

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

## Wisconsin



JUNE 2015



Race to the Top  
Early Learning Challenge

# Table of Contents

<b>APR Cover Sheet</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Certification</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Successful State Systems</b> .....	<b>5</b>
Governance Structure .....	5
Stakeholder Involvement .....	6
Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders.....	7
Participating State Agencies .....	7
<b>High-Quality, Accountable Programs</b> .....	<b>8</b>
Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application).....	8
Promoting Participation in the TQRIS (Section B(2) of Application) .....	12
Performance Measure (B)(2)(c).....	15
Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application).....	19
Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application).....	21
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) .....	25
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) .....	27
Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application).....	30
<b>Focused Investment Areas: Sections (C), (D), and (E)</b> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>Promoting Early Learning Outcomes</b> .....	<b>32</b>
Early Learning Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application) .....	32
Engaging and Supporting Families (Section C(4) of Application) .....	35
<b>Early Childhood Education Workforce</b> .....	<b>38</b>
Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials (Section D(1) of Application) .....	38
Early Learning Data Systems (Section E(2) of Application) .....	43
<b>Data Tables</b> .....	<b>46</b>
Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age.....	46
Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs .....	47
Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age .....	49
Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity.....	51
Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development.....	52
Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State .....	54
Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards.....	55
Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State.....	56

<b>Budget and Expenditure Tables .....</b>	<b>57</b>
Budget Summary Table .....	57
Budget Table: Project 1 – Overall Grants Management.....	59
Budget Table: Project 2 – YoungStar Training and Technical Assistance .....	61
Budget Table: Project 3 – Increase YoungStar Participation .....	63
Budget Table: Project 4 – Increase YoungStar Participation of High Needs Children.....	65
Budget Table: Project 5 – Increase Quality of YoungStar Program via Scholarships, Training and Bonuses.....	67
Budget Table: Project 6 – YoungStar Validation Study .....	69
Budget Table: Project 7 – Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards.....	71
Budget Table: Project 8 – Family Engagement.....	73
Budget Table: Project 9 – Professional Development.....	75
Budget Table: Project 10 – Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System .....	77

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



## APR Cover Sheet

### General Information

1. **PR/Award #:** S412A130037
2. **Grantee Name:** Office of the Governor, State of Wisconsin
3. **Grantee Address:** 201 E. Washington Avenue, Madison, Wisconsin 53708
4. **Project Director Name:** Eloise Anderson
- Title:** Secretary, Wisconsin Department of Children and Families
- Phone #:** (608) 267-9685      **Fax #:** (608) 266-6836
- Email Address:** Eloise.Anderson@wisconsin.gov

### Reporting Period Information

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

### Indirect Cost Information

#### 6. Indirect Costs

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

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

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



## Certification

**The Grantee certifies that the State is currently participating in:**

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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program

Yes  No

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

**Signed by Authorized Representative**

**Name:** Eloise Anderson

**Title:** Secretary, Department of Children and Families

## Executive Summary

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

During the second year of the Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) in Wisconsin, there have been significant accomplishments in all areas of the grant, some challenges from year one have been overcome, and new strategies have been developed.

In 2014, RTT-ELC helped improve the quality of early care and education provided to children in Wisconsin by enhancing the Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), helping more children gain access to high-quality care, and helping child care providers improve the quality of their care.

YoungStar, Wisconsin's QRIS, was enhanced in a number of ways. The reliability, validity, and speed of the current ratings were improved through a contract with Branagh Information Group and training from the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute. Starting in 2016, the YoungStar evaluation criteria will include a progression of family engagement standards developed by a cross-sector workgroup and the RTT-ELC Family Engagement Analyst. Providers will be required to meet these standards starting in 2017. Data collection was completed and analysis was started on the YoungStar validation study. The results of this study will help Wisconsin evaluate the effectiveness of YoungStar.

In order to help parents and families become engaged in the role they play in providing and selecting high-quality early care, work has continued on the YoungStar media campaign. Three videos highlighting YoungStar and the importance of early brain development were created, improvements were made to the YoungStar website, and a paid media campaign will begin in the spring of 2015. To help ensure that all children have access to high-quality early care, outreach efforts continue to increase the YoungStar participation of Head Start, tribal child care providers, Licensed Day Camps, and 4KCA. ("4KCA" stands for "4-Year-Old Kindergarten Community Approaches." In 4KCA programs, public schools and community child care programs form partnerships to provide high-quality programming for four-year-olds.)

RTT-ELC offered child care providers many opportunities in 2014 to increase the quality of the care they provide Wisconsin's children. The Educational Opportunities Grant is giving child care providers across the state access to credit-based instruction at no cost; 263 T.E.A.C.H. scholarships were provided with RTT-ELC funds; Registry Coupons allowed child care providers to obtain Registry Career Levels at no cost; 1,059 hours of on-site technical consultation were provided in addition to the standard YoungStar hours; and new training and technical assistance opportunities are being created for child care providers serving children with special needs or disabilities and their families.

In addition to directly improving the quality of early care and education (ECE), in 2014 RTT-ELC helped to strengthen and align the overall ECE system in Wisconsin. Wisconsin's ECE system has many components, and RTT-ELC has given these components the opportunity to come together in order to build and align their many working pieces. This includes the creation of the Tribal-State Relations Work Group with members from the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, Inc. (GLITC), the creation of an Online Professional Development System Portfolio, the completion of the Wisconsin Core Competencies for Professionals Working with Young Children and Their Families, and continued work on the collaboration between 4K and YoungStar.

A challenge to building an improved system of early childhood in Wisconsin during year one was the creation of an Early Childhood Integrated Data System (EC IDS). Loss of critical staff slowed progress on many of the

activities related to the creation of the EC IDS. With the help of the Early Learning Challenge (ELC) State Support Team, the EC IDS staff from all three State agencies came together, drafted a new mission and goals statement, revised the scope of work, and began meeting as cross-agency workgroups again.

## Successful State Systems

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

---

### Governance Structure

---

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

The governance structure of the grant was established during the first year and has continued to be successful in the second year. At the highest level, Wisconsin's grant is overseen by the Secretary of the Department of Children and Families (DCF), the top executive at the lead agency.

The Grant Manager oversees the day-to-day grant activities and reports to the leadership committee. The leadership committee consists of a Division Administrator from DCF and the Department of Health Services (DHS) and an Assistant State Superintendent from the Department of Public Instruction (DPI). The complexity of the ECIDS requires that a Portfolio Manager, housed at DPI, oversee the projects and activities at each agency that are related to data systems. With the high amount of staff turnover during 2014, the Grant Manager plays a larger role in guiding this project in 2014 than in 2013.

The Governor's Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC) continues to play an important role in Wisconsin's RTT-ELC grant activities. The ECAC was instrumental in developing many of the foundational concepts within the state's RTT-ELC grant application, and RTT-ELC activities continue to align with and support ECAC stated outcomes: public-private partnership, comprehensive screening and assessment, professional development, family and community engagement, and integrated data systems.

A core component of our system-building and overall governance efforts has been to create a central point of coordination among the eleven tribal nations, state staff across multiple departments, and other cross-sector professionals. To serve as this central point of coordination, in 2014 a Tribal Coordinator - Early Childhood was hired through an interagency agreement with the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, Inc. (GLITC).

A "Tribal-State Relations Work Group" continues to meet quarterly and provide additional structures to increase coordination and information-sharing among the eleven tribal nations and broader state collaborative efforts. This workgroup includes two members from GLITC, sixteen members from the three state departments and related RTT-ELC coordinators, tribal liaisons from each of the three departments, the Head Start Collaboration Office, three other tribal representatives including an ECAC member, and representatives from three other related associations. A smaller leadership group began to meet that included the tribal liaisons from each of the three state departments, to assure more coordination of efforts directly among the state departments and a higher level of tribal input at the state level.

Work is also continuing on the creation of a public-private partnership. After a temporary slow-down due to changes in staff, the work is continuing to move forward with the decentralized approach that was presented to the state agencies in 2013 and focuses on the creation of a network of local coalitions. This plan was the result of collaboration among the ECAC, Partners for Wisconsin's Economic Success (PWES), and the Celebrate Children Foundation, and interviews and work group meetings with state and national experts and stakeholders.

The work plan will be finalized in the early weeks of 2015, and work will begin in the spring of 2015.

---

## Stakeholder Involvement

---

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

Stakeholder involvement remained a central component of the majority of Wisconsin RTT-ELC activities and programs in 2014.

Many of the activities in Wisconsin's scope of work require strong stakeholder engagement and participation. As described in areas C(1) and D(1), workgroups have been formed around issues like the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards (WMELS) and professional development. These workgroups consist not only of staff from all three state agencies (internal stakeholders), but also staff from community organizations (external stakeholders). Regional meetings and communities of practice continued in 2014, including the grant-sponsored event that brings together 4K leadership/coordinators from school districts across Wisconsin to network with state staff and build support structures within their regions. Federal RTT-ELC Grant Administrators were able to participate in this event this year.

Family Engagement [or C(4) and B(4)] are additional examples of stakeholder involvement because they look both to families with young children and to child care providers to directly influence the direction of policies and activities related to RTT-ELC. In 2014, as part of the YoungStar media campaign, a number of focus groups were conducted that asked parents across the state what was important to them when it came to child care and how they made decisions about which child care providers they selected. Also in 2014, plans were made to pilot the new Family Engagement Standards Training with two different groups of providers. The Family Engagement Standards Training is a curriculum that was developed to accompany the new YoungStar family engagement standards, and it is critical that providers give feedback on this curriculum.

Stakeholders play an especially important role when it comes to activities that involve tribal providers. The "Tribal-State Relations Work Group" includes two members from the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, Inc. (GLITC), sixteen members from the three state departments, the Head Start Collaboration Office, three other tribal representatives, and three other related associations. This group includes the RTT-ELC Tribal Coordinator - Early Childhood, who was hired to help increase tribal stakeholder involvement in many RTT-ELC activities, as well as share RTT-ELC opportunities with tribal stakeholders.

Many RTT-ELC staff are also engaged in stakeholder activities outside RTT-ELC. For example, the DCF Family Engagement Analyst participates in the ECAC Family and Community Partnership Project Team, the DCF Professional Development Analyst plays an active role in the higher education articulation workgroup, and the DCF Inclusion Analyst has been invited to semi-annual meetings of Birth to 3 staff.

RTT-ELC staff from all three agencies continue to share the work and opportunities of RTT-ELC with stakeholders by presenting at all early childhood conferences across the state, including the Pathways to Quality Conference and Resource Fair, Wisconsin Child Care Administrators Association Conference, Preserving Early Childhood Conference, and many others.

---

## Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders

---

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

A significant piece of legislation from 2014 was the reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) Act. The focus of this historic re-envisioning is to both promote self-sufficiency for low-income families and to support the healthy development and school readiness needs of children. Many of the requirements outlined in the CCDBG are closely related to activities and programs supported by RTT-ELC. For example, the public-private partnership and the ECIDS are both directly mentioned in the CCDBG. Many RTT-ELC activities and programs will help ensure that Wisconsin is able to fulfill the new requirements of the CCDBG.

To update 4K/4KCA policy documents, DPI and DCF finalized the review of existing 4K and 4KCA policies. Policy and Information Advisory 12.14 (<http://ec.dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/ec/pdf/4kbul14.pdf>) was then revised to address items identified in the review, as were other documents.

At the beginning of the 2014-15 school year, the new performance-based Educator Effectiveness evaluation system went into full implementation in school districts across the state. The system includes kindergarten classrooms, but exempts 4K community sites unless the teacher is directly hired by the school district. A number of districts are piloting processes to include teachers hired by community programs. The Educator Effectiveness process is being monitored to see how the model can align with YoungStar policies on provider supervision.

The DPI state biennial budget proposal continues to support 4K start-up grants. DPI continues efforts to support school districts in adopting and sustaining 4KCA models through resources and promotion of best practices, including the continued development of web resources such as: <http://4kca.dpi.wi.gov/>

RTT-ELC activities continue to be affected and supported by legislation and policies from 2013, including the legislative Joint Resolution that "policy decisions enacted by the Wisconsin state legislature will acknowledge and take into account the principles of early childhood brain development" (<https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/2013/related/proposals/sjr59>); the increased tiered reimbursement rate for 4 Star programs that went into effect on January 1, 2014; and 2013 Wisconsin Act 20, which directed that DCF and the Department of Workforce Development (DWD) be included with DPI, the University of Wisconsin System, the Wisconsin Technical College System, and the Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in a State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) compact.

---

## Participating State Agencies

---

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

There has been no change to the commitment of the participating state agencies; all state agencies remain fully committed. The Department of Health Services (DHS) continues to become more actively engaged on a day-to-day basis with the addition of dedicated staff. .

