

# Early Learning Challenge

## 2016 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT



JUNE 2017





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

**Michigan**

---

2016

Due: February 28, 2017

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

**Paperwork Burden Statement**

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



## Annual Performance Report Section List

General Information

Executive Summary

A(3) Successful State System

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

B(2) Promoting Participation in the TQRIS

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

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

B(5) Validating the Effectiveness of the State TQRIS

C(1) Early Learning and Development Standards

C(2) Comprehensive Assessment Systems

C(3) Health Promotion

C(4) Engaging and Supporting Families

D(1) Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and Progression of Credentials

D(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in Improving their Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities.

E(1) Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry

E(2) Early Learning Data Systems

A(1) Background Data Tables



Performance Report: Cover Sheet

General Information

1. PR/Award#: 412A130044
2. Grantee Name: Office of the Governor, State of Michigan
3. Grantee Address: 111 S Capitol
City: Lansing
State: Michigan Zip: 48909
4. Project Director Name: Susan Broman
Title: Deputy Superintendent, Office of Great Start, Michigan Department of Education
Phone #: (517) 335-4092 Ext.: Fax #: (517) 335-4565
Email: bromans@michigan.gov

Reporting Period Information

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

Indirect Cost Information

6. Indirect Costs

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

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s): From: 10/01/2015 To: 09/30/2016

Approving Federal agency: [X] ED [ ] HHS [ ] Other Specify other:

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

## Executive Summary

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

Strengthened investment in high-quality early learning and development continues to energize educational improvement efforts in Michigan. From the governor's office and the legislature to local providers, business leaders, schools, and families, people are deeply committed to improving opportunities for young children with high needs in Michigan. In 2013, the Michigan Department of Education, Office of Great Start (MDE-OGS) held conversations with 1,400 parents of young children, educators, business leaders, and local and state program directors to inform development of a statewide plan to achieve Governor Snyder's stated outcomes for young children:

- Children are born healthy.
- Children are healthy, thriving, and developmentally on track from birth to third grade.
- Children are developmentally ready to succeed in school at the time of school entry.
- Children are prepared to succeed in fourth grade and beyond by reading proficiently at the end of third grade.

The resulting publication, entitled *Great Start, Great Investment, Great Future: The Plan for Early Learning and Development in Michigan*, illustrates that Michigan's citizens recognize the vital foundation that a system rich in parent involvement, community and state collaboration, and high-quality accessible early learning and development programs can provide for our youngest citizens.

Drawing from the guiding principles of this plan and with the identified outcomes for young children as a focal point, in 2013 Michigan submitted a comprehensive application for a Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) competitive federal grant. As a result, Michigan was awarded \$51,737,456 for the purposes of improving early learning and development in the state over a period of four years, beginning January 2014 and ending December 2017. The grant is focused on the improvement of early childhood systems through: increasing access to high-quality programs for children with high needs; implementing and coordinating an integrated system of programs; and evaluating and rating program quality.

The Michigan Department of Education, Office of Great Start was identified as the lead agency for RTT-ELC implementation in the grant application. Michigan has prioritized its work into seven projects for improving early childhood outcomes for all children. These projects are designed to support the creation of a truly collaborative system of early learning and development - one that requires the collective efforts of policymakers, program directors, providers, and parents. The projects are as follows:

1. Grant Management and Governance;
2. Improving Quality through Increased Participation in Great Start to Quality;
3. Promotion of Physical and Social-Emotional Health;
4. Enhancing and Increasing Access to the Great Start to Quality System;
5. Improving the Early Learning and Development Workforce;
6. Measuring Outcomes for Children, Programs, & Educators; and
7. Increasing Family Engagement.

To execute these projects effectively, Michigan's RTT-ELC initiative involves the following key partners: the Early Childhood Investment Corporation (ECIC); Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS); the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) within the Michigan Department of Technology, Management and Budget; and the Michigan Association for the Education of Young Children (MiAEYC). (Note that the Michigan Department of Community Health and the Michigan Department of Human Services merged in 2015 to become the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services as described in the "Governance Structure" portion of this report.)

Through the various activities and initiatives within the seven RTT-ELC projects, we are striving to meet the following goals:

1. Increase access for children with high needs to high-quality early learning programs;
2. Increase opportunities for licensed and unlicensed home-based providers to improve the quality of their programs;
3. Ensure meaningful engagement of families in their children's early learning and development;
4. Promote children's physical, social, and emotional health;
5. Expand education and professional learning opportunities, especially for home-based providers;
6. Build an early learning data system that provides information (anonymously and in aggregate) on children across departments and programs.

Building upon the foundation that was established during the first year of Michigan's Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, during years two and three the Grant Implementation Group convened on a bi-monthly basis and monitoring meetings with individual RTT-ELC partners were held monthly. This infrastructure has allowed for significant progress on activities within each of Michigan's seven projects. Michigan's RTT-ELC Year 3 early learning developments, accomplishments, and challenges are organized by the five key areas defined by the federal RTT-ELC competition:

### **1. Establishing Successful State Systems**

In establishing the Office of Great Start (OGS) in 2011, Governor Snyder laid out OGS's charge to (a) align, consolidate, and/or integrate early childhood funding and related programs around the state's early childhood outcomes, and (b) coordinate the state's policy, budget, and programs for early childhood. As such, OGS coordinates and aligns the state's early learning and development investments for children with high needs in close and regular collaboration with senior staff from MDHHS and ECIC to work toward achieving our early childhood outcomes. OGS oversees the ECIC's implementation of our tiered quality rating and improvement system. OGS also partners with Michigan's intermediate school districts (ISDs) to ensure coordination between state level early childhood efforts and that of local early childhood collaborative bodies and parent coalitions, with the goal of balancing both local and state perspectives in decision making, accountability, and policy. Fifty-four Great Start Collaboratives (GSCs) serve all 83 Michigan counties and members consist of public and private community leaders, including parents. Each GSC has a partner organization called a Great Start Parent Coalition (GSPC), comprised of passionate local volunteers who educate community and state leaders about the importance of investing in young children and provide the "parent voice" to inform the GSCs' decision making. GSPCs are coordinated by a paid Parent Liaison position.

Through RTT-ELC initiatives, Michigan works to further strengthen this coordination and collaboration both across partner agencies and across state and local

networks.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 3 includes:

- Convening the RTT-ELC Grant Implementation Group bi-monthly, inclusive of representation from partner organizations;
- Convening of the Great Start Operations Team monthly, guiding operational coordination of interagency initiatives that align with the Governor's early childhood outcomes for the population's 0-8 year olds;
- Establishing an Early Childhood Data Governance Council comprised of State agency leadership to ensure that the data required to enable OGS to meet its strategic objectives are available, trusted and of consistent quality;
- Hiring a Family Engagement Specialist within MDE;
- Hiring a Social-Emotional Health Coordinator within MDHHS;
- Hiring a Data Specialist within MDE;
- Maintaining staffing to provide direct oversight to the scope of work and budget for individual grant partners;
- Obtaining local and stakeholder input/involvement for a number of RTT-ELC initiatives;
- Convening members of the Office of Great Start Advisory Council to help identify and define policy issues, use local experiences to improve state policy, and identify how best to communicate with key stakeholders across OGS initiatives, including RTT-ELC;
- Developed a robust communication plan to effectively engage and inform all RTT-ELC partners and stakeholders.
- Developing a Request for Proposals to identify a contractor to collaborate with RTT-ELC grant partners for the development and implementation of a Sustainability Plan.

## **2. Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children**

Michigan is committed to ensuring that children with high needs have greater access to high quality early learning programs, wherever such programs are delivered. Great Start to Quality (GSQ), our tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System, is essential to achieving that goal. Through RTT-ELC, Michigan will develop and implement effective strategies for improving the quality of early learning programs by increasing participation in Great Start to Quality. Michigan's first goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is to significantly increase access to high-quality early learning and development programs for children with high needs. In Michigan, center-based early learning programs and group homes are licensed, home-based providers are registered, and individuals who enroll to care for children eligible for child care subsidies are considered unlicensed, subsidized. The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Increase unlicensed provider participation in GSQ by providing training and consultation to support quality improvement of unlicensed providers;
- Increase home-based provider participation in GSQ in target communities through placement of regional Quality Improvement Specialists offering outreach and individualized technical assistance;
- Increase licensed provider participation in GSQ through participation bonuses targeted toward providers serving families at or below 185% of the federal poverty

level;

- Increase licensed provider participation in GSQ through targeted offering of Quality Improvement Grants;
- Support licensing consultants to become ambassadors for GSQ.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 3 includes:

- Achieving forty percent provider participation in Great Start to Quality, progressing toward Michigan's metric of fifty percent participation by the end of the grant.
- Implementation of the unlicensed, subsidized provider cohort project, to support this particular provider population. This resulted in participation of a total of 305 unlicensed, subsidized providers over the course of Year 3. At the end of the Year 3, 165 were participating as part of the eight cohorts. Of those, 105 received the second level of the Quality Development Continuum and nine achieved the third level. These are the first unlicensed subsidized providers to reach Level 3 since the inception of the Quality Development Continuum. Additionally, one cohort participant achieved licensure with the State of Michigan;
- Execution of contracts for Great Start to Quality Resource Centers in targeted RTT-ELC communities to increase participation for family/group home providers;
- Implementation of the GSQ participation incentives based on stakeholder feedback. The Participation Bonus was awarded to 1,458 programs and providers in Year 3;
- Gathering feedback from licensing consultants to learn about their use of the Great Start to Quality STARS platform - Michigan's online platform where providers receive their star rating;
- Implementation of the Quality Improvement Grants based on stakeholder feedback. Quality Improvement Grants were awarded to 366 programs and providers during the pilot. An additional 604 awards were made during the second cycle; and
- Developing Michigan's Professional Development Registry system.

Michigan's second goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is to realize an early learning and development system with improved access for families and children to high-quality early learning programs and services. The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Encourage participation of tribal and early childhood special education programs (Early Childhood Special Education/Section 619) in GSQ through system enhancements and stronger relationships with these programs;
- Streamline program monitoring efforts to allow licensing consultants to increase focus on improving program quality;
- Increase access to high-quality early learning and care programs in Pathways to Potential communities by providing scholarships (Pathways to Potential is a community-based approach placing Michigan Department of Health and Human Services employees in schools where high numbers of families are already receiving assistance through the department. The Pathways approach targets five outcome areas: attendance, education, health, safety, and self-sufficiency. It also relies on a number of support networks and partnerships to wrap their arms around children and families to help them succeed.);
- Conduct outreach to families in Pathways to Potential communities to increase the percentage of families accessing high-quality early learning and development programs.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 3 includes:

- Development of child care licensing key indicators;
- Maintaining a MDHHS Departmental Specialist position to provide critical support and assistance administering departmental responsibilities relating to RTT-ELC and to connect and align early childhood funding and programs across departments;
- Developing partnerships for outreach and engagement of tribal programs to encourage participation in GSQ;
- Requesting an amendment to the RTT Budget to repurpose child care scholarship funds toward sustainable approaches for increasing access to high-quality early learning and care programs (see Section B(1) of the report).

Michigan is implementing a strategy to promote early learning and development outcomes for children by expanding and improving efforts to engage families in meaningful ways and support their development as leaders for their own children and communities. Efforts will focus on increasing family access to skill development resources designed to promote the physical, social, and emotional health of their children. Therefore, Michigan's third goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is to invest in family engagement and education strategies designed to increase access to high-quality early learning programs with an emphasis in Pathways to Potential communities. The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Incorporate Strengthening Families™ (SF) Protective Factors into the GSQ program standards;
- Place Family Engagement Consultants in target communities to support parents and providers;
- Provide training modules about the GSQ Family and Community Partnerships standards;
- Assist families and providers in understanding and adopting protective factors into daily practice;
- Establish and coordinate networks of trusted advisors able to provide support to families in their local communities;
- Develop and distribute supplemental materials to support family understanding and interpretation of Kindergarten Entry Assessment data.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 3 includes:

- Hiring a Family Engagement Specialist within the Office of Great Start to lead RTT-ELC efforts focusing on increasing family engagement;
- Conducting training sessions for Pathways to Potential Success Coaches to strengthen family engagement efforts in local communities;
- Developing of a model for specialized consultation for strengthening parent engagement efforts in Pathways to Potential communities, including the creation of position descriptions and making determinations for which local agencies will hire the Family Engagement Consultants early in 2017;
- Establishing grant criteria and the application process for administering funding for the trusted advisors work;
- Convening a committee to conduct a Gap Analysis amongst the Great Start to Quality Program Indicators, the Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, the Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, and the Program Quality Assessments for Pre-k, Infants & Toddlers, and Family Child Care. These indicators and standards will be compared with the Strengthening Families Framework to identify if the SF Protective Factors

are adequately addressed.

### **3. Defining High-Quality, Accountable Programs**

Michigan is also implementing a strategy to assist families and providers of early learning and care in supporting the healthy development and well-being of children with high needs. To accomplish this goal, Michigan is building on efforts already underway across the state to increase healthy behaviors through education and personal action. Through RTT-ELC, these efforts will increase the availability of high-quality early learning programs that meet the physical and social-emotional health needs of young children, with a focus on Pathways to Potential communities. Michigan's goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is to help create an early learning and development system that supports the physical and social-emotional development of children from birth to 8 years of age.

The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Align GSO program standards with nationally recognized physical and social-emotional health standards;
- Develop training and technical assistance materials and supports that promote both healthy habits for families and providers, as well as developmental screening and referral procedures;
- Provide consultants to support home-based providers in meeting the physical and social-emotional health needs of young children.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 3 includes:

- Conducting a Gap Analysis of the QRIS system standards with regard to children's health and safety by comparing them to the Caring for Our Children Stepping Stones national health and safety performance standards guidelines for early care and education programs;
- Hiring two positions to focus on the work of Project 3, a Departmental Analyst and a Health Coordinator, who will lead the work of the Physical Health Consultants within the selected communities. Both positions start in January 2017;
- Developing a model for specialized consultation to support home-based providers in meeting the physical and social-emotional health needs of young children, including development of position descriptions for the Physical Health and Social Emotional Health Consultants, gathering stakeholder feedback, and identifying the hiring entities for both types of consultants;
- Developing the evaluation for specialized consultation;
- Hiring a Social Emotional Health Coordinator at MDHHS;
- Developing the assessment tools and training materials for Social Emotional and Physical Health Consultants;
- Hiring, training and deploying the first cadre of Social Emotional Consultants in Genesee, Kalamazoo and Saginaw counties.

