitious but not achievable goals in this application. The timelines to have the TQRIS established and ready for piloting by spring 2012 are unreasonable given the lack of complete definition and the draft of the TQRIS presented in the appendix.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs	15	8

The extent to which the State and its Participating State Agencies have developed and implemented, or have a High-Quality Plan to develop and implement, a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by--

(a) Using a valid and reliable tool for monitoring such programs, having trained monitors whose ratings have an acceptable level of inter-rater reliability, and monitoring and rating the Early Learning and Development Programs with appropriate frequency; and

(b) Providing 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) and making 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.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(3)

Hawaii with pilot the TQRIS on licensed centers. This pilot of the TQRIS will use the appropriate environmental ratings scales, ECERS-R, FCCERS-R, ITERS-R, PAS/BAS and the CLASS to monitor programs. In order to ensure inter-rater reliability, assessors will be trained to use the tools by the authors of the assessment. This is a considerable strength of the rating and monitoring plan. A TQRIS pilot will be conducted to establish a baseline with a follow-up review conducted 2-12 months after initial assessment. This is a good beginning, but does not establish the frequency of reviews using the above tools after the pilot. Hawaii has provided a good set of methods to establish baselines, but does not indicate how this will be extended beyond the pilot. Hawaii plans to conduct focus groups with parents to determine the most effective strategies to inform parents of the TQRIS and how they will receive relevant information on the centers that serve their children. The purpose of the focus groups is not adequately discussed. Because this is a type of research and data are being collected, the overall design of these focus groups, including the target population and the relevant information that will be ascertained is not presented. Hawaii is considering the use of the internet to disseminate information regarding licensing and ratings. No additional options have been presented. It is not clear how the focus group information is connected to the TQRIS pilot and plan.

	Available	Score
(B)(4) Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs	20	10

The extent to which the State and its Participating State Agencies have developed and implemented, or have a High-Quality Plan to develop and implement, a system for improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by--

(a) Developing and implementing policies and practices that provide support and incentives for Early Learning and Development Programs to continuously improve (e.g., through training, technical assistance, financial rewards or incentives, higher subsidy reimbursement rates, compensation);

(b) Providing supports to help working families who have Children with High Needs access high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs that meet those needs (e.g., providing full-day, full-year programs; transportation; meals; family support services); and

(c) Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for increasing--

(1) The number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System; and

(2) 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 Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(4)

Hawaii has identified two types of incentives for encouraging programs to strive for and remain at the high quality (4+ tiers) rating. Awards are monetary and will begin in 2015 using identified resources within the state. Additionally, Hawaii has set ambitious goals to increase the number of programs at Tier 4+ and the number of children at Tier 4+. Hawaii does not discuss how this will be sustained after funding in 2015. Providing support for working families will start with the Head Start programs. Hawaii does not address this directly but states that it will develop policies to funnel resources to build a stronger system. This is a weakness of the proposal as it indicates that there is no commitment of funding after 2015. The goals for increasing the number of programs and number of high needs children enrolled in quality programs is achievable but not ambitious. The expectation that by 2015 fewer than 10% in two programs, IDEA Part B and CCDF (Table (B)(4)(c)(2), is not aggressive enough and for the third year of the project and the increase of about 2% from third to fourth year is a low expectation. Hawaii has two years to promote this project to the early learning centers and could aim for a percentage of 10%-15%.

	Available	Score
(B)(5) Validating the effectiveness of the State Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System.	15	12

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to design and implement evaluations--working with an independent evaluator and, when warranted, as part of a cross-State evaluation consortium--of the relationship between the ratings generated by the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System and the learning outcomes of children served by the State's Early Learning and Development Programs by--

(a) Validating, using research-based measures, as described in the State Plan (which also describes the criteria that the State used or will use to determine those measures), whether the tiers in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System accurately reflect differential levels of program quality; and

(b) Assessing, using appropriate research designs and measures of progress (as identified in the State Plan), the extent to which changes in quality ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (B)(5)

Hawaii has indicated that an evaluator will be engaged to evaluate the TQRIS pilot. A series of questions will be identified as to how the evaluation might determine the TQRIS's effectiveness, quality of measures, etc. Hawaii has already consulted with an evaluator from RAND. Hawaii has met this criteria. The plan at this time is appropriate for the stage of development of the TQRIS. The design will include quantitative analysis on key TQRIS elements including quality assessment results, quality improvement plans, frequency and intensity of coaching support provided to programs, frequency and intensity of support for quality coaches, amount and type of financial support received by programs, implementation of quality improvement plans, program characteristics including but not limited to staff information and qualifications, program size and location, staff retention, and child information. Focus group and interview data will be analyzed using qualitative techniques. This discussion of the design, data to be collected is comprehensive and appropriate. The design with include programs in the TQRIS and DHS licensed and participating in P-3 programs. The design includes appropriate measures of progress including the Social Skills Rating Scale, the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test and Teaching Strategies GOLD. Hawaii indicates that the findings will inform the further development of procedures and indicators for assessing the relationship between quality rating changes and child progress. A timeline for these activities could not be found in Section B or specifically in B4. Therefore it is difficult to determine how these activities align with other activities and if the timeline for completion is appropriate. This is a weakness of the plan.

Focused Investment Areas (C), (D), and (E)

Each State must address in its application--
(1) Two or more of the selection criteria in Focused Investment Area (C);
(2) One or more of the selection criteria in Focused Investment Area (D); and
(3) One or more of the selection criteria in Focused Investment Area (E).
The total available points for each Focused Investment Area will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address in that area, so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points.

C. Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children

The total available points that an applicant may receive for selection criteria (C)(1) through (C)(4) is 60. The 60 points will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points. For example, if the applicant chooses to address all four selection criteria under this Focused Investment Area, each criterion will be worth up to 15 points. If the applicant chooses to address two selection criteria, each criterion will be worth up to 30 points.

The applicant must address at least two of the selection criteria within Focused Investment Area (C), which are as follows:

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.	20	7

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to put in place high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards that are used statewide by Early Learning and Development Programs and that--

(a) Includes evidence that the Early Learning and Development Standards are developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate across each age group of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers, and that they cover all Essential Domains of School Readiness;

(b) Includes evidence that the Early Learning and Development Standards are aligned with the State's K-3 academic standards in, at a minimum, early literacy and mathematics;

(c) Includes evidence that the Early Learning and Development Standards are incorporated in Program Standards, curricula and activities, Comprehensive Assessment Systems, the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and professional development activities; and

(d) The State has supports in place to promote understanding of and commitment to the Early Learning and

Development Standards across Early Learning and Development Programs.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (C)(1)

Hawaii has an ambitious timeline of developing ELDS by April 2012 and aligning them with the K-3 academic standards the ELDS will be endorsed by three state agencies (Education, Health, and Human Services). The ELDS are presented via a table of contents Hawaii's standards in the appendix. There is no other evidence that Hawaii provides that gives assurance that these standards will be completed and ready for dissemination by April 2012. Hawaii has not provided any evidence of the existing academic standards of K-3. The High Quality Plan lists six activities to finalize Hawaii ELDS in alignment with K-2 Core State Standards (the narrative refers to K-3 standards while the High Quality Plan refers to K-2 State Standards) with the responsibilities of these activities being carried out by the ELDSP staff, consultant, coordinator, and/ or manager. There is no discussion throughout C1 regarding this group, where they come from, which agencies, outside stakeholders, hired consultants, etc. While there are MOU's in place, the discussion of the collaboration of agencies is non-participatory in the development and finalization of the ELDS. There is a minor discussion that these agencies will come together to endorse and commit to the ELDS, determine how they will be delineated, etc. There is no clear discussion of who is doing this work, who is taking the lead on the activities, or how the departments will coordinate time, staff and information on how this work will be accomplished. Hawaii will align the ELDS to the K-2 Common Core Standards to be completed after this school year, the first year the K-2 Common Core Standards will be implemented. The presentation is not convincing that the development of the ELDS will meet the deadline that has been set or that the ELDS will be developed by experts in the field of early childhood. The time table to align the standards with the K-2 Common Core Standards is unlikely to be achievable as the development of the standards may not meet its deadline. Hawaii has identified appropriate steps to incorporate the ELDS into program standards, curricula, the comprehensive assessment system, the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and professional development activities. Hawaii indicates that it will integrate the standards into all relevant aspects of the TQRIS. However, this work will be delayed because of the development of the ELD standards, the development of the Competency Framework, and the development of the Data Systems.

