Early Learning Challenge

2016
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

Oregon

JUNE2017

Race to the Top
Early Learning Challenge

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

Oregon

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 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.

Race to the Top
Early Learning Challenge

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

Race to the Top
Early Learning Challenge

Performance Report: Cover Sheet

General Information

1. PR/Award#: S412A130030-13A
2. Grantee Name Early Learning Division, Oregon Department of Education
3. Grantee Address 775 Summer St NE

City: Salem

State: Oregon Zip: 97301

4. Project Director Name: Nakeshia Knight-Coyle

Title: Director of Early Learning Programs and Cross Systems Integration

Phone #: (503) 947-0023 Ext.: Fax #: 503-947-1955

Email: nakeshia.knight-coyle@state.or.us

Reporting Period Information

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

Indirect Cost Information

6. Indirect Costs

a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? (●) Yes ( ) No

b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s) approved by the Federal Government? (●) Yes ( ) No

c. If yes, provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s): From: 07/01/2015 To: 06/30/2017

Approving Federal agency: ☑ ED ☐ HHS ☐ Other Specify other:

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

Executive Summary

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

In 2016, Oregon continued on its trajectory to creating a dynamic early learning system capable of anticipating and addressing the myriad and diverse needs of its children and families. Efforts are guided by the state's 40-40-20 goals: by 2025, 40% of adult Oregonians will earn a bachelor's degree or higher; 40% will earn an associate's degree; and 20% will earn a high school diploma or equivalent. Oregon's early learning system aims to support children to learn and thrive by focusing on three statutory goals: ensure that 1) children arrive at kindergarten ready to succeed; 2), families are healthy, stable and attached; and 3) the early learning system is coordinated, aligned and family-centered.

Through funding that reinforces essential infrastructure, the Race to the Top- Early Learning Challenge grant (RTT-ELC) has been integral to Oregon's efforts to meet the goals outlined above by cultivating quality early learning environments, where cross-systems coordination occur, staff are well trained, culturally-responsive practices are the norm, and parents are engaged.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The 2016 Annual Performance Report offers highlights from the fourth year of Oregon's RTT-ELC grant. As the following highlights show, we have had a very productive year.

Building an Equity-Driven System

Oregon continues to operationalize our vision of an early learning system, where equitable outcomes are achieved and each child and family has access to meaningful learning opportunities. Racially, ethnically, and linguistically diverse children, and children and families in poverty are disproportionately impacted by systems of oppression. This creates a lack of opportunity and access to systems of support. Addressing this opportunity and access gap is a first and major step toward achieving equity for all of children and families in Oregon. The Early Learning Division has created a pathway to make our vision of an equity-driven early learning system actionable.

The Early Learning Division's equity goal is to create a state- and regional-wide culture that supports the eradication of systemic oppression, while developing a framework that will conscientiously interrupt systems of oppression by creating equitable policies, practices, and procedures that produce the outcomes needed to narrow the current and predictable racial achievement gap by:

- Improving the Divisions capacity to design and deliver equity-centered professional development for staff. With the no cost-extension, the ELD had an opportunity to extend the timeline for the execution of the projects that were outlined in the original plan. We wanted to learn from the lessons of other agencies around us, and create a learning atmosphere that would allow staff members the time and energy to focus on job embedded equity focused content. We did not want to make the mistake of overwhelming staff with a lot of content without opportunities to apply what they would learn to their jobs. To create job embedded equity focused content, we developed a work alignment plan that mapped out the current capacity building work of the division and the future work. With this information, we found that half of ELD was in the middle of a leadership training. To avoid training fatigue, we scheduled the equity training, funding by Race to the Top, to start after the completion of the 2016 leadership

trainings. In preparation for the equity leadership trainings, we worked alongside that contractor to make sure that equity was embedded in their training. After the completion of this training and the holiday season, we sent out our 2017 equity leadership training announcement. These trainings will commenced in February 2017 and end in November 2017.