## High-Quality, Accountable Programs

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

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

<b>(1) Early Learning &amp; Development Standards</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Early Learning &amp; Development Standards that currently apply to:</b>	
State-funded preschool programs	
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

<b>(2) A Comprehensive Assessment System</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>A Comprehensive Assessment System that currently apply to:</b>	
State-funded preschool programs	
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

<b>(3) Early Childhood Educator qualifications</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Early Childhood Educator qualifications that currently apply to:</b>	
State-funded preschool programs	
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

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

<b>(4) Family engagement strategies</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Family engagement strategies that currently apply to:</b>	
State-funded preschool programs	
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

<b>(5) Health promotion practices</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Health promotion practices that currently apply to:</b>	
State-funded preschool programs	
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

<b>(6) Effective data practices</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Effective data practices that currently apply to:</b>	
State-funded preschool programs	
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

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

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

**Note:** If a 4K or Head Start program offers child care in addition to their other programming they may choose to participate in YoungStar and have the child care portion of the day rated. YoungStar, Wisconsin's TQRIS, only rates the child care portion of 4K and Head Start programs, so although the 4K curriculum is aligned with the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards, for example, the TQRIS standards related to the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards do not apply to 4K or Head Start.

The year 2014 continued to be a time of building and refinement for YoungStar, Wisconsin's TQRIS. Large programs and initiatives continued to focus on (1) expanding provider knowledge of child assessment and screening, the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards, and Wisconsin Pyramid Model through on-site technical consultation, (2) strengthening family engagement, and (3) creating training and technical assistance opportunities for child care providers serving children with disabilities/special needs and their families.

#### **On-site Technical Consultation for YoungStar Providers**

Although training is a great way for providers to increase their knowledge, understand theory, and connect with peers, research has demonstrated that consultation and coaching are necessary to really change practice. With this in mind, during 2014, the YoungStar Consortium developed a process to train YoungStar Technical Consultants (TCs) in a content area and give the trained TCs a set of protocols for on-site technical consultation related to that content area. The first three content areas were the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards, the Ages & Stages Questionnaires, and the Wisconsin Pyramid Model.

Once a provider has taken the training associated with a particular content area, s/he becomes eligible to apply for additional hours of on-site technical consultation. These on-site hours are in addition to the provider's regular YoungStar consultation hours and focus on the protocols given to the YoungStar TCs. These additional on-site hours allow providers the opportunity to apply the content learned in the training to their specific programs, and providers can ask questions and receive support around their specific needs.

In 2014, 1,059 hours of additional on-site technical consultation were completed with 127 total providers (34 family child care programs, 92 group child care programs, and 1 school-age program). Of these 1,059 hours, 643 were on the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards, 287 were on the Wisconsin Pyramid Model, and 127 were on the Ages & Stages Questionnaires. This consultation reached 60% of the counties in the state during 2014, with about a quarter of the consultation being delivered in rural areas.

This process will continue in 2015 and will expand to include Family Engagement and potentially Inclusion and Health & Wellness.

### **Family Engagement**

In 2014, the cross-agency, cross-sector workgroup recruited by the DCF Family Engagement Analyst drafted the family engagement standards that will be included in the YoungStar evaluation criteria starting in 2016. In 2017 these standards will be required for 3, 4, and 5 Star programs.

In order to support providers in meeting these new standards, a Family Engagement curriculum was developed in 2014 for all child care providers.

### **Training and Technical Assistance for Providers Serving Children with Disabilities/Special Needs and their Families**

In 2013, the DCF Inclusion Analyst began a work plan to expand the services provided by Milwaukee Early Childhood Administration (MECA) Special Needs Supports Program (SNSP), by creating a mechanism where disability-specific workshops would be available online for child care providers state-wide. A cross-agency, cross-sector workgroup was also created in order to develop web pages for child care providers that would provide them resources and tools for serving children with disabilities and/or special needs and their families.

In 2014, the training and technical assistance "package" for child care providers serving children with disabilities and/or special needs and their families expanded to include a number of other opportunities. With the support of DCF's Secretary, a more comprehensive package is being created.

During 2014, in addition to the MECA SNSP and the YoungStar provider web pages, collaboration between DCF Wisconsin Shares Child Care Subsidy Program staff and the Inclusion Analyst has resulted in the creation of a Special Needs Rate Verification Form which will be implemented in all 72 counties. This form will be used to document requests for special needs authorization rates for families receiving Shares subsidies and represents the first step in creating a more consistent system.

In 2014, conversations and work plans were also started that would create even more opportunity for network-building and professional development for child care providers serving children with disabilities and/or special needs and their families. A cross-agency Charter or MOU was established among DCF, DPI, and DHS that documents a shared philosophy around the importance of providing early intervention and special education services in the natural or least restrictive environment. For young children, this least restrictive environment is often at child care. Plans are also being created for an Inclusion Institute that would bring together YoungStar Technical Consultants and staff from all sectors of Birth to 3 and special education to collaborate and learn from each other on how best to support child care providers in serving children with disabilities and/or special needs and their families.

### **Health and Wellness**

DHS successfully expanded its capacity to provide training and technical assistance to the early care workforce by recruiting a Health and Wellness Analyst.

---

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

---

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

### **4K Providers and YoungStar**

Wisconsin's four-year-old kindergarten (4K) has been part of the school funding formula for over 30 years. For the past 14 years about one-fourth of the elementary school districts have implemented 4K through contracts with community programs including child care and Head Start. These four-year-old kindergarten community approaches (4KCA) require the school to assure that the community providers are implementing all of the state standards for 4K including a licensed 4K teacher, required hours of instruction, standards-based approach, and a variety of other areas.

When Wisconsin developed YoungStar, our TQRIS, the focus was on child care and the locally controlled school district programs were not built into the system. When the national QRIS focus grew to consider all early childhood structures, Wisconsin began to look at ways to better involved 4K in the system. The 4KCA programs were targeted to begin to address this alignment.

DCF and DPI developed policies that defined when YoungStar applied to 4KCA districts and increased efforts to promote districts to use and sustain these models.

The 2014-2015 school year saw five new school districts join 391 other school districts in implementing 4K, thus bringing the state to 95% district implementation. These districts provide 4K to 47,844 students according to the 3rd Friday in September count. Over 100 school districts reported using a 4K Community Approach model (4KCA). Districts implementing these 4KCA models contract with child care, Head Start, and/or private schools to provide programming for four-year-olds.

Since many of these 4KCA districts provide 4K in child care settings, we continue to promote the alignment of policies and practices between DPI and DCF YoungStar. DPI and DCF consultants completed extensive review of the DPI question-and-answer policy advisory document, with input from community 4K leadership. This document was then approved through the DPI administrative approval process and showcased at the October 2014 4K Networking and Head Start Directors' meetings. It was released to the public in December 2014 via email and posting on the DPI website. (See <http://ec.dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/ec/pdf/4kbul14.pdf>.)

These Community Approach models demonstrate the benefits of local partners working together and the effects of quality improvement practices. Data collection related to 4K and 4KCA models has been problematic in the past, as each year the numbers of participating districts and participating community partners change. However, internal and cross-department data collection efforts, through the ECIDS project, will improve data collection and allow better research. Despite the problematic data collection, we have been able to show an increase in the number of 4KCA programs, from 2001-02 to 2012-13. In 2013-14, we saw a first-time drop in the number of 4KCA programs, with several districts moving back to a traditional school-based approach or reducing the number or type of partnerships due to a variety of issues, including concerns about accountability and program quality and parental desire for school-based programs. A reduction in the number of 4KCA programs likely has little or no effect on the number of child care programs participating in YoungStar. It can be assumed that if the child care program was participating in YoungStar and also contracted to provide 4K the program would continue to participate in YoungStar even if they no longer had a contract to provide 4K.

Communication and networking continues among DPI, DCF, the twelve Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs), school districts, and YoungStar technical consultants and trainers. The Annual State Superintendent's Advisory Committee on 4K and Community Approaches, held on April 9, 2014, engaged multiple stakeholders in aligning their work efforts. Two annual events brought school district 4K coordinators and community partners from across the state to network and discuss issues with the state team. The first event was the 4K Networking Meeting, held on October 21, 2014, as a regional meeting with statewide videoconferencing. The second event was the statewide Preserving Early Childhood (PEC): Collaborative Leadership Forum, held on March 19-20, 2014. Over 200 people attended PEC to engage in topics ranging from early childhood leadership, Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards, community councils, cultural diversity, and 4K start-up. YoungStar and 4K coordination were woven into these networking forums and will be woven into various activities throughout the grant period. The intended result is a system-building effort that is deeply informed by the concerns and perspectives of providers, foundations, and other stakeholders from all corners of Wisconsin.

Funds continue to be used to support the efforts of the six 4K Regional Collaboration Coaches to increase cross-sector best practices and resource-sharing on the regional and local level, including alignment with YoungStar. School districts have typically viewed YoungStar as a child care program unrelated to their work. To combat this view, the Collaboration Coaches work with districts, 4K coordinators, and DPI staff to promote use of the Community Approach model and participation of community partners in YoungStar. This strategy provides increased opportunity for shared training content delivery, including cross-system participation in the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards and Wisconsin Pyramid Model trainings. The Collaboration Coaches have worked with three districts to share short video stories promoting 4KCA and describing how these communities address quality, including the YoungStar quality standards. These stories are available on the DPI website. (See <http://4kca.dpi.wi.gov/>.)

### **Tribal Child Care Providers and YoungStar**

The RTT-ELC Tribal Coordinator - Early Childhood took the lead on an early childhood "scan" identifying the service and professional development linkages and gaps between state and tribal programs for young children and families. The cataloging of the various programs at the state and within the eleven Tribal Nations has been more difficult than anticipated, and it is still partially completed.

Following the 2013 Tribal Gathering/Listening Session held in conjunction with the ECAC, efforts have continued to implement some of the potential methods for increasing access and utilization of state professional development opportunities. But it was also clear that there is still much work to do to fully learn from the eleven tribal communities about their perceptions of early childhood programs, including their individual challenges, and their hopes and concerns about greater links with each other and the broader state system through the RTT-ELC process. The Liaison and Tribal-State Relations workgroups have partnered with the IDEA Disproportionality Technical Assistance Network (The Network) Grant to continue to seek a systematic approach to gather information and make connections to each of the Tribal Nations. The Network is a project funding under the US DOE Office of Special Education to improve supports that address racial disproportionality in special education. Early Childhood is one of their focus areas with a project specifically addressing Tribal disproportions in the early childhood years. The two projects overlap in the stakeholders involved within each Tribal Community, they share common areas of focus, and recognize that collaboration will benefit both projects. Plans are in development for another 2015 Tribal Gathering/Listening session, followed by events with each of the individual tribes.

Our 2014 tribal work, as well as planning for 2015-16, was shaped by the 2013 project evaluation report. For example, it highlighted (1) the importance of bringing the department tribal liaisons together in a more direct manner, (2) the need to consider each Tribe's unique differences and find ways to connect more on an individual bases with each Tribal Nation, (3) that difference approaches were needed to address Wisconsin Model Learning Standards training with the tribal nations, and (4) the need to improve how we collect data on tribal participation. A 2014 project evaluation is nearing completion.

### **Head Start and YoungStar**

Although TQRIS standards only apply to programs receiving CCDF funds and not Head Start programs, Head Start programs are still encouraged to participate in YoungStar. Originally, all programs associated with Head Start were given an automatic 5 Star rating. That policy was revised in 2013, and now only Head Start programs that offer an average of three or fewer hours of child care per day in addition to the Head Start hours are given an automatic 5 Star rating. The current Head Start policy is as follows; participating Head Start sites are awarded a 5 Star automatic rating if: (1) the site is a stand-alone Head Start site with no child care provided or (2) the site provides 3 or fewer hours of child care per day in addition to their Head Start hours. Head Start partner sites that offer more than 3 hours of child care per day are not eligible for the 5 Star automatic rating because they do not receive the same oversight and review by the Administration for Children and Families as Head Start grantees and delegates. All Head Start programs that are not eligible for the automatic 5 Star rating are required to participate in YoungStar if they receive Wisconsin Shares payments and encouraged to participate in YoungStar if they do not receive Shares payments.

In 2014, the Administration of Children and Families (ACF) changed its compliance review process of Head Start programs. The original ACF policy was evaluated by YoungStar to ensure it met the criteria necessary for programs to earn an automatic 5 Star rating. In order to continue to engage Head Start programs in YoungStar, three phone calls were held with Head Start Directors and YoungStar state staff to revise the Policy on Head Start Participation in YoungStar to reflect the changes made by ACF. The updated Policy on Head Start Participation in YoungStar has been drafted and is currently going through a feedback process involving Head Start directors and other stakeholders before it is finalized.

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

Eligibility for YoungStar participation has been rolled out in phases, with different types of programs becoming eligible at different times. In 2010, family and group child care providers became eligible for participation. In 2012, school-age care programs were added to the list of eligible providers. In 2013, a group of stakeholders met to develop standards for rating Licensed Day Camps, and beginning in March 2014, Licensed Day Camps became eligible for participation in YoungStar. Licensed Day Camps receiving Wisconsin Shares authorizations were required to submit YoungStar contracts before June 1, 2014, in order to continue receiving Wisconsin Shares. Outreach efforts during 2014 resulted in a seamless entry for Licensed Day Camp participation in YoungStar, and during the summer of 2014, 58 Licensed Day Camps participated in YoungStar.