	Available	Score
(C)(3) Identifying and addressing the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs to improve school readiness.	20	2

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to identify and address the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs by--

(a) Establishing a progression of standards for ensuring children's health and safety; ensuring that health and behavioral screening and follow-up occur; and promoting children's physical, social, and emotional development across the levels of its Program Standards;

(b) Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators who are trained and supported on an on-going basis in meeting the health standards;

(c) Promoting healthy eating habits, improving nutrition, expanding physical activity; and

(d) Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual targets to increase the number of Children with High Needs who--

(1) Are screened using Screening Measures that align with the Medicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment benefit (see section 1905(r)(5) of the Social Security Act) or the well-baby and well-child services available through the Children's Health Insurance Program (42 CFR 457.520), and that, as appropriate, are consistent with the Child Find provisions in IDEA (see sections 612(a)(3) and 635(a)(5) of IDEA);

(2) Are referred for services based on the results of those screenings, and where appropriate, received follow-up; and

(3) Participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well-child care, including the number of children who are up to date in a schedule of well-child care.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (C)(3)

Throughout this section, Hawaii has presented a number of historical efforts, practices, and policies related to supporting the health needs of young children. These efforts point to the strength of Hawaii's setting health as a priority. There is not much evidence in several of these past efforts presented other than the discussion of this section to plan to develop an appropriate system that meets the criteria of this section. Reports, documents, and other helpful information are not included in the appendices. There is no evidence presented of Hawaii's progress/ present status in coordinating these practices to align with the ELDS. Hawaii reports that the ELDS in health will be developed. Without any documentation, there is no support that Hawaii has begun this process. There are some indications that this process may be impeded in a number of ways, foremost, the lack of the development and sign-off on an MOU with the Department of Health (Medicaid). While there is an MOU with the Department of Health in the application, the High Quality Plan indicates that such a document with Medicaid will be developed in 2012. There is no discussion of this step in the narrative. It is not clear why this separate MOU must be developed. Hawaii presents its background and some details on Medicaid Early Periodic Screening. There is a

statement that 27.2% of children receive screening. Hawaii states that there will be an increased in screening of children ages 2-5 and this will enhance the state's ability to leverage dollars. Hawaii does not indicate how this leverage of dollars is related to the increase in screening infants. More information is needed to determine how this will happen and fit into the overall plan. A reference is made to the High Quality Plan but the plan indicates that there will be an increase in providers who use the Family Centered Medical Home. Hawaii does not give a clear indication of how much of an increase in children screened is expected. There is no discussion of how this will be developed or coordinated. Hawaii describes current referral system from Head Start and WIC. Hawaii does not describe how the TQRIS will incorporate health screenings, coordinate to a wide range of early childhood settings, or how it will be developed and implemented through the coordination of the state departments/ agencies/ offices. Finally, the narrative in this section does not describe the goals in mental health; yet, there is a goal clearly stated in the High Quality Plan with steps identifying a toolkit to be used by ELD practitioners and providers. There is discussion in the narrative regarding the ELD practitioners and health care providers, who they represent and how they will work within the TQRIS. There is no discussion of the 'toolkit' and how it is envisioned, what it will measure and how it will be used. Hawaii indicates that because the Department of Human Services administers the Medicaid program, Hawaii will leverage public and private resources through the screening process. The private resources are not identified by Hawaii. Hawaii describes a plan to analyze data to create developmental screening recommendations. Hawaii also describes current practices to make referrals. Hawaii does not directly address how it will increase its referral process based on results. Several strategies are identified to ensure that children with high needs receive ongoing health care. The number of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care is not reported. Hawaii does not offer any discussion as to why there are no numbers reported. Hawaii does not adequately address the needs of promoting healthy eating habits, improving nutrition, and expanding physical activity. Children who are at 300% are screened, the plan includes to increase the number of children who are screened.

	Available	Score
(C)(4) Engaging and supporting families.	20	5

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to provide culturally and linguistically appropriate information and support to families of Children with High Needs in order to promote school readiness for their children by--

(a) Establishing a progression of culturally and linguistically appropriate standards for family engagement across the levels of its Program Standards, including activities that enhance the capacity of families to support their children's education and development;

(b) Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators trained and supported on an on-going basis to implement the family engagement strategies included in the Program Standards; and

(c) Promoting family support and engagement statewide, including by leveraging other existing resources such as through home visiting programs, other family-serving agencies, and through outreach to family, friend, and neighbor caregivers.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (C)(4)

Hawaii states that addressing the needs culturally promising practices is essential to the success of this program. However, Hawaii fails to address the progression of culturally and linguistically appropriate standards for family engagement to be included in the Program Standards. Other sections do not provide an adequate discussion of culture as presented in Program Standards. Hawaii indicates that there are requirements and recommendations of family engagement standards in IDEA and additional recommendations and regulations in the child care licensing. Hawaii identifies that the family engagements standards to be developed for the TQRIS will view family involvement as a continuing process and partnership. There is no evidence provided in the narrative or the appendices (aside from the table of contents) Presented is a conceptualization of the tiered rating of Family Engagement standards. The standards will be based on PAS and BAS. Hawaii has provided evidence that it has begun to design these elements but has not indicated how these will be developed, reviewed, piloted, and finalized by participating public and private sectors or State Agencies of Hawaii. Hawaii has described a number of resources and programs and projects to implement the new standards in family engagement. A strength of the description provided is that there will 15 hours of professional development by 90% of the EDL workforce in 2014. This is very ambitious goal as the standards have yet to be developed and there is no clear plan in place as to how these EDL professionals will be reached. While the ELDSP is noted to take responsibility, there is no descriptions of which of the various departments are involved in collaborating on the development of family engagement standards. The state has not indicated that there will be a state policy/ regulation/ etc. in place to support any type of requirement. Training of professionals will take place. It is not clear how the workforce will be informed and at what level participation is 'required' There are a number of resources in Hawaii that are described and can be leveraged to ensure that professionals will have access to training in family engagement. It is not clearly stated that how Hawaii will accomplish this task or under what conditions the professionals will be contacted and offered training. State agency partnerships are identified however the High Quality Plan does not clearly outline who will be undertaking which roles and responsibilities. This plan is ambitious. A great deal of developmental work is expected to be accomplished and there are few details that indicate that this work will be completed within the time frame specified in the High Quality Plan.

D. A Great Early Childhood Education Workforce

The total points that a State may earn for selection criteria (D)(1) and (D)(2) is 40. The 40 points will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points. For example, if the applicant chooses to address both selection criteria under this Focused Investment Area, each criterion will be worth up to 20 points. If the applicant chooses to address one selection criterion, the criterion will be worth up to 40 points.

The applicant must address at least one of the selection criteria within Focused Investment Area (D), which are as follows:

	Available	Score
(D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.	20	2

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to--

(a) Develop a common, statewide Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework designed to promote children's learning and development and improve child outcomes;

(b) Develop a common, statewide progression of credentials and degrees aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework; and

(c) Engage postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers in aligning professional development opportunities with the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (D)(1)

Hawaii presented a one-page document on its Framework in the appendix that identifies the progression of credentials. There is no discussion of how this Framework is related to the improvement of child outcomes. Hawaii's CANOES, its Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, is presented in the appendix in draft form. It is currently being aligned with the University of Hawaii to offer a progression of certificates and degrees to cover all levels of the Career Lattice. In reviewing the CANOES document the competencies as written are presented as a definition with a rationale. No other information is presented that indicates how these competencies are used to define a quality workforce. There is no discussion of how the state of Hawaii will develop a progression of credentials and how these may apply to all EDL professionals. Hawaii indicates that the CANOES is currently being aligned with the Career Lattice and that the State's University of Hawaii system and other professional development providers together offer a progression of certificates and degrees that cover all levels of the Career Lattices. The discussion throughout this section does not make a clear link between the present system of credentialing at the post-secondary institutions mentioned and the use of the CANOES. It is not clear from this presentation how the post-secondary institutions are directly involved in the development and implementation of the Competency Framework, CANOES. This discussion does not address how this facet of the TQRIS is being used by the present post-secondary credentialing system.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.	20	3

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to improve the effectiveness and retention of Early Childhood Educators who work with Children with High Needs, with the goal of improving child outcomes by--

(a) Providing and expanding access to effective professional development opportunities that are aligned with the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework;

(b) Implementing policies and incentives (e.g., scholarships, compensation and wage supplements, tiered reimbursement rates, other financial incentives, management opportunities) that promote professional improvement and career advancement along an articulated career pathway that is aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and that are designed to increase retention;

(c) Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention; and

(d) Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for--

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

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

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (D)(2)

Hawaii has provided little discussion, evidence of progress toward development and or implementation of practices, or a time table of activities that suggest that the criteria in D 2 will be addressed. There is a lack of clarity and inconsistencies throughout this section. Specifically: Hawaii lists a number of organizations that provide professional development trainings throughout the state. There is no discussion of how the state will provide, oversee and monitor training of EDL professionals on the TQRIS, the ELDS, family engagement standards, etc. The trainings identified in the narrative are not coordinated with each other and have overlap of information. Because there is no evidence otherwise presented, it is not clear how these trainings are specifically aligned with the CANOES. There is no discussion how Hawaii will bring all these opportunities together to develop a coordinated system that will provide EDL professionals with opportunities to progress and obtain certification through the state on the quality of their knowledge. There is no discussion of implementing current or developing new policies that are designed to improve career advancement as this is aligned with the CANOES. All incentives and financial motivations described and are in existence today are from private or non-state sources. Hawaii is not addressing how the state will undertake a policy or an executive order that will enhance not only obtaining a degree or CDA but to stay within the profession and to keep improving through a progress of steps that should be identified in the Core Competencies. Hawaii plans to capture as many early childhood practitioners who work in unlicensed settings as possible. The state plans to form a work group through HCYC to develop a more comprehensive data system to identify the current workforce of early childhood practitioners. Hawaii has provided no discussion or evidence that it has a viable plan to report aggregated data on development, advancement, and retention of the quality of its workforce. No discussion was offered to explain the data presented in Tables D2 d 1 or D2 d 2. How target numbers were arrived at or the percent increases expected over the 4 years is not discussed. The high quality plan does not extrapolate on these numbers and percents. No baseline data was offered. There is a lack of specificity overall.