- Improving equity-centered child care, preschool and home visiting leadership and support.

- Implementing equity-centered policies, practices, and procedures, and outcomes to create antiracist, anti-bias environments within the early learning system in the state.

In 2016, we continued to work towards promoting the following:

- Positive, anti-racism, anti-bias, and anti-privilege environments within the early learning system;
- Culturally relevant verbal and written communications;
- Accurate, accessible, consistent and comprehensive data; and
- Diverse and inclusive early learning system workforce, including leadership, staff, contractors, and early learning providers.

Focusing on these four areas has resulted in individual, institutional, and structural changes that build the foundation to accomplish the early learning goals. Examples of successful equity efforts include the addition of deliverables and language in our contracts that requires contractors to self-administer the `Tool for Organizational Self-Assessment Related to Racial Equity' developed by the Coalition of Communities of Color (http://www.coalitioncommunitiescolor.org/research-data-tools/cccorgassessment) and completes structural racism training. Early Learning Division staff were also trained.

Establishing Successful State Systems

As outlined above, Oregon's early learning system has three statutory goals: to support Oregon's children to enter kindergarten ready to succeed; ensure children are raised in healthy, stable and attached families and integrate resources and services statewide into a coordinated system for parents and families. The RTT-ELC grant has enabled us to build and sustain our infrastructure to such a level that our state legislature is now investing in our work. Oregon made substantial progress on these goals in the last year through its policy body (Early Learning Council), regional Early Learning Hub system, and stakeholder engagement and communications. Each of these accomplishments is summarized below.

Early Learning Council

The Early Learning Council continues to guide the policy, direction and development of the early learning system. Megan Irwin stepped down from her position as the Early Learning Systems Director. David Mandell was appointed by Governor Kate Brown as the Interim Director, while a nationwide search for a permanent Director ensues.

During 2016, the Early Learning Council engaged in deliberations and discussions relevant to adopting or amending Oregon Administrative Rules to implement and regulate the federal Child Care and Development Fund regulations. In addition to CCDF regulatory issues, the adopted rules for the newly created Preschool Promise program.

Early Learning Hubs

Early Learning Hubs continue to serve a critical role in their local communities as well as the Early Learning system. Having achieved statewide coverage in 2015, Hubs continue to engage partners from early childhood, K-12 education, health, human services, and the business sectors around a common vision and shared measurable outcomes for children and families. While Hubs are at different stages of development, they are all responsible for identifying children for whom the existing system has not sufficiently prepared for kindergarten. A major aspect of Hubs is its emphasis on measurable outcomes that are shared across systems, moving beyond a fragmented system to one that is coordinated, aligned, and collectively accountable to our children and families. RTT-ELC funding has been instrumental in these efforts. In 2016, several Hubs began using cross sector data to inform decisions and make quality improvements. In addition, ELD and Hubs co-designed a monitoring system to evaluate cross sector collaboration. Finally, Hubs are playing an active role in setting the agendas for quarterly learning collaborative sessions, which provide opportunities for peer-to-peer exchange and learning.

Stakeholder Engagement and Communications

Stakeholder engagement is a value to our work and is considered essential to our efforts to build a world-class early learning system. The "Principles of Community Engagement" continue to be applied across our system to ensure that our work incorporates and reflects the input of myriad stakeholders impacted by our work. RTT-ELC funding has helped us to build staff capacity to develop and lead this work.

2016 was an exciting year. Additional communication-related highlights include the following:

- We began development of a new website that, when completed, will combine child care licensing with early learning programs and resources in one centralized location. On April 10th the Early Learning Division launched its new website www.oregonearlylearning.com. This website connects the Office of Child Care with the rest of the Early Learning Division and provides an on-line space that will benefit parents, families, providers, educators and the community. The new site will be easy for families and partners to navigate and accessible for anyone seeking information.

- Oregon's TQRIS was rebranded as SPARK.