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

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

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

Targets										
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	5	1.00%	21	5.00%	42	10.00%	63	16.00%	100	25.00%
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	37	27.00%	54	40.00%	88	65.00%	108	80.00%	136	100.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	3,858	100.00%	4,000	100.00%	4,200	100.00%	4,500	100.00%	5,000	100.00%
Other 1	4,897	77.00%	5,000	79.00%	5,100	80.00%	5,150	81.00%	5,200	82.00%
Describe:	All regulated programs									

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

Actuals									
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs									
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	393	5	1.00%	389	17	4.00%	391	18	5.00%
Specify:	State-funded Preschool								
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	136	37	27.00%	127	42	33.00%	311	45	15.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	3,858	3,858	100.00%	3,510	3,481	99.00%	3,290	3,255	99.00%
Other 1	6,361	4,897	77.00%	5,912	4,593	78.00%	5,459	4,339	79.00%
Describe:	All regulated programs								
<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.									

Actuals						
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs						
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Year 3			Year 4		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool						
Specify:						
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619						
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA						
Programs receiving from CCDF funds						
Other 1						
Describe:						
Other 2						
Describe:						
<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.						

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

*Indicate if baseline data are actual or estimated; describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.*

#### **State-Funded Preschool**

State-funded preschool data are collected by school district. The state has 413 elementary school districts, and 391 (95%) of these districts offer 4K.

#### **Early Head Start and Head Start**

The number of Head Start and Early Head Start programs in the state is based on the Head Start Program Information Report (PIR) and not the YoungStar automated system (as it had been in previous years). This accounts for the apparent increase in programs from last year.

The number of Head Start programs in the state is higher than baseline and Year 1 because YoungStar reviewed and changed its policy regarding which programs were designated as Head Start in the automated system. Previously, the automated system allowed any program that had a Head Start affiliation to be tracked as a Head Start program; this included not just those programs that were Grantees or Delegates, but also subcontracted child care partner sites that delivered some Head Start services. Therefore, in the past, the number of Head Start programs was different because these programs were given an automatic 5 Star rating, regardless of how many hours of child care were being provided. Currently, YoungStar gives an automatic 5 Star rating only to those Head Start programs that provide an average of three or fewer hours of child care per day. Programs with less than 3 hours of child care receive more oversight and review by the Administration for Children and Families which is why they are eligible for an automatic 5 Star rating. This change in policy reduced the apparent number of Head Start programs participating QRIS because the YoungStar automated system only tracks those with the automated 5 Star rating with a designation of Head Start.

#### **Programs Receiving from CCDF Funds**

The number of programs that receive CCDF funds is calculated as a "point-in-time" figure. The total number that received funds at any point during the year is higher, but we used a methodology consistent with the original CCDF application.

#### **Other 1: All Regulated Programs**

These data are actual data based on YoungStar participation and do not use any estimates.

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

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

#### **State-Funded Preschool**

Of the 391 districts offering 4K, approximately 104 districts report offering 4KCA. The current YoungStar automated system does not have a way of tracking a designation of 4KCA, and there are thus many more 4KCA sites participating in YoungStar than are reflected in the data.

DPI collects data about the models that school districts use to implement 4K. Districts report if they are school-based only or if they have contracts with child care, Head Start, private schools, or other community programs. DPI does not collect data on the individual community sites with district contracts.

The ECIDS project has increased the awareness of the need for this data. As part of the ECIDS effort, DPI as identified a list of areas for improved data in early childhood areas. This information will be considered in 2015 as DPI works to improve its data collection systems. The issue has been brought to the attention of the ECIDS as it explores how to provide un-duplicated counts in child reporting.

### **Early Head Start and Head Start**

Because of changes in the way data are currently being collected, the Head Start data do not accurately reflect the number of Head Start programs participating in TQRIS. Many sites, including subcontracted child care partner sites that deliver some Head Start, are not being designated as Head Start programs in the automated system. The only programs being designated as Head Start programs are those that offer an average of three or fewer hours of child care per day and receive an automatic 5 Star rating. There are many more programs that offer some Head Start and are participating in YoungStar not included in the current count.

We are currently working on a system of designating sites as Head Start without tying that designation to an automatic 5 Star rating. Once that is in place, we will do a scan of the Head State sites in Wisconsin and will be able to see the full picture of Head Start. This was planned to be in place by the end of 2014; however, it was delayed.

All Head Start programs that do not receive the automatic 5 Star rating continue to have the opportunity to participate in YoungStar through the regular YoungStar service delivery and points calculation process to earn a YoungStar rating.

### **Programs Receiving from CCDF Funds**

All programs that are eligible to participate in TQRIS must participate in order to receive Wisconsin Shares funding. A small number of in-home providers receive Wisconsin Shares subsidies but are not eligible to participate in TQRIS, so the percentage is 99%.

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

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

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

*Describe progress made during the reporting year in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs by the end of the grant period.*

### **Improving the reliability, validity, and speed of YoungStar Formal Raters**

In order to increase the granularity and speed of YoungStar Environment Rating Scales (ERS) ratings, the State selected to purchase the ERS Data System developed by the Branagh Information Group. In 2014, the contract with Branagh was completed, and work started on implementing the system in Wisconsin.

In October 2014, all YoungStar Formal Raters attended a three-day training where they learned to use the software on their tablets. Plans are for the YoungStar Formal Raters to start using the software and their tablets to conduct ERS observations in early 2015. The Bureau of Information Technology Systems (BITS) at DCF has been working closely with the technical team at Branagh to ensure that all the technical components are in place.

The Environment Rating Scale Institute (ERSI) was held in September of 2014. Staff from the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute traveled to Wisconsin for this six-day event.

The week began with intensive inter-rater reliability observation and training sessions for all YoungStar Formal Raters. For three days, Formal Raters conducted three-hour observations of child care programs, followed immediately by a debriefing session to discuss the scoring and agree on a consensus score for each item. Observations were done for the ECERS-R, ITERS-R, FCCERS-R, and SACERS tools, with a score of 85% or higher required for a rater to be considered reliable. Each rater received her/his reliability percentage, and if a rater did not meet the 85% criterion, a plan was created to complete further observations.

On Friday of ERSI week, staff from local YoungStar offices, the Wisconsin Early Childhood Association (WECA), Supporting Families Together Association and Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies (SFTA/CCR&R), and DCF attended a full-day training with Tracy Link and Cathy Riley. This training focused on personal care routines and

activities; specifically, hand-washing, diapering/toileting, and meals/snacks were discussed in great detail. At the same time on Friday, 21 participants from 4K programs attended a four-hour training with Debby Cryer on the ECERS-R.

On Saturday of ERSI week, Debby Cryer held a general session on all of the Environment Rating Scales that was open to child care providers and other community stakeholders.

### **Media Campaign, Communication Plan, and Parent Outreach**

In order to ensure that all parents with young children have access to information on the importance of quality early care and education, the YoungStar/RTT-ELC team selected, through RFP process, Knupp & Watson & Wallman (KW2), a well-known local marketing firm with experience promoting social brands. KW2 will bring its marketing expertise to YoungStar and help create and implement a communication and media campaign plan that will target parents and families.

After much research and development during the first year of the grant, in 2014 the communication became more solidified, and many products were developed and finalized.

Three videos were created by KW2, all of which will be housed on the YoungStar website. The first is a general 'What is YoungStar' video that describes how YoungStar works. Two additional videos were created to help educate parents and families on the importance of early brain development and the effects of toxic stress.

Many changes were made to the YoungStar website as well. New content was added, and the format and many features were made more user-friendly. The new website will become live as the media campaign rolls out in early 2015.

In addition, plans were made to create a targeted, non-traditional, outreach campaign to complement the media roll-out. This campaign will be spearheaded by YoungStar outreach teams and ambassadors from Milwaukee, Beloit, and Green Bay. These teams will be provided with training on talking points and given materials developed by KW2, such as palm cards and brochures, to communicate messages on the importance of quality early care and education, the important roles parents and families play, and how YoungStar can help. These teams and ambassadors will then go out into their communities and reach out to families who are often difficult to reach with other traditional media and communication plans.

Paid advertising and non-traditional outreach will begin in March of 2015.

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

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

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

Number of tiers/levels in the State TQRIS
5

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

	State-funded preschool programs	Early Head Start	Head Start programs	Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	Center-based Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	Family Child Care Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program
TQRIS Programs that Moved Up at Least One Level						191	94
TQRIS Programs that Moved Down at Least One Level						100	28

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

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

Wisconsin either does not track TQRIS movement data or it is not applicable for state-funded preschool programs, Head Start, IDEA B & C, or ESEA.

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

<b>High-Quality Benchmarks at the Highest Level(s) of the TQRIS</b>	
Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet State preschool standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, or there is a reciprocal agreement between State preschool and the TQRIS)	Yes
Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet Federal Head Start Performance Standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, there is a reciprocal agreement between Head Start and the TQRIS, or there is an alternative pathway to meeting the standards)	Yes
Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet national accreditation standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, or an alternative pathway to meeting the standards)	Yes
Early Learning and Development Standards	Yes
A Comprehensive Assessment System	Yes
Early Childhood Educator qualifications	Yes
Family engagement strategies	Yes
Health promotion practices	Yes
Effective data practices	Yes
Program quality assessments	Yes

*Please provide more detail on your development of high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in developing high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS by the end of the grant period.*

### **Registry Coupons**

In order to increase from a 2 Star rating to a 3 Star rating, a child care provider needs a Career Level assigned by The Registry. The initial cost of The Registry application to obtain a Career Level is \$50, which is a barrier for many providers. In 2014, RTT-ELC funds were used to provide "coupons" that covered the cost of The Registry application for YoungStar-participating child care providers.

In order to be eligible for a Registry Coupon in 2014, a provider must have been participating in YoungStar, had a 2 Star rating, and been ready to increase her/his YoungStar rating. The provider also must have completed at least 6 credits of credit-based instruction.

Registry Coupons became available in April of 2014. Coupons were available until October 2016 or until the funds (\$45,000) were depleted, and the funds were depleted in January 2015.

A total of 1,048 coupons were issued. Of these, 587 were new applications (at \$50 each), 286 were expired renewals (at \$40 each), 140 were renewals (at \$25 each), 23 were early renewals (at \$15 each), and 12 were 'other'. The majority (81%) of coupons were used by providers at licensed group centers (781), followed by licensed family providers (77). In addition, 134 day camp counselors used coupons, which is significant because 2014 was the first year that Licensed Day Camps participated in YoungStar.

### **Challenge Awards**

In 2014, RTT-ELC funds were used to give monetary Challenge Awards to YoungStar providers who increased their star ratings during 2013 to reach a 3 Star, 4 Star, or 5 Star rating. These Challenge Awards did not include providers whose initial rating occurred in 2013.

It was decided that a Challenge Award check would be sent directly to each provider as a separate payment and would not be included with other payments such as Wisconsin Shares Child Care Subsidy payments.

The total Challenge Awards amount of \$326,400 was divided among the providers in a tiered manner so that large group centers who increased their ratings to 5 Stars received the largest amount, while certified family providers who increased their ratings to 3 Stars received the smallest amount. Amounts ranged from \$300 to \$1,300. A total of 178 large group centers, 90 small group centers, 126 licensed family child care programs, and 22 certified family child care programs received Challenge Awards in 2014.

A second round of Challenge Awards will be issued in early 2015 for providers who increased their star ratings during 2014.

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

In 2014, RTT-ELC funds continued to provide funding to T.E.A.C.H., so that scholarships could be given to child care providers, and a waiting list could be eliminated. In 2014, there were 922 programs with active T.E.A.C.H. recipients. Of these, 911 of them were participating in YoungStar. Of these 911 programs, 225 increased their YoungStar educational points in 2014, and 98 of those programs also increased in star level. In 2014, there were 263 T.E.A.C.H. contracts awarded with RTT-ELC funding, and all went to recipients working at 2 or 3 Star programs.

T.E.A.C.H. is a geographically diverse program that helps providers all across the state. Scholarship recipients live in 66 of Wisconsin's 72 counties. Thirty-five of Wisconsin's institutes of higher education provided instruction to T.E.A.C.H. scholarship recipients, including all institutions in the Wisconsin Technical College System and the majority of University of Wisconsin System schools across the state.

Child care providers who are participating in the Educational Opportunities Grant (see below) will be receiving individual professional development counseling and will be allowed to receive free instruction under the grant and have a T.E.A.C.H. scholarship at the same time. We anticipate that this connection will encourage providers to remain in the field after the Educational Opportunities Grant concludes and will directly connect interested providers to the next step of higher education after they complete The Registry Credentials.

### **Educational Opportunities Grant**

In 2014, RTT-ELC funds were used to provide access to free credit-based instruction for YoungStar-participating child care providers who had earned 2 and 3 Stars. The Educational Opportunities Grant is based on a pilot project done at the Milwaukee Area Technical College in 2013. The grant will provide 2 and 3 Star-rated YoungStar child care providers with the opportunity to complete specific Wisconsin Registry Credentials and/or earn credit for prior learning experiences. The courses will be offered in community settings, at non-traditional times of day, and in languages other than English (if applicable), and academic supports such as individual professional development counseling will be included.