### **4. Supporting a Strong Early Childhood Education Workforce**

Research shows the positive impact of a quality early childhood educator on a child's development. Therefore, Michigan is focused on ensuring that early childhood educators have the skills and knowledge they need to be successful. While supporting early childhood educators statewide, Michigan's RTT-ELC initiatives are targeting home-based providers who serve high needs children in their programs. Michigan's goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is that every young child in Michigan has access to an effective early childhood educator by 2020. The specific strategies being implemented and related

outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Expand online Child Development Associate (CDA) credential programs for early childhood educators;
- Increase the number of National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) accredited community college early learning programs;
- Expand opportunities for home-based providers to earn a degree, as well as increase the supply of staff qualified to teach in Michigan's Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP), through Teacher Education And Compensation Helps (T.E.A.C.H.) scholarships;
- Increase access to training focused on achieving GSQ standards for program administration.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 3 include:

- Requesting and receiving approval for an amendment to the scope of work for CDA Online, shifting from generating new programs to increasing awareness of the existing programs that have emerged organically since the time of the RTT-ELC application (see Section D(1) for details);
- Awarding funding to eight colleges to pursue NAEYC accreditation and one college to pursue reaccreditation from NAEYC;
- Planning and implementing a Higher Education summit where the primary topic of discussion was improving available high quality online course offerings;
- Providing 556 T.E.A.C.H. scholarships to eligible providers for 2016, including 152 scholarships to home-based providers and 404 scholarships to providers seeking certification to teach in GSRP.
- Contracting with Public Consulting Group to develop, implement and evaluate a Business Training model for home and center-based providers.

## **5. Measuring Outcomes and Progress**

Michigan is implementing a strategy to include data for all federal and state funded early learning programs in the Statewide Longitudinal Data System (MSLDS). This will enable the state to better understand the quality of care and education experiences of our youngest learners. Michigan will ensure that these data are also available to families, educators, researchers, and others needing access to data to support early learning improvements. Michigan's goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is to build an early learning data system that provides aggregated data across departments and programs. The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Create a management structure that will plan, organize, regulate, and guide the collection of, access to, and use of MSLDS data;
- Improve the existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System (MSLDS) to create links to essential early childhood data elements;
- Increase access to data to improve program delivery and effectiveness, to inform resource investment and policy decisions, and to empower families to make better decisions for their children;
- Improve data collection about early childhood educators to help improve policies that impact Michigan's early childhood educators.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 3 includes:

- Conclusion of a pilot to establish Unique Identification Codes (UIC) for Head Start

children;

- Conducting outreach to Head Start grantees to connect additional programs to MSLDS;
- Establishing a process for longitudinally tracking children who receive subsidized childcare services in Michigan;
- Beginning a process for collecting and connecting Great Start to Quality data in MSLDS;
- Releasing two Early Childhood reports, including "Early Childhood Count of Children Receiving Early Childhood Programs and Services" and "Count of Kindergarten Students receiving Early Childhood Programs and Services in the Prior Year";
- Creation of two additional Early Childhood reports, including "Pathways to Kindergarten" and "Early Childhood Impact on K-3 Absenteeism," to be released on the MI School Data website early in 2017;
- Establishing a Data Governance structure for Early Childhood Data in Michigan;
- Hiring a Data Specialist within MDE.

### **Year 3 Challenges:**

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) and the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) experienced major challenges over the course of 2016 resulting from the Flint Water Crisis (described in the Successful State Systems section of this report). These challenges caused significant delay to activities outlined in Project 3. However, by the end of 2016, a clear plan for implementation was established between MDE and MDHHS, which is in process of being executed.

Early in 2016, the Family Engagement Specialist was hired. This individual is responsible for leading the majority of activities within Project 7. While the start to this work has been slow, focused efforts to lay the foundation for these activities have positioned Michigan for successful implementation in 2017.

Both projects impacted by these challenges include activities that pertain to Michigan's plan to develop, implement and evaluate a model for Specialized Consultation. While the first three social-emotional consultants were hired at the end of 2016, the second cadre of social-emotional consultants and both cadres of physical health and family engagement consultants will not be hired until early in 2017. The scope of work outlines that these consultants will be in the field for close to two years. Given that 2017 is the fourth year of this four year work project, Michigan plans to request a one year no-cost extension to fully implement this work.

## 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).

Participating State Agencies responsible for the implementation of grant projects and activities have been the Michigan Department of Education (MDE), the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS), and the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI), within the Michigan Department of Technology, Management, and Budget (DTMB). The Lead Agency for the grant continues to be MDE, with the MDE Office of Great Start leading the implementation, management, and cross-partner collaboration efforts of the grant. In addition, the Early Childhood Investment Corporation (ECIC) and Michigan Association for the Education of Young Children (MiAEYC) are participating partner organizations and have significant responsibility for implementing numerous grant activities. Representatives from all partner agencies and organizations serve on the Grant Implementation Group for the purposes of coordination, communication, and collaboration.

Michigan's established state-level governance for its early childhood systems reform work continues to provide the overarching collaborative governance necessary to reach the established goals of the RTT-ELC State Plan. That structure allowed for collaborative decision making to continue through 2016, even as significant transitions initiated at what is now the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services in 2015 continued through 2016. On February 6, 2015, Governor Snyder issued an Executive Order to reorganize the programs within the Department of Community Health and Department of Human Services, with the majority of the programs being placed into one state agency known as the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS). One exception to the reorganization was the state entity tasked with the registration, licensing and monitoring of child care. Its new placement after the reorganization is within Licensing and Regulatory Affairs (LARA).

The stability offered by the primary facilitation of RTT-ELC residing in the Office of Great Start (OGS) allowed work within the plan to move forward during these transitions over the past two years. OGS collaborates closely and regularly with senior staff from MDHHS, CEPI, ECIC, the Child Care Licensing Division within LARA, and MiAEYC to work toward achieving Michigan's early childhood outcomes. The Great Start Systems Team contains senior state agency staff of those state agencies that report to the Governor through what is known as the People's Group; staff within those agencies with major responsibility for programs that impact the lives of young children convene on a monthly basis through the Great Start Operational Team, serving as statutorily-required advisory and/or action committees for a variety of initiatives, including as the State Advisory Committee required under RTT-ELC.

For RTT-ELC, the Grant Implementation Group meets bi-monthly to bring forth key issues that require enhanced coordination across systems and ensure that the projects have the cross-partner support to be successful.

## 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.

Michigan recognizes that coordination and collaboration in a comprehensive early learning and development system must go beyond state agencies and partner organizations to engage with key early childhood stakeholders from local communities across the state. As such, OGS established the OGS Advisory Council in October 2014 to help identify and define policy issues, use local experiences to improve state policy, and identify how best to communicate with key stakeholders. The 18-member council is inclusive of parents, local providers, and other community leaders from diverse economic and geographic backgrounds.

The foundation for the projects and activities within RTT-ELC, *Great Start, Great Investment, Great Future: The Plan for Early Learning and Development in Michigan*, is testament to the importance of stakeholders in decisions made at the state level. Ongoing to the work, the OGS Advisory Council continues to guide and inform the implementation of the recommendations in the report, as well as system-building efforts across agencies. During 2016, specific, targeted stakeholder groups were convened for a variety of purposes, including to inform the implementation of participation bonuses and quality improvement grants for providers participating in GSQ (Project 2). Additionally, stakeholders were engaged in exploring new avenues to articulation agreements between 2-year and 4-year higher education institutions (Project 5).

Further stakeholder involvement includes committee involvement in completing a Gap Analysis of social emotional and physical health indicators as well as family engagement indicators within the Great Start to Quality (GSQ) indicators. The work of the Gap Analysis committee formed for social emotional and physical health indicators began meeting in Year 2 and concluded the work in August 2016 to identify gaps in the GSQ Indicators in comparison to national Stepping Stones Standards. Several programs within various agencies had representatives serving on this committee, including the OGS (Early Childhood), the ECIC, Early On (Part C of IDEA), and the MDHHS. In addition, there were three Parent Liaisons that served on the committee from various locations across the state. One of these members is the parent of a child with special health care needs. The Gap Analysis Committee formed for the family engagement indicators began meeting in November 2016, including representation from MDE, MDHHS, home and center-based child care providers, parent liaisons and local Resource Centers.

As the model for Specialized Consultation has been developed, stakeholders have been engaged at various points in the planning process, specifically as it pertains to determining the roles of the social emotional, physical health, and family engagement consultants as the roles intersect with child care licensing consultants and quality improvement consultants at the Resource Centers. Similarly, as the planning for implementation of Trusted Advisors occurred during 2016, feedback from Great Start Collaboratives and Resource Centers informed the process for developing Grant Criteria in preparation for the Grant Application process scheduled for early 2017. Significant feedback is gathered in Michigan's [Great Start, Great Investment, Great Future Report](#), reflecting the voice of nearly 1,400 Michiganders. Stakeholders expressed that "trusted advisors" for parents should be used as a core network to disseminate clear and concise information to families about the importance of early childhood learning and development. To inform the development of the application feedback was gathered from Great Start Collaboratives requesting the opportunity to map proposed activities onto their existing strategic plan. This approach has been built into the application process. In addition, the Early Childhood Investment Corporation, who has responsibilities for training

and technical assistance for Great Start Coalitions also provided input regarding the current context and priorities based on feedback they received from local leaders.

In 2016 Public Sector Consultants prepared a report for the Michigan Department of Education entitled, "Building a Better Child Care System; What Michigan Can Do to Help More Parents and Children Access Quality Care." For the purpose of exploring how Michigan can improve, input was gathered from over 1,000 individuals across the state including parents, providers, advocates and administrators. This report summarized their feedback and identifies a number of ways to improve Michigan's child care system, particularly focusing on methods related to the state's child care subsidy. Here is a link to the [Building a Better Child Care System](#) report. Recommendations include practical ways to improve the ability of low-income families to access child care subsidy, including simplifying the application process, changing eligibility thresholds, and rationalizing the way that providers are reimbursed. Addressing access issues would allow many more low-income families a chance to access high quality child care.

The building of the Professional Development Registry relied heavily on stakeholder research and input. Two work groups were convened with cross sector, cross setting, and cross funding representatives. The groups began exploring other state registries and participated in technical assistance at the start of our RTT award notification and will continue to inform the business rules and functionality as we move to making the registry live.

Finally, relative to National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Accreditation of Early Childhood Education, a work group of currently accredited colleges was convened in Year 2 to develop a grant application and scoring mechanism. As a result, eight community colleges were granted funding to pursue NAEYC accreditation, and one additional community college was granted funding to pursue reaccreditation with NAEYC.

### **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.

On January 5, 2016, Governor Snyder issued a proclamation declaring a state of emergency within the city of Flint, due to significant lead contamination in the city water supply. All state agencies were charged with contributing to the coordination of response and assistance to the community of Flint. Within early childhood education and care, coordination of the additional resources that are provided for in a statewide effort are considered in the context of necessary targeted efforts. In January the state legislature identified supplemental funds to assist with services and supports to families with very young children, focusing on early intervention, as well as screening, evaluation, behavioral supports, and attention to nutrition - all aiming to mitigate the negative effects of lead. Additional funds for both 2016 and 2017 were contained in appropriation bills that were signed into law in July of 2016, allowing families within the affected Flint zip codes with 4-year-old children universal access to state-funded preschool (Great Start Readiness Program), universal access to 20 hours/week of CCDF-financed child care for children birth through age 3, sufficient funding to universally support children birth through age 3 with early intervention services, targeted funds to support the identification and services for early childhood mental health, as well as supporting and serving as a state partner in foundation-led collaborative efforts to increase the availability of high-quality child care. Throughout the year, state agency leaders met to discuss progress with local leaders as part of the Governor-initiated Flint Water Interagency Coordinating Committee (FWICC). The agency/department Directors are named to this committee, and engage their employees in communicating progress toward identified supports, as

well as identified needs and challenges. Progress toward primary objectives is highlighted at [www.michigan.gov/flintwater](http://www.michigan.gov/flintwater). The state leadership for RTT-ELC considers the needs of the early education and care of children in the Flint community, and will continue to identify specific needs that may be supported through current efforts or through re-purposing of the RTT-ELC funds.

As reported in Michigan's 2015 APR, Executive Order 2015-4 that formed the MDHHS and moved Child Care Licensing into LARA represented a significant shift for staff who have been collaborating over the years. The continuing impact of the reorganization was felt throughout 2016, as in April there was an additional shift as the bureau within MDHHS that has been the primary partner for RTT-ELC work (Family, Maternal and Child Health) moved to a newly created bureau, and again in September as a Bureau of Family Health Services was designed. As was the case in 2015, with each move staff were required to learn new reporting structures and internal expectations for procurement and hiring, pausing as there were new policy and procedures implemented. This caused continued delay in the building of the personnel to implement the specialized consultants for health and social-emotional support, as well as slowing the activities designed to support those individuals. Even as these bureaucratic changes were being navigated, partners continued to meet and plan with enthusiasm toward a well-informed launch. Most significantly, the individual who was both the thought-leader and champion for Michigan's engagement of specialized consultants for child care in the area of child health was placed on leave in August as part of on-going investigations of the state's response to the Flint water crisis, thus requiring a new approach to ensure leadership in implementation be brokered and instituted in November.

In 2015, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) welcomed a new State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Brian Whiston. Mr. Whiston launched a broad stakeholder-informed process to determine overarching goals and strategies to lead toward Michigan advancing to being a state for educational outcomes that is in the Top 10 in 10 years. The goals and strategies that are outlined require innovative approaches to address comprehensive evidence-based instruction and supports for the P-20 population. Efforts to increase preschool access and to enhance the foundations for family engagement are included. In order to both lead and coordinate efforts across MDE as well as with the breadth of stakeholders, MDE identified the need for a State Transformation Specialist who will engage the birth to third grade continuum and the transitions beyond. This Specialist is currently being funded with RTT-ELC resources. Further, identified efforts will intersect well with some of the family engagement activities within Michigan's RTT-ELC.

Early literacy and the impact on children not reading on grade level in third grade continued to be high priority for both the Governor and the legislature. In July, the Governor announced the creation of the PreK-12 Literacy Commission to provide policy recommendations and reports on the state's progress in becoming a national leader in literacy. In October, initial appointments were announced that coincided with the enactment of legislation that laid out expectations for intensive and coordinated supports for children in K-3 to ensure greater achievement in English language arts on the grade 3 state assessment. The RTT-ELC work in Michigan seeks to contribute to increasing the quality of settings prior to K entry, thus enabling stronger transitions into the K-3 settings in the state.