- Community engagement occurred in multiple languages across the state, in person and survey methods to gather input on both the rebranding and revisions for TQRIS (SPARK).

- We continue to work with the Bezos Foundation to roll out Vroom statewide, with particular emphasis on reaching children and families from traditionally underserved communities. (https://oregonearlylearning.com/VROOM/)

- Preschool Promise, a new publicly-funded preschool program serving three- and four-year olds living in families up to 200% FPL and that builds upon the Oregon's TQRIS and Early Learning Hub system, was launched. 1300 enrollment opportunities were awarded across five Hubs (Marion & Polk Early Learning Hub, Inc., Southern Oregon Early Learning Hub Lane Early Learning Alliance, South-Central Early Learning Hub Eastern Oregon Early Learning Hub and one Hub region (Northwest Regional Early Learning Hub, Early Learning Multnomah, Clackamas Early Learning Hub, Early Learning Washington). (https://oregonearlylearning.com/preschool-promise)

Defining High-Quality, Accountable Programs
RTT-ELC funding has been instrumental in efforts to operationalize Oregon's TQRIS, a key strategy for achieving the system goal of ensuring that children arrive at kindergarten ready to learn. This is accomplished through the expansion of the supply of and access to high quality Early Learning and Development Programs (ELDP).

Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System
In 2016, Validation Study-1 was completed and published. All five components of the QRIS are currently being revised: Standards, Accountability/Monitoring/Rating, Supports, Financial Incentives, and Consumer Engagement. The revisions are based on a number of data points and input, including the validation study, process evaluation, stakeholder input, national TA and trends, best practices, and state priorities.

In addition, we continue to work with our “commitment to quality” programs that have intentionally engaged in quality improvements but have not been rated yet. As of present, all of our Oregon Prekindergarten/ Head Start programs are in TQRIS. While there remains work to be done in individual sites, we continue to make great progress towards getting all of our sites licensed.

In addition, a system of tiered reimbursement to star-rated programs receiving CCDF funded Employment Related Day Care (ERDC) subsidy was implemented, known as Provider Incentive Payments. Reduced copays were also implemented for parents receiving child care subsidies, who voluntarily choose a star-rated provider.

We continue to work towards aligning TQRIS with Early Learning Hubs around a set of shared metrics and joint work with Focused Networks of providers of color and Russian and Spanish speaking providers.

Professional Development
Oregon maintained its commitment to create a system that offers high quality and accessible practitioner training. Additional trainings were added to Oregon's professional development system specifically in response to needs in TQRIS domains and standards, such as the Ages and Stages Questionnaire-3 ASQ-3. Efforts continue to be made to diversify and provide technical assistance to providers through Child Care Resource and Referral Programs.

Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children
In 2016, Oregon continues to engage a cross section of stakeholders and partners and work towards the development and implementation of shared goals that support our system goals of kindergarten readiness; healthy, stable and families; and aligned, coordinated, and family-centered systems.

Standards Alignment
We completed the process of aligning Oregon's learning and developmental standards for children aged three to five with Oregon's kindergarten Common Core State Standards in the domains of language and communication, literacy, and mathematics. Additionally, our work group of external stakeholders and experts finalized new kindergarten standards in the domains of approaches to learning and social-emotional development, which also aligns with Oregon's early learning standards. The creation of these new kindergarten standards provides a crucial bridge for connecting early learning and K-3 education, and is designed to strengthen children's readiness for kindergarten and beyond in important non-cognitive skill

areas. Each of these sets of newly aligned standards will be published in February, 2017 in a document titled Oregon's Early Learning and Kindergarten Guidelines.

Health Promotion

In 2016, Oregon continued to make major progress in all areas of health promotion. Highlights include: (1) delivery of workforce development trainings on implementation of developmental screening in early childhood settings, (2) development and delivery of webinars on topics relevant to developmental screening, (3) leveraging of other funds to support health promotion goals, (4) cross-systems coordination to support health and early learning system transformation, (5) exploration of electronic sharing of developmental screening results and (6) an equity focus in all components of our work.