DCF issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) in July of 2014. There were enough funds available to contract with each school that submitted a proposal, and eight contracts were created: seven with technical colleges and one with a University of Wisconsin System school (UW-Platteville). These eight schools are located across the state, so that providers statewide can be served locally. Each of the seven technical colleges is offering the courses to students in its own geographical area, while UW-Platteville is offering its online courses at no cost to students across the entire state.

Schools began offering courses in January of 2015, and anecdotal reports indicate a high level of provider interest and a successful kick-off. Quarterly reports will be submitted to DCF, including data on courses being offered and students served, with the first report expected from each school in April of 2015.

After awarding the initial eight contracts, some additional funding remained. Because of stipulations around the RFP process, these funds could only be made available to the schools who originally submitted proposals. DCF looked at areas of the state that could be better served by this grant and asked nearby grant recipients to reach out to technical colleges in these areas to determine if partnerships could be created. Most of these under-served areas are located in the western area of the state, and the majority are very rural. Contract amendment proposals to fund these partnerships were due and will be evaluated in February 2015; initially it appears that some partnerships have been created, and providers in these rural areas will have the opportunity to earn credits in their local communities.

### **On-site Technical Consultation for YoungStar Providers**

As mentioned previously, in 2014 YoungStar providers were offered opportunities for additional on-site technical consultation. The YoungStar Consortium developed a process to train YoungStar Technical Consultants (TCs) in a content area and give the trained TCs a set of protocols for on-site technical consultation related to that content area. Once a provider has taken the training associated with a particular content area, s/he becomes eligible to apply for additional hours of on-site technical consultation. These on-site hours are in addition to the provider's regular YoungStar consultation hours and focus on the protocols given to the YoungStar TCs. These additional on-site hours allow providers the opportunity to apply the content learned in the training to their specific programs, and providers can ask questions and receive support around their specific needs.

The first three content areas were the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards, the Ages & Stages Questionnaires, and the Wisconsin Pyramid Model. In 2014, 1,059 hours of additional on-site technical consultation was completed with 127 total providers (34 family child care programs, 92 group child care programs, and 1 school-age program). Of these 1,059 hours, 643 were on the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards, 287 were on the Wisconsin Pyramid Model, and 127 were on the Ages & Stages Questionnaires.

This process will continue in 2015 and will expand to include Family Engagement and potentially Inclusion and Health & Wellness.

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

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

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

Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline	Targets				Actuals			
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Total number of programs covered by the TQRIS	4,897	5,000	5,100	5,150	5,200	4,593	4,339		
Number of Programs in Tier 1	36	36	34	32	30	27	14		
Number of Programs in Tier 2	2,980	3,400	3,000	2,662	2,200	2,621	2,330		
Number of Programs in Tier 3	852	1,069	1,426	1,581	2,000	1,228	1,264		
Number of Programs in Tier 4	128	165	240	386	420	174	187		
Number of Programs in Tier 5	269	330	400	489	550	342	370		

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

Describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

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

The total number of programs participating in TQRIS is greater than the sum of the programs in each tier, because some of the participating programs have a pending rating.

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

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

Trends in the proportions of participating programs indicate that while the number of participating programs has not met the target for each tier (the overall number of regulated child care providers in Wisconsin has been decreasing over the last decade, similar to the national trend), the proportion of higher-rated programs is increasing.

Meaningful changes in the percentages of participating programs at each star level can be seen. The proportions of participating programs in Tiers 1 and 2 have shown a decreasing trend for the last two years (e.g., Tier 1 decreased from 6% of participating programs in 2013 to 3% of participating programs in 2014), and there are now fewer programs in the lower tiers. The proportions of participating programs in Tiers 3, 4, and 5 have shown increasing trends (e.g., Tier 5 increased from 7% of participating programs in 2013 to 9% of participating programs in 2014), and now there are more high-quality programs.

These meaningful trends indicate more programs with high levels of quality. Given these trends, we believe that continuing current programs and initiatives will continue to support the movement of programs to higher tiers of quality. For example, the Educational Opportunities Grant is providing providers from 2 and 3 Star rated programs access to credit-based instruction at no cost. Earning credits increases the providers Registry Career Level. Higher Registry Career Levels are required for 2, 4, and 5 Star ratings. Providers with lower tier ratings

are also being given the opportunity to apply for additional onsite coaching and mentoring. These additional hours will give providers the chance to expand on what they learned during a training session such as the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards or the new Family Engagement standards. Another initiative that is aimed at increasing the number of high-quality programs is the YoungStar Media Campaign. The YoungStar Media Campaign is directed at helping parents and families understand the importance of high quality care.

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

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

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

Targets										
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool										
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	2,432	15.00%	5,775	35.00%	8,250	50.00%	12,375	75.00%	16,500	100.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	6,219	15.00%	6,913	17.00%	8,132	20.00%	9,759	24.00%	10,572	26.00%
Other 1	8,325	15.00%	9,435	17.00%	11,100	20.00%	13,332	24.00%	14,430	26.00%
Describe:	All regulated programs									

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

Actuals									
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS									
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%
Specify:	State-funded Preschool								
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	16,500	2,432	15.00%	15,433	2,983	19.30%	15,105	3,172	21.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	40,662	6,219	15.00%	42,831	8,432	19.70%	42,028	9,022	21.50%
Other 1	55,000	8,325	15.00%	57,934	11,413	19.70%	56,848	11,825	21.50%
Describe:	All regulated programs								
<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.									

Actuals						
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs						
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Year 3			Year 4		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool						
Specify:						
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619						
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA						
Programs receiving from CCDF funds						
Other 1						
Describe:						
<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.						

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

*Please indicate whether baseline data are actual or estimated; and describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.*

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

"Children in programs receiving CCDF funding" is based on the actual number of children in the Wisconsin Shares Child Care Subsidy Program with an open authorization at the time the data report was created. This is a point-in-time value as opposed to the number of open authorizations for the entire reporting period. The later is used in table (A)(1)-3a.

Head Start totals are from the Head Start Program Information Report (PIR).

"Children in all regulated programs" is an estimate based on the assumption that the total number of children with high needs will change at the same rate as the number of children in programs who receive CCDF funds.

The baseline number of 55,000 children for all regulated programs is intended to capture both those children listed for Head Start and CCDF as well as those children with high needs in 4 and 5 Star-rated programs that do not receive Wisconsin Shares subsidies. Wisconsin does not currently have a method for tracking this number so it is therefore an estimate. It is expected that the number of children with high needs in all regulated programs will change over time at the same rate as the number of children with high needs in programs receiving CCDF funds.

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

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

The number and percentage of children with high needs in programs receiving CCDF funds met and exceeded the target in 2014.

We believe that current programs and initiatives will continue to support the movement of programs to higher tiers of quality and therefore increase the number and percentage of children with high needs in top-tier programs. Specifically programs such as the YoungStar Media Campaign which are directed at teaching parents and families about the importance of high quality early care and education will lead to more children attending high quality care.

---

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

---

*Describe progress made during the reporting year in validating the effectiveness of the TQRIS during the reporting year, including the State's strategies for determining whether TQRIS tiers accurately reflect differential levels of program quality and assessing the extent to which changes in ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made by the end of the grant period.*

Dr. Katherine Magnuson from the University of Wisconsin's Institute on Research and Poverty was selected to run the YoungStar Validation Study. Dr. Magnuson is a well-known expert in early childhood research, with special expertise in the well-being and development of economically disadvantaged children and their families.

The validation study made significant progress in 2014.

### **Data Collection**

Data collection was completed in the summer of 2014.

All participating classrooms were evaluated using either the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale or the Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale.

Eight different measures of school readiness were collected. The assessment tools covered all broad areas of school readiness including language and literacy, early math skills, concept development, and self-regulatory capacity. The measures included the Woodcock-Johnson Applied Problems subtest, Woodcock-Johnson Letter-Word Identification, Test of Preschool Early Literacy (TOPEL) Phonological Awareness subtest, Bracken School Readiness Assessment, Head-Toes-Knees-Shoulders, Social Competency and Behavior Evaluation - teacher versions, Preschool Learning Behaviors Scale, and Social Skills Improvement System parent survey.

Survey tools were developed to collect information from family and group care administrators, classroom teachers, and families.

Participants were recruited from the Northeast region of the state and from the Milwaukee area.

A total of 35 family child care providers and 204 group child care centers participated.

### **Data Analysis**

Data analysis was started in the fall of 2014. Initial results are expected in early spring 2015.

YoungStar staff are planning to use these results during the annual review and revision of the YoungStar Evaluation Criteria.

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

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

### Focused Investment Areas

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

## Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

---

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

---

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

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

*Describe the progress made in the reporting year, including supports that are in place to promote the understanding of and commitment to the Early Learning and Development Standards across Early Learning and Development Programs. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.*

Early childhood trainers are an important part of Wisconsin's early childhood system, and through RTT-ELC we were able to increase the skill and knowledge base of our trainer community around the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards (WMELS). In Wisconsin, WMELS is the common framework that specifies developmental expectations for children from birth through entrance to first grade. The standards were first created in 2003 and are now in their fourth revision. They reflect attention to all the domains of a child's learning and development. Wisconsin has a robust, cross-sector, professional development framework for implementing training on the standards. The system includes a statewide WMELS coordinator, regional coordination, a 15-hour training format with 91 state-approved trainers, and a website for trainers and the general community. Participation in this training is part of the YoungStar rating process. The grant supported a statewide community of practice event on March 3-4, 2014, showcasing implementation of WMELS in child care settings.

RTT-ELC also supported translation of materials into Spanish as well as ongoing updates to trainer and participant material packages. Our trainers continue to be prepared to work directly with providers and share WMELS information that will inform providers' work with children. The trainers now have their own website at <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com> that houses their materials.

Data collection has been an ongoing challenge with this project. There are several different points of data collection among the sectors involved in the project. While approved WMELS trainers are responsible for the provision of data about the number of trainings, the data remain segmented, and all trainings are not reported. This issue was addressed in 2014 through several different means, including the in-progress development of a more effective data reporting format and new linkages with The Registry. There were 40 full trainings reported throughout the regions. These trainings included 999 participants from a variety of sectors: child care (771), Head Start (93), public schools (40), special education (2), and others (93). These data do not include trainings provided through our technical colleges or universities nor those provided specifically by school districts such as Milwaukee that provided training to all elementary schools. To address this issue, the WMELS Coordinator has

developed a new online system for data collection and is working with the child care Registry to better align data collection.

### **Increased the number of and support for WMELS trainers.**

Grant funds have supported increasing the number of WMELS trainers by providing stipends to currently approved trainers to mentor new trainer candidates. In 2014, there were seven mentor stipends awarded. These mentors helped assure consistency and best-practice adoption by new trainers. Trainers were also supported in maintaining their status within The Registry.

In 2014, we began to implement improved strategies for recruiting and deploying WMELS model trainers to assure that training capacity is available and accessible to providers. We surveyed trainers to obtain more insight from those who frequently provided training and from those who did not frequently provide training. We have targeted training within tribal communities and in Milwaukee with lower-tiered programs. These targeted trainings helped to deploy trainers to previously unreached areas and also helped identify more people who may be interested in becoming trainers. Preliminary discussions with the new RTT-ELC Tribal Coordinator - Early Childhood are identifying new potential strategies specific to expanding the number of trainers from the eleven tribal nations.

The expansion of WMELS communities of practice events in each of Wisconsin's six regional communities of practice regions has increased consistency of regional coordination, improved coordination of training delivery, provided networking opportunities, and provided a venue for distributing information, updated material, evidence-based practices, and related resources. The evaluation in 2013 has led to more involvement of the WMELS Coordinator in these events and implementation of more strategies to support trainers.

### **Engaged families and schools around the WMELS.**

In 2013, the focus was on families and schools. We saw the creation of a WMELS training module including "Tip Sheets" for families. In 2014, these tip sheets became available on the WMELS website. (See <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/wmels-family-training.php>.)

Our team also worked with the DPI Common Core State Standards (CCSS) team to design a training module to help school districts align community learning targets across WMELS, CCSS, and Common Core Essential Elements (alternate achievement standards, aligned with the CCSS, for students with significant intellectual disabilities). This process was piloted with 14 districts. The WMELS Coordinator, Literacy Coordinator, and Early Childhood Program Support Coordinators within the 12 CESAs had contacts with 49 school districts that have been interested in implementing the process. The material is available to districts through "Live Binder" technology available on the DPI website. (See <http://ec.dpi.wi.gov/files/ec/pdf/elsalign.pdf>.)