In 2016, Michigan expanded its entrance income requirements for Child Development and Care (CDC) subsidy from 121% FPL to 125% FPL to begin to expand access. Also pertaining to child care subsidy the allowable timeframe for processing applications and making eligibility determinations changed from 45 days to a maximum of 30 days. This reduces the wait time for both families and providers related to eligibility determinations, as families were often asking child care providers to care for children without authorizations, which was risky for their business. It also limited family choice/access to high quality settings. By reducing the time it takes for eligibility decisions we believe we

are increasing access to high quality programs and parental choice.

To ensure and improve the health and safety of children in child care settings Michigan has completed hiring and training approximately 20 new child care licensing consultants. Michigan also hired and trained 2 new managers covering 2 new regions (from 6 to 8 regions) to help reduce coverage area sizes. Both changes have allowed licensing consultants' caseloads to fall from approximately 1:146 to 1:107. Early in 2017 Michigan will hire 2 more "floater" consultants which will bring the average caseload down to 1:105 ratio. Michigan will monitor fluctuations in the number of licensees from month to month as well any impact that changes to Michigan's child care licensing law may have on the provider community.

**Participating State Agencies**

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

There have been no changes in participation and/or commitment by any Participating State Agency or partner organizations.

## High-Quality, Accountable Programs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Michigan's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS or QRIS) is known as the Great Start to Quality (GSQ). Michigan is committed to ensuring the integration and use of science-based child development principles and practices, which are linked or highly correlated to program quality in our GSQ program standards. Prior to the 2011 implementation of GSQ, we worked with the HighScope Educational Research Foundation to conduct a beta test of the standards with 10 early learning and development programs. Programs in the beta test were accredited by NAEYC or the National Association of Family Child Care (NAFCC). The standards were adjusted based on the findings of this test. Michigan adopted the GSQ Program Standards initially in 2011 and reaffirmed them in 2013.

Statewide Alignment -- The GSQ standards align with the state's early learning standards (approved by Michigan's State Board of Education), the *Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs* (ECSQ-IT), and the *Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Pre-kindergarten* (ECSQ-PK). Our early learning standards are consistent with and meet thresholds of the National Research Council.

Early Learning and Development Standards -- The GSQ standards include early learning and development standards that align with, and have been cross-walked to, the ECSQ-PK, ECSQ-IT, Head Start performance standards, and NAEYC accreditation. The GSQ indicators under the Curriculum and Instruction section incorporate the state's early learning and development standards.

Michigan's TQRIS is clear and has standards that are measurable, meaningfully differentiate program quality levels, and reflect high expectations of program excellence commensurate with nationally recognized standards that lead to improved learning outcomes for children. The tiered QRIS standards are expressed in terms of levels that correspond to a tiered QRIS rating. The levels are organized by five standards of quality: Curriculum and Instruction; Staff Qualifications and Professional Development; Family and Community Partnerships; Environment; and Administration and Management -- with identified indicators of high quality within each category. Our tiered QRIS levels measure a progression of improved program quality. As a part of the GSQ evaluation through RTT-ELC, a validation study of the standards will be conducted. During Year 3 of the grant, a contract was established with McREL International to complete this study, and a first round of data collection was completed in fall 2016.

Applicable to strengthening the tiered Program Standards, results from the gap analysis of the social emotional and physical health indicators, as well as family engagement indicators, will inform decisions regarding future modifications to the Program Standards. The gap analysis of the social-emotional and physical health indicators was completed in summer 2016, and the work of the gap analysis for the family engagement indicators began in fall 2016. A workgroup is being convened to discuss next steps for the results of these analyses.

### **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.

Unlicensed, subsidized providers are included in the quality improvement portion of the tiered quality rating and improvement system, Great Start to Quality. In Michigan, center-based early learning programs and group homes are licensed, home-based providers are registered, and individuals who enroll to care for children eligible for child care subsidies are considered unlicensed, subsidized. Unlicensed, subsidized providers are not rated using the quality star rating system, but are rated at Level 1 through Level 3 based on their amount of professional development. A change was made in language during Year 2 from Tier to Level to not confuse this process with the state's tiered reimbursement. All unlicensed, subsidized providers start at Level 1 with the required completion of seven hours of CPR, health and safety and child development training, called Great Start to Quality Orientation. Level 1, or Great Start to Quality Orientation, must be completed before the unlicensed, subsidized provider becomes eligible to receive the child care subsidy. Unlicensed, subsidized providers are eligible for tiered reimbursement as Level 2 and Level 3 are achieved.

A RTT-ELC activity designed to increase participation of the unlicensed, subsidized providers in Great Start to Quality was developing a cohort model focused on supporting these providers to attain Level 2. Contracts for all six Great Start to Quality Resource Centers implementing the cohorts were issued by ECIC in Year 3. Each of the Resource Centers employs a Quality Improvement Consultant (QIC) for each designated county to implement the cohorts. In addition, a second QIC was hired in Genesee County to implement a second cohort to further support the community in Flint in response to the water crisis. QICs support cohort members to develop a training plan and/or quality improvement plan unique to them, and make connections to resources. They plan for trainings and engagement activities that align with cohort members' interests and needs and that build upon their strengths. Resource Centers are supported to implement the cohort models locally with technical assistance from the Early Childhood Investment Corporation. The QICs are supported in their role with a planned program of training and technical assistance to ensure a base level of knowledge and skill, including adult learning principles, group facilitation, understanding poverty, and continuous quality improvement.

In Year 3, a total of 305 unlicensed, subsidized providers participated in the cohorts. At the end of Year 3, 165 were participating across the nine cohorts. During Year 3, 105 participants reached Level 2 in the Quality Development Continuum, and 9 reached Level 3, the first unlicensed, subsidized providers in the state to achieve the status. During Year 3, one cohort participant achieved licensure through Michigan's child care licensure entity as a result of her Quality Improvement Plan.

Contracts for five Great Start to Quality Resource Centers to increase participation for family/group home providers in targeted communities were developed and issued by ECIC. A total of seven Quality Improvement Specialists (QIS) are employed by these five Resource Centers to serve the seven Pathways to Potential counties. The QIS will conduct outreach to family/group home providers to encourage their participation in Great Start to Quality and provide individualized technical assistance, as needed. The QIS also supports parents in the child care referral process. Each of the five Great Start to Quality Resource Centers developed a regional approach for increasing home-based provider participation and also participated in continuous quality improvement efforts

around the strategies identified in the regional approach.

Participation Bonuses were designed to increase participation in Great Start to Quality. Participation Bonuses relaunched in the beginning of Year 3, after completing the pilot at the end of Year 2. Bonuses continued to remain open to licensed/registered providers, based on the eligibility criteria initially determined during the pilot.

To be eligible for the participation bonus, child care providers must meet all of the following criteria:

- Be a licensed or registered child care provider or preschool program, in good standing with Child Care Licensing.
- Have received a published rating on Great Start to Quality, on or after August 3, 2015.
  - Published rating may be an initial rating or received through Re-Rating or Reassessment.
- Have created or completed a Quality Improvement Plan on the Great Start to Quality STARS platform
  - Applicable only for programs exclusively offering the Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP) as a non-Community Based Organization (CBO).

The eligibility requirement to have served at least one child receiving a child care subsidy in the last six months or participate in the Child and Adult Food Care Program (CACFP) was removed toward the end of Year 3. This change encouraged additional programs and providers to consider participation in Great Start to Quality. In order to incorporate this change, a pause in the Participation Bonuses occurred for approximately one month. During this time ECIC made revisions to the application, support materials, and website. The Participation Bonus application became available to those seeking to apply after the month long pause, and will remain open through the end of Year 4. During Year 3, the \$500 Participation Bonus was awarded to 1,458 programs and providers.

In order to increase efficiency, a specific access to the Great Start to Quality STARS platform was created in Year 1 for 81 Licensing and Regulatory Affairs (LARA) child care licensing consultants. Training was held in Year 2 to support their understanding of the platform and how they could utilize this resource to support their work. In Year 3, the use of this resource was evaluated and it was learned that very few child care licensing consultants were utilizing their access. Michigan sought feedback from those consultants who had accessed STARS to learn of the benefits and barriers. While the intent of providing access was to create efficiencies for the consultants, the multiple ways to evidence certain requirements, as well as the lack of a naming scheme for organizing files did not result in decreased time for the consultants to cite documentation in STARS to confirm compliance for licensing needs. In addition, feedback provided by the consultants was that having access to the Professional Development Registry information would likely be more beneficial. Therefore, Michigan has not pursued increased utilization of STARS by the licensing consultants. Rather, further exploration of access to the Professional Development Registry will occur once it is live.

Quality Improvement Grants were designed to help programs achieve quality based on the indicators included in a Great Start to Quality - Quality Improvement Plan. The indicators included in a Quality Improvement Plan support quality efforts that move child care programs above and beyond basic health and safety standards set by licensing. Quality Improvement Grants are intended to help increase quality based on current

research supporting best practices and developmentally appropriate early childhood education and care.

Implementation of Quality Improvement Grants (QI Grants) began early in Year 3 through stakeholder feedback gathered in the form of individual calls, or interviews, made to interested licensed/registered providers. Based on the information gathered from these calls, QI Grant processes were developed, and a 4-week pilot was launched. During the pilot, eligible licensed/registered providers completed an online application requesting items for activities supporting their individual Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) goals.

To be eligible for a Quality Improvement Grant, child care providers must meet all of the following criteria:

- Be a licensed or registered child care provider or preschool program, in good standing with Child Care Licensing.
- Have received a published star rating on Great Start to Quality.
- Served at least one child receiving a child care subsidy in the last six months and/or participate in the Child and Adult Food Care Program (CACFP) *and* have submitted at least one claim in the past six months.
  - Have a Quality Improvement Plan with the status "created" on the Great Start to Quality STARS platform.

During the pilot, a total of 366 QI Grants were awarded, ranging between \$450-\$4,500, equating to \$1,386,401 total in grant funding. After awardees expend all QI Grant funds received during the pilot, they are required to complete a report indicating how the grant award increased/did not increase program quality, along with basic expenditure information. The application process opens and closes to providers on a cyclical basis, or approximately once every 3 months. Eligible licensed/registered providers can apply for up to \$4,500 once every other cycle. One additional QI Grant cycle was implemented, after revisions were made to pilot processes and support materials, prior to the end of Year 3. This second cycle resulted in an award of 604 Quality Improvement Grants. An additional four cycles are planned for implementation before the end of Year 4.

For outreach purposes the Michigan Department of Education developed a Request for Proposals (RFP) for communications work to increase awareness of the importance of early childhood as well as available resources for children and families. This work will include targeted outreach to home-based child care providers as well as tribal programs for increasing participation in Great Start to Quality. The RFP will be posted early in 2017.

The promotion of tribal participation in Great Start to Quality requires the enhancement of systems. A process for tribal programs interested in participating in Great Start to Quality has been established, which will allow them to access the Great Start to Quality STARS platform, to complete the rating process, as well as to receive a published rating, publically visible. Unique identifiers were created for these programs to support the process.

To increase tribal participation in Great Start to Quality, the RTT Project Manager has been working with state agency leads for Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), Head Start Collaboration, and DHHS to understand the current landscape in Michigan as it pertains to tribes in Michigan. In 2016 an Indigenous Initiatives workgroup began convening to assist with the alignment of all initiatives within the Michigan Department of Education that impact indigenous children and youth. One result of this work in 2016

includes the development of an agreement between the Michigan Department of Education and the United Tribes of Michigan to engage in consultation around education issues and the implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The RTT Project Manager is actively participating in this workgroup to obtain stakeholder feedback that will inform the development of an outreach plan to be implemented in 2017.

In 2015 Michigan began conversations with local leadership for Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) on engaging ECSE programs in Michigan's quality rating improvement system - Great Start to Quality. This leadership group explored the barriers to engaging ECSE programs in Great Start to Quality including policy, programming and funding. This leadership group proposed exploring a potential pilot for this work. In 2016 Michigan identified a local ECSE program that was interested in exploring the possibility of a pilot. Conversations between the Michigan Department of Education and this local program further examined the benefits and barriers to participation in Great Start to Quality, and to date have not been successful in identifying a clear path for moving forward.

The primary challenge to engaging ECSE programs in Great Start to Quality is rooted in Michigan's value of the inclusion of children with disabilities in early childhood programs. This value poses a philosophical dissonance when considering providing a high quality rating for self-contained classrooms. In addition, self-contained ECSE classrooms fall under the auspices of school districts with their local superintendents and administration answering to a local board of education. Consequently, ECSE programs are reluctant to enter a voluntary rating system that may yield a low-quality rating per the Great Start to Quality Indicators.

As 2017 begins, Michigan intends to request an amendment to this portion of the scope of work for the RTT-ELC grant. This amendment request will propose the exploration of an approach that would further incentivize child care providers to include children with disabilities in their care, and to ensure that they have support to feel confident with inclusive practices. Additionally, the amendment request will propose providing support to ECSE programs to implement Division of Early Childhood (DEC) Recommended Practices.

To improve the program inspection process, Michigan has contracted with National Association for Regulatory Administration (NARA) to identify a set of key indicators to monitor for compliance. By streamlining compliance monitoring, licensing consultants will have more time to help programs focus on improving their quality outcomes for children. In January 2016, Michigan established a contract with NARA to develop, pilot and refine the use of key indicators in the licensing process. Upon completion of data analysis NARA provided a report to Michigan, in August 2016, which included the identification of a set of Key Indicators. Stakeholder feedback has informed the development of eligibility criteria to determine which child care programs will be eligible for this expedited inspection process. The key indicators will be piloted in spring 2017 with plans for statewide implementation in summer 2017.

Regarding Child Care Scholarships, Section B(4)(b) of Michigan's application for Early Learning Challenge funds, which was to focus on "Supports to help working families access high quality care," included a proposal to offer nearly \$6 million to provide scholarships to families with children 0-3. Michigan explored the implementation of this activity and considered the current context with regard to whether or not it would be sustainable. As part of this process Michigan received Technical Assistance to identify a sustainable model for the child care scholarships, and in this process researched models from Minnesota and Arizona. Michigan was not able to identify a sustainable model for providing child care scholarships. While the application for the scholarships identified

services/supports for this cohort of birth-to-three-year-old children, the concern regarding sustainability is related to public perception that there is the possibility of sustained access to scholarships for children beyond the period of the grant. While this was a bold goal to offer the support for a needy population, further reflection regarding the impact on the trustworthiness of the state to address child care financial support needs in a sustained manner led us to this conclusion.