E. Measuring Outcomes and Progress

The total points an applicant may earn for selection criteria (E)(1) and (E)(2) is 40. The 40 points will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points. For example, if the applicant chooses to address both selection criteria under this Focused Investment Area, each criterion will be worth up to 20 points. If the applicant chooses to address one selection criterion, the criterion will be worth up to 40 points.

The applicant must address at least one of the selection criteria within Focused Investment Area (E), which are as follows:

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.	20	4

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to implement, independently or as part of a cross-State consortium, a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that informs instruction and services in the early elementary grades and that--

(a) Is aligned with the State's Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness;

(b) Is valid, reliable, and appropriate for the target population and for the purpose for which it will be used, including for English learners and children with disabilities;

(c) Is administered beginning no later than the start of school year 2014-2015 to children entering a public school kindergarten; States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation;

(d) Is reported to the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and to the early learning data system, if it is separate from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, as permitted under and consistent with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws; and

(e) Is funded, in significant part, with Federal or State resources other than those available under this grant, (e.g., with funds available under section 6111 or 6112 of the ESEA).

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (E)(1)

Hawaii has in place a tool to assess the classroom skills as the kindergarten entry assessment. Hawaii has indicated that while this tool will continue to be used a Kindergarten Entry Assessment will be developed and and fully operational (100% of the children assessed) by August 2014. Hawaii has outlined in its narrative and high quality plan the steps it will take to develop, pilot, and assess all children by 2014. Additionally, Hawaii notes that the processes of establishing validity and reliability are familiar to the state and have done so through the validation of the Hawaii State School Readiness Assessment. Hawaii indicates that the tool will be administered within the time frame required by the RTTT definition and data will be housed in the Department of Education. A Statewide Longitudinal Data System is being developed by Hawaii and will include all Essential Early Learning

Data Elements in the system. Hawaii indicates that it will be used to analyze data on the strengths, weaknesses and educational service gaps for children and their families. There is no additional detail on how the state may use this data system in conjunction with other information collected, such as site information, provider background, etc. Hawaii has provided discussion on all of these elements, however, there is a lack of specificity in the discussion that includes: • It is not explained who or how the KEA will be developed. An ambitious goal of piloting is set for August 2012. This is just a few months after the ELDS have been developed which are also on a short time line. There is no definitive evidence that indicates that Hawaii can meet this goal. • The validation/ reliability study is not clearly outlined. There is no description of the design or implementation of the pilot. The plan lists DOE and consultants. • While it is ambitious to set a goal of 100% of the children will be assessed by 2014, it is not realistic considering how much needs to be developed in 2012 and two pilot studies to follow. Meeting this deadline would be very difficult especially since Hawaii has yet to identify the team and consultants who will participate in the development of Hawaii's KEA. Additionally indicating that the DOE current data system will be used without discussion suggests that Hawaii is depending that the system is friendly toward the data that will be collected. Even if this is a given, Hawaii will need time to build the data set within the existing system which will be based on the results of the final pilot. • There is a lack of specificity in funding resources. Hawaii only addressed these criteria in a cursory manner. There is no commitment of funds from specific resources that lends confidence that the system will be maintained at the conclusion of the grant period. There is a plan in place to develop a longitudinal data system.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.	20	12

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to enhance the State's existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System or to build or enhance a separate, coordinated, early learning data system that aligns and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and that either data system--

(a) Has all of the Essential Data Elements;

(b) Enables uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating State Agencies and Participating Programs;

(c) 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;

(d) 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

(e) Meets the Data System Oversight Requirements and complies with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (E)(2)

Hawaii indicates that there will be a state data system. This system is detailed and meets the definitions of Essential Data Sets, ensures that it will be used across all State Departments and agencies, and will be governed by The Subcommittee on Data Quality. Hawaii has provided essential and important information to make this determination. This is a strength of the overall proposal. Hawaii indicates that the data set will have easy and friendly access. Hawaii will not modify the P20 LDS as it already has a single identifier in place. What is not discussed at all in this section is who will have access to enter data. This is critical as it speaks to the access of timely and relevant reports for the Hubs, early childhood centers, etc. Not addressing who will have access to enter data is a weakness of this plan. Reports will be easily accessible. Privacy laws are included in the MOUs.

	Available	Score
Total Points Available for Selection Criteria	280	125

Priorities

Competitive Preference Priorities

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Including all Early Learning and Development Programs in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	10	4

Competitive Preference Priority 2 is designed to increase the number of children from birth to kindergarten entry who are participating in programs that are governed by the State's licensing system and quality standards, with the goal that all licensed or State-regulated programs will participate. The State will receive points for this priority based on the extent to which the State has in place, or has a High-Quality Plan to implement no later than June 30, 2015--

(a) A licensing and inspection system that covers all programs that are not otherwise regulated by the State and that regularly care for two or more unrelated children for a fee in a provider setting; provided that if the State exempts programs for reasons other than the number of children cared for, the State may exclude those entities and reviewers will score this priority only on the basis of non-excluded entities; and

(b) A Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System in which all licensed or State-regulated Early Learning and Development Programs participate.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (P)(2)

Hawaii will use incentives as supports for participation in the TQRIS program. Each type of early childhood center is identified and how they will be participating in the TQRIS. Hawaii also recognizes that its biggest challenge in working with the various types of ELD centers are the FFNs, a group whose culture in child care is likely to view this project as intrusive. One solution is being considered to bring these centers into the TQRIS system and provide incentives through the hub PDRRC system – that being converting to CCDF funding streams. However, no other solutions are described and there is no evidence on how this groups would react to participation in TQRIS or the solution. Hawaii has not attempted any type of survey (qualitative or quantitative) to gather information on this new effort. Additionally, Hawaii has not presented any rationale for the differences in regulating the TQRIS by the type of ELD center other than there are already monitoring strategies in place. For example, Head Start programs will be required to complete an ITERS/ ECERS, IDEA part C seems to be exempt from an ITERS/ECERS because there are already 14 Federal and 12 State indicators in place. This approach is faulty as it will complicate data collection and management and interpretation of results. Additionally, Hawaii will 'encourage' programs to participate and to become accredited. While it is important to present the TQRIS as a system that monitors quality and outcomes as a state initiative that promotes the best learning opportunity for Hawaii's children, it is not setting legislation or policy that supports the program.

Priorities

	Available	Yes/No
Competitive Preference Priority 3: Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry	**0 or 10**	**Yes**

To meet this priority, the State must, in its application--

(a) Demonstrate that it has already implemented a Kindergarten Entry Assessment that meets selection criterion (E)(1) by indicating that all elements in Status Table (A)(1)-12 are met; or

(b) Address selection criterion (E)(1) and earn a score of at least 70 percent of the maximum points available for that criterion.

Comments on (P)(3)

Hawaii does have an existing Kindergarten Entry Assessment that meets the selection criterion (E) (1) for (a). Hawaii did not meet 70% of the maximum points for (b)

Absolute Priority

	Met? Yes/No
Absolute Priority - Promoting School Readiness for Children with High Needs.	**No**

To meet this priority, the State's application must comprehensively and coherently address how the State will build a system that increases the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs so that they enter kindergarten ready to succeed.

The State's application must demonstrate how it will improve the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs by integrating and aligning resources and policies across Participating State Agencies and by designing and implementing a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System. In addition, to achieve the necessary reforms, the State must make strategic improvements in those specific reform areas that will most significantly improve program quality and outcomes for Children with High Needs. Therefore, the State must address those criteria from within each of the Focused Investment Areas (sections (C) Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children, (D) A Great Early Childhood Education Workforce, and (E) Measuring Outcomes and Progress) that it believes will best prepare its Children with High Needs for

kindergarten success.

Comments on Absolute Priority

Hawaii has presented a bold and interesting plan to develop professional development hubs in the rural communities of Hawaii. This concept is important and essential to Hawaii's young population who are high needs and difficult to reach with services. However, there are several areas in which Hawaii's application is lacking. First, Hawaii does not consistently discuss promoting school readiness for children with high needs. While there is an emphasis on this population the discussions of how each component will serve this population is cursory. Next, Hawaii's proposal does not present a coordinated plan for developing, piloting, and implementing the TQRIS system and the various components. The pacing of the development of several components indicate that Hawaii may not meet all its goals by 2015. The goals are ambitious but the discussions lack detail and depth. Although the needs of there is not enough evidence and documentation that the goals and their related timelines are achievable. The overlap for demanding projects, such as the development of the early learning development standards, alignment with the Kindergarten Entry Assessment tool, the development of the TQRIS, the completion of the CANOES, and alignment with the K-3 standards is challenging. Hawaii does not clearly identify how this system will be built in an organized manner. Some elements that weaken this proposal include: Finally, while plans to distribute the work are even among the state agencies and the University of Hawaii are fairly even, there is no discussion of how these agencies will work with the Early Childhood Executive Committee. There is no evidence of an organizational structure and Hawaii is 'considering' tools of project management and decision-making process. This is likely to hinder the governance of the overall project. The Hub system is not fully discussed in each section. This is central to the application yet there is no consistency in how this target group will be considered under each aspect of this proposal. There are weaknesses in reporting numbers with tables that do not have complete information (missing cells). While Hawaii has much to plan it does not adhere to the Race to the Top-Early Childhood Challenge definitions in all cases and has not identified the steps to reach goals.

Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge Review

Technical Review Form Page

Application # HI-5010

Peer Reviewer: [redacted]
Lead Monitor:
Support Monitor:
Application Status: **Reviewed**
Date/Time: **11/17/2011 - 10:28 PM**

CORE AREAS (A) and (B)

States must address in their application all of the selection criteria in the Core Areas.