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

The social and emotional domain of WMELS remains a priority focus for the state effort and the Pyramid Model for Social and Emotional Competence has been the primary focus of professional development. RTT-ELC has allowed us to support existing program-wide implementation sites (previously called demonstration sites). Seven new sites were added in 2014, including three in Milwaukee. In 2014, Regional Coaches became even more involved in the training coordination, trainer application processes, and implementation of the Pyramid Model Communities of Practice. Forty-nine (49) Pyramid Model trainings were completed in 2014. There were 988 participants involved in the trainings, including individuals from group child care (419), Early/Head Start (162), public schools (109) and many others. Training content included group care and education, parent

education, home visiting, and intervention. The 2014 Pyramid Model Implementation Academy was held in Milwaukee, with “tracks” covering Preschool Provider content, Program Implementation content, and Parenting module content. Previous implementation site data were transferred to the web-based Pyramid Model Benchmarks of Quality data system.

Planning occurred in 2014 for program expansion using the RTT-ELC supplemental funding. Two areas of expansion have occurred. The first focused on expanding the number of programs and providers who received content-specific and targeted training on social-emotional development and application to practice and ensured the workforce had the resources needed to apply social-emotional, evidence-based practices through implementation of the Pyramid Model training and technical assistance structure. The second supported communities in implementing Parents Interacting with Infants (PIWI) groups, in order to enhance parental competence and confidence, increase parental engagement, and provide optimal experiences for healthy brain development.

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

#### **Focused on cross-sector early literacy content and professional development.**

A new 2014 focus was on expanding skills and knowledge in the domain related to early literacy. A cross-department committee (representing CCSS, Libraries, Response to Intervention, PALS, YoungStar, and Tribal) was convened to explore existing resources, current efforts, and make a plan for early literacy training. A training module was developed for use by the CESA network, where it was piloted on March 10, 2014. The module went back to the committee for further consideration of how it would apply across sectors. The module was presented at a conference on August 14, 2014, with over 250 participants. The workgroup is currently seeking input to assure more relevance to the tribal communities and 5-year-old kindergarten populations. The module is available at the collaboratingpartners.com website. (See <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/curriculum-assessment-emergent-literacy.php>.)

---

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

---

*Has the State made progress in:*

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

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

### **Peer-to-Peer Learning on Family Engagement**

The RTT-ELC Family Engagement Analyst completed research of other states' family engagement standards for TQIRS. The Family Engagement Analyst concluded that TQRIS in California, Ohio, New York, and Washington have family engagement standards that fit well with Wisconsin's structure and used these four states to help shape the new family engagement point for YoungStar. California's Steps to Excellence provided a way of meeting the family engagement requirement through a tiered process. Ohio's Step Up to Quality provided a number of ways to incorporate transitioning of children within a program, which Wisconsin does not currently incorporate into YoungStar. New York's Quality Stars provided clear descriptions of how they validate their programs. Washington's Early Achievers has a key piece around the Strengthening Families framework that Wisconsin wants to enhance in YoungStar.

### **Family Engagement Standards**

The Family Engagement Analyst recruited members across departments and sectors to participate in a workgroup to develop the new required family engagement standards for YoungStar. Based on a scope of work developed by the Family Engagement Analyst, this group met a total of seven times and created (1) a Guiding Principles document that highlights research-based best practices for engaging families and (2) a draft of a progression of standards for family engagement across star levels.

These standards will be included in YoungStar's evaluation criteria in 2016 as an optional point and then become required for all 3, 4, or 5 Star child care providers in 2017. The standards will include over 20 different family engagement strategies for programs to choose from in a tiered model. In 2017, programs rated as 3 Star will be required to select among the 20 strategies to earn 1 point, and programs rated as 4 and 5 Star will be required to select among the 20 strategies to earn 2 points.

### **Family Engagement Standards Training for YoungStar**

The State of Wisconsin has contracted with an outside consultant to develop a family engagement training curriculum that encompasses best practices and YoungStar's family engagement standards. The training will be offered statewide in coordination with the Supporting Families Together Association (SFTA) and Wisconsin Early Childhood Association (WECA). SFTA and WECA will facilitate the training sessions and some additional on-site coaching and mentoring, in order to prepare all YoungStar-participating programs to meet the new standards.

Approved trainers from both SFTA and WECA will participate in a train-the-trainer event in order to increase their professional development around family engagement and provide them with the knowledge needed to support programs.

### **Parent Cafés Statewide Implementation**

A Parent Café is a series of structured conversations that engagement parents and families in discussions about the Center for the Study of Social Policy's Strengthening Families Five Protective Factors. The Family Engagement Analyst completed and issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a statewide implementation of Parent Cafés. The deadline for proposals is February 2015, and the selection process dates are set for March 2015. Once the RFP is awarded, a timeline and action plan will be created for the remainder of the RTT-ELC grant period.

**What is currently being done with Parent Cafés across Wisconsin?** The Department of Children and Families does not currently and has not previously supported a Parent Café Initiative within the state of Wisconsin. However there are Parent Cafés that have been supported by other agencies or organizations throughout Wisconsin.

The Children's Trust Fund (CTF) has in prior years funded Parent Cafés in Outagamie and Winnebago counties through CESA 6, Kenosha County through the Prevention Services Network, and Rock County through the Exchange Family Resource Center.

The Wisconsin Head Start Association (WHSA) also has a long standing position of supporting Parent Cafés for Head Start parents and caregivers.

In 2013 there was one Parent Café that was very well received in Kimberly, Wisconsin. Due to that success in the Fox Valley region, in 2014 there were two additional Parent Cafés supported in both Kimberly and Oshkosh Wisconsin. Additionally, in 2014 a Parent Café was piloted in LaCrosse, Wisconsin though a FRC called the Parenting Place supported through a Community Development Block Grant through the city of LaCrosse.

**What does Wisconsin hope to accomplish and what is the purpose of the Parent Café Initiative?** The Race to the Top Parent Café Initiative will accomplish two separate goals. One goal is to use an organization that has an infrastructure of well-trained and qualified professionals that are located in different regions across Wisconsin. The second goal is that through the Parent Café Initiative this infrastructure will have the ability to support Parent Cafés regionally and to provide parents and caregivers with access and knowledge to a variety of different community supports while promoting the importance of family engagement.

### **Contract with Be Strong Families (BSF)**

Be Strong Families has agreed to train Wisconsin professionals on its Parent Café model. The organization that is awarded the Parent Café RFP will contract with BSF directly. The training will cover the following topics: parent leadership, communication and marketing, protective factors, supporting professionals to reliably evaluate protective factors across the state, effectively training parents to become parent hosts, and effectively training facilitators.

Parent Cafés were developed by Be Strong Families. Be Strong Families was born out of Strengthening Families Illinois, as part of the national Strengthening Families effort. Their expertise and resources have been highly praised by the 15,000 + parents who have partnered with Illinois along with the family support, child welfare, and early care and education professionals. Be Strong Families serve parents and those who want to work in partnership with parents. They offer a systematic means to engage a parent in meaningful conversations around the Strengthening Families Five Protective Factors that research has demonstrated mitigate the negative impacts of trauma and reduce abuse and neglect among young children.

## **Family Engagement at DPI**

The hiring of the DPI Family and Community Engagement Consultant was delayed until the late spring of 2014, but since then progress has been made on many pieces of the DPI Project 8 scope of work, while planning for other activities moved forward on many fronts. The cross-division family engagement workgroup within DPI has almost completed a comprehensive data base of communications and resources existing in the Department targeted at families and communities, which will be used to align approaches and raise the visibility and importance of family outreach within DPI. Planning has begun for an online “story site” to highlight exemplary strategies for family and community engagement in Wisconsin. Starting with the annual Preserving Early Childhood conference in March, we will be offering workshops for recruiting and developing parent leaders at professional development opportunities that draw participation from many early childhood sectors. Coordination of family engagement and parent outreach efforts is proceeding with frequent opportunities for dialogue among existing systems such as the DCF Family Engagement plan and the DPI K-12 Family/Community Partnership efforts. Workshops and conference sessions on family and community engagement have been scheduled for several professional development events occurring in the winter and spring of 2015, including the annual Wisconsin Head Start Association conference for Head Start directors and personnel; the Preserving Early Childhood conference targeting professionals engaged in 4-year-old kindergarten programs, as well as other sectors of Wisconsin's early childhood care and education workforce; and the Finding Your Way conference, which will bring together community-based teams of parents and professionals from a wide variety of sectors to engage in vibrant conversations about what really works in family and community engagement. Communities who put together cross-sector teams to participate in the Finding Your Way conference will be eligible to receive pre-conference mini-grants to assess their current practice and prepare stories and questions to bring to the May event.

## Early Childhood Education Workforce

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

*Has the State made progress in developing:*

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

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

This project area focused on increasing coordination and alignment across the various sectors of early childhood professional development structures in Wisconsin, including but not limited to: child care, Head Start, four- and five-year-old kindergarten, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B and C, home visiting, and higher education. This project is based on the concept that cross-sector professional development will build common knowledge and increase skills while maximizing state resources. Much of this coordination work was (and will continue to be) overseen and coordinated by the grant-supported Professional Development Coordinator. This position is viewed as an “air traffic controller” for professional development at the state level. The coordinator manages professional development activities to avoid overlap and conflict, maximize resource usage, and help maximize cross-sector efforts. Funds also supported various activities and events that helped move these efforts forward. The various components of this project in 2014 are described in more detail below:

#### **WI Professional Development Systems Scan**

As part of the WI Professional Development Systems Portfolio, a scan of professional development systems is in progress. This scan involves identifying existing infrastructure and areas of professional development among system partners, identifying strengths and gaps, and analyzing ways to maximize resources such as unifying content, delivery, audiences, or funding. This scan is a consistent topic of discussion at the Professional Development Initiative (PDI) meetings, is a joint effort between the Departments of Public Instruction and Children and Families, and involves the vast array of cross-sector partners in Wisconsin. The goal is to identify the professional development that is taking place by content area (in concert with the 2014 WI Core Competencies for Professionals Working with Young Children and Their Families) and provide a detailed listing of websites, deliverables, training packages, technical assistance, and cross-sector efforts to inform next steps in strengthening cross-sector, aligned professional development systems. As a part of this PD Systems Scan, the design of the cross-sector WI Early Childhood Collaborating Partners (WECCP) website was evaluated. This led to moving the tab on Professional Guidance to the top of the menu to highlight the WI Core Competencies, Career Guide, and future professional development system work. Other tabs were renamed to more accurately describe the recent work, and new tabs were added such as Child Development and Brain Development. Select

versions of the scan are on the [collaboratingpartners.com](http://www.collaboratingpartners.com) website. (See <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/professional-guidance-wi-pd-initiative.php>)

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

The WI Professional Development Systems Portfolio was a concept that began as a written document with intentions of highlighting the efforts to strengthen professional development systems in Wisconsin. This concept has been evolving, and a decision has been made to create an online, interactive portfolio that would also serve as a cross-sector multi-level infrastructure tool to enhance communication and coordination of the professional development system. This online portfolio would not replace other existing tracking systems in Wisconsin; it will be a way to store, track, and evaluate the various projects, committees, leadership, deliverables, documents, work plans, and training/ technical assistance materials. This online portfolio is being developed in collaboration with the University of Wisconsin - Madison Division of Information Technology, and paper prototypes are in design. Careful consideration has been given to how this online portfolio links with The Registry Professional Development Approval System as well as DPI early childhood related efforts.

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

The 2014 Professional Development Report will capture professional development efforts in specified areas, including WI Model Early Learning Standards, Pyramid Model of Social-Emotional Competence, Homelessness/Poverty, Regional Collaboration Coaches and Networks, and many other areas. This report is divided by area and includes a description of the area, its infrastructure, coordination within the area and with other areas, and 2014 efforts. Because the goal is to use this report format to inform the Professional Development Systems Portfolio, the timeline for completion of this report has been extended to 2/28/15. The 2014 January-June Consolidated Report was completed and shared with cross-sector partners.

### **WI Core Competencies for Professionals Working with Young Children and Their Families**

These competencies were finalized in July 2014 and translated into Spanish. They are available on the WI Early Childhood Collaborating Partners (WECCP) website (<http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/professional-guidance-wi-core-competencies.php>). Two thousand copies were printed, and these are available to the workforce free-of-charge from the Child Care Information Center (CCIC, at <http://ccic.dpi.wi.gov/>). The twelve content areas of the WI Core Competencies are used by The Registry for organizing data on trainings offered and on individual learning records. They are also being used in Professional Development counseling, as common language in Communities of Practice, and to inform job descriptions for those in the early childhood workforce.

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

The year 2014 brought renewed focus and commitment to strengthening Wisconsin's early childhood training and technical assistance (T-TA) systems. The goal is to have statewide policies, competencies, and courses that guide, educate, and track a large segment of the T-TA workforce. The T-TAP competency workgroup has developed draft materials, which will be finalized by May 2015 and presented at the annual Intersecting Interests cross-sector event. The T-TAP course development work group has been developing materials for a basic 6-hour T-TAP course, which will provide detailed guidance on the T-TAP competencies. Two additional 6-hour courses are being developed; one for trainers and one for technical assistance professionals. These courses will link to The Registry Professional Development Approval System and the WI Core Competencies.