The child care scholarship proposal focused on assisting families with high need to access higher quality settings. Since the crafting of Michigan's proposal for RTT-ELC funding, Michigan has made improvements to address access and quality. In August 2014 Michigan implemented a tiered rating system including reimbursement to child care providers based upon the level of quality of their program. Currently Michigan is exploring new methods of conducting our market rate survey to ensure that we better access costs, availability and access. In addition, the Department contracted with Public Sector Consultants (PSC) to create the [Better Child Care System](#) report on the landscape of child care in Michigan. The report's recommendations stemmed from research on how other states structure their child-care subsidy programs, and from a broad stakeholder engagement campaign. More than 1,000 individuals across the state participated in the study, including parents, providers, and advocates from 72 of Michigan's 83 counties.

The report recommends focusing on five key areas:

- Increase financial assistance to families
- Increase access to quality providers
- Make it easier for providers to improve their programs
- Increase access to quality information
- Support the early childhood workforce

These activities will increase access for all Michigan children and families in a sustainable way, as opposed to the subset that these scholarship dollars would impact for a shorter period.

Further impacting the access to quality infant/toddler settings is a new tack taken with CCDF's Infant-Toddler Quality set aside. Through an agreement with the Early Childhood Investment Corporation (ECIC), infant-toddler providers will be targeted to participate in a year-long intensive training and support, building a cohort of regional providers who will form a learning community; each will be supported by an Infant-Toddler Specialist at the Great Start to Quality Resource Center, who in turn will receive support from the Infant-Toddler Specialist at the ECIC.

Proposed Activities Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs include:

- Establishing a model for Pre-K for 3 year olds
- Expanding the work of Trusted Advisors and Parent Cafes
  - This work includes encouraging the use of available Child Care Subsidy dollars

The proposal for 3 year olds will allow a focus on that 4<sup>th</sup> year of the 0-3 age group, e.g., 0-1, 1-2, 2-3, 3-4, with the overarching goal to design an accessible state-funded program for that age cohort. As the landscape in Michigan has changed over the past few years we continue to focus on systemic improvements that will lead to increased

participation in high quality care.

Also impacting access to high quality early learning setting in Michigan, the Head Start State Collaboration Office and Child Development and Care Program finalized an MOU in March 2016 with Michigan's five Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership grantees (EHS-CCP). The EHS-CCP grants are a collaborative grant program administered by the Department of Health and Human Services at the federal level. They focus on building the capacity of child care providers through partnerships with grantee agencies who provide funds to meet the Early Head Start Performance Standards. Current EHS-CCP grantees assist providers in their communities with, among other initiatives, attaining higher levels of education, meeting health and safety requirements and implementing an evidence-based curriculum. Macomb Community Action: Head Start 0-5, St. Joseph Intermediate School District, Matrix Human Services, The Order of Fishermen Ministry Head Start and Capital Area Community Services are funded to provide full-year, full day programing to approximately 870 infants and toddlers in child care centers and homes.

The MOU focuses on facilitating the layered funding model advanced by the federal government through implementation of a pilot. The pilot allows EHS-CCP child care providers to collect child care subsidy for the full amount a child is authorized for, while using the EHS-CCP dollars for quality initiatives. This is a departure from current policy, which would typically limit the amount of subsidy a provider can collect to those hours of the day they are not receiving Early Head Start dollars.

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

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

<b>Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.</b>										
<b>Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS</b>										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	580	76%	766	100%	766	100%	766	100%	766	100%
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	199	35%	257	45%	314	55%	342	60%	371	65%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	0%								
Programs receiving CCDF funds	8,624	66.7%	9,101	70.46%	9,578	74.16%	10,055	77.85%	10,531	81.54%
Other 1	8,148	100%	8,148	100%	8,148	100%	8,148	100%	8,148	100%
<i>Describe:</i>	Subsidized FFN Providers (Breakout 1 of CCDF Funding)									
Other 2	476	10%	953	20%	1,430	30%	1,907	40%	2,383	50%
<i>Describe:</i>	Licensed Early Learning and Development Programs (Breakout 2 of CCDF Funding)									
Other 3	659	6%	1,075	10%	3,224	30%	4,299	40%	5,373	50%
<i>Describe:</i>	All Licensed Programs Combined Total									

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

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

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

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

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	766	580	76%	764	764	100%	1,029	1,029	100%	1,084	1,084	100%			
<i>Specify:</i>	Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP)														
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	570	199	35%	685	399	58%	631	539	85%	686	518	75.5%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	56	0	0%	56	0	0%	56	0	0%	0	0	0%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	56	0	0%	56	0	0%	56	0	0%	0	0	0%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	630	0	0%	630	0	0%									
Programs receiving CCDF funds	12,915	8,624	66.7%	9,969	7,679	77%	8,141	1,541	19%	7,669	3,411	44%			
Other 1	8,148	8,148	100%	5,706	5,706	100%	4,126	4,126	100%	3,692	3,692	100%			
<i>Describe:</i>	Subsidized FFN Providers (Breakout 1 of CCDF Funding)														
Other 2	4,767	476	10%	4,263	1,973	46.3%	4,015	1,541	38%	3,977	3,085	77.6%			
<i>Describe:</i>	Licensed Early Learning and Development Programs (Breakout 2 of CCDF Funding)														
Other 3	10,747	659	6%	10,403	2,076	20.3%	9,190	2,841	31%	8,484	2,913	34%			
<i>Describe:</i>	All Licensed Programs Combined Total														

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

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

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

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

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

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

Context: A licensed or registered program is considered to be participating upon completion and submission of a Self-Assessment Survey and issuance of a published rating. Unlicensed, subsidized providers are considered to be participating upon completion of the required Great Start to Quality Orientation (Level 1). TQRIS data is reflective of January 2017 and collected from the Great Start to Quality STARS platform. The number of GSRP, Early Head Start and Head Start programs may be inaccurate as these fields are self-reported by programs, meaning that the data rely on providers to accurately report their information because there is no mechanism to verify the data.

State Funded Preschool: Great Start Readiness Program funds can only be distributed to programs that are at a 3, 4 or 5 star level in Great Start to Quality; number of programs retrieved from CEPI; number of programs in TQRIS retrieved from ECIC.

Early Head Start and Head Start data: retrieved from Head Start Collaborative Director, Office of Great Start, Michigan Department of Education.

Part C of IDEA provides services and supports designated on the Individualized Family Service Plan and does not provide programs or operate classrooms.

Section 619, Part B numbers are reflective of total grantees (regionally operated by ISDs) and not their respective number of total programs or classrooms.

Programs receiving funding from IDEA Part B and IDEA Part C, section 619 are not currently participating in GSQ and are not expected to, as indicated in the check boxes on p. 17.

Title I numbers are intentionally left blank because we cannot reliably report the number of programs utilizing Title I funds - once distributed to ISDs, Title I funds are not tracked for grade-level spending.

Programs receiving CCDF funds data reflect the number of programs that received a payment during the reporting period, provided by Child Care and Development Program, Office of Great Start, MDE.

Subsidized FFN Providers (Breakout 1 of CCDF funding) is total unlicensed subsidized providers who received a payment and who have completed tier 1/level 1 training to receive payment, from January to December 2016.

Licensed Early Learning and Development Programs (Breakout 2 of CCDF funding) is the number of licensed/registered subsidized providers who received a payment and who are rated 1-5 stars in GSQ. Licensed Early Learning and Development programs represents total programs statewide (Child Care & Preschool Centers, Group Child Care Homes, Family Child Care Homes), and "Total Programs (1-5 Star)," retrieved from Great Start to Quality Participation Dashboard Report, 1/2/2017 (defined as any early learning and development program licensed by the state that receives CCDF funding). The difference between the two provider types pertains to capacity. Family Homes are licensed for up to 6 children and Group Homes are licensed for up to 12 children with two adults.

**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.

Targets were not met for two of the programs displayed:

Programs receiving CCDF Funds had a target of 77.85% and an actual result of 44%. As described in the section "Promoting Participation in the TQRIS", Michigan launched multiple efforts for the first time in 2016 to increase participation in Great Start to Quality. These include the Participation Bonus and Quality Improvement Grants. It is anticipated that these activities will ensure measurable progress to reach the RTT-ELC grant targets. In 2016 the Participation Bonuses were awarded to 1,458 providers and programs and over 600 Quality Improvement Grants were awarded. These activities are fully launched and will continue through 2017.

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

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

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

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

Michigan has developed and implemented a system for rating and monitoring the quality of early learning and development programs participating in GSQ that is rigorous, reliable, and accountable to families, policymakers, and funders.

All licensed and registered early learning and development programs that participate in GSQ beyond the entry point of licensure complete an assessment of quality against the GSQ program standards. Programs with an assessment point total that places them at a 1, 2, or 3 Star level are subject to a 25 percent random selection for on-site validation that includes a review of the program's Self-Assessment Survey and uploaded evidence documentation. Once the validation is complete, the program's rating will be published on GSQ at the validated quality level. For programs with a 1-3 Star rating not selected for validation, the self-assessed rating will be the published rating. Programs with an assessment point total that places them at a 4 or 5 Star level are required to have an on-site validation and a Program Quality Assessment (PQA), after which the program's rating will be published on GSQ. Validators use the Self-Assessment Survey to conduct inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability testing is completed for 10% of all validations on a monthly basis. Assessors complete reliability testing annually on each version of the Program Quality Assessment (PQA) tool with High Scope.

Program ratings are valid for two years. After two years, the program starts the self-assessment process again and tries to achieve a higher rating. During the six months preceding the expiration of the current rating, programs are notified and encouraged to re-engage in GSQ in order to maintain a published rating. Once the rating expires, programs may still elect to re-engage in GSQ and earn a new published rating. Additionally, programs meeting a specified list of criteria, such as an increase in quality or a change in license capacity or staffing, may apply for a reassessment of their current rating, which may result in the receipt of a new published rating.

An additional Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge initiative is the development of child care licensing key indicators. To improve the child care licensing

inspection process, Michigan has contracted with National Association for Regulatory Administration (NARA) to identify a set of key indicators to monitor for compliance. By streamlining compliance monitoring, licensing consultants will have more time to help programs focus on improving their quality outcomes for children. In January 2016, Michigan established a contract with NARA to develop, pilot and refine the use of key indicators in the licensing process. Upon completion of data analysis, NARA provided a report to Michigan in August 2016, which included the identification of a set of Key Indicators. Stakeholder feedback has informed the development of eligibility criteria to determine which child care programs will be eligible for this expedited inspection process. The key indicators will be piloted in spring 2017 in two counties, with plans for statewide implementation in summer 2017.

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

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

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

Describe the progress made in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in your State TQRIS during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

To strengthen the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in TQRIS, Michigan has employed a number of strategies, including program and provider training and technical assistance, offering Participation Bonuses, and utilizing higher, tiered child care subsidy reimbursement rates. In addition to the seven Quality Improvement Specialists (QIS) now employed through the Resource Centers, Michigan is deploying specialized consultants in the Pathways to Potential communities. Areas of specialization will include physical health, social-emotional health, and family engagement. These consultants will work directly with program providers to enhance existing services to children and families. The first three social-emotional consultants were hired in fall 2016. Five additional social-emotional consultants will be hired early in 2017, along with eight physical health consultants. Eight family engagement consultants will be hired in April 2017.

A technical assistance and training plan for QIS has been developed and was implemented in Year 3. Also in Year 3, Michigan fully launched the offering of Participation Bonuses to providers to encourage participation in GSQ. During Year 3, the \$500 Participation Bonus was awarded to 1,458 programs and providers.

Implementation of Quality Improvement Grants (QI Grants) began in the beginning of year 3 through stakeholder feedback gathered in the form of individual calls, or interviews, made to interested licensed/registered providers. Based on the information gathered from these calls, QI Grant processes were developed and a 4-week pilot was launched. During the pilot, eligible licensed/registered providers completed an online application requesting items for activities supporting their individual Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) goals. During the pilot, a total of 366 QI Grants were awarded, ranging between \$450-\$4,500, equating to \$1,386,401. The median amount received by awardees was \$3,787.98. Grants were awarded based on eligibility criteria; geographic distribution was not a factor during the pilot. Post-award analysis by region is as follows:

- Central-7.10%
- Eastern-5.46%
- Kent-5.74%
- Northeast-11.20%

- Northwest-7.92%
- Southeast-11.75%
- Southwest-9.02%
- Upper Peninsula-6.28%
- Wayne-Oakland-Macomb-13.11%
- Western-22.40%

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

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

<b>Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.</b>					
<b>Targets</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS</b>	659	1,074	3,224	4,299	5,373
<b>Number of programs in Tier 1</b>	19	107	323	430	537
<b>Number of programs in Tier 2</b>	36	215	645	860	1,075
<b>Number of programs in Tier 3</b>	187	268	1,128	1,720	2,149
<b>Number of programs in Tier 4</b>	397	429	967	1,075	1,343
<b>Number of programs in Tier 5</b>	20	54	161	214	269
<b>Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated</b>					

<b>Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.</b>					
<b>Actuals</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS</b>	659	2,076	2,841	3,411	
<b>Number of programs in Tier 1</b>	19	62	83	101	
<b>Number of programs in Tier 2</b>	36	133	278	397	
<b>Number of programs in Tier 3</b>	187	698	1,131	1,484	
<b>Number of programs in Tier 4</b>	397	1,015	1,185	1,267	
<b>Number of programs in Tier 5</b>	20	168	164	162	
<b>Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated</b>					

**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.

TQRIS data is reflective of January 3, 2017 and collected from the Great Start to Quality STARS platform. The total number of programs covered by the TQRIS includes licensed/registered providers considered in good standing with child care licensing and have a published rating on the public website, [www.greatstarttoquality.org](http://www.greatstarttoquality.org). Therefore, licensed/registered providers with a status of "inactive" or "provisional" are not eligible to participate and excluded from the count. Licensed/registered providers choosing not to participate in GSQ or who are not eligible to participate publicly display with an "Empty Star" and are not included in this count. As of January 3, 2017, 8,484 licensed/registered providers were considered eligible to participate in GSQ. Of these programs, 3,411 had a rating of 1 Star to 5 Stars in Great Start to Quality.