A final Training of Trainers (TOT) for the ASQ-3 was conducted, with targeted outreach to dual language speakers and a focus on culturally responsive screening. This brings the project to a total of five TOTs across diverse regions of the state. Oregon now has 108 Master Trainers and 29 Home Visiting Field Specialists trained and equipped with the curriculum and all accompanying resources and tools to conduct Training of Providers (TOPs) for early childhood professionals throughout Oregon. Of the 137 trained trainers, 22 are Spanish-speaking, four are Russian-speaking, one can train in Japanese, one in Chinese and Vietnamese, and one in American Sign Language. The Oregon Center for Career Development (OCCD) Professional Development Registry has been a partner throughout this project and provides official professional development credit for this training. Two communities of practice were also conducted to support ASQ-3 trainers who conduct trainings in languages other than English.

Developing and Supporting a Professional Early Childhood Education Workforce

Oregon has a robust professional development system with a Career Lattice that connects with state licensing data and tracks ongoing training requirements and degree attainment. In 2016,
Oregon's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, also known as the Core Body of Knowledge (CBK), went through an extensive community engagement process among the early learning workforce community. As of 2016, 12 (out of 17) of Oregon's Community Colleges use CBK in their early childhood Care and Education Degree curriculum.

In 2016, the Oregon Center for Career Development added an, “Oregon Registry and Community College” section on their website. The section includes a map of the state of Oregon with details about the community colleges including links and a google maps photo of the college, and the college's “credit for prior learning” criteria.

RTT-ELC funding has been essential to efforts to create a sustainable system of supports for our early learning workforce. We continue to work with our state Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program leads to build from this work and develop a plan for creating an integrated early childhood professional development system for home visitors.

Measuring Outcomes and Progress

Kindergarten Assessment

In 2016, Oregon completed the fourth statewide administration of the kindergarten assessment. The focus during this period was on strengthening both the administration and content of the assessment. This work aligns with the cross-agency Kindergarten Assessment work plan developed in 2015 which identified four primary focus areas: communications, data analysis and interpretation, training and technical assistance, and continuous improvement.

As a result of stakeholder feedback and an alignment study of Oregon's Early Learning and Common Core State Standards, the Early Literacy measures were revised to provide, with increased accuracy, a picture of the strengths of Oregon's incoming kindergartners and a measurement of growth over time. Effective in the Fall of 2016, the Oregon Department of Education modified the security provision for Oregon's Kindergarten Assessment so that more information about what is assessed could be shared with parents and communities, allowing for greater transparency about the assessment and is uses. Oregon reconvened the Kindergarten Assessment Advisory Panel (comprised of early learning professionals, kindergarten teachers, school district administrators, and university researchers) to review the assessment, examined data, and provided recommendations for implementation and future revisions. The panel also provided recommendations to ensure that test items and implementation procedures are culturally responsive and help to eliminate opportunity gaps from communities of color and students who are emerging bilinguals.
A part of an ongoing commitment to strengthening assessment measures, implementation supports, and data interpretation, Oregon engages in research and collaborates with other states around the development of new and improved assessments for kindergarten entry. For example, Oregon is participating in the K-3 Assessment Consortium led by North Carolina.

CHALLENGES AND STRATEGIES

While we continue to make meaningful progress towards meeting our systems goals, we have also encountered challenges. For example, maintaining cross-agency/cross-system relationships and focus on shared goals and outcomes, amid significant system-level reforms. Our biggest opportunity as we approach the end of the RTT-ELC grant is to truly hold each system accountable to a shared set of outcome metrics, work Oregon is now prepared to do thanks to the groundwork laid through the initiatives funded through this grant. We are fortunate to work with partners who are invested in creating a strong and sustainable system of support for our children and families. Early Learning Hubs also play an important role in this. Beyond the life of RTT-ELC, Oregon is poised to build upon the foundation established through the grant.