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

Work groups have been meeting to address the articulation of degrees and coursework between two- and four-year Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs), as well as addressing the need for credit for prior learning. Primarily this addresses the needs of the child care workforce in obtaining degrees and licenses to teach in four-year-old kindergarten, Head Start, and other settings that require a bachelor's degree and/or Wisconsin DPI teaching license. Work plans were created to plan for a 2015 Articulation Summit, provide mini-grants to IHEs, and create a more detailed database of early childhood degree programs, contacts, existing articulation agreements, and opportunities for progress towards a more coordinated career pathway system.

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

This project was aligned with other RTT-ELC Projects (Tribal, B1, C1, C4) to frame a cross-sector, comprehensive, and consistent approach to professional development content and approaches including the topics of early learning, classroom environment, inclusive practices for children with special needs/disabilities, homelessness/poverty, dual language learners, and screening/assessment. The PDI cross-sector systems scan is becoming the framework for this. 2014 activities and efforts are summarized below:

The inclusion workgroup in RTT-ELC Project B has become the lead on this area, with the DCF RTT-ELC Inclusion/Special Needs Analyst as the lead coordinator. IDEA Part B 619 and Part C play an active role. Part B 619 has designated the Preschool Options Coordinator as one of the co-leads. The Roles and Responsibilities section in the Inclusive Childcare document was updated and has framed further discussion about strategies for formal agreements among departments. Work is still occurring on a Preschool Options Inclusion Module. DCF is developing a webpage on the topic for YoungStar which will align with [collaboratingpartners.com](http://collaboratingpartners.com).

In conjunction with the McKinney-Vento Homeless program, a module is now available to promote better understanding of the effects of homelessness and poverty on young children and to share strategies for programs and communities. A monthly e-blast is being sent on multiple listservs and through other means to keep the field informed. Webcasts occurred on October 8, 2014, and December 17, 2014, to provide basic information on the effects of homelessness and to support networking among the various sectors on the topic. These resources are located on [collaboratingpartners.com](http://collaboratingpartners.com). (See: <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/homelessness-and-poverty-about.php>.)

An Early Dual Language Learners Initiative (EDLLI) is being revitalized through WIDA (<https://www.wida.us/aboutUs/mission.aspx>). This initiative includes a statewide needs assessment, continued translations, improved coordination, and professional development. Key early childhood stakeholders co-sponsored a Dual Language Learners (DLL) training through a statewide project at Madison's Edgewood College in June. An internal DPI assessment occurred in September. A new cross-sector group has defined an EDLLI structure for future work; members of this EDLLI structure will include lead coordinators, a council, and a stakeholder group. Connections are now being made with other key professional development initiatives to ensure that DLL children are addressed in professional development products. These resources are located on [collaboratingpartners.com](http://collaboratingpartners.com). (See: <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/dual-language-learners-facts-and-tips.php>.)

Consistent strategies, content, and professional development related to screening and assessment are another focus of this work. This project builds on the work the cross-department Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC) Healthy Children Project Team has done. Their WI Comprehensive Screening and Assessment Blueprint (2012) is being expanded to include a scan of all the areas of comprehensive screening and assessment as identified in

the periodicity schedule, including existing screening efforts and perceived gaps. An overview of a professional development module was developed and presented at the Wisconsin Early Childhood Association (WECA) Conference. The DCF ECAC website and [collaboratingpartners.com](http://collaboratingpartners.com) currently house these materials. (See [http://dcf.wi.gov/ecac/pdf/healthy\\_children\\_blueprint\\_2012.pdf](http://dcf.wi.gov/ecac/pdf/healthy_children_blueprint_2012.pdf) and <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/curriculum-assessment-curriculum.php>)

The Healthy Children Project Team expanded its focus to include Kindergarten Entrance Assessment (KEA), and a coordinator and work groups are being supported. The national Center on Enhancing Early Learning Outcomes (CEELO) is providing technical assistance in this area. The KEA workgroup began meeting in March, and three smaller workgroups were formed to look at other state efforts, draft an options paper, and examine related training. The coordinator attended the June CEELO meeting in Minneapolis to learn more about national efforts, and the committee has met with DPI assessment and accountability staff. The key decision was to consider 4K as the kindergarten entrance point, and several options were identified to explore in the KEA paper. These options varied along the voluntary-mandatory continuum and included the following options: no state involvement, school district participation voluntary with selection among several tools, school district participation voluntary with required tools, school district participation required with selection among several tools, or school district participation required with required tools. To align with the Blueprint, the KEA workgroup is emphasizing a birth-to-school age process and is considering the unique Wisconsin situation of 4K as the kindergarten entrance point.

Vision health is one area contained in the Blueprint. In April 2014, funding was provided to the Prevent Blindness Wisconsin Association to develop and deliver three webinars: “Why Should Early Childhood Programs, Preschools, Head Start, and Schools Vision Screen?,” “Conducting Vision Screening,” and “After Vision Screening: Follow-Up and Care.” Through the webinars, Prevent Blindness Wisconsin trained 256 schools, provided trainings to two CESAs with 20-30 nurses at each CESA, provided trainings for La Crosse-area school nurses and school health assistants, and developed partnerships and/or trained with six Head Start grantees. Each approximately 45-minute webinar is now housed on the DPI website and the Prevent Blindness Wisconsin websites. (See <http://wisconsin.preventblindness.org/attention-school-nurses-and-health-professionals-webinars-vision-screening> or <http://ssp.wi.gov/files/ssp/doc/snvisionwhatisinvolved.doc>.)

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

The WI Early Childhood Cross-Sector Professional Development Initiative (PDI) serves as the leadership, advisory, and working roles for various components of the projects defined above. PDI also serves as the Professional Development Project Team of the WI Governor's Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC). Quarterly meetings were held on April 3, July 10, and October 23, 2014. During 2014, PDI members reviewed and endorsed the WI Core Competencies, provided input into the Professional Development Scan, and provided input for the draft of WI Training and Technical Assistance Competencies. A group of PDI members attended the National Association for the Education of Young Children Professional Development Institute and State Team Systems Day in Minneapolis on June 6, 2014. This team brought back ideas from other states on professional development systems, as well as strengthened the conversation here in Wisconsin around systems thinking. The annual Intersecting Interests/Training and Technical Assistance Event was held on February 12-13, 2014, with a focus on supporting adult learners through reflective coaching, mentoring, assistance, and supervision. Marilyn Chu was the guest speaker, and all participants were provided with a copy of her book, *Developing Mentoring and Coaching Relationships in ECE: A Reflective Approach*. Collaboration Coaches facilitated regional meetings at this event.

PDI's Cross-Sector Alignment Workgroup has focused on the professional development systems scan and identified guiding principles, cross-sector efforts, and gaps. The Pathways Workgroup worked to assure consistency and reduce duplication among educational providers.

### **Supporting Regional Collaboration Coaches in Their System Coordination Roles**

WI Early Childhood Collaborating Partners (WECCP) Regional Collaboration Coaches and Networks is a cross-department structure supported and aligned with RTT-ELC. Similar to the role that the Professional Development Coordinator plays at a state level, Collaboration Coaches provide critical “air traffic control” at a regional level by coordinating system development, trainings, technical assistance opportunities, and other relevant activities in each of six regions across the state and through the corresponding six Regional Action Teams (five regions plus Milwaukee). Their work increases collaboration, reduces redundancies, identifies gaps for further support, and helps make the system work more efficiently. Regional Collaboration Coaches have been in place since 2004 through braided funding efforts among all three Wisconsin state departments participating in RTT-ELC, and they work to connect, build, and sustain cross-sector systems around state and regional priority areas.

Coaches network with regional systems through Regional Action Teams. Through the Regional Action Teams, Collaboration Coaches have enhanced cross-sector collaboration in the areas of WI Model Early Learning Standards (WMELS), Pyramid Model of Social-Emotional Competence, Screening and Assessment, Homelessness/Poverty, and other areas. Each action team received a small amount of funding to support its work. This year regional mini-grants were one of the strategies used to allow local programs to benefit from the RTT-ELC funds and implement local projects that align with professional development goals.

During 2014, the reporting mechanisms for Collaboration Coaches have been refined. A pilot system was tested in the fourth quarter of 2014 to better capture the work of the coaches and regional networks and to aggregate the data. The creation of a Collaboration Coach and Networks brochure was started in 2014 and will be posted on the WECCP website soon. More detailed efforts of the coaches will also be highlighted in the 2014 Professional Development Consolidated Report. Information about the Coaches and Regional Networks is housed on [collaboratingpartners.com](http://www.collaboratingpartners.com). (See <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/about.php>.)

Coaches also coordinated Communities of Practice in each region to support consistency of regional efforts, improve coordination of training delivery, provide networking opportunities, and share information, updated materials, evidence-based practices, and related resources. These Communities of Practice grew in 2014 to include one-day events, with practices meetings for WMELS-approved trainers in the morning and Pyramid Model trainers in the afternoon. Some regions included screening and assessment stakeholders for additional networking.

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

*Has the State made progress in enhancing its existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System or building or enhancing a separate, coordinated, early learning data system that aligns and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and that:*

Early Learning Data Systems	
Has all of the Essential Data Elements	Yes
Enables uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating State Agencies and Participating Programs	Yes
Facilitates the exchange of data among Participating State Agencies by using standard data structures, data formats, and data definitions such as Common Education Data Standards to ensure interoperability among the various levels and types of data	Yes
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	Yes
Meets the Data System Oversight Requirements and complies with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws	Yes

*Describe the progress made during the reporting year, including the State's progress in building or enhancing a separate early learning data system that aligns with and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and that meets the criteria described above. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.*

Although the work on Wisconsin's Early Childhood Integrated Data System (ECIDS) that began in 2013 was continued in 2014 in many regards, there were also a number of hurdles during 2014. During 2014, there was a large amount of turnover in the staff who were critical for moving various aspects of this large project forward.

In November of 2014, staff from the ELC State Support Team came to Wisconsin for a "kick-off" event that brought the ECIDS team from all three state agencies back together. At this event, a mission statement and revision of the goals for the WI ECIDS were created and agreed upon. After the meeting, the State Support Team created a report for Wisconsin that has helped us revise the scope of work and re-start much of the important work necessary for the completion of the ECIDS.

A major accomplishment in 2014 was a revision of the scope of work so that accomplishments could be better tracked and movement forward would be guided systematically. The revised scope of work does not change our ability to meet the deliverables set out in the Wisconsin application. This revised scope of work is divided into four major components: staffing, system build, research, and data governance.

### **ECIDS Staffing**

DPI had many changes to lead ECIDS roles in 2014. The second Portfolio Manager started in March 2014. In April, a Data Governance Coordinator started at DPI. In September, the Portfolio Manager left the project. A new Portfolio Manager started in November, and in December a Research Analyst was hired for DPI. At the end of 2014, the ECIDS was fully staffed at DPI, including a lead for the technical solution.

## **ECIDS System Build**

Although no milestones or activities were completed in 2014, the project goals were re-solidified, and the scope of work was re-written. Therefore, the project gained enough momentum to begin design and development discussions again.

## **ECIDS Research**

During 2014, cross-departmental research meetings were held twice a month to begin the process of identifying research questions for the ECIDS. With the addition of a Research Analyst at DPI, DPI also decided to create a research agenda related to DPI-specific data.

## **ECIDS Data Governance**

In 2014, DPI hired a Data Governance Coordinator who held cross-departmental data governance meetings and created a cross-departmental Data Governance Charter, which was signed by the Executive Leadership from each agency. This Charter will lead the team in approving all decisions related to ECIDS work.

## **DCF L.I.F.T. Warehouse and DHS Customer Hub**

Both DCF and DHS have inter-agency data system projects and activities related to the ECIDS, described below.

### **DCF L.I.F.T Warehouse**

In 2014, DCF implemented the 2013 recommendations regarding an internal data governance structure, a standardized research request vetting process, a standardized data-sharing agreement template and approval process, security protocols, and an improved interface for publicly available data on a department website. DCF has implemented a SharePoint site for its internal data governance processes, including a central repository of data-sharing requests and agreements. DCF has been tracking metrics on its data requests since early 2014 and expects to publish these metrics in 2015.

In addition, DCF continued to work on its internal data governance, producing the following deliverables in 2014: a data classification/sensitivity matrix, a data governance communication & implementation plan, data governance policy & manual, data governance role descriptions, a standardized data-sharing agreement template and approval process, an internal data governance structure, a data governance charter, Secure Exchange of Files Protocol (CAKE), and a link to publicly available data.

DCF also kicked off a Business Intelligence (BI) metadata review in 2014, producing recommendations for improving the current metadata strategy for BI. These recommendations are expected to be further reviewed and defined in 2015, spawning additional projects in areas such as data quality, metadata documentation, and subject-area registries of research data.

The first year of funding for RTT-ELC research at DCF was 2014. DCF hired two Research Analysts who began identifying and prioritizing research questions to inform the build of the DCF data warehouse. They communicated across DCF divisions to ensure engagement and input of staff in the research process and will continue this work in 2015. The Research Analysts also worked with the ECIDS research group to begin prioritizing cross-agency research questions and participated in the cross-departmental Data Governance work group. The DCF Business Analysts continued their work to identify business requirements for the program participation data warehouse. The Business Analysts worked with program and technical experts to understand DCF child care, child welfare, TANF/W2 DCF programs, and their supporting data. They identified and documented requirements to assess a person's participation across these programs. The Business Analysts also

worked with DCF Research Analysts to determine research needs to be addressed by the program participation data warehouse. In addition, the Business Analysts identified and documented matching rules for matching persons across systems, precedence rules for determining the ideal source system for data once a person match was determined, information not captured in current systems that would be beneficial in the new data warehouse for reporting and research purposes (known as “data gaps”), and data definition discrepancies (known as “tough terms”).