**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.

Targets were not met for Tier 1 (1 Star), Tier 2 (2 Star), and Tier 5 (5 Star) programs during 2016; however, the total number of licensed/registered programs and those in Tier 3-4 (3-4 Stars) exceeded the target. A large majority of the licensed programs in the higher tiers of GSQ (3-5 Stars) reflect the mandatory GSQ participation for state-funded preschool (Great Start Readiness Program) providers and their community-based partners. A continued focus on increasing home-based provider participation and the continued state-wide implementation of the Participation Bonus in Year 4 should yield further progress toward participation targets in the lower tiers of GSQ (1-2 Stars). The implementation of the Quality Improvement Grant may help additional programs and providers achieve the highest tier. Actual number for overall participation was 79% of the target number for Year 3. Actual number to percent of target by Star rating:  
1 Star = 23.5% (of target) or 101 programs, 2 Star = 46.2% (of target) or 397 programs, 3 Star = 86.3% (of target) or 1,484 programs, 4 Star = 117.9% (of target) or 1,267 programs, 5 Star = 75.7% (of target) or 162 programs.

Michigan's targets were developed based on the goal of 50% participation by Dec. 2017; however, in this data table, the targets are reflected as hard numbers. Michigan is on target as far as percentage participating.

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

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

Michigan considers the top tiers of its TQRIS to be programs rated with 3 Stars or higher.

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

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

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

<b>Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2): Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS.</b>										
<b>Targets: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS</b>										
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	24,426	51%	48,075	100%	48,075	100%	48,075	100%	48,075	100%
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	13,060	35%	16,791	45%	20,522	55%	22,388	60%	24,253	65%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	0%	227	2%	227	2%	453	4%	453	4%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	0	0%	2,722	10%	8,164	30%	10,886	40%	13,607	50%
Other 1										
<del>Describe:</del>										
Other 2										
<del>Describe:</del>										

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	48,075	24,426	51%	30,517	30,517	100%	37,506	37,506	100%	38,771	38,771	100%			
<i>Specify:</i>	Great Start Readiness Programs (GSRP)														
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	37,313	13,060	35%	41,310	22,545	54.6%	38,434	34,255	89%	35,129	34,227	97.4%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0	0%	12,028	0	0%	8,898	0	0%	8,901	0	0%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0	0%	19,987	0	0%	12,144	0	0%	12,793	0	0%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	11,332	0	0%	8,440	0	0%	8,264	0	0%	8,559	0	0%			
Programs receiving CCDF funds	27,215	0	0%	23,635	8,458	35.8%	16,975	8,957	53%	18,953	1,439	8%			
Other 1															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 2															
<i>Describe:</i>															

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

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

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

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

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

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

Michigan considers the top tiers of its TQRIS to be programs rated 3 stars or higher.

State-funded preschool: The GSRP numbers are based on funded enrollment from 2016. All GSRP programs are required to be 3 Stars or higher. Number of children served provided by CEPI.

Early Head Start and Head Start: Federal Office of Head Start Program Information Report, reporting year 2015-16. Number of students served by high-quality programs does not represent actual students but slots available for students to be served. Data supplied by Head Start Collaborative Director, and ECIC.

IDEA, Part C and IDEA Part B, section 619 Programs: IDEA, Part C provides services and supports to parents/guardians of eligible children in the environment that is most natural for infants and toddlers, predominantly their home. There is no provision for rating a parent's home. IDEA Part B, section 619 programs are not licensed, and the platform for GSQ is built on child care licensing. IDEA Part B, section 619 data provided by the Preschool & Out-of-School Learning office, MDE. Part C data provided by Part C Snapshot, EMAPS Child Count and Setting.

Programs funded under Title I: Data currently not available on the number of children in Title I programs, disaggregated by star rating. Total number of children served derived from State Consolidated Report, Part II, 2014-15.

Programs receiving CCDF funds: Data provided by Child Development and Care Program office, MDE.

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

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

While data for the 2014-15 Consolidated State Performance Report II reflect that 8,559 children were served with Title I ESEA funds (ages birth to 5 (not Kindergarten), the data are not cross-referenced to any settings where service is provided such as enrollment in other publicly funded preschool settings where use of Title I, Part A funds may be used to enroll children in a classroom that also has children funded through the Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP) or Head Start. CSPR II indicated that 7,625 children ages 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten), received services through Title I, Part A. An additional 934 children ages birth through 2 received services with Title I, Part A funds. Title I, Part A allows for funds to be directed to both classroom and home-based services, and data collection submitted with the APR does not identify what type of service is delivered to the children enrolled. The data provided for the CSPR II is provided by local district's submitting information through the Michigan Student Data System, which only provides for personal demographic information by district. Anecdotal information from the Office of Field Services within MDE which monitors the use of these federal funds indicate that there are few Title-funded stand-alone classrooms.

The target of serving 40% of children receiving CCDF subsidized care in top tiers of GSQ has been impacted both by the decreasing number of children identified as eligible as well as the decreased number of licensed and registered providers with openings for children utilizing subsidy. National trends reflect reduction in subsidized enrollments as discussed by Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) in articles accessed by the following links: <http://www.clasp.org/resources-and-publications/publication-1/CCDBG->

[Participation-2015.pdf](#) and <http://www.clasp.org/resources-and-publications/publication-1/CCDBG-Participation-2015.pdf>. In addition, Michigan has seen a decline in the number of licensed and registered care providers, which has also been impacting the number of providers who accepted children eligible for subsidy.

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

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

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) contracted with McREL International to conduct a multi-year evaluation of Great Start to Quality (GSQ), Michigan's Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS). The study began in May 2016 and is planned to conclude in December 2017. This study will provide the first rigorous evaluation of GSQ, focusing on the following three research questions:

- How effectively do the GSQ rating levels differentiate the quality level of programs;
- To what extent do the GSQ levels relate to progress in children's learning, development and school readiness; and
- What are the specific local, regional, and state conditions that promote the implementation of GSQ and the increase of higher quality early childhood programs throughout the state and ensure children with high needs receive high-quality care?

Upon identification of the study sample McREL completed the first round of data collection in fall 2016.

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

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

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

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

## Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

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

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

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

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

Michigan did not address this.

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

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

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

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

Michigan did not address this.

### Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application)

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

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

Describe the progress made 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.

Substantial tasks have been completed within the health and safety portion of the RTT-ELC grant. The health and safety gap analysis was completed August 2016. This gap analysis included review of Michigan's child care licensing and Great Start to Quality indicators against the Stepping Stones National Health & Safety Performance Standards. Resulting from the analysis were several recommendations for both child care licensing and Great Start to Quality that are being explored for adoption into the early childhood quality rating and licensing systems.

During 2016, significant focus has been on developing the infrastructure needed to successfully launch the Specialized Consultation activities for social emotional health, physical health, and family engagement. The data collection and evaluation system for the Specialized Consultation model has been established. In addition, an orientation and training plan was established collaboratively by members of the partner agencies involved in the planning of this model. The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) leveraged a partnership with Michigan Virtual University (MVU) to generate an online space to host the training modules. This online space will ensure quality and consistency in the training, foster a learning community amongst the consultants, and will be sustainable beyond the life of the RTT-ELC grant. Modules include orientation to Great Start to Quality, as well as content on developmentally appropriate practices, trauma informed care, and cultural responsiveness.

The first three social emotional consultants were deployed in Genesee, Saginaw and Kalamazoo counties during fall 2016. It is anticipated that the second cadre of consultants will be hired early in 2017. The Child Care Health Consultants position description was finalized mid-year 2016 and will be posted in January 2017.

One significant challenge to the hiring of the Child Care Health Consultants (CCHC) was determining where these staff would be hired and how they would be supervised. Given that the CCHC is a new position for Michigan, there were many discussions at the state level as to which agency would be the most appropriate, and included selections such as Health Departments, Federally Qualified Health Centers and Resource Centers. Each presented a unique challenge which prevented choosing one appropriate local entity to hire and house the consultants. It was ultimately decided to contract with an agency that would be responsible for supervising and hiring independent consultants in each selected community, allowing the flexibility needed for ensuring effective implementation.

The selection process for two leadership positions for this scope of work took place at the end of 2016. Individuals selected for these positions will begin work in January 2017. The Project Purveyor has completed many tasks to develop the infrastructure for the child care health consultant program. These include: developing the assessment that will be given to child care providers to assess their understanding of Health and Safety standards in child care settings; creating the curriculum for the Child Care Health Consultant orientation and training; gathering/developing the materials and resources that will be used by the Specialized Consultants in their work with the child care providers to understand foundational elements that will be used as part of the integrated training; consulting with other states to understand the strengths and barriers of implementing a cadre of Child Care Health Consultants; and serving on committees and workgroups to ensure smooth, uniform integration into the quality child care system.

An additional challenge moving this work forward also involved the lack of staff capacity by the MDHHS State Team (Population Health). The lead DHHS staff person for Race to the Top was also a key staff person for work related to other critical work for the Department including the Flint Water Crisis. This unanticipated lack of capacity by this staff person prevented parts of the grant moving forward as timely as we would have preferred. After a length of time, duties for the Race to the Top position were able to be moved to a staff person who had more capacity to be able to take action on the hiring which had been delayed. Since that time, all Race to Top positions have been or are in process of being filled, including the Physical Health Specialized Consultants.

**Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)**

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

<b>Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.</b>					
<b>Baseline and Annual Targets</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Number of Children with High Needs screened</b>	14,400	18,113	21,736	25,358	28,981
<b>Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment</b>					
<b>Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care</b>	166,373				
<b>Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care</b>	166,373				

<b>Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.</b>					
<b>Actuals</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Number of Children with High Needs screened</b>	14,400	56,763	58,457	62,856	
<b>Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment</b>					
<b>Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care</b>	166,373	165,214	150,901	118,385	
<b>Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care</b>	166,373	75.07	70.26	70.66	

**Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) Data Notes**

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

These data from the Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set (HEDIS) is developed and maintained by the National Committee for Quality Assurance and is the most widely used standardized performance measure in the managed care industry. A hybrid data collection method was utilized for this data set that requires Medicaid Health Plans to identify the eligible population using administrative data and then extract a systematic sample of members from the eligible population, which becomes the denominator. Administrative data are used to identify services provided to those members. Medical records must then be reviewed for those members who do not have evidence of a service being provided using administrative data.

Correct interpretation of results for measures using the HEDIS hybrid methodology requires an understanding of sampling error. Measures collected using the hybrid method include only a sample from the eligible population and statistical techniques are used to maximize the probability that the sample results reflect the experience of the entire eligible population. Information regarding these data points, and for a more thorough explanation of the methodology, please refer to: MDHHS HEDIS results [http://www.michigan.gov/mdhhs/0,5885,7-339-71547\\_4860-39268--,00.html](http://www.michigan.gov/mdhhs/0,5885,7-339-71547_4860-39268--,00.html)

**Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) 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.

[Empty box for target notes]

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

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

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

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

In February 2016, Michigan hired a Family Engagement Specialist to lead activities within Project 7. Over the course of the year, significant progress has been made toward activities within this scope of work.

Trainings for Pathways to Potential (P2P) Success Coaches were held in spring and fall 2016. Feedback from 2015 trainings with Success Coaches informed the planning for the 2016 trainings. These regional trainings for the Success Coaches in the original seven Pathways to Potential counties included an overview of resources available through local Great Start to Quality Resource Centers as well as United Way 211, a centralized hotline for identifying available resources within local communities. The topics of focus for the fall training included Trauma Informed Practices, as well as exploring the ways that personal bias impacts services provided to families. Given the format and topics of this training, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) and the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) determined to combine resources to be able to offer the training to all Pathways to Potential Success Coaches in Michigan (providing training to the staff implementing P2P programming in nearly 230 schools).

Michigan received technical assistance in spring 2016 to begin the planning for building networks of trusted advisors to provide support to families in local communities. Grant Criteria for this work was approved by the Michigan Board of Education in fall 2016. The purpose of the Trusted Advisors Grants is to engage Great Start Parent Coalitions (GSPC), through a competitive grant funding opportunity, to strengthen, become engaged in, and develop their community's cadre of trusted advisors and work with the advisors to disseminate culturally and linguistically appropriate materials and information about early childhood learning and development. The application process was developed at the end of 2016 with the expectation that the application will be open to local Great Start Parent Coalitions in the first Quarter of 2017. The total amount of available funds is \$3,610,000, and GSPC's may apply for awards ranging from \$5,000 - \$60,000.

The Position Description for Family Engagement Consultants to be hired in the seven original Pathway to Potential counties plus one rural community was finalized in the summer of 2016. Also in summer 2016 Michigan submitted and was approved for a budget amendment request to increase effort for the planning and implementation of the family engagement activities within Project 7. This additional effort was leveraged in partnership with the Early Childhood Investment Corporation for the collaborative planning of the implementation of Trusted Advisors as well as the Family Engagement Consultants. In November and December 2016 local-level planning meetings were scheduled with each county to receive the additional support of the Family Engagement Consultants to determine the best fit for hiring and housing these consultants. In each of the counties these planning meetings included the Great Start Collaboratives and Great

Start to Quality Resource Centers. Decisions will be finalized in January 2017, with the target of hiring all Family Engagement Consultants by April 1, 2017.

In November 2016, the first committee meeting was held for conducting a gap analysis of the Great Start Quality Program Indicators and the Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs and Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten. They will be compared with the Strengthening Families Framework to identify if the Strengthening Families Protective Factors are adequately addressed. This committee includes representatives from the Michigan Department of Education, Michigan Department of Health and Human Services, Early Childhood Investment Corporation, Resource Centers, child care providers, and families of young children. It also includes content experts on parent engagement and the Strengthening Families Framework. This work is scheduled for completion in summer 2017.

## Early Childhood Education Workforce

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

(Section D(1) of Application)

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

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

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

Michigan did not address this.

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

(Section D(2) of Application)

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

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

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

The Michigan Association for the Education of Young Children (MiAEYC) leads several activities within the RTT-ELC scope of work that pertain to the early childhood workforce. During Year 3 progress on activities included:

- Planning and implementing a Higher Education summit where the primary topic of discussion was improving available high quality online course offerings. Information was also shared and feedback was collected about the Professional Development Registry and Career Pathways document. There were approximately 34 attendees at the IHE Summit representing 16 colleges and universities in Michigan. Overall in Michigan there are 25 community colleges, and 13 four-year colleges that have early childhood programs. Michigan does not have any 2 year vocational schools with early childhood programs.