A. Successful State Systems

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Demonstrating past commitment to early learning and development	20	5

The extent to which the State has demonstrated past commitment to and investment in high-quality, accessible Early Learning and Development Programs and services for Children with High Needs, as evidenced by the State's--

(a) Financial investment, from January 2007 to the present, in Early Learning and Development Programs, including the amount of these investments in relation to the size of the State's population of Children with High Needs during this time period;

(b) Increasing, from January 2007 to the present, the number of Children with High Needs participating in Early Learning and Development Programs;

(c) Existing early learning and development legislation, policies, or practices; and

(d) Current status in key areas that form the building blocks for a high quality early learning and development system, including Early Learning and Development Standards, Comprehensive Assessment Systems, health promotion practices, family engagement strategies, the development of Early Childhood Educators, Kindergarten Entry Assessments, and effective data practices.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (A)(1)

(a) From information provided, most state contributions to programs for young children (keiki) have either remained level or decreased. It appears that overall state budget shortfalls are reflected in lower contributions to early childhood programs too. However, with a new state administration, there is a slight rise in program budgets in the last year. The yearly total state contribution for state-funded preschool has risen, however, from $136 K in 2007 to $994 K in 2012. The state served only 12 children in 2007, compared to 76 children in 2012. This yearly increase shows a positive attempt for Hawaii to be investing in a program for young children, but the total number of children served is not adequate for the population of the state. (a) In several cases the narrative does not appear to match the tables in reporting the amount of money spent and the numbers of children served in specific early childhood programs. For instance, the narrative may state a dollar amount for money spent, and the table (A)(1)-4 shows "Not available" in the same years. Therefore, the evidence is inaccurate or incomplete. In other cases, the applicant chose and described the fund increases that were positive from one year to another, but didn't mention other years in the same category in which the funds remained about the same or decreased. That shows inconsistent reporting. (c)The state's Early Learning Council (SAC) was just established this year to eliminate confusion over the titles and responsibilities of previous councils. However, it is not operational yet. This recent, but positive step has not been in place long enough to influence early childhood policy. (c) The State Department of Health has priorities and practices in place that guide their early childhood planning and policy. These should be helpful for building Hawaii's TQRIS. However,a change in public educational programming in Hawaii is scheduled to take effect beginning SY2013-2014.This change will mean that young children who turn 5 years old between August 2 and December 31 will no longer be provided with access to free kindergarten or junior kindergarten services. Unless those interested in early childhood education find a way to provide services for this group of children, fewer of them will be served in the future than at the present time. (c),(d) The "Departmental Policies and Practices Supporting Early Learning and Development "and "Current status in key areas..." lack specificity and depth of description. For instance, "The DHS's many early childhood initiatives are described throughout this application. The most recent policy change came in September 2011 with the introduction of a new form, the Early Childhood Pre-K Health Record Supplement (DHS 908), to be completed by a physician prior to

entry into a pre-K program." That was the only policy or practice that supports early learning by the DHS described in this application, and represents a lack of appropriate information about departments involved in submitting this application (DOE, DOH, etc.). This is a medium/low quality response.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Articulating the State's rationale for its early learning and development reform agenda and goals.	20	4

The extent to which the State clearly articulates a comprehensive early learning and development reform agenda that is ambitious yet achievable, builds on the State's progress to date (as demonstrated in selection criterion (A)(1)), is most likely to result in improved school readiness for Children with High Needs, and includes--

(a) Ambitious yet achievable goals for improving program quality, improving outcomes for Children with High Needs statewide, and closing the readiness gap between Children with High Needs and their peers;

(b) An overall summary of the State Plan that clearly articulates how the High-Quality Plans proposed under each selection criterion, when taken together, constitute an effective reform agenda that establishes a clear and credible path toward achieving these goals; and

(c) A specific rationale that justifies the State's choice to address the selected criteria in each Focused Investment Area (C), (D), and (E), including why these selected criteria will best achieve these goals.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (A)(2)

(a) Hawaii has decided it will focus its initial field testing of various strategies and practices on four of its highest needs communities, one on each of the four largest islands. Oahu has 70% of the population of the state, but only one site will be on that island. Distances are far in this state made up of islands, and its rural demographics will make it difficult to select centers with enough population to make a difference with large numbers of young children, as well as a location where activities and services from RTT-ELC can be imported without difficulty. (a) The state chose to provide more RTT-ELC services and programs in rural areas, based on their higher percent of poverty numbers. However, the great distances between young children and possible programs and services may cause a travel hardship and may not make much of an impact on the state as a whole. This applicant proposes to have four PDRRCs to provide one-stop services in rural areas with a high percentage of families with high needs. Operating costs will be minimized by colocating these centers at public schools or with other early childhood programs. The applicant did not tell how far these centers would be from each other, and how far children and families might have to travel to obtain services at these centers. Consequently, a clear description of how effective these centers might be is not able to be envisioned. (a) The descriptions of goals for young children are not complete, several of them are not appropriate, and the benchmarks are vague and not specific enough. For example, the goal: Increase the quality of early learning and development programs through enrollment in the TQRIS has a benchmark of "Enroll at least 150 FFNs (Family, Friend and Neighbor Care) in the TQRIS by 2014 and 200 by 2015." Enrolling FFNs in TQRIS does not ensure that the quality of early learning and development programs will increase. It takes commitment for a provider to improve quality, and FFNs are typically the most informal, disengaged, and least interested in professional development to improve their child care skills of all other kinds of caregivers. Many of them care for one grandchild or family friend in their home, and they may not ever provide child care again after that one child goes to school. Therefore, they are probably not interested in the goals of TQRIS, and their enrollment in it will not improve outcomes for young children in Hawaii. (a) The applicant may look at trying to enroll more high needs children in quality programs, and improve the quality of more programs in a variety of settings. This was not suggested in this narrative. (a) In this plan,there is not enough focus on improved outcomes for children, and too much emphasis on the number of children being given a particular evaluation, how many caregivers are being trained on how to use a tool, and how many children and their families have access to particular trainings. Hawaii has described a series of "'Aspirational Goals" and objectives to support its submission of a High Quality Plan. These are made up of Objectives such as "A high proportion of keiki , including those with high needs, meet the benchmarks of the Hawaii Kindergarten Entry Assessment." This is not specific enough, and therefore insufficient. (c) The applicant chose to address the following criteria in the Focused Investment Areas :(C)(1), (C)(3), (C)(4), (D)(1), (D)(2),(E)(1) and (E)(2). (In (C)(1), Hawaii described its need to spread their (draft) ELDS throughout the ELD system. Their rationale for (C)(3) was that they want to ensure that all young children experience optimal growth and development and that attention and energy are needed to mitigate the effects of the state budget crisis on funding to meet the health, behavioral, and developmental challenges of young children with high needs who will enter kindergarten. In addition, they chose (C)(4, Engaging and Supporting Families, because family engagement is one of the program standard domains for only a subset of ELD programs, and they decided upon D)(1), Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, because Hawaii recognizes that that framework is an essential component of a comprehensive professional development plan,and (D)(2), Supporting Early Childhood Educators to Improve Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities was selected because ongoing collaborative efforts to improve professional development has provided a foundation for reform. The (E)(1)rationale for being chosen was that assessing readiness to enter kindergarten has been identified as a key indicator of how well Hawaii's children are being served in ELD programs, and (E)(2), because it is already a priority being addressed by the P-20 Partnership for Education in Hawaii. For each selected criteria the state described its present status and what they would do if they were awarded RTT-ELC funding. From the information on current status for each criterion, it is abundantly clear that the area could benefit from the infusion of energy and funds from this initiative, so their goals are justified. However, the plans at present are not adequate. This is a low quality response.

	Available	Score
(A)(3) Aligning and coordinating early learning and development across the State	10	1

The extent to which the State has established, or has a High-Quality Plan to establish, strong participation and commitment in the State Plan by Participating State Agencies and other early learning and development stakeholders by--

(a) Demonstrating how the Participating State Agencies and other partners, if any, will identify a governance structure for working together that will facilitate interagency coordination, streamline decision making, effectively allocate resources, and create long-term sustainability and describing--

(1) The organizational structure for managing the grant and how it builds upon existing interagency governance structures such as children's cabinets, councils, and commissions, if any already exist and are effective;

(2) The governance-related roles and responsibilities of the Lead Agency, the State Advisory Council, each Participating State Agency, the State's Interagency Coordinating Council for part C of IDEA, and other partners, if any;

(3) The method and process for making different types of decisions (e.g., policy, operational) and resolving disputes; and

(4) The plan for when and how the State will involve 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 planning and implementation of the activities carried out under the grant;

(b) Demonstrating that the Participating State Agencies are strongly committed to the State Plan, to the governance structure of the grant, and to effective implementation of the State Plan, by including in the MOU or other binding agreement between the State and each Participating State Agency--

(1) Terms and conditions that reflect a strong commitment to the State Plan by each Participating State Agency, including terms and conditions designed to align and leverage the Participating State Agencies' existing funding to support the State Plan;

(2) "Scope-of-work" descriptions that require each Participating State Agency to implement all applicable portions of the State Plan and a description of efforts to maximize the number of Early Learning and Development Programs that become Participating Programs; and

(3) A signature from an authorized representative of each Participating State Agency; and