The DCF IT team also attended the Spring Best Practices Workshop in Washington, DC, and traveled to Colorado to exchange ECIDS design information and best practices with IT experts. The team continued to design, develop, and test the internal matching process, including refinement of matching rules and “precedence rules” used to build a “person golden record.” They also began a search for a more robust vendor tool for master data management, attending many vendor demonstrations. This investigation and review will continue in 2015. The IT team consulted with other DCF technical experts to analyze the available data in different warehouses which would be sources for the new warehouse. At the end of 2014, DCF also officially named its program-participation data warehouse “L.I.F.T.” (Longitudinal Information for Family Touchpoints). With the finalization of the business requirements for program participation in early 2015, the L.I.F.T. warehouse's first iteration is expected to be built by the end of 2015.

### **DHS Customer Hub**

In 2014, there was continued development of the DHS Division of Public Health (DPH) Customer Hub database through the testing of algorithms to match customers across the three DPH data systems. The development of the DPH Customer Hub interface for DPH Data Stewards to support QA/QC functions was initiated and designed. The Customer Hub database was populated with additional Birth, Immunizations, and Secure Public Health Electronic Record Environment (SPHERE) records. There were two additional data systems identified for addition to the Customer Hub.

Capacity was increased at DHS with the addition of a Research Analyst and the replacement of the Data Informaticist position. Staff at DHS continued to participate in all areas of the ECIDS work, including Scope of Work revisions, data governance, research, and system build activities. Staff facilitated meetings with a group of DPH Research Analysts to identify analytic opportunities for the ECIDS and created a Program Leaders Group, comprised of DPH Data Stewards. This Program Leaders Group meets monthly to discuss Customer Hub issues.

## Data Tables

### Commitment to early learning and development

In the tables that follow, provide updated data on the State's commitment to early learning and development as demonstrated in Section A(1) of the State's RTT-ELC application. Tables A(1) -1 through 3 should be updated with current data. Tables 4 and 5 should provide data for the reporting year as well as previous years of the grant. Tables 6 and 7 may be updated only where significant changes have occurred (if no changes have occurred, you should note that fact).

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

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income <sup>1</sup> families, by age		
	Number of children from Low-Income families in the State	Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State
Infants under age 1	29,276	44%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	58,552	44%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	95,753	43%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	183,580	44%

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

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

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

Data are from 2012 as reported by the National Center for Children in Poverty (NCCP), Demographics of Young, Low-Income Children ([http://nccp.org/profiles/WI\\_profile\\_8.html](http://nccp.org/profiles/WI_profile_8.html)).

Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families is based on NCCP data for children under 6 (NCCP only provides data for birth through three and three through five).

For Infants under age 1 and Toddlers ages 1 through 2, an equal distribution of children from the birth through three data was assumed (87,827 young children under age 3, live in low-income families according to NCCP).

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

Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs		
Special Populations: Children who...	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...
Have disabilities or developmental delays <sup>1</sup>	21,906	5.4%
Are English learners <sup>2</sup>	1,707	0.4%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	2,952	0.7%
Are migrant <sup>3</sup>	13	0.0%
Are homeless <sup>4</sup>	1,281	0.1%
Are in foster care	4,367	1.0%
Other as identified by the State	70	0.0%
Describe:	Are refugees	
<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children with disabilities or developmental delays are defined as children birth through kindergarten entry that have an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) or an Individual Education Plan (IEP). <sup>2</sup> For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are English learners are children birth through kindergarten entry who have home languages other than English. <sup>3</sup> For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are migrant are children birth through kindergarten entry who meet the definition of "migratory child" in ESEA section 1309(2). <sup>4</sup> The term "homeless children" has the meaning given the term "homeless children and youths" in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (425 U.S.C. 11434a(2)).		

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

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

Denominator for percentage calculations is 408,137 - total number of children under 6 years old from American Community Survey 2013 (age by ratio of income to poverty level).

[http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS\\_13\\_1YR\\_B17024&prodType=table](http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_13_1YR_B17024&prodType=table)

Have disabilities or development delays includes:

- (1) Part C: Data is from the October 1 Child Count report dated 10-1-2013.
- (2) Part B: Data as of October 1, 2013.

Are English learners and migrant: these data were retrieved from the Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES) with the 3rd Friday of September count date. It includes children from 3 years of age until kindergarten entry. These totals vary significantly from last year's totals. The source of last year's data is unclear, and we are confident in the source and accuracy of the data reported here.

Reside on "Indian Lands": these data were retrieved from the American Community Survey 2013. Total Wisconsin Population Under 5 Years = 341,440. Total Population in Wisconsin = 5,742,713. Percent of Population Under 5 Years in Wisconsin = 341,440/5,742,716 = 5.9%. Total Population of American Indian/Alaska Native in Wisconsin - 49,653. Estimate of American Indian/Alaska Native Children Under 5 Years Old = 49.653 \* 0.059 = about 2,952.

Are homeless: these data were retrieved from the Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES) with the 3rd Friday of September count date. It includes children from 3 years of age until kindergarten entry. These totals vary significantly from last year's totals. The source of last year's data is unclear, and we are confident in the source and accuracy of the data reported here.

Are in foster care: Values represent the number and percentage of children who were in out-of-home care at some point during Calendar Year 2014. For a point-in-time estimate, as of December 31, 2014, 2,760 children were in out-of-home care. American Community Survey estimates on the total population in this age group were used to determine the percentage. (Data Source: eWisACWIS.)

Are refugees: calculations determined by Department of State Reports on Arrivals for 2014. 781 refugees arrived in Wisconsin. 8.94% of refugees in 2014 were under the age of 5, for an estimated total of 70. Arrival figures do not reflect secondary migration. In addition, the children who may have been born to refugee parents during this time, but born in Wisconsin, are U.S. citizens, and therefore not included in this count.

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

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

<b>Table (A)(1)-3a: Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age</b>				
<b>Type of Early Learning &amp; Development Program</b>	<b>Infants under age 1</b>	<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	<b>Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	-	-	47,844	47,844
Specify:	State-funded Preschool			
Data Source and Year:	2012-2013 ISES enrollment data for state funded 4-year-old kindergarten (does not include children in early childhood special education, Title 1, or Head Start)			
<b>Early Head Start &amp; Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	1,156	910	13,803	15,869
Data Source and Year:	2013-14 Head Start Program Information Report (PIR)			
<b>Programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619</b>	695	5,045	16,166	21,906
Data Source and Year:	Part B: October 1, 2013. Part C: Child Count report dated 10-1-2013.			
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b>	-	-	51,158	51,158
Data Source and Year:	Wisconsin 2013-14 Consolidated State Performance Report			
<b>Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program</b>	4,561	7,515	36,011	48,087
Data Source and Year:	Child Care Child Universe in WebI (Wisconsin State Administrative Data).			
<b>Other 1</b>	1,152	944	138	2,234
Specify:	Home Visiting			
Data Source and Year:	Wisconsin Public Health Information Network, 2014			
<b>Other 2</b>	1,432	6,334	1,005	8,771
Specify:	Medicaid Therapy Services			
Data Source and Year:	DHS Medicaid Fee For Service Claims Data			
<b>Other 3</b>	6	47	293	346
Specify:	Children's LTS Waivers (non-autism)			
Data Source and Year:	2013-14 data is from CLTS database.			
<b>Other 4</b>	-	18	527	545
Specify:	Children's LTS Waivers (autism)			
Data Source and Year:	2013-14 data is from CLTS database.			

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

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

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

Programs receiving funds from State's CCDF program - Calendar Year 2014 Child Care Payment System Management Report - Open Authorizations in 2014. Report Period: 12-29-2013 to 12-27-2014. The numbers

represent unduplicated counts of children with open authorizations for report period. Total represents the total children under age 6 with open authorizations during report period.

Title 1 count is from the WI Consolidated State Performance Report and includes only public Title 1 schools and grades PK, K3, K4, and KG.

Home Visiting: These counts include participants with data entered in the state's Public Health data base, Secure Public Health Electronic Record Environment (SPHERE). All state- and MIECHV-funded programs are required to enter data in SPHERE; however, there are other non-state and non-MIECHV-funded home visiting programs in Wisconsin that do not enter data into SPHERE and whose data are not readily available to the State. Therefore, totals in this table under-report actual participation in home visiting across the state.

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

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

Table (A)(1)-3b: Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Hispanic Children	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Non-Hispanic Black or African American Children	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Non-Hispanic White Children
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	6,188	494	2,023	5,402	66	1,646	33,944
Specify:	For "state-funded preschool" enrollment numbers from WISEDash for K3, K4 & PK combined, 3rd Friday of September, 2013-14.						
<b>Early Head Start &amp; Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	4,458	13,377	664	4,018	12	1,596	9,133
<b>Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C</b>	867	68	94	600		216	3,895
<b>Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619</b>	2,401	215	362	1,831	25	477	10,855
<b>Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b>	8,913	1,020	1,990	11,299	46	1,314	26,576
<b>Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program</b>	10,029	770	952	26,140	42	4,116	22,956
<b>Other 1</b>	381	81	48	361	3	140	749
Describe:	Home Visiting						

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

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

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

Head Start: 2013-14 Head Start PIR.

Part C: Data are from the October 1 Child Count report dated 10-1-2013.

Part B: 10-1-2013 Child Count.

Title 1 count is from the WI Consolidated State Performance Report and includes only public Title 1 schools and grades PK, K3, K4, and KG.

CCDF programs: These numbers represent an unduplicated count of children receiving Wisconsin Shares for the most recent month. There were also 14,000 children listed with 'unknown' race.

Home Visiting: Wisconsin Public Health Information Network (SPHERE). There were also 29 children listed with 'other' and 4 children listed with 'unknown'.

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

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

<b>Table (A)(1)-4: Funding for each Fiscal Year</b>					
<b>Type of investment</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>
<b>Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start &amp; Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	\$5,775,000	\$5,775,000	\$6,200,000		
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	\$148,350,000	\$162,350,000	\$169,000,000		
Specify:	State School Aid Appropriation and 4K start up grants				
<b>State contributions to IDEA, Part C</b>	\$20,968,343	\$23,158,380	\$21,256,965		
<b>State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry</b>	\$14,914,061	\$14,866,070	\$15,165,582		
<b>Total State contributions to CCDF<sup>2</sup></b>	\$28,849,400	\$28,849,400	\$28,849,400		
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Met	Met	Met	-	-
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>					
<b>TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs<sup>3</sup></b>	\$217,030,087	\$161,334,925	\$170,666,677		
<b>Other State contributions 1</b>	\$3,881,300	\$4,032,234	\$3,221,996		
Specify:	School Based Services				
<b>Other State contributions 2</b>	\$9,778,200	\$11,062,453	\$11,211,677		
Specify:	MA Therapies				
<b>Other State contributions 3</b>	\$1,985,030				
Specify:	CLTS Waivers				
<b>Other State contributions 4</b>	\$781,158	\$1,148,552	\$985,700		
Specify:	Home Visiting				
<b>Total State contributions:</b>	<b>\$452,312,579</b>	<b>\$412,577,014</b>	<b>\$426,557,997</b>		
<sup>1</sup> Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.					
<sup>2</sup> Total State contributions to CCDF must include Maintenance of Effort (MOE), State Match, and any State contributions exceeding State MOE or Match.					
<sup>3</sup> Include TANF transfers to CCDF as well as direct TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs.					

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

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

Children's Long-Term Support (CLTS) Waivers is a program that uses Medicaid funding to support children with long-term needs to live in the community. The data is currently unavailable due to a vacancy in staffing.

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

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

<b>Table (A)(1)-5: Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program<sup>1</sup></b>			
<b>Type of Early Learning and Development Program</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b> <i>(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)</i>	46,914	48,590	47,844
Specify: 2013-14 school year			
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>2</sup></b> <i>(funded enrollment)</i>	19,302	19,920	15,869
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b> <i>(annual December 1 count)</i>	22,458	-	21,906
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b> <i>(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report )</i>	79,443	46,996	51,158
<b>Programs receiving CCDF funds</b> <i>(average monthly served)</i>	51,776	47,803	46,315
<sup>1</sup> Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.			
<sup>2</sup> Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.			

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

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

State-funded preschool: 2013-14 ISES enrollment data for state funded 4-year-old kindergarten.

Early Head Start and Head Start: Wisconsin Office of Head Start PIR (2013).

Title 1 count is from the WI Consolidated State Performance Report and includes only public Title 1 schools and grades PK, K3, K4, and KG. The Year One information was updated to include information from the same report for consistency.

CCDF: child care attendance of children who receive Wisconsin Shares subsidy.