In addition to the challenges and inherent opportunities in cross-systems work, Oregon experienced delays in TQRIS revisions. This is due to the prioritized need to engage our communities, which required additional time, yet is important to ensuring that culturally and linguistically diverse populations have an opportunity to provide input. In addition, Validation Study-1 took more time to complete than anticipated. With a solid plan and timeline in place as well as the additional time allotted through our no-cost extension, we are excited to begin implementation in the Fall of 2017.

Oregon also faced challenges in efforts to develop the Early Learning Information System (ELIS) due to a couple of factors. First, the Request-for-Application (RFP) process undertaken by the state to identify a vendor to develop the system took longer than expected. Second, key staff changes resulted in delays in our original timeline as well as a need to clarify the intent of ELIS and the project work plan. We have successfully worked through these challenges and are enthusiastic about wrapping this work up during year five of the grant.

Finally, despite the great strides we are making in creating and promoting policies and practices aimed at addressing equity in our Early Learning system, we continue to be challenged to ensure that staff has the necessary information and resources to manage their contracts and projects. This includes offering multiple opportunities for ELD staff and system partners to participate in trainings and discussions that elevate understanding. This work is

foundational and requires on-going and regular opportunities for learning. It also requires an intentional focus on individual, institutional and structural bias. This is an area where we will continue to target efforts in the upcoming year and beyond. We are appreciative of RTT-ELC for contributing to this important, transformational body of work.

In closing, RTT-ELC has been instrumental in launching a new phase of systems change in Oregon. This has been accomplished through funding and technical supports that have assisted us in our efforts to reach children and families furthest from opportunities using strategies that aim to improve the quality and availability of culturally responsive resources that support all of Oregon's children and families to learn and thrive. The strides we have made towards developing relationships with myriad partners representing different systems have laid a foundation for continued partnership. The work launched under RTT-ELC has set us on the trajectory towards success at meeting the state's 40-40-20 goal as well as early learning system goals of ensuring that children arrive at kindergarten ready to learn, families are healthy, stable and attached, and that the early learning system is coordinated, aligned and family centered.

Successful State Systems

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

Governance Structure

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

The Early Learning Council (ELC) was created in 2012 as the single body charged with guiding early learning and development programs in Oregon. As the rulemaking body for programs for which the Early Learning Division has statutory authority, the ELC guides development of the early learning system and provides policy direction to promote the health, safety and development of children, and stable and attached families.

In 2013, the Early Learning Division was established within the Oregon Department of Education, reorganizing early learning child care, preschool, and home visiting programs under one agency. During this time, Oregon launched a system of community-based and community-owned coordinators of early learning services called Early Learning Hubs.

Early Learning Hubs are responsible for convening early childhood, K-12 education, health, human services and the business sector around a common vision and shared measurable outcomes for children and families. The statewide Early Learning Hub system is made up of 16 Hubs operating in all regions of the state. With the emphasis on measurable outcomes, shared across systems, the Early Learning Hubs have advanced Oregon's efforts toward a coordinated and aligned early learning system with shared accountability for children and families. RTT-ELC funding has been instrumental in efforts to strengthen and enhance the Early Learning Hub system.

Oregon's early learning system has achieved significant accomplishments over the past three years in system alignment efforts. These accomplishments have been achieved through the Hub system as well as the robust and agile governance structure highlighted below.

- The Measuring Success Committee provides on-going monitoring and support in the use of performance metrics by the Hubs and tracks the progress and success of the early learning system. The Committee has been charged to advise the Early Learning Council on the issues, challenges, successes and priorities related to measuring the success of the early learning system and ensuring equitable outcomes for all children.

- The Early Learning Council and Oregon Health Policy Board have teamed to create a joint subcommittee to ensure all children in Oregon are healthy and ready to be successful in Kindergarten. By integrating health care and early learning policies, sharing resources, and aligning goals, the joint subcommittee is helping children in Oregon get the health care and the education they need to flourish. Work in 2016 includes the development of a set of recommendations for coordinating the various components of the state's home visiting system through the development of shared metrics and program agnostic screening tool to coordinate and streamline access to services to children and families.