(c) Demonstrating commitment to the State Plan from a broad group of stakeholders that will assist the State in reaching the ambitious yet achievable goals outlined in response to selection criterion (A)(2)(a), including by obtaining--

(1) Detailed and persuasive letters of intent or support from Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, and, if applicable, local early learning councils; and

(2) Letters of intent or support from such other stakeholders as Early Childhood Educators or their representatives; the State's legislators; local community leaders; State or local school boards; representatives of private and faith-based early learning programs; other State and local leaders (e.g., business, community, tribal, civil rights, education association leaders); adult education and family literacy State and local leaders; family and community organizations (e.g., parent councils, nonprofit organizations, local foundations, tribal organizations, and community-based organizations); libraries and children's museums; health providers; and postsecondary institutions.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (A)(3)

(a) The proposal was unclear about a governance plan, because it is in its initial stages of development, and not yet ready to take on a project such as RTT-ELC. An organizational chart was not included, and the completed table that lists governance-related roles and responsibilities was not located in this section. In addition, a new Department of Childhood Education, which is planned to be the lead agency for this proposal, will not be in place until 2015. Therefore, this RTT-ELC will initially be under an interim Office of Early Childhood until then. Consequently, the plan for present or future governance was not clear, and there was insufficient evidence to evaluate this area. (b) The MOUs which showed commitment to this grant application by the supporting agencies and partners, included the responsibilities of the different partners, how decision-making would take place, and the scope of work. They all contained the signatures for each partner agency. These were sufficient and appropriate. (c) Appropriate letters of intent or support from a range of 60 stakeholders in this application are included in the Appendix, showing a wide variety a wide of interest in the success of this application. This is a low-quality response, minimally implemented.

	Available	Score

(A)(4) Developing a budget to implement and sustain the work of this grant.	15	1

The extent to which the State Plan--

(a) Demonstrates how the State will use existing funds that support early learning and development from Federal, State, private, and local sources (e.g., CCDF; Title I and II of ESEA; IDEA; Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Program; State preschool; Head Start Collaboration and State Advisory Council funding; Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program; Title V MCH Block Grant; TANF; Medicaid; child welfare services under Title IV (B) and (E) of the Social Security Act; Statewide Longitudinal Data System; foundation; other private funding sources) for activities and services that help achieve the outcomes in the State Plan, including how the quality set-asides in CCDF will be used;

(b) Describes, in both the budget tables and budget narratives, how the State will effectively and efficiently use funding from this grant to achieve the outcomes in the State Plan, in a manner that--

(1) Is adequate to support the activities described in the State Plan;

(2) Includes costs that are reasonable and necessary in relation to the objectives, design, and significance of the activities described in the State Plan and the number of children to be served; and

(3) Details the amount of funds budgeted for Participating State Agencies, localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, or other partners, and the specific activities to be implemented with these funds consistent with the State Plan, and demonstrates that a significant amount of funding will be devoted to the local implementation of the State Plan; and

(c) Demonstrates that it can be sustained after the grant period ends to ensure that the number and percentage of Children with High Needs served by Early Learning and Development Programs in the State will be maintained or expanded.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (A)(4)

(a) Table (A)(4)(1) was not included in the application, and the narrative did not address this issue either, so the proposal did not demonstrate how it will use existing funds that support ELD. (b) It is difficult to assess the budget's appropriateness and strengths without the organizational chart and completed table that lists the roles and responsibilities of each organization, which is not included in section A3(a). For example, the Budget describes the OEC as responsible for the overall project implementation and oversight, and the DHS as the lead agency and the fiscal manager for the project, but the OEC is still in the planning stage. Therefore, without an office of OEC yet, and without an organizational chart, it is not possible to understand their relationship to each other. Consequently, when leadership positions and their salaries are outlined, it is difficult to make a judgment as to their value. The key to Hawaii's plan was to have four "hubs" on four islands to serve children and families in those areas. However, I saw no place in the Budget where funding to support those hubs was shown. (a,c) The applicant did not describe how existing funds will be used to achieve its outcomes, nor did it convincingly demonstrate that a high quality state plan can be maintained or expanded after the grant period ends. Table (A)(4)-1 is incomplete for FY 2013, 2014, and 2015, as it does not show any amounts of Federal and State funds that c/would be contributed to early childhood education in those years, and the governor's plan to create dedicated funding for early childhood development through a tax of one penny for each ounce of sugar-sweetened beverage purchased is just in the proposal stage. This is a low-quality response.

B. High-Quality, Accountable Programs

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	10	2

The extent to which the State and its Participating State Agencies have developed and adopted, or have a High-Quality Plan to develop and adopt, a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System that--

(a) Is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards that include--

(1) Early Learning and Development Standards;

(2) A Comprehensive Assessment System;

(3) Early Childhood Educator qualifications;

(4) Family engagement strategies;

(5) Health promotion practices; and

(6) Effective data practices;

(b) Is clear and has standards that are measurable, meaningfully differentiate program quality levels, and reflect

high expectations of program excellence commensurate with nationally recognized standards that lead to improved learning outcomes for children; and

(c) Is linked to the State licensing system for Early Learning and Development Programs.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(1)

(a) Table (B)(1)-1 names a variety of early childhood programs in Hawaii and the elements, important to the TQRIS, that they address, but there is not one program that has complete tiered program standards. Table (B)(1)-2 shows their plan for establishing and operating a statewide TQRIS, but he timelines are not realistic for the activities and outcomes expected, and it would be difficult or impossible for Hawaii to adopt an appropriate TQRIS with their described plan. The State DHS is presently in the process of developing components of the TQRIS for the programs it funds or licenses, and it is planned to be piloted in January 2012. The descriptions of the TQRIS describe their program standards (Early Childhood Care and Education, Diversity and Inclusion, Program Design and Management, etc.) and what should be included. However,the health TQRIS is not one document, but a group of present procedures and assessments in different agencies, as well as plans and suggestions for what a good TQRIS might contain. It does not differentiate quality levels, nor does it have standards that are measurable. (b)The Hawaii Early Learning Standards (ELDS) have not yet been completed, but it is expected that the standards in the domains of Early Childhood Care and Education, Family Engagement, and Program Design and Management will be integrated into the TQRIS design. The proposal states that expected evidence at each TQRIS level will be documented. However, this applicant writes in generalities about outcomes, and a specific and workable plan to include measurable and meaningful quality levels and standards was not included. (c) Hawaii states that the TQRIS pilot requires that all participating programs to be licensed. There is no comprehensive plan in this application, however, to specifically develop and adopt a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System that is linked to the state licensing system for early learning and development programs. This is a low-quality response, minimally implemented.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Promoting participation in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	15	1

The extent to which the State has maximized, or has a High-Quality Plan to maximize, program participation in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by--

(a) Implementing effective policies and practices to reach the goal of having all publicly funded Early Learning and Development Programs participate in such a system, including programs in each of the following categories--

(1) State-funded preschool programs;

(2) Early Head Start and Head Start programs;

(3) Early Learning and Development Programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA;

(4) Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of the ESEA; and

(5) Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program;

(b) Implementing effective policies and practices designed to help more families afford high-quality child care and maintain the supply of high-quality child care in areas with high concentrations of Children with High Needs (e.g., maintaining or increasing subsidy reimbursement rates, taking actions to ensure affordable co-payments, providing incentives to high-quality providers to participate in the subsidy program); and

(c) Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for the numbers and percentages of Early Learning and Development Programs that will participate in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by type of Early Learning and Development Program (as listed in (B)(2)(a)(1) through (5) above).

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(2)

(a) The completion implementation of an inclusive TQRIS tool for Hawaii is still in the infancy stage, and one is not expected to be fully operational for at least another year. Therefore, the development of policies and practices to assure participation by all publicly funded Early Learning and Development Programs is incomplete too. And since the TQRIS is not finished, it is therefore not able to be used as the basis of a plan. (b) In this proposal, the applicant has not described any implemented or proposed policies and practices to help more families afford high-quality child care, but rather describes what is in place at the present time. The applicant does propose to research different ways other states have approached developing a TQRIS for license-exempt family child care providers, but this is not sufficient for this RTT-ELC application because it is not promoting participation in their TQRIS. (b) In this application a goal is to increase the supply of qualified practitioners outside the Honolulu School District, in rural areas, through more community-based trainings and use of online distance education. However, a plan to achieve it is not fully formulated or described in this section. (c)The targets set in the table for (B)(2)(c) as shown are neither ambitious nor achievable. There is not a TQRIS plan at the present time, and therefore, no guidelines or expectations for the quality tier ratings. Consequently, the targets have no value, and are not

achievable. This is a low-quality response, minimally implemented.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs	15	2

The extent to which the State and its Participating State Agencies have developed and implemented, or have a High-Quality Plan to develop and implement, a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by--

(a) Using a valid and reliable tool for monitoring such programs, having trained monitors whose ratings have an acceptable level of inter-rater reliability, and monitoring and rating the Early Learning and Development Programs with appropriate frequency; and

(b) Providing 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) and making 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.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(3)