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

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

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

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

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

No significant changes occurred during 2014. The table was updated to represent where the Wisconsin Early Model Early Learning Standards, now in their fourth edition, address the different age groups by essential domain of school readiness.

The Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards include the five essential domains of school readiness: Health and Physical Development, Social and emotional Development, Language Development and Communication, Approaches to Learning, and Cognition and General Knowledge. Each domain is broken down into sub-domains. For example, Language Development and Communication is broken down into Listening and Understanding, Speaking and Communication, and Early Literacy. Each sub-domain includes performance standards that represent the specific information and/or skills that a child should know and be able to do. They are designed “forward” from birth to first grad and are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.

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

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

Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State					
Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
State-funded preschool					✓
Specify:					
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	✓	✓		✓	
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	✓	✓			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓	✓			
Programs receiving CCDF funds	✓	✓	✓		
Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier)	✓	✓	✓		
Tier 1					
Tier 2	✓	✓	✓		
Tier 3	✓	✓	✓		
Tier 4	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Tier 5	✓	✓	✓	✓	
State licensing requirements	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Other 1	✓		✓	✓	
Describe:	Home Visiting				

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

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

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

Wisconsin continues to explore early childhood comprehensive screening and assessment through the expansion of Response to Intervention, the efforts of the ECAC Healthy Children Project Team, and research on KEA.

The Blueprint for a Comprehensive & Aligned System for Screening & Assessment of Young Children ([http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/documents/22112\\_blueprint.pdf](http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/documents/22112_blueprint.pdf)) was revised during 2014 and now includes recommendations for the selection of a general development screening tool as well comprehensive assessment tools.

Besides continued work and research, there were no additional changes to this information in 2014.

# Budget and Expenditure Tables

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

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

### Budget Summary Table

Budget Summary Table					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$140,392.00	\$393,386.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$533,778.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$64,614.00	\$194,192.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$258,806.00
3. Travel	\$7,348.00	\$13,262.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$20,610.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$78,040.00	\$253,817.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$331,857.00
6. Contractual	\$440,876.00	\$3,086,063.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,526,939.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$1,661.00	\$4,703.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,364.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$732,931.00	\$3,945,423.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,678,354.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$2,137.00	\$5,571.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,708.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$1,290,935.00	\$1,860,047.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,150,982.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$1,226.00	\$12,854.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,080.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$2,027,229.00	\$5,823,895.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,851,124.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,023,665.00	\$1,167,914.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,191,579.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$3,050,894.00	\$6,991,809.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10,042,703.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Budget Summary Table Narrative**

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

All of the Wisconsin RTT-ELC Projects (with the exceptions of Project 1 and Project 10) are moving forward with spending as expected. The delays in project start dates due to the late hiring of staff in 2013/2014 caused an initial delay in spending during 2013/2014; however, the projects are being implemented, and funds are being spent, although not necessarily at the originally estimated timelines. There are no concerns about our ability to complete the grant activities and spend the remaining funds.

Budget figures often do not reflect actual or obligated spending as there can be significant delays between obligation, expenditure, and accounting. We do not account funds as spent until they are processed by DCF. A significant number of projects are administered by other state agencies and community partners. Invoicing periods vary by entity, and there can be a delay of up to 6 months before invoices reach the DCF accounting system.

**Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2015 budget, with the exception of Project 10. Funds unspent in 2014 will be used for the same activity in 2015 for which they were originally obligated. If there are underspent amounts from salary or related costs that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2015, they will be used to expand and strengthen activities in the same project. If necessary, the team will solicit approval through the established budget amendment process. Underspent funds in Project 10 may need to be assigned to additional activities, and the established amendment process will be followed if necessary.

## Budget Table: Project 1 – Overall Grants Management

Budget Table: Project 1					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$65,034.00	\$86,244.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$151,278.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$26,101.00	\$43,231.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$69,332.00
3. Travel	\$1,706.00	\$1,701.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,407.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$24,479.00	\$37,908.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$62,387.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$3,169.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,169.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$117,320.00	\$172,253.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$289,573.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$173.00	\$302.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$475.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$1,226.00	\$12,854.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,080.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>\$118,719.00</b>	<b>\$185,409.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$304,128.00</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$16,857.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$16,857.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$135,576.00</b>	<b>\$185,409.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$320,985.00</b>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Project 1 Budget Narrative**

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

Work with the tribal nations has started with the hire of the RTT-ELC Tribal Coordinator - Early Childhood in 2014. Work plans and budget outlines are near completion for funds to be spent for these activities in 2015 and 2016.

The development of a Public/Private Partnership was delayed due to changes in staff. Work plans and budget outlines are near completion for funds to be spent for these activities in 2015 and 2016.

**Project 1 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2015 budget. Funds unspent in 2014 will be used for the same activity in 2015 for which they were originally obligated. If there are underspent amounts from salary or related costs that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2015, they will be used to expand and strengthen activities in the same project. If necessary, the team will solicit approval through the established budget amendment process.

Budget Table: Project 2 – YoungStar Training and Technical Assistance

Budget Table: Project 2					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$14,942.00	\$71,953.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$86,895.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$5,997.00	\$36,068.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$42,065.00
3. Travel	\$1,138.00	\$2,223.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,361.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$11,141.00	\$61,523.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$72,664.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$21,817.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$21,817.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$33,218.00	\$193,584.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$226,802.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$80.00	\$475.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$555.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$33,298.00	\$194,059.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$227,357.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$384,396.00	\$344,145.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$728,541.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$417,694.00</b>	<b>\$538,204.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$955,898.00</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.  
 Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.  
 Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.  
 Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.  
 Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.  
 Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Project 2 Budget Narrative**

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

All funds for this project (with the exception of salary and related costs) are obligated for activities either implemented in 2014 or activities that will be implemented in 2015.

Some funds may not have appeared in our accounting system yet.

**Project 2 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2015 budget. Funds unspent in 2014 will be used for the same activity in 2015 for which they were originally obligated. If there are underspent amounts from salary or related costs that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2015, they will be used to expand and strengthen activities in the same project. If necessary, the team will solicit approval through the established budget amendment process.

**Budget Table: Project 3 – Increase YoungStar Participation**

Budget Table: Project 3					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$4,703.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,703.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$4,703.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,703.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$4,703.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,703.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$4,703.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,703.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.  
 Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.  
 Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.  
 Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.  
 Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.  
 Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Project 3 Budget Narrative**

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

All funds for this project are obligated for activities either implemented in 2014 or activities that will be implemented in 2015.

Some funds may not have appeared in our accounting system yet.

**Project 3 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2015 budget. Funds unspent in 2014 will be used for the same activity in 2015 for which they were originally obligated.

Budget Table: Project 4 – Increase YoungStar Participation of High Needs Children

Budget Table: Project 4					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$1,598.00	\$235,821.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$237,419.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$1,598.00	\$235,821.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$237,419.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$1,598.00	\$235,821.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$237,419.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$1,598.00</b>	<b>\$235,821.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$237,419.00</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.  
 Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.  
 Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.  
 Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.  
 Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.  
 Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Project 4 Budget Narrative**

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

All funds for this project are obligated for activities either implemented in 2014 or activities that will be implemented in 2015.

Some funds may not have appeared in our accounting system yet.

**Project 4 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2015 budget. Funds unspent in 2014 will be used for the same activity in 2015 for which they were originally obligated.

**Budget Table: Project 5 – Increase Quality of YoungStar Program via Scholarships, Training and Bonuses**

Budget Table: Project 5					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$40,250.00	\$102,821.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$143,071.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$16,154.00	\$51,540.00
3. Travel	\$2,612.00	\$5,171.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,783.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$21,208.00	\$64,307.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$85,515.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$735,840.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$735,840.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$80,224.00	\$959,679.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,039,903.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$151.00	\$505.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$656.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$1,290,935.00	\$1,860,047.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,150,982.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>\$1,371,310.00</b>	<b>\$2,820,231.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$4,191,541.00</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$1,371,310.00</b>	<b>\$2,820,231.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$4,191,541.00</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.  
 Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.  
 Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.  
 Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.  
 Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.  
 Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Project 5 Budget Narrative**

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

All funds for this project (with the exception of salary and related costs) are obligated for activities either implemented in 2014 or activities that will be implemented in 2015.

Some funds may not have appeared in our accounting system yet.

**Project 5 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2015 budget. Funds unspent in 2014 will be used for the same activity in 2015 for which they were originally obligated. If there are underspent amounts from salary or related costs that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2015, they will be used to expand and strengthen activities in the same project. If necessary, the team will solicit approval through the established budget amendment process.

Budget Table: Project 6 – YoungStar Validation Study

Budget Table: Project 6					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$517,642.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$517,642.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$517,642.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$517,642.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$517,642.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$517,642.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$35,919.00	\$539,391.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$575,310.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$35,919.00</b>	<b>\$1,057,033.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$1,092,952.00</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.  
 Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.  
 Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.  
 Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.  
 Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.  
 Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Project 6 Budget Narrative**

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

Spending for this project is proceeding as expected. All funds are obligated in a contract, but some funds may have not yet been invoiced by our contracted partner.

**Project 6 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2015 budget. Funds unspent in 2014 will be used for the same activity in 2015 for which they were originally obligated.

## Budget Table: Project 7 – Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards

Budget Table: Project 7					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$11,605.00	\$147,523.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$159,128.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$11,605.00	\$147,523.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$159,128.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$1,728.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,728.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$11,605.00	\$149,251.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$160,856.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$244,560.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$244,560.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$256,165.00</b>	<b>\$149,251.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$405,416.00</b>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Project 7 Budget Narrative**

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

All funds for this project (with the exception of salary and related costs) are obligated for activities either implemented in 2014 or activities that will be implemented in 2015.

Some funds may not have appeared in our accounting system yet. .

**Project 7 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2015 budget. Funds unspent in 2014 will be used for the same activity in 2015 for which they were originally obligated. If there are underspent amounts from salary or related costs that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2015, they will be used to expand and strengthen activities in the same project. If necessary, the team will solicit approval through the established budget amendment process.

## Budget Table: Project 8 – Family Engagement

Budget Table: Project 8					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$20,166.00	\$55,165.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$75,331.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$16,362.00	\$29,033.00
3. Travel	\$1,757.00	\$3,712.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,469.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$21,212.00	\$37,470.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$58,682.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$12,527.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$12,527.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$59,497.00	\$137,907.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$197,404.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$120.00	\$661.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$781.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>\$59,617.00</b>	<b>\$138,568.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$198,185.00</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$59,617.00</b>	<b>\$138,568.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$198,185.00</b>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Project 8 Budget Narrative**

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

All funds for this project (with the exception of salary and related costs) are obligated for activities either implemented in 2014 or activities that will be implemented in 2015.

Some funds may not have appeared in our accounting system yet.

**Project 8 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2015 budget. Funds unspent in 2014 will be used for the same activity in 2015 for which they were originally obligated. If there are underspent amounts from salary or related costs that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2015, they will be used to expand and strengthen activities in the same project. If necessary, the team will solicit approval through the established budget amendment process.

Budget Table: Project 9 – Professional Development

Budget Table: Project 9					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$65,482.00	\$115,853.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$181,335.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$65,482.00	\$115,853.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$181,335.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$65,482.00	\$115,853.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$181,335.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$72,748.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$72,748.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$138,230.00</b>	<b>\$115,853.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$254,083.00</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.  
 Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.  
 Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.  
 Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.  
 Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.  
 Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Project 9 Budget Narrative**

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

All funds for this project (with the exception of salary and related costs) are obligated for activities either implemented in 2014 or activities that will be implemented in 2015.

Some funds may not have appeared in our accounting system yet.

**Project 9 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2015 budget. Funds unspent in 2014 will be used for the same activity in 2015 for which they were originally obligated. If there are underspent amounts from salary or related costs that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2015, they will be used to expand and strengthen activities in the same project. If necessary, the team will solicit approval through the established budget amendment process.

Budget Table: Project 10 – Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System

Budget Table: Project 10					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$77,203.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$77,203.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$34,320.00
3. Travel	\$135.00	\$455.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$590.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$52,609.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$52,609.00
6. Contractual	\$362,191.00	\$1,295,871.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,658,062.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$1,661.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,661.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$363,987.00	\$1,460,458.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,824,445.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$1,613.00	\$1,900.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,513.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$365,600.00	\$1,462,358.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,827,958.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$269,185.00	\$284,378.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$553,563.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$634,785.00</b>	<b>\$1,746,736.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$2,381,521.00</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.  
 Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.  
 Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.  
 Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.  
 Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.  
 Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Project 10 Budget Narrative**

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

Staff losses and turnover continued to have a significant effect on the activities in this project during 2014. In the last quarter of 2014, the project was finally fully staffed, and a "kick off"/revision meeting was held to get work back on track. Since this meeting, work has been moving forward again, and many projects are being completed.

Some funds may not have appeared in our accounting system yet.

**Project 10 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

There may be significant changes to the 2015 budget. Funds unspent in 2014 will be used for the same activity in 2015 for which they were originally obligated; however, a significant amount of underspent funds will remain. Underspent funds from previous years may need to be assigned to new activities which are more related to the revised scope of the project, given the amount of time left in the grant period. The team will solicit approval through the established budget amendment process.