- The Early Learning Council's Equity Implementation Committee (EIC) is charged with

operationalizing the Equity Lens within Oregon's early learning policy, programs, and systems transformation efforts, and ensuring that all policies and procedures adopted by the Early Learning Council reflect its commitment to equity. This Committee provides support and recommendations to both the Early Learning Council and Early Learning Division. Through these supports and recommendations, the EIC foster alignment of the ELC and the ELD to the equity goals and outcomes developed for the early learning system.

- The Child Care and Education Committee is chartered to advise the Early Learning Council (ELC) on the issues, challenges, successes and priorities related to affordable, quality child care and early education programs in Oregon, to provide outreach and act as a liaison between citizens and the ELC through community forums and surveys to engage parents, early care and education providers and union representatives and to prioritize outcome based policies for child care and early education issues related to quality, affordability and system coordination. The child care and education committee is also responsible for providing input on rules before they are approved by the council. During 2016, the Child Care and Education Committee (CCEC) of the Early Learning Council engaged in deliberations and discussions relevant to adopting or amending Oregon Administrative Rules to implement and regulate the federal Child Care and Development Fund regulations. In addition to CCDF regulatory issues, the CCEC considered rule recommendations for the newly created Preschool Promise program.

- The Early Learning Council's Best Beginnings Committee, which also serves as the Healthy Families Oregon Advisory Committee, advises the Early Learning Council on the issues, challenges, successes, and priorities related to serving at-risk families who are pregnant and/or have children aged three years old or under. The Committee's areas of responsibility include defining a set of core prenatal through age three priorities in accordance with the strategies and tactics adopted in the 2015 - 2020 strategic plan developed by the Early Learning Council. In 2016, BB collaborated with the Public Health Division and other state partners on the development of a home visiting entry questionnaire that would enable the state to track and report on a common set of data elements for all publically funded home visiting programs.

- The Early Learning Division continues to build upon a solid relationship with the Oregon Health Authority's Public Health Division, a key partner in developmental screening efforts. We continue to work actively towards bridging health and early learning systems to support our ambitious education goals.

Building an Equity-Driven System

While there is no one area of this report template designated to address equity, in Oregon, it is a major body of work that impacts our state system. Oregon continues to operationalize our vision of an early learning system, where equitable outcomes are achieved and each child and family has access to meaningful learning opportunities. Racially, ethnically, and linguistically diverse children, and children and families in poverty are disproportionately impacted by systems of oppression. This creates a lack of opportunity and access to systems of support. Addressing this opportunity and access gap is a first and major step toward achieving equity for all of children and families in Oregon. The Early Learning Division has created a pathway to make our vision of an equity-driven early learning system actionable.

The Early Learning Division's equity goal is to create a state- and regional-wide culture that

supports the eradication of systemic oppression, while developing a framework that will conscientiously interrupt systems of oppression by creating equitable policies, practices, and procedures that produce the outcomes needed to narrow the current and predictable racial achievement gap by:

- Improving the Divisions capacity to design and deliver equity-centered professional development for staff.

- Improving equity-centered child care, preschool and home visiting leadership and support.

- Implementing equity-centered policies, practices, and procedures, and outcomes to create antiracist, anti-bias environments within the early learning system in the state.

In 2016, we continued to work towards promoting the following:

- Positive, anti-racism, anti-bias, and anti-privilege environments within the early learning system;

- Culturally relevant verbal and written communications;

- Accurate, accessible, consistent and comprehensive data; and

- Diverse and inclusive early learning system workforce, including leadership, staff, contractors, and early learning providers.