(a) The applicant reports that it has developed a high-quality plan for its licensed centers and FCCs enrolled in their TQRIS pilot. They selected valid and reliable tools for student assessment, and said they would establish systematic procedures that will be used for training and assessing the reliability of the QRIS assessors. Their description of this process tells how it should be done, but lacks details about how they specifically would do that work. The state DHS presently is using some well-known, valid and reliable tools to evaluate classrooms and programs (ECERS-R, CLASS, etc.), but there was no discussion about how they would monitor and assure the validity and reliability of their administration. In addition, these tools do not appear to be in universal use among all preschool settings, nor does it appear that is their expectation. (a) The focus in this response is a description of the correct use of the tools in the TQRIS, and their reliability. The applicant states that Hawaii's training on the use of the tools, some by representatives of the tool's publisher, is underway, and that, from their manuals, reliability on these tools will be established. (b) The results of the use of the tools to improve outcomes in programs and among young children are not addressed in a systematic or constructive way. They did not explain how they would provide quality rating and information to parents of children enrolled in their early learning programs, so there appears to be little connection between administering the tools and what will be done after the evaluations are given. (b) The path from one level or tier of the TQRIS and the next higher one is not clear in this application. It appears as if a program will be assigned a level, and then next year that program will hope for a higher one, and may be assigned a different level then. Support for programs to learn about the levels in Hawaii's TQRIS and to aspire to meet the expectations of a level, was not described. (b) The applicant states: "Public outreach efforts will be initiated while the various TQRIS components are still in the piloting phase. Parent focus groups will be conducted to gain insight into which strategies will be most effective in informing parents about tiered quality levels, and the results will be used to develop a public awareness campaign explaining what constitutes a high-quality early childhood program." This is not an appropriate or quality response because it describes how Hawaii will ask the public for a strategy to do outreach on a tool that does not exist. This is not specific, and too general. This is a low-quality response, minimally implemented.

	Available	Score
(B)(4) Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs	20	2

The extent to which the State and its Participating State Agencies have developed and implemented, or have a High-Quality Plan to develop and implement, a system for improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System by--

(a) Developing and implementing policies and practices that provide support and incentives for Early Learning and Development Programs to continuously improve (e.g., through training, technical assistance, financial rewards or incentives, higher subsidy reimbursement rates, compensation);

(b) Providing supports to help working families who have Children with High Needs access high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs that meet those needs (e.g., providing full-day, full-year programs; transportation; meals; family support services); and

(c) Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for increasing--

(1) The number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System; and

(2) 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 Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (B)(4)

(a) Incentives for quality improvement for programs participating in TQRIS include financial "quality awards" and "quality improvement grants." They would generally be based on the level achieved, moving from Level 1 toward Level 5, the number of children in the program, and the number of children subsidized by DHS. There was no mention of how the awards and grant funds would/should be used to support continuous improvement. Other kinds of incentives, such as training, technical assistance, higher subsidy rates, or compensation for the individual teachers and caregivers who work in the programs were not included. (b) This applicant suggested that the State of Hawaii, through the RTT-ELC, would support Head Start and Early Head Start programs in the state to improve their programs and practices. This is positive, because Head Start and Early Head Start have a large population of children with high needs. This proposal said the "Head Start philosophy embraces continuous program quality improvement" and Head Start has to "meet federal program quality standards" is not adequate for this criteria. The expectation is that the state will lead the way to new and innovative activities to push programs and caregivers to excel, rather than continue doing the same things they have been doing. In the application, the plan to expand access for children with high needs was that Hawaii "will need to look at every local, State, and Federal dollar, public or private, that touches and can touch keiki (young children) ages 0-5 and develop policies that can funnel these resources to build a stronger ELD system with many more slots for those with high needs." This is not an adequate or workable plan to support working families who have children with high needs to access high-quality early learning and development programs that meet their needs. There was no discussion of providing full-day, full-year programs, transportation, meals or any other family support services that would help young children with the highest needs attend a variety of ELD programs The proposed goals as suggested include increasing enrollment of programs in TQRIS, but none related to improving the quality of those programs, using the TQRIS. Also, increasing the quality of FFNs by developing an inspection system to verify elements of their health and safety is valuable, but not enough to satisfy this element. Neither of these goals is at the heart of the program and caregiver quality that this initiative is supporting. The goals that were suggested here are merely steps to a more ambitious goal, which was not provided. (c) There are presently programs in place that provide technical assistance, training, and financial incentives to support the TQRIS and programs to achieve better quality education and care for young children. There is no indication, however, that this would be universally available to all care givers and programs, but would be provided on an "as needed" basis. In addition, this applicant has not addressed the distances between programs and FFN providers, especially in the rural locations that the proposal is focusing on, and has not discussed how this application will reach them with their "quality improvement" services. Hawaii's goal of this section of the proposal is to provide services to programs and FFNs, but there was not a description of how these supports would lead to improved outcomes, especially for children with high needs, and what they wanted those goals would be, including raising levels on the TQRIS. There was no direct link between them shown in this application. In Hawaii's performance plan to increase the number of programs in the upper tiers of the TQRIS, the chart (B)(4)(c)(1) shows that no targets, besides the total number of programs covered by the TQRIS, have been established before the end of the calendar year 2014. In addition, those targets in 2014 and 2015 appear arbitrary and unreasonable because there does not appear to be a connection between each level or tier on the TQRIS and the expectations of the next higher one, nor a well-thought-out plan on what must be done to reach them. (c) This application said it was important to improve the quality of programs in Hawaii in which children with high needs are served, because "they are too often served in segregated settings." The plan of this proposal is that children with high needs will be taught in programs with typically developing children, as well as to be in duel enrollment programs. There has been no suggestion in this application on how to find and identify more children with high needs in the rural areas this grant application is focusing on, which is an important target of this application. This is a low-quality response, minimally implemented.

	Available	Score
(B)(5) Validating the effectiveness of the State Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System.	15	2

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to design and implement evaluations--working with an independent evaluator and, when warranted, as part of a cross-State evaluation consortium--of the relationship between the ratings generated by the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System and the learning outcomes of children served by the State's Early Learning and Development Programs by--

(a) Validating, using research-based measures, as described in the State Plan (which also describes the criteria that the State used or will use to determine those measures), whether the tiers in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System accurately reflect differential levels of program quality; and

(b) Assessing, using appropriate research designs and measures of progress (as identified in the State Plan), the extent to which changes in quality ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality**

Comments on (B)(5)

(a) Hawaii plans to engage an experienced evaluator to oversee the TQRIS pilot. The evaluator "will be responsible for the evaluation design, including research questions, data collection, use of results to inform adjustments to the TQRIS design, implementation, and quality improvement supports." No description of whether the suggested research questions have been validated, using research-based measures, was offered. In this (B)(5)(a) response this applicant suggested six examples of possible research questions that an outside evaluator might ask. At least half of them could not be readily answered by an outside evaluator, may not be measurable, or would not be important for an evaluation of this RTT-ELC program. For example, "How well do the criteria for different levels that make up the TQRIS represent different levels of quality?" is in that category. (b) The tools

used by DHS licensed programs were named here (SSRS, WSS, PPVT, and GOLD). There was a suggestion that information from them should be linked with TQRIS and the data collection from P-3 to show the impact of program quality. However, the connection on how that could or would be done was not made in this application. In this proposal, the applicant names some assessment tools that are already being used in a TQRIS pilot and a DHS initiative, and says they will be linked to obtain preliminary insights into the impact of program quality. There was no research design or measures of progress mentioned that would evaluate changes related to children's learning, development, or school readiness. This is a low-quality response.

Focused Investment Areas (C), (D), and (E)

Each State must address in its application--
(1) Two or more of the selection criteria in Focused Investment Area (C);
(2) One or more of the selection criteria in Focused Investment Area (D); and
(3) One or more of the selection criteria in Focused Investment Area (E).
The total available points for each Focused Investment Area will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address in that area, so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points.

C. Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children

The total available points that an applicant may receive for selection criteria (C)(1) through (C)(4) is 60. The 60 points will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points. For example, if the applicant chooses to address all four selection criteria under this Focused Investment Area, each criterion will be worth up to 15 points. If the applicant chooses to address two selection criteria, each criterion will be worth up to 30 points.

The applicant must address at least two of the selection criteria within Focused Investment Area (C), which are as follows:

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.	20	0

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to put in place high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards that are used statewide by Early Learning and Development Programs and that--

(a) Includes evidence that the Early Learning and Development Standards are developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate across each age group of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers, and that they cover all Essential Domains of School Readiness;

(b) Includes evidence that the Early Learning and Development Standards are aligned with the State's K-3 academic standards in, at a minimum, early literacy and mathematics;

(c) Includes evidence that the Early Learning and Development Standards are incorporated in Program Standards, curricula and activities, Comprehensive Assessment Systems, the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and professional development activities; and

(d) The State has supports in place to promote understanding of and commitment to the Early Learning and Development Standards across Early Learning and Development Programs.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (C)(1)

(a) The ELDS were not enclosed with this application (only the Table of Contents in the Appendix) nor was other evidence provided to demonstrate that the standards are developmentally, linguistically, and culturally appropriate for all children, from infants to preschoolers. In addition, without the ELDS or other evidence to view, it is not possible for a reviewer to document that, in addition to being appropriate, they address all of the essential domains of school readiness and are of high quality, and that they are aligned with Hawaii's K-3 standards. In (C)(1)(b) the applicant states that the Hawaii ELDS will be brought into alignment with the K-12 Common Core State Standards when they are phased into the K-2 system. Neither of them are in place yet, and therefore, don't show specific evidence that they are aligned. However, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation's funding is working to ensure that K-3 programs are aligned with their early education partners by promoting a P-3 framework. The work is still in progress. (c) Hawaii states in its application that it will promote the adoption and use of ELDS to inform and guide program standards, curricula and activities, Comprehensive Assessment systems, Hawaii's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and professional development activities. They also named some steps they would take to do this, but in general terms, because the ELDS are not yet complete. (d) After the ELDS standards are adopted, Hawaii will ask departments to commit to use them, and sign MOUs to that effect, integrate the ELDS into the data system, develop guidelines and trainings for each user group, enhance coordination among departments in the use of the ELDS, and then work with state departments to incorporate them into program standards, the QRIS, the workforce knowledge and competency framework, and assessment and data collection. This plan is not described with enough detail to provide appropriate information as to how this will be done. The proposal says that the state will promote understanding about the ELDS by informing families and engaging them in discussion, disseminating information to promote understanding of the ELDS, and publicizing the availability of training and technical assistance. The details about how this would be done were not

explained in this application. This is a low-quality response, not implemented.