- Provision of 556 T.E.A.C.H. scholarships to eligible providers for 2016, including 152 scholarships to home-based providers and 404 scholarships to providers seeking certification to teach in GSRP.

- Awarding funding to eight colleges to pursue NAEYC accreditation and one college to pursue reaccreditation from NAEYC. Michigan AEYC partnered with NAEYC to provide onsite technical assistance for grantees (and others) in a one-day training in August 2016. One Community College submitted all requirements, and had their site visit for NAEYC Reaccreditation. Three Community Colleges completed their self-study in 2016 and submitted it to NAEYC. They are scheduled for Spring 2017 site visits from NAEYC.

- Amending the Online CDA scope of work to focus more on marketing and outreach about available credit-bearing online CDA coursework, and support for preparing the CDA portfolio.

In fall 2016, the Michigan Department of Education contracted with Public Consulting Group (PCG) to develop, implement and evaluate a Business Training model for home and center-based providers. Along with the development of the modules, a "Train the Trainer" model will be developed and implemented in order to provide these trainings broadly within Michigan beyond the life of the RTT-ELC grant. Stakeholder feedback, representative of child care providers, child care licensing consultants and Great Start to Quality Resource Centers, was gathered to inform the topics for these trainings. The curriculum is in process of development and trainings will be offered in spring and fall of 2017 in six regions within the state.

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

In the tables below, indicate State progress toward meeting ambitious yet achievable targets for: Increasing the number of postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and the number of Early Childhood Educators who receive credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

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

<b>Baseline and Annual Targets</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers</b>	27	28	30	31	32
<b>Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider</b>	759	789	849	909	969

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

<b>Actuals</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers</b>	27	7	7	7	
<b>Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider</b>	759	154	300	293	

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

The number of institutions remained at seven for 2016. The number of graduates from aligned institutions was obtained from the Michigan Community College Network for both 2015 and 2016 by CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0708, and 19.0709

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

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

The baseline numbers on the chart from our initial application were self-reported numbers from the IHE's as to whether or not they aligned their program with the old core knowledge and core competencies. The CKCCs were updated, released and approved in 2014, so when we reported on the APR the following year, IHEs wouldn't have had a chance to align with the new standards at that time. Since the new CKCCs are aligned with the NAEYC's Community College Accreditation standards, it was

determined after discussion during that year's APR to only use the number of Accredited IHEs and their graduation numbers for the reporting for the APR.

There are seven community colleges currently NAEYC accredited, and we are working with an additional eight to become accredited; since none of them have completed the accreditation process as of yet, the number has remained at seven.

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

In the tables below, indicate State progress toward meeting ambitious yet achievable targets for: Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

<b>Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2): Increasing number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.</b>										
<b>Baseline and Annual Targets</b>										
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	<i>Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year</i>									
	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
<Select Progression>	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Credential Type 1</b>	383		414		445		476		507	
<i>Specify:</i>	CDA									
<b>Credential Type 2</b>	827		858		889		920		951	
<i>Specify:</i>	AA									
<b>Credential Type 3</b>	1,141		1,142		1,143		1,155		1,168	
<i>Specify:</i>	BA									
<b>Credential Type 4</b>	920	93.4%	1,212	72.8%	1,582	95%	1,582	95%	1,582	95%
<i>Specify:</i>	ZS/ZA Endorsement (GSRP only)									
<b>Credential Type 5</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 6</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 7</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 8</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 9</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 10</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 11</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 12</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 13</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										

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

**Actuals**

Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	<i>Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year</i>									
	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
<Select Progression>	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Credential Type 1</b>	383									
<i>Specify:</i>	CDA									
<b>Credential Type 2</b>	827									
<i>Specify:</i>	AA									
<b>Credential Type 3</b>	1,141									
<i>Specify:</i>	BA									
<b>Credential Type 4</b>	920	93.4%								
<i>Specify:</i>	ZS/ZA Endorsement (GSRP only)									
<b>Credential Type 5</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 6</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 7</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 8</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 9</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 10</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 11</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 12</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 13</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										

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

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

The new database to collect this information was built in 2016 and is currently in hibernation mode; therefore, this data remains unable to be collected. The database is in hibernation mode due to the need to identify an organizational home. The RTT budget amendment request submitted Dec. 14, 2016 requested to repurpose RTT funds for implementing the registry, including securing the organizational home. There is a contract in place with the IT source that built the registry to maintain updates until this is turned back on. At this time there isn't any other way to obtain the data for performance measure (D)(2)(d)(2).

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

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

## Measuring Outcomes and Progress

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

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

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

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

Michigan's investment in piloting the comprehensive multi-domain assessment provided opportunities to consider the degree to which districts in the state, which are governed by locally-elected boards of education, would embrace the time, on-going professional development, and costs to fully support kindergarten teachers. In February 2016, an announcement was made within the weekly [newsletter](#) distributed by the office/division within the MDE stating that the effort would be modified in the future, in part due to state legislation requiring K-2 assessment specifically targeting early literacy and mathematics as part of a multi-pronged approach to address concerns with student achievement in early literacy. The newsletter also briefly noted the continued work on exploration and on development of "authentic observation-based assessment at kindergarten entry."

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.

Michigan administered the TS Gold Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA) Tool for three years. Some schools have elected to continue using the KEA in 2016-2017, as teachers found great value in observation-based assessment as it relates to individual student objectives. Other districts are using the Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KRA). Observation-based assessments require a significant level of preparation, training and professional development for our educators. A stakeholder feedback group has been formed and will inform the 2017-18 implementation of the Kindergarten Entry Status Observation of Skills (KEOS).

Michigan's Early Literacy and Mathematics Benchmark Assessments are online assessments that are fully aligned to Michigan's academic standards and may be used as

one measure of student growth. The Early Literacy and Mathematics Benchmark assessments (also referred to as the K-2s) were developed in cooperation with Michigan educators beginning with item writing and continuing through field-test data review. The benchmark assessments currently offered by Michigan are for students in Kindergarten, First Grade, and Second Grade, in both English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. In the fall of 2016, the Benchmark assessment became operational for grades 1 and 2 and will also be administered in spring of 2017. The Benchmark assessment tool for Kindergarteners is only administered in the spring and will be operational in the spring of 2017. MDE is also participating in a learning group with the Council of Chief State School Officers - Implementing College and Career Standards (CCSSO-ICCS).

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

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

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

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

The Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) leads several activities within the RTT-ELC scope of work as it pertains to early childhood data. Over the first few years of the RTT-ELC grant, the data collection elements were established for early learning programs. CEPI maintains the data collection applications and will continue to modify as necessary to accommodate any changes.

CEPI is working to collect Great Start to Quality data, subsidized childcare data, and Early Literacy and Math data. CEPI is in discussion with the Early Childhood Investment Corporation about the collection and connection of Great Start to Quality indicators with data in the Michigan State Longitudinal Data System (MSLDS). CEPI is working with the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to determine what data elements CEPI can acquire from the Michigan BRIDGES system in order to provide additional reports beyond those in the scope of the grant. BRIDGES is the online portal for Michigan's residents to apply for child care, health care coverage, food assistance, cash assistance, and emergency services. Specific to child care BRIDGES serves as an integrated eligibility system that houses CDC cases, children and providers serving children. This system also captures correspondence sent and payments made.

Encouraging all programs to report data can be challenging, as not all programs are required to report. Head Start is one program that has optional reporting in the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS). With the release of the new national Head Start Performance Standards in September 2016, grantees are encouraged to report student data to state education data systems. CEPI will continue working to improve reports as well as provide support in the data submission process.

In 2016, progress was made toward longitudinally tracking children who receive subsidized childcare services in Michigan. CEPI, in partnership with DHHS, has been working toward this goal since 2015. DHHS collects and houses records of children receiving subsidized childcare, and CEPI matches students to education records and

assigns Unique Identification Codes (UICs). CEPI has continued working to identify and build relationships with other key data stewards in the state as well.

In late 2015, initial tests of matching the children for UIC assignment took place, and in Spring 2016, preliminary matching of students took place. This preliminary matching was to see how many students from the DHHS data could be matched with CEPI's unique identifier. This produced a 60.5 percent match rate.

In 2016, modifications were made to our existing identity management and UIC matching/assignment process to include these children. The modification not only includes the regular UIC matching, but for any child that is not matched to a UIC, they are also assigned a new UIC number. The UIC numbers are then stored in a data table that the CEPI Longitudinal Data Unit can access which allows them to do analysis on those children as well as create reports. The development has been completed and is scheduled to be operational in January 2017. CEPI also hired a new identity management analyst whose role is dedicated to the identity management and matching processes with external systems. He has been getting up to speed over the last few months and is now contributing.

When the matching occurs operationally (scheduled for January 2017), CEPI will perform analysis on the matched data. Part of that analysis will include a review of the matching algorithms to ensure that CEPI is getting the best matched results. Matching is currently scheduled to occur every other week, from July 2017 through October 2017, and then once a month from December 2017 through May 2018. This schedule will repeat for subsequent years as well. Discussions continue with DHHS about the other child-level attributes that can accompany the matching data so richer analysis can be performed.

To successfully capture students in the MSLDS, students must be assigned a UIC and have their educational data submitted to the state. Historically, these processes have been difficult for Head Start grantees, as their time and resources are limited. CEPI and the Michigan Department of Education have been working to make these processes simpler and more affordable for grantees.

In summer 2015, CEPI completed a successful pilot for requesting UICs for Head Start children. The feedback from participating grantees was positive, and the request process has been communicated to all Head Start grantees in Michigan. Grantees can now request UICs this way with the capacity they have available. After a successful UIC pilot, CEPI began planning a pilot for Michigan's Early Childhood collections, which was accomplished in 2016.

Data submitted to CEPI's Early Childhood collections in the MSDS for the 2016 pilot included personal, demographic, and educational data. Capacity to learn and work within the MSDS varies across agencies, so to make the process easier, CEPI contracted with Macomb Intermediate School District (MISD) in 2016 to supply an easier application that is compatible with MSDS. The application, known as MISDmsds, allows Head Start and other early childhood programs to upload, modify, and download their student data before submitting in MSDS. Grantees were provided the application along with two documents to help guide the data submission process: one is a file explaining how to use Microsoft Excel to map and create an XML extract, and the other explains how to use the MISDmsds software for early childhood data submission in MSDS.

The Early Childhood collections pilot included six Head Start grantees and was implemented in five phases in 2016: security access and UIC request, manual entry in MSDS, use of the MISDmsds software method, data quality, and post-pilot feedback.

Overall, grantee feedback about the Early Childhood collections pilot was positive. For small entities, using the MISDmsds software reduced the time it took to report, but for larger entities, this method proved to be time-consuming. Grantees voiced concerns about the amount of formatting that needed to be done in Excel, complications with the

MISDmsds tool, and about data characteristics that are not collected by grantees but can be submitted in MSDS. Respectively, CEPI addressed these concerns by encouraging grantees to work with their data in smaller groups so it would be easier to maintain, by making MISD aware of the issues with the tool, and by encouraging grantees to capture the missing information in their systems. At least one grantee was unable to download and take advantage of the MISDmsds application because of their local security policies. Some grantees were challenged by the data entry, as their information systems are not configured to provide a usable data extract. Grantees have also provided feedback that they need more support from the state to understand the processes and to submit the data. To address these immediate concerns so that the participating grantees can continue to share data with the state, CEPI is training the internal customer support team to better address questions as they come in from grantees. CEPI is also increasing the amount of regular communication and face-to-face training opportunities for the grantees.

Results from the Early Childhood collections pilot led CEPI back to the drawing board to encourage Head Start participation in data collection. CEPI is revisiting the idea of working with third-party early childhood data vendors with which Head Start programs contract to collect and manage child-level data. Once such vendor is ChildPlus which holds a substantial share of the Head Start market nationally. This approach would allow CEPI to collect the data directly from the vendors and provides grantees with the ability to report data to the state from within their own vendor-hosted software and not have to interact with multiple data systems. This work entails trying to find an efficient, sustainable way to retrieve the data from these third-party systems and load them into the state-wide longitudinal data system. This solution would reduce reporting burden on Head Start grantees (by reducing need for duplicate, or even triplicate, data entry) and thus improve the likelihood of sustained participation by Head Start grantees following the grant period. Data exchange between CEPI and vendors could allow for unique identifier integration, which would help with consistency in reporting the students longitudinally. There have been roadblocks in work with vendors, but CEPI is committed to crafting a solution that is acceptable for all parties.

Since November 2016, CEPI has been working on a proposal to send to popular early childhood data software vendors in 2017. Cross-state collaboration has been an important piece of this work. CEPI has been in conversation with early childhood data contacts in multiple states, learning how different states are working with data vendors and their visions moving forward, and working together to create a process that could work for different states. CEPI is also striving for an option that prioritizes compliance to an Ed-Fi data standard. Conversations with Ed-Fi Alliance began in December 2016 and will continue as work progresses.

Two new reports, titled "Early Childhood Program Participation" and "Early Childhood Kindergarten Participation," were released to the public in March 2016 through the MI School Data portal. The "Early Childhood Program Participation" report shows the early childhood programs children have been enrolled in and how many children were enrolled in these programs. The "Early Childhood Kindergarten Participation" report shows the early childhood program participation by kindergarten cohort class.

CEPI solicited feedback from different customer groups, including elementary educators and administrators, to ensure that the reports were understandable and useful. Their feedback was an important tool to ensure these reports filled Early Childhood data needs.

CEPI is preparing to release two more Early Childhood reports in early 2017. The "Early Childhood Kindergarten-Third Grade Attendance" report allows users to see elementary school absence rates based on the children having a publicly-funded early childhood program before kindergarten. Development was completed for this report in December of 2016, and final customer feedback is currently being solicited. The

anticipated release of this report is late January 2017.

The Kindergarten Pathways report allows users to observe the number of children and the program order in which a group of children were reported to have participated in early childhood programs prior to entering kindergarten. Development is underway for the Kindergarten Pathways report as of the beginning of December 2016, with an anticipated public release of March 2017. Ideas for other new data displays are now being developed and requirements gathering will begin in early 2017.