	Available	Score
(C)(3) Identifying and addressing the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs to improve school readiness.	20	0

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to identify and address the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs by--

(a) Establishing a progression of standards for ensuring children's health and safety; ensuring that health and behavioral screening and follow-up occur; and promoting children's physical, social, and emotional development across the levels of its Program Standards;

(b) Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators who are trained and supported on an on-going basis in meeting the health standards;

(c) Promoting healthy eating habits, improving nutrition, expanding physical activity, and

(d) Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual targets to increase the number of Children with High Needs who--

(1) Are screened using Screening Measures that align with the Medicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment benefit (see section 1905(r)(5) of the Social Security Act) or the well-baby and well-child services available through the Children's Health Insurance Program (42 CFR 457.520), and that, as appropriate, are consistent with the Child Find provisions in IDEA (see sections 612(a)(3) and 635(a)(5) of IDEA);

(2) Are referred for services based on the results of those screenings, and where appropriate, received follow-up; and

(3) Participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well-child care, including the number of children who are up to date in a schedule of well-child care.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (C)(3)

Hawaii does not have a specific plan, different than what they have already been doing, to identify and address the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of children with high needs. The results of a 2005 study showed that children with special health care needs reported difficulties accessing and using community-based services. With that knowledge, the applicant suggests that with the help of a RTT-ELC-funded enhanced data system, young children's health and development will be monitored. This is not an adequate plan. (a) The Hawaii application depends on programs and plans already in place, as well as showing the Table of Contents of the draft ELDS to back up their suggestion that they have addressed the issue of improving the health and safety, as well as the development, of young children in their state. Their proposal does not tell how many children are medically screened or cared for now, under the present system, and how many more children would receive screening and medical services under this RTT-ELC plan. For that reason, their response is inadequate. This proposal describes present programs for promoting young children's physical, social, and emotional development in Hawaii. That information does not appropriately explain how those programs will be improved upon, enlarged, and aligned with the RTT-ELC plan, especially as it relates to young children with high needs. (b) The application states that Hawaii will focus on health consultants, and then it describes the health consultants it already has available to young children. It does not say that it will increase the numbers of these professionals, or improve the amount of health services available to the target populations. Therefore it has given no evidence that it has adequately met these criteria. Hawaii's application describes its attention to promoting physical activity and healthy nutrition by describing some programs it presently has in place. The proposal did not describe its plan to identify and address the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of children with high needs, so therefore it has given no evidence that it has adequately met these criteria. (d) According to this application, 27.2 % of Hawaii's children ages 10 months to 5 years receive a screening for developmental or behavioral problems, and 27.6% of those ages 4 months to 5 years are considered to be moderate-to-high risk of developmental or behavioral problems. This RTT-ELC plan proposes to increase the screening rate of children 2 to 5 years of age, but it does not mention children from birth to 2 years olds, it does not specify what that increase will be, or how the state will attempt to make the increase. Therefore, this applicant has given an incomplete and inadequate response because it has provided no evidence that it has adequately met these criteria. The applicant describes the present process for making referrals for health care within their early childhood and Head Start's screening system, and it also suggests that some families are not able to take advantage of the health care available due to scheduling and transportation difficulties. However, the applicant recommends no specific way to increase the participation of young children with high needs in ongoing health care other than prioritizing availability, increasing rates of screenings prior to kindergarten (with no plan on how to do that), developing a data system to measure what is happening now, and promoting closer collaborations between children with high needs and health practitioners. These responses do not adequately tell how Hawaii will improve in these areas. Table (C)(3)-1 discusses developing and promoting awareness in the medical community and among families to enhance child health and development outcomes. However, the activities suggested will not specifically help move individual children with high needs toward that goal because they don't say how their activities will change outcomes for more young children in Hawaii. (d) The Table (C)(3)(d) is incomplete. Hawaii did not report present baseline information on performance measures for leveraging existing resources to meet annual statewide targets, and did not include its annual targets for two out of the four categories. This is a low-quality response, not implemented.

	Available	Score
(C)(4) Engaging and supporting families.	20	0

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to provide culturally and linguistically appropriate information and support to families of Children with High Needs in order to promote school readiness for their children by--

(a) Establishing a progression of culturally and linguistically appropriate standards for family engagement across the levels of its Program Standards, including activities that enhance the capacity of families to support their children's education and development;

(b) Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators trained and supported on an on-going basis to implement the family engagement strategies included in the Program Standards; and

(c) Promoting family support and engagement statewide, including by leveraging other existing resources such as through home visiting programs, other family-serving agencies, and through outreach to family, friend, and neighbor caregivers.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (C)(4)

(a) The application acknowledges the importance of family support and education for young children of high needs, and reports that most early childhood programs in the state are not subject to family engagement requirements. However, Hawaii's statewide proposal to provide culturally and linguistically appropriate information to families of high needs children has not been developed enough to provide a plan for the next four years. This part of the proposal only describes what is presently available in family engagement and what will be part of the TQRIS, but no way to move from one to the other. (b) This application describes the trainings and classes available to early childhood educators in the state, but did not explain how Hawaii could increase the number of those providers who would be trained and supported in the future to enrich family engagement strategies though this RTT-ELC grant. The Table (C)(4)-1 states that Hawaii will develop its Family Engagement Standards and have them endorsed by the newly-formed Hawaii Sate Advisory Council between January and March 2012. In addition, it will develop a toolkit, translate the guide into other languages, and several other activities before July 2012. With the little amount of progress on this work at the present time, the stated timelines for the activities and outcomes, this plan is unworkable in the time stated, and, in reality, may take years to perform. (c) The applicant says they have created a plan to develop and disseminate information about Hawaii-specific Family Engagement Standards as the basis for increasing access to high quality ELD programs. However, it also states that RTT-ELC funds will be used to establish the project. The Table (C)(4)-1 lacks more specific information to support this plan, so it lacks necessary information to be evaluated. This is a low-quality response, not implemented.

D. A Great Early Childhood Education Workforce

The total points that a State may earn for selection criteria (D)(1) and (D)(2) is 40. The 40 points will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points. For example, if the applicant chooses to address both selection criteria under this Focused Investment Area, each criterion will be worth up to 20 points. If the applicant chooses to address one selection criterion, the criterion will be worth up to 40 points.

The applicant must address at least one of the selection criteria within Focused Investment Area (D), which are as follows:

	Available	Score
(D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.	20	0

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to--

(a) Develop a common, statewide Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework designed to promote children's learning and development and improve child outcomes;

(b) Develop a common, statewide progression of credentials and degrees aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework; and

(c) Engage postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers in aligning professional development opportunities with the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (D)(1)

(a) Hawaii Career Access and Navigation of Early Childhood Systems (CANOES) has been developed over the last four years, but is still in draft form. From the information about the CANOES in the Appendix, it is made up of Definitions and Rationales for 11 Common Core Competencies, and its purpose is to "promote professional growth for all practitioners in the early education and care field." The section that is displayed in the Appendix is about the Early Childhood Trainer. It is not clear if there are other sections that are complete, or are planned to be completed, and therefore, the evidence is not available in this proposal. (b)The applicant says that the CANOES Common Core are currently being aligned with the Career Lattice, that shows the educational levels required for many positions in the EDC field. In addition, the proposal states that the state's University of Hawaii system and other professional development providers together offer a progression of certificates and degrees that cover all levels of the Career Lattice. There is no indication, however, that there is a common statewide progression of credentials and degrees aligned with each other. (c) "All of the primary public and private providers of early childhood professional development, including community-based organizations and institutions of higher education, have been involved in developing or providing feedback on major workforce tools....The RTT-ELC grant will build on this foundation to promote alignment of all professional development with the Hawaii Career Framework, ensuring that coursework and workshops address the relevant competencies and support practitioners to advance up the early childhood career ladder." This is neither complete nor appropriate evidence to engage postsecondary institutions and others with the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. This is a low-quality response, not implemented.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.	20	0

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to improve the effectiveness and retention of Early Childhood Educators who work with Children with High Needs, with the goal of improving child outcomes by--

(a) Providing and expanding access to effective professional development opportunities that are aligned with the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework;

(b) Implementing policies and incentives (e.g., scholarships, compensation and wage supplements, tiered reimbursement rates, other financial incentives, management opportunities) that promote professional improvement and career advancement along an articulated career pathway that is aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and that are designed to increase retention;

(c) Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention; and

(d) Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for--

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

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

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (D)(2)

(a) This application describes present professional development contents and opportunities, and in general, what it would like to do in the future. There is not a plan in this application to improve the effectiveness and retention of early childhood educators who work with children with high needs by expanding access to quality professional development aligned with the state's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. (b) This application lacks any information about policies and incentives that Hawaii would offer to promote professional improvement and career advancement. (c) The plan described in this application is to have a data system that will allow for the tracking of recruitment and retention data for early childhood care givers, as well as to inform practitioners about the availability of professional development opportunities, scholarships, and supplement awards. There was no mention of a plan to improve child outcomes by publicly reporting aggregated data on early childhood educator development, advancement, and retention. Therefore, complete and appropriate evidence was not presented. (d) The Hawaii application describes its current review and update of professional development documents, and in general, what each one entails. However, it has not presented a comprehensive plan that promotes professional improvement and career advancement from one credential to another, along an articulated career pathway that is aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and that are designed to increase early childhood care giver retention. Therefore, complete and appropriate evidence was not presented. (d) The applicant's targets for supporting early childhood educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities [Tables (D)(2)(d)(2)] are general and lack specificity because no baseline data was provided. Many of the activities in Table (D)(4)-1 are not able to be measured, either, such as "Train Recruitment and Retention Specialist for 6 months" and its outcome "Each staff member has necessary skills and knowledge" is not an appropriate nor measurable. In addition, there was not an accompanying narrative as to how the targets were decided upon and how RTT-ELC could help them be reached. Therefore, not enough evidence was presented. This is a low-quality response, not implemented.

E. Measuring Outcomes and Progress

The total points an applicant may earn for selection criteria (E)(1) and (E)(2) is 40. The 40 points will be divided by the number of selection criteria that the applicant chooses to address so that each selection criterion is worth the same number of points. For example, if the applicant chooses to address both selection criteria under this Focused Investment Area, each criterion will be worth up to 20 points. If the applicant chooses to address one selection criterion, the criterion will be worth up to 40 points.

The applicant must address at least one of the selection criteria within Focused Investment Area (E), which are as follows:

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.	20	0

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to implement, independently or as part of a cross-State consortium, a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that informs instruction and services in the early elementary grades and that--

(a) Is aligned with the State's Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness;

(b) Is valid, reliable, and appropriate for the target population and for the purpose for which it will be used, including for English learners and children with disabilities;

(c) Is administered beginning no later than the start of school year 2014-2015 to children entering a public school kindergarten; States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation;

(d) Is reported to the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and to the early learning data system, if it is separate from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, as permitted under and consistent with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws; and

(e) Is funded, in significant part, with Federal or State resources other than those available under this grant, (e.g., with funds available under section 6111 or 6112 of the ESEA).

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (E)(1)

(a)(b)(c) The Hawaii Early Learning and Development Standards (ELDS) are in the process of being written, and the expected approval date by the Hawaii SAC is March, 2012. Hawaii presently has a plan to develop a new common statewide assessment of the school readiness of young children at entry to kindergarten, with plans to administer it beginning at the start of SY2014-2015. However details about it, including its validity, reliability, and appropriateness to the target population, were not given. (d) The applicant reports that data collected with the upcoming kindergarten readiness assessment tool will be reported to the State DOE data system, which will have the capacity to access and analyze historical and longitudinal data to identify strengths, weaknesses, and educational service gaps for keiki and their families. However, timelines in this part of the application as well as others on the Table (E)(1)-1 are unrealistically short because there is an inordinate amount of work that is not yet complete. For instance, the first Kindergarten Entry Assessment's draft is supposed to be complete by February 2012, the second one by March 2012, and the draft approved by the Hawaii SAC (which does not presently exist) and DOE by March 2012. Therefore, information on the status of the kindergarten entry assessment, its implementation and uses, was inadequate or inappropriate, and therefore, does not show a high-quality plan. (e) This proposal says that Hawaii will us a a combination of federal and state human and financial resources, other than those of this grant, to implement the assessment and sustain its use. There is inadequate detail in this response. This is a low-quality response, not implemented.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.	20	3

The extent to which the State has a High-Quality Plan to enhance the State's existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System or to build or enhance a separate, coordinated, early learning data system that aligns and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and that either data system--

(a) Has all of the Essential Data Elements;

(b) Enables uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating State Agencies and Participating Programs;

(c) 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;

(d) 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

(e) Meets the Data System Oversight Requirements and complies with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (E)(2)

(a) Hawaii's application says it "has many aspects of the seven essential early learning data system elements, and Table (E)(2)-2 shows the status of each essential data element as well as plans to achieve or improve it." However, their stated activities, timelines, and outcomes on that table are unrealistic and not complete. For example, one activity is to "Develop a TQRIS data collection and reporting system that is interoperable with existing/planned data systems," the Timeline is "Feb '12- Dec '13," and the Outcome is "TQRIS data system linked to P20 LDS." This is not possible in the timeframe described because the TQRIS is not yet complete or functional. (a)(b)(c) Hawaii's application shows that different departments and programs in the state collect different data in different ways for different purposes. The plan to universalize information in the data systems is not well-developed and will take much longer than described in this proposal. Therefore, not enough appropriate evidence was presented. (d)(e) A "design build" process will be used to ensure that data, reports, and analyses are easily accessible to a variety of stakeholders. The second half of the grant period will focus on activities that support the access and use of data to inform decision-making. Although the plan is not complete, some thought has been put into the requirements and uses of a complex data system. However, the length of time to put in place a comprehensive data system as required for this application is much longer than described in Table (E)(2)-1. (e) This application states that it has an MOU in place that meets the system oversight requirements for this proposal. However, it was not clear in the narrative if that MOU would cover the data to be collected for this specific RTT-ELC grant. (e) As required in this application, the proposal stated that the data systems meet the data system oversight requirements and comply with the requirements of federal, state, and local privacy laws. This response did not supply enough information to be able to evaluate this response. This is a low-quality response, not implemented.

	Available	Score
Total Points Available for Selection Criteria	**280**	**23**

Priorities

Competitive Preference Priorities

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Including all Early Learning and Development Programs in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	**10**	**0**

Competitive Preference Priority 2 is designed to increase the number of children from birth to kindergarten entry who are participating in programs that are governed by the State's licensing system and quality standards, with the goal that all licensed or State-regulated programs will participate. The State will receive points for this priority based on the extent to which the State has in place, or has a High-Quality Plan to implement no later than June 30, 2015--

(a) A licensing and inspection system that covers all programs that are not otherwise regulated by the State and that regularly care for two or more unrelated children for a fee in a provider setting; provided that if the State exempts programs for reasons other than the number of children cared for, the State may exclude those entities and reviewers will score this priority only on the basis of non-excluded entities; and

(b) A Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System in which all licensed or State-regulated Early Learning and Development Programs participate.

Scoring Rubric Used: **Quality and Implementation**

Comments on (P)(2)

(a) Hawaii does not presently have a licensing and inspection system that is regulated by the State for caregivers who regularly care for two or more unrelated children. The applicant states that they will make "concerted efforts to encourage and support FFN providers to voluntarily participate in formal quality improvement systems." This is not an appropriate or adequate response to this criteria. The applicant does not expect or mandate that all licensed or state-registered early learning and development programs participate in its TQRIS. The DOH's Early Interventions that are not Head Start collaboration sites would not be part of TQRIS, but only would be encouraged to partner with TQRIS programs. Therefore, this does not meet the RTT-ELC requirements. The applicant does not have, and did not describe, a tiered quality rating and improvement system in which all licensed or state-regulated ELD programs participate. Therefore, this response is not adequate. This is a low-quality response, not implemented.

Priorities

	Available	Yes/No
Competitive Preference Priority 3: Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry	0 or 10	No

To meet this priority, the State must, in its application--

(a) Demonstrate that it has already implemented a Kindergarten Entry Assessment that meets selection criterion (E)(1) by indicating that all elements in Status Table (A)(1)-12 are met; or

(b) Address selection criterion (E)(1) and earn a score of at least 70 percent of the maximum points available for that criterion.

Comments on (P)(3)

The Hawaii application did not meet this priority. The state was not convincing that it had enough programs in place on which to build, and adequate plans to move forward using this RTT-ELC funding, over the next four years. The necessary changes and integrated programs have not been proposed, and plans are not adequate to garner the quality and comprehensive outcomes expected from young children with high needs, their programs, their early care and education providers, and a data system that can adequately and systemically measure outcomes and progress.

Absolute Priority

	Met? Yes/No
Absolute Priority - Promoting School Readiness for Children with High Needs.	No

To meet this priority, the State's application must comprehensively and coherently address how the State will build a system that increases the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs so that they enter kindergarten ready to succeed.

The State's application must demonstrate how it will improve the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs by integrating and aligning resources and policies across Participating State Agencies and by designing and implementing a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System. In addition, to achieve the necessary reforms, the State must make strategic improvements in those specific reform areas that will most significantly improve program quality and outcomes for Children with High Needs. Therefore, the State must address those criteria from within each of the Focused Investment Areas (sections (C) Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children, (D) A Great Early Childhood Education Workforce, and (E) Measuring Outcomes and Progress) that it believes will best prepare its Children with High Needs for kindergarten success.

Comments on Absolute Priority

The Hawaii application did not meet this priority. The state was not convincing that it had enough programs in place on which to build, and adequate plans to move forward using this RTT-ELC funding, over the next four years. The necessary changes and integrated programs have not been proposed, and plans are not adequate to garner the quality and comprehensive outcomes expected from young children with high needs, their programs, their early care and education providers, and a data system that can adequately and systemically measure outcomes and progress.