With regards to early childhood educator workforce data, the Early Childhood Investment Corporation issued an RFP in 2015 to identify a vendor to produce a Professional Development Registry system for Michigan. Collaboratively, MDE-OGS and ECIC selected New World Now as the contractor for this scope of work. New World Now was selected as the vendor, in collaboration with the Michigan Department of Education, Office of Great Start (MDE-OGS). The Professional Development Registry system was completed in 2016, incorporating data elements created by the Qualifications, Credentials, and Pathways Work Stream, a subgroup of the Professional Development Stakeholder Group led by MDE-OGS, in alignment with the National Workforce Registry Alliance standards. These data elements were accepted by the State's Professional Development Stakeholder Group and approved by the Michigan Department of Education-Office of Great Start.

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) hired an Early Childhood Data Specialist in summer 2016. Unfortunately this individual took another position late in the year and completed their service with MDE in December 2016. The position was re-posted in December and the hiring process will take place early in 2017. While this turnover slows progress on moving the scope of work forward, MDE and CEPI worked collaboratively to determine a plan for the interim until a new Data Specialist is onboard.

The Michigan Department of Education established a contract with Berry Dunn in January 2016 for the purposes of coordinating the establishment of a state-level early childhood data governance structure including appropriate representation within and outside of state government, and the development of short- and long-term implementation plans. Over the course of 2016 key stakeholders were identified for the initial phase of the data governance structure and council meetings were convened monthly beginning in April 2016. Incorporating stakeholder feedback, this council worked to identify critical questions that must be answered with data to support the early learning and development outcomes and indicators. As this scope of work is funded by the Kellogg Foundation, a request to extend the contract for an additional year through 2017 was submitted and approved. A Sustainability Plan will be established for the Early Childhood Data Governance Council within 2017.



## Data Tables

### Commitment to early learning and development.

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

<b>Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income<sup>1</sup> families, by age</b>		
	<b>Number of children from Low-Income families in the State</b>	<b>Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State</b>
<b>Infants under age 1</b>	50,757	7.37%
<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	101,502	14.75%
<b>Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry</b>	154,071	22.38%
<b>Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families</b>	306,330	44.5%

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

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

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

U.S. Census Bureau, All People Below 200% Poverty, Percentage Under 5 Years; American FactFinder B17001: Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months by Sex by Age (Male and Female Under 5 Years); Kids Count Data Center, Child Population by Single Age (2015)

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

The State should use these data to guide its thinking about where specific activities may be required to address special populations' unique needs.

Special populations: Children who	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...
Have disabilities or developmental delays <sup>1</sup>	25,087	3.6%
Are English learners <sup>2</sup>	22,689	3.3%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	2,288	0.3%
Are migrant <sup>3</sup>	2,864	0.42%
Are homeless <sup>4</sup>	3,198	0.46%
Are in foster care	3,610	0.52%
Other 1 as identified by the State	38,467	5.59%
<i>Describe:</i>	Children at 100% of Poverty or below, 0-5 years old, Rural (Not in a MSA)	
Other 2 as identified by the State	112,977	16.4%
<i>Describe:</i>	Children at 100% of Poverty or below, 0-5 years old, Urban (Not in a MSA)	

<sup>1</sup>For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children with disabilities or developmental delays are defined as children birth through kindergarten entry that have an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) or an Individual Education Plan (IEP).

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

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

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

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

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

Population of children 0-5 in the state accessed from Kids Count Data Center, Child Population by Single Age, 2015.

"Have Disabilities or Developmental Delays": Children Ages 0-5 in Special Education, Kids Count Data Center.

"Are English Learners": Center for Educational Performance and Information data request, Language Spoken at Home by Ability to Speak English (American Community Survey, US Census Bureau Table B16001)

"Reside on "Indian Lands"": U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, S0101

"Are migrant": CEPI data request, federal migrant population report, percentage estimated based on K-2 population.

"Are homeless": Consolidated State Performance Report: Part I, School Year 2015-16, 1.9.2.1, Homeless Children and Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants (Age Birth Through 2 + Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten))

"Are in foster care": Michigan Department of Health and Human Services, number of children entering care for 2016

Children in Poverty (100 percent poverty): Kids Count Data Center (total number, 2015); percent under 5 derived from U.S. Census, (all people, under 5 years, all races below 100% Poverty); divided by percentage of population urban and rural in Michigan (American FactFinder, Urban and Rural Universe)

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

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

<b>Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age</b>				
<b>Type of Early Learning and Development Program</b>	<b>Infants under age 1</b>	<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	<b>Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	0	0	38,771	38,771
<i>Specify:</i>	Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP)			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Center for Educational Performance and Information Data Request, spring 2015-16			
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	2,679	6,642	30,249	39,570
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Program Information Report (PIR) Cumulative Enrollment for 2015-2016 Reporting year (Cumulative enrollment, not funded)			
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b>	838	8,518	16,302	25,658
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	CEPI Data Request, fall 2015-16			
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b>	466	468	7,625	8,559
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Consolidated State Performance Report: Part 2 for School Year 2014-15			
<b>Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program</b>	554	6,421	11,978	18,953
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Child Care and Development program data, MDE, 2016			
<b>Other 1</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 2</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 3</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 4</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 5</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				

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

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

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

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

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

IDEA Part C, and Part B, 619 business rules: Michigan School Data System data for fall, by age range and race/ethnicity.

State-funded preschool business rules: Michigan School Data System spring count.

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

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

Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Hispanic Children	Number of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Black or African American	Number of Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Number of Non-Hispanic White Children
State-funded preschool	3,839	174	672	9,876	55	1,563	19,444
<i>Specify:</i>	Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP)						
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	6,130	763	573	13,140	25	2,779	16,425
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	774	84	189	1,844	7	337	8,104
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	1,140	128	370	2,360	17	530	10,996
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA							
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	941	135	32	9,107	4	7	7,197
Other 1							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 2							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.							

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

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

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

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

State-funded Preschool data supplied by Center for Educational Performance and Information.

Early Head Start and Head Start data supplied by State Head Start Collaboration Office, Michigan Department of Education.

Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C, and Early Learning and Development Program funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619 data supplied by CEPI.

Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program data supplied by the Child Development and Care Program office.

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

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

Funding for each Fiscal Year					
Type of investment	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
<b>Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	\$691,262	\$791,570	\$705,856	\$755,158	
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	\$109,275,000	\$174,275,000	\$239,275,000	\$243,600,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP)				
<b>State contributions to IDEA Part C</b>	0	0	0	0	
<b>State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry</b>	\$19,767,784	\$20,431,354	\$20,863,437	\$20,934,329	
<b>Total State contributions to CCDF<sup>2</sup></b>	\$51,123,693	\$45,227,916	\$38,745,208	\$36,132,376	
<b>State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met</b>	Exceeded	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>	\$1,005,842				
<b>TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs<sup>3</sup></b>	0	0	0	0	
<b>Other State contributions 1</b>	0	0	0	0	
<i>Specify:</i>	Great Parents, Great Start (parenting information and education program birth to kindergarten entry)				
<b>Other State contributions 2</b>	\$6,703,915	\$6,449,747	\$7,023,192	\$7,851,398	
<i>Specify:</i>	State reimbursements for special education programs and services under rule 340.1755				
<b>Other State contributions 3</b>	\$1,557,221	\$730,873	\$755,355	\$1,366,230	
<i>Specify:</i>	Section 31a of State School Aid Act: At Risk Early Childhood Instructional Services				
<b>Other State contributions 4</b>	\$15,775,971	\$14,918,745			
<i>Specify:</i>	Medicaid School Based Services (SBS)				
<b>Other State contributions 5</b>	\$17,652,969	\$3,194,711	\$3,508,188	\$7,971,034	
<i>Specify:</i>	Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program (MIECHV)				
<b>Other State contributions 6</b>	\$3,919,284	\$112,610	\$2,682,513	0	
<i>Specify:</i>	Office of Great Start Supplemental funds				

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

**Funding for each Fiscal Year**

Type of investment	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
<b>Other State contributions 7</b>	\$10,900,000	\$10,900,000	\$13,400,000	\$13,400,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	Early Childhood Block Grant				
<b>Other State contributions 8</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Total State contributions:</b>				<b>\$332,010,525</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.

Note: Michigan's fiscal year ends on September 30th.

Supplemental Funding Early Head Start and Head Start: Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program (Title V) funding supporting Head Start and Early Head Start. Data provided by the Michigan Department of Community Health.

State-funded preschool: Great Start Readiness Program - GSRP History of Funding 2015-16.

State Contributions to IDEA Part C: See state reimbursements for programs for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages birth to age three under rule 340.1755.

State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry: Office of Special Education calculation for programs under Michigan Administrative Rule 340.1754.

Total State contributions to CCDF and State match to CCDF: ACF-696 4th Quarter Report. The state's contributions to CCDF dropped in Michigan because funding is appropriated through a caseload consensus process. Funds are appropriated to cover the cost of cases. As our cases have decreased so has our funding appropriation, which means not all of our federal funding is appropriated each year. State General Fund contribution is based on the appropriated amount, not the federal award amount.

TANF Spending on Early Learning and Development Programs: Michigan does not directly appropriate TANF funding to directly support the care of children.

State reimbursements for programs for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages birth to age three under rule 340.1755: Office of Special Education calculation for programs under Michigan Administrative Rule 340.1755. Special education expenses are driven by the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) for each child/student, and thus fluctuates from year-to-year dependent on the number of children receiving services, as well as the intensity and duration of the delivery of the services written on the IFSP.

Great Parents, Great Start: Originally appropriated under State School Aid Act

section 32j, Great Parents, Great Start funds were collapsed into the Early Childhood Block Grant in 2012. Great Parents, Great Start is a parent involvement and education program for families with children from ages birth to kindergarten entry.

Section 31a of State School Aid Act: At Risk Early Childhood Instructional Services: Estimate based on programs receiving funding from 31a.

Medicaid School Based Services (SBS): Program helps defray some of the costs of health care and related services delivered to students under IDEA Part B, section 619 and C. Historical funding provided by the Michigan Department of Community Health, latest data available is for 2014. Data for 2015 was not available at time of 2015 APR. Data not yet available for 2016.

Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program (MIECHV): MIECHV funding, based on federal awards made to Michigan for the federal grant year. (This does not represent how much funding we have to spend during a particular spending period, only new federal awards that were made during the time frame.) FY2014 is the most recent data available. Data provided by MDHHS. The figure reported regarding the MIECHV does not represent the state contribution to MIECHV, it represents the amount of the federal MIECHV award to Michigan in the specific reporting year. In FY2013, the state received a large three-year MIECHV Competitive grant plus the annual Formula grant; in FY2014, only the Formula grant was received. The federal MIECHV awards are included in this chart because they, in turn, contribute to the overall effort in the state to implement a comprehensive early childhood system e.g., home visiting - regardless of fund source - is a resource that contributes to the comprehensive early childhood system.

Office of Great Start Supplemental Funds: Funds for the development of a kindergarten entry status assessment and implementation of Great Start to Quality were appropriated in P.A. 29 of 2012. Funding was made available through 9/30/2015, at a total of \$12,500,000 over the course of three years. Data provided reflects actual expenditures for each year 2013 through 2015. Numbers reported for 2014 and 2015 are corrections to reflect amount of actual expenditures in each year, not including indirect costs.

Early Childhood Block Grant: Funds are appropriated under section 32p of the State School Aid Act.

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

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

<b>Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program<sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>Type of Early Learning and Development Program</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b> (annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)	23,879	30,517	37,506	35,623	
<i>Specify:</i>	Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP) (funded enrollment)				
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>2</sup></b> (funded enrollment)	37,313	41,310	34,255	39,570	
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b> (annual December 1 count)	30,289	29,718	21,042	25,658	
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b> (total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report )	11,677	8,440	8,264	8,559	
<b>Programs receiving CCDF funds</b> (average monthly served)	27,215	23,635	17,510	18,953	
<b>Other 1</b>	8,458	0	0	0	
<i>Describe:</i>	Great Parents, Great Start (GPGS)				
<b>Other 2</b>	1,584	1,296	1,752	1,119	
<i>Describe:</i>	Section 31a of State School Aid Act: At Risk Early Childhood Instructional Services				
<b>Other 3</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 4</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 5</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 6</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 7</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 8</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					

<sup>1</sup> Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.

<sup>2</sup> Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

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

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

State-funded preschool count provided by Center for Educational Performance and Information.

Early Head Start and Head Start data provided by State Head Start Collaboration Office, MDE. Number reflects number of slots available. Count is not unduplicated.

Programs funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 count provided by CEPI.

Programs receiving CCDF funding count provided by Child Development and Care Program, MDE.

Section 31a of State School Aid Act count provided by Office of Field Services.

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

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

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

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

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Budget and Expenditures

### Budget Summary Table Narrative

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

In 2016, Michigan spent 35% or \$10,812,089 of the allocated funding within the Year Three budget. The total budget available in Year Three and associated spending was reflective of carry-over of unspent funds from Years 1 and 2 of the grant. While Year 3 spending increased significantly from Year 2 the expenditures for Year 3 reflect a discrepancy with the overall Year 3 budget that is inclusive of carry-over from Years 1 and 2. The following items have contributed to under spending the total Year 3 allocation:

- Across the Year Three project budgets, there was a total of \$1,041,106 in unspent staffing funds due to the delay on all projects resulting from the time it took in Year 1 to establish the infrastructure for the grant. Furthermore, turnover in project management staff in Year 2 has contributed to unexpended funds. Staffing has also been impacted by the 2015 merge of the Department of Human Services and Department of Community Health;
- Fringe benefit costs were also less than anticipated, with \$831,852 in unexpended funds. This cost reduction can be attributed to actual benefits coming in under projections as positions were hired, as well as delayed hiring;
- Given the delay on some aspects of the scope of work, budgeted travel was underspent by \$105,961. Year 4 of the grant will rely more heavily on travel funds, especially given the need to engage stakeholders statewide in a geographically diverse state;
- Supplies funding was underspent by \$33,747 due to delays in staff hiring;
- Training Stipends were budgeted for \$5,000, and \$0 was spent due to delay in hiring lead staff for Project 3;
- Contractual costs were underspent by \$15,193,395 because of delays within the scope of work. These delays resulted from the time required during Year 1 to establish the infrastructure for the grant, turnover of project management staff during Year 2, and significant delays to Project 3 due to the 2015 merge of the Department of Human Services and Department of Community Health and emerging water crisis in Flint in 2016.

In December 2016, Michigan submitted a detailed plan to accelerate spending, including a request to repurpose a total of \$8.3 million dollars toward activities that expand upon those currently within the scope of work or align well with projects within the grant. Beyond this request Michigan plans to distribute Year 3 unspent funds from travel, equipment, supplies, training stipends, and other lines into Year 4. In addition to the budget amendment request submitted in December, Michigan will submit a request for a one year no-cost extension by April 2017 with a plan to expend all RTT-ELC funds by the end of 2018.

**Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes**

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

The substantive change to the RTT-ELC budget for Year 4 would result from the budget amendment request submitted December 2016 to re-purpose \$8.3 million toward activities that expand upon those currently within the scope of work or align well with projects within the grant. Of the \$8.3 million requested for re-purposing, nearly \$5.8 million dollars of this total amount is from Project 4. This request is described within the report. Beyond this budget amendment request Michigan plans to distribute Year 3 unspent funds from travel, equipment, supplies, training stipends, and other lines into Year 4 to support ongoing program work.

## **Project Budget 1**

**Project Name: Grant Management and Governance**

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

The Year 3 budget for Project 1 included carry over of unspent funds from Years 1 and 2 of the grant. While Year 3 spending increased significantly from Year 2 the expenditures for Year 3 reflect a discrepancy with the overall Year 3 budget that is inclusive of carry-over from Years 1 and 2. Michigan will submit a request for a one year no-cost extension by April 2017 with a plan to expend all RTT-ELC funds by the end of 2018.

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

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

Michigan does not anticipate substantive changes in the budget for Year 4. The Year 3 budget rollover will be added to the Year 4 budget to support the payment for ongoing program work.

## **Project Budget 2**

**Project Name:** Improving Quality through Increased Participation in Great Start to Quality

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

The Year 3 budget for Project 2 included carry over of unspent funds from Years 1 and 2 of the grant. While Year 3 spending increased significantly from Year 2 the expenditures for Year 3 reflect a discrepancy with the overall Year 3 budget that is inclusive of carry-over from Years 1 and 2. With the full launch of Participation Bonuses and Quality Improvement Grants in Year 3 it is anticipated that Project 2 spending will accelerate significantly in Year 4. Michigan will submit a request for a one year no-cost extension by April 2017 with a plan to expend all RTT-ELC funds by the end of 2018.

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

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

Michigan does not anticipate substantive changes in the budget for Year 4. The Year 3 budget rollover will be added to the Year 4 budget to support the payment for ongoing program work.

## **Project Budget 3**

**Project Name: Promotion of Physical and Social-Emotional Health**

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

In 2015 the Department of Community Health and Department of Human Services merged to become the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services. On January 5, 2016, Governor Snyder issued a proclamation declaring a state of emergency within the city of Flint, due to significant lead contamination in the city water supply. These two events have contributed to significant delays with Project 3. Late in 2016 the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services established a plan to hire the lead staff necessary for implementing activities by December 2016, and those positions have been filled. Timelines have been adjusted accordingly for Project 3.

The Year 3 budget for Project 3 included carry over of unspent funds from Years 1 and 2 of the grant. In December 2016, Michigan submitted a detailed plan to accelerate spending, including a request to repurpose a total of \$8.3 million dollars toward activities that expand upon those currently within the scope of work or align well with projects within the grant. Of the \$8.3 million requested for repurposing, \$1.3 million dollars is from Project 3.

In addition to the budget amendment request submitted in December, Michigan will submit a request for a one year no-cost extension by April 2017 with a plan to expend all RTT-ELC funds by the end of 2018.

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

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

Of the \$8.3 million requested for repurposing, \$1.3 million dollars is from Project 3. Remaining funds from the Year 3 budget rollover will be added to the Year 4 budget to support the payment for ongoing program work.

## **Project Budget 4**

**Project Name:** Enhancing Great Start to Quality System

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

Nearly \$5.8 million dollars of Project 4 was budgeted for Child Care Scholarships. In December 2016, Michigan submitted a budget amendment request to repurpose \$8.3 million dollars, inclusive of the amount budgeted for Child Care Scholarships in Project 4. The purpose for this request is described in the full report.

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

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

As discussed in this report, Michigan is requesting to repurpose the child care scholarship dollars from Project 4 toward activities that expand upon those currently within the scope of work or align well with projects within the grant. Remaining funds from the Year 3 budget rollover will be added to the Year 4 budget to support the payment for ongoing program work.

## **Project Budget 5**

**Project Name:** Improving the Early Learning Child Care Workforce

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

The Year 3 budget for Project 3 included carry over of unspent funds from Years 1 and 2 of the grant. While Year 3 spending increased significantly from Year 2 the expenditures for Year 3 reflect a discrepancy with the overall Year 3 budget that is inclusive of carry-over from Years 1 and 2. Michigan will submit a request for a one year no-cost extension by April 2017 with a plan to expend all RTT-ELC funds by the end of 2018.

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

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

As part of the budget amendment request submitted in December 2016, Michigan seeks to increase the Project 5 budget by \$2.8 million to strengthen Michigan's early childhood workforce, inclusive of additional funding to award more education scholarships. In addition, remaining funds from the Year 3 budget rollover will be added to the Year 4 budget to support the payment for ongoing program work.

## Project Budget 6

**Project Name:** Measuring Outcomes for Children, Programs, & Educators

---

### Project Budget Narrative

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

The Year 3 budget for Project 6 included carry over of unspent funds from Years 1 and 2 of the grant. While Year 3 spending increased significantly from Year 2 the expenditures for Year 3 reflect a discrepancy with the overall Year 3 budget that is inclusive of carry-over from Years 1 and 2. In December 2016, Michigan submitted a detailed plan to accelerate spending, including a request to repurpose \$8.3 million dollars toward activities that expand upon those currently within the scope of work or align well with projects within the grant. In addition to the budget amendment request submitted in December, Michigan will submit a request for a one year no-cost extension by April 2017 with a plan to expend all RTT-ELC funds by the end of 2018.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

Of the \$8.3 million requested for repurposing, close to \$1 million is from Project 6 due to the QRIS Validation project costing less than originally budgeted. Otherwise, remaining funds from the Year 3 budget rollover will be added to the Year 4 budget to support the payment for ongoing program work.

## **Project Budget 7**

### **Project Name: Increasing Family Engagement**

---

#### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

Activities in Project 7 have been slow to launch as the Family Engagement Specialist was hired in February 2016. In summer 2016, Michigan submitted a budget amendment request to leverage additional effort to implement Project 7 activities. Spending for the Trusted Advisors, Specialized Consultants and Parent/Community Cafes did not occur in 2016. However, the Trusted Advisor funds are expected to be awarded early in 2017 and the Specialized Consultants implementing the Parent/Community Cafes are to be hired by April 2017. In December 2016, Michigan submitted a detailed plan to accelerate spending, including a request to repurpose \$8.3 million dollars toward activities that expand upon those currently within the scope of work or align well with projects within the grant. In addition to the budget amendment request submitted in December, Michigan will submit a request for a one year no-cost extension by April 2017 with a plan to expend all RTT-ELC funds by the end of 2018.

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

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

As part of the budget amendment request submitted in December 2016, Michigan seeks to increase the Project 7 budget by nearly \$2.5 million to expand the work of Trusted Advisors and Family Engagement Consultation. In addition, remaining funds from the Year 3 budget rollover will be added to the Year 4 budget to support the payment for ongoing program work.

**Project Budget 8**

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

***MICHIGAN'S RTT-ELC APPLICATION INCLUDED 7 PROJECTS.  
PAGES 92-113 HAVE BEEN DELETED.***

### RTT-ELC Summary of Actual Expenditures

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$108,559.70	\$580,920.73	\$707,455.90	\$0.00	\$1,396,936.33
2. Fringe Benefits	\$65,169.92	\$381,597.04	\$462,758.03	\$0.00	\$909,524.99
3. Travel	\$2,837.04	\$14,893.13	\$8,909.14	\$0.00	\$26,639.31
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$5,896.86	\$21,108.07	\$33,132.07	\$0.00	\$60,137.00
6. Contractual	\$121,059.25	\$1,926,199.63	\$8,346,815.09	\$0.00	\$10,394,073.97
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$4,528.59	\$155,500.11	\$799,129.08	\$0.00	\$959,157.78
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$308,051.36	\$3,080,218.71	\$10,358,199.31	\$0.00	\$13,746,469.38
10. Indirect Costs*	\$20,946.04	\$161,655.03	\$217,655.95	\$0.00	\$400,257.02
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$21,911.86	\$122,878.75	\$281,893.36	\$0.00	\$426,683.97
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$15,649.08	\$25,803.61	\$49,293.93	\$0.00	\$90,746.62
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$366,558.34	\$3,390,556.10	\$10,907,042.55	\$0.00	\$14,664,156.99
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$366,558.34	\$3,390,556.10	\$10,907,042.55	\$0.00	\$14,664,156.99

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 1 - Create a comprehensive governance/advisory structure that will coordinate and streamline the early learning system in Michigan through strong leadership, stakeholder involvement, and a multi-agency coordination plan.**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$80,753.88	\$326,971.24	\$471,056.44	\$0.00	\$878,781.56
2. Fringe Benefits	\$57,871.43	\$253,620.59	\$368,776.10	\$0.00	\$680,268.12
3. Travel	\$1,526.72	\$338.88	\$5,403.34	\$0.00	\$7,268.94
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$5,638.78	\$14,861.25	\$17,917.23	\$0.00	\$38,417.26
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	\$4,232.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,232.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$150,022.81	\$595,791.96	\$863,153.11	\$0.00	\$1,608,967.88
10. Indirect Costs*	\$13,572.72	\$66,530.97	\$92,866.00	\$0.00	\$172,969.69
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$21,911.86	\$122,878.75	\$281,893.36	\$0.00	\$426,683.97
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$15,649.08	\$25,803.61	\$49,293.93	\$0.00	\$90,746.62
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$201,156.47	\$811,005.29	\$1,287,206.40	\$0.00	\$2,299,368.16
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$201,156.47	\$811,005.29	\$1,287,206.40	\$0.00	\$2,299,368.16

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 2 - Develop and implement effective strategies for improving the quality of early learning environments, across provider types, through increased participation in Great Start to Quality (GSQ), Michigan's tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS)**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$22,748.25	\$176,130.11	\$182,313.69	\$0.00	\$381,192.05
2. Fringe Benefits	\$6,065.27	\$95,827.83	\$69,048.77	\$0.00	\$170,941.87
3. Travel	\$1,310.32	\$14,554.25	\$3,371.56	\$0.00	\$19,236.13
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$258.08	\$6,246.82	\$9,022.43	\$0.00	\$15,527.33
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$736,562.54	\$6,032,521.52	\$0.00	\$6,769,084.06
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$296.59	\$153,331.94	\$799,129.08	\$0.00	\$952,757.61
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$30,678.51	\$1,182,653.49	\$7,095,407.05	\$0.00	\$8,308,739.05
10. Indirect Costs*	\$4,601.78	\$52,590.71	\$113,917.28	\$0.00	\$171,109.77
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$35,280.29	\$1,235,244.20	\$7,209,324.33	\$0.00	\$8,479,848.82
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$35,280.29	\$1,235,244.20	\$7,209,324.33	\$0.00	\$8,479,848.82

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 3 - Support an early learning and development system that meets the physical and social-emotional health development needs of young children, and increases the availability of high quality early learning and development programs--particularly for families and children in Pathways to Potential communities**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$4,679.90	\$15,558.44	\$0.00	\$20,238.34
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$1,985.06	\$12,063.82	\$0.00	\$14,048.88
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$134.24	\$0.00	\$134.24
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,192.41	\$0.00	\$6,192.41
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$36,987.34	\$0.00	\$36,987.34
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	\$6,664.96	\$70,936.25	\$0.00	\$77,601.21
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$1,180.24	\$350.44	\$0.00	\$1,530.68
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$7,845.20	\$71,286.69	\$0.00	\$79,131.89
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$7,845.20	\$71,286.69	\$0.00	\$79,131.89

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 4 - Support an early learning system that enhances access for families and children to high-quality early learning programs and services.**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$2,179.34	\$37,626.50	\$28,019.88	\$0.00	\$67,825.72
2. Fringe Benefits	\$308.32	\$16,102.98	\$9,359.52	\$0.00	\$25,770.82
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	\$146,911.50	\$463,834.60	\$0.00	\$610,746.10
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$2,168.17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,168.17
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$2,487.66	\$202,809.15	\$501,214.00	\$0.00	\$706,510.81
10. Indirect Costs*	\$373.16	\$20,001.32	\$7,694.55	\$0.00	\$28,069.03
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$2,860.82	\$222,810.47	\$508,908.55	\$0.00	\$734,579.84
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$2,860.82	\$222,810.47	\$508,908.55	\$0.00	\$734,579.84

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 5 - Support access to highly qualified early childhood educators for all children in Michigan**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$120,675.38	\$886,490.86	\$1,496,266.68	\$0.00	\$2,503,432.92
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)	\$120,675.38	\$886,490.86	\$1,496,266.68	\$0.00	\$2,503,432.92
10. Indirect Costs*	\$1,825.00	\$1,825.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,650.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$122,500.38	\$888,315.86	\$1,496,266.68	\$0.00	\$2,507,082.92
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$122,500.38	\$888,315.86	\$1,496,266.68	\$0.00	\$2,507,082.92

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 6 - Build an early learning data system that provides information (anonymously and in aggregate) on children across departments and programs and allows the State to assess programs' value to parents and children.**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$2,878.23	\$35,512.98	\$10,507.45	\$0.00	\$48,898.66
2. Fringe Benefits	\$924.90	\$14,060.58	\$3,509.82	\$0.00	\$18,495.30
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	\$383.87	\$146,353.52	\$296,385.26	\$0.00	\$443,122.65
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)	\$4,187.00	\$195,927.08	\$310,402.53	\$0.00	\$510,516.61
10. Indirect Costs*	\$573.38	\$17,813.73	\$2,126.81	\$0.00	\$20,513.92
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$4,760.38	\$213,740.81	\$312,529.34	\$0.00	\$531,030.53
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$4,760.38	\$213,740.81	\$312,529.34	\$0.00	\$531,030.53

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 7 - Invest in intensive family engagement and support strategies designed to increase access to high-quality early learning and development programs with an emphasis in Pathways to Potential (P2P) communities**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$9,881.21	\$20,819.69	\$0.00	\$30,700.90
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	\$9,881.21	\$20,819.69	\$0.00	\$30,700.90
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$1,713.06	\$700.87	\$0.00	\$2,413.93
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$11,594.27	\$21,520.56	\$0.00	\$33,114.83
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$11,594.27	\$21,520.56	\$0.00	\$33,114.83

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.