Focusing on these four areas has resulted in individual, institutional, and structural changes that build the foundation to accomplish the early learning goals. Examples of successful equity efforts include the addition of deliverables and language in our contracts that requires contractors to self-administer the `Tool for Organizational Self-Assessment Related to Racial Equity' developed by the Coalition of Communities of Color (http://www.coalitioncommunitiescolor.org/research-data-tools/cccorgassessment) and completes structural racism training. Early Learning Division staff was also trained.

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.

The Early Learning Division (ELD) has made stakeholder involvement a priority. “Principles of Community Engagement” was developed for division-wide use to ensure more rounded policy decisions, inclusive of outside stakeholders, that support Oregon children and families. The principles include:

PREPARATION AND PLANNING - Through thoughtful and inclusive planning, we ensure that the design, organization and convening process for engagement serves both a clearly defined purpose and the needs and interests of all participants.

EQUITY AND INCLUSION - We equitably incorporate diverse people, voices, ideas and perspectives to lay the groundwork for feedback that can inform better decision-making and support efforts to institutionalize equity.

COLLABORATION AND SHARED PURPOSE - We support and encourage all residents of

Oregon to work together in service of children, families and communities through community engagement.

OPENNESS, LEARNING AND FLEXIBILITY - We help each other to listen, foster mutual learning and engage in deep dialogue to explore new ideas unconstrained by predetermined outcomes. We are flexible as new recommendations and solutions are generated.

TRANSPARENCY AND TRUST - We are clear and open about the process of community engagement and provide information that participants need to know in order to contribute in a meaningful way. We capture the range of views and ideas that come from engagement opportunities and communicate how feedback has been used to determine policies and practices.

IMPACT AND ACTION - We ensure each community engagement has real potential to make a difference. We want participants to know that their contributions will impact the direction and decisions of the Early Learning Division's work.

PARTICIPATORY CULTURE AND SUSTAINED ENGAGEMENT - We promote a culture of participation with organizations that support ongoing quality community engagement for sustainable decisions. We also rigorously evaluate community engagement activities for effectiveness.

We have also created a Community Engagement Model and Worksheet so community engagement strategies are consistent across the division. The worksheet is structured around the Equity Lens and lays out a community engagement plan and process for gathering information. It includes a feedback loop and opportunities for communities to provide additional input as needed.

Preschool Promise

ELD began the rollout of our stakeholder involvement with Preschool Promise, the mixed delivery preschool pilot project to support children and families at 200% of federal poverty level.

We engaged over 300 stakeholders to inform what Preschool Promise should deliver for children. Stakeholders included: community based organizations, tribal communities, K-12 educators and administrators, child care providers, Early Learning Hubs, Oregon Pre-K programs, and families. What resulted were 25 public meetings covering the following seven topics that effect implementation: the role of the Early Learning Hubs, culturally responsive teaching, parent engagement and enrollment, wrap around services, bachelor's degree requirement, professional support needs, and approaches to continuous improvement.

What resulted is a comprehensive analysis of the input and was integrated during Preschool Promise's rule making stage and the rules reflect the feedback staff collected. A matrix was created with the topline results and was then shared with community members that attended the feedback sessions.

Website

ELD has also started on the development of a new website, merging the currently Office of Child Care and Early Learning Division websites to maximize our ability to work with providers,

parents and the community at large that are invested in the development of children. The new website will:

- Include monitoring data on health, safety and quality requirements for both licensed and license-exempt facilities and the child care and early learning workforce;
- Focus on the integration of disparate systems while automating the submission, review, approval and monitoring of child care license data;
- Provide a method for automating provider's submission of evidence to allow ELD and early learning partners to expedite determination of a provider's quality rating designation
- Allow parents to access facility quality, staff education and training, and compliance information.

The projected end date for website development is February 2017.

Quality Rating Improvement System: Community Engagement

ELD conducted multiple methods of obtaining feedback to inform the TQRIS revision process. We held over 30 community engagement sessions conducted from March through September of 2016.
Topics included TQRIS standards, TQRIS supports, Rating and Monitoring, Consumer Education, and the TQRIS Process. There were over 250 early learning professionals contacted. They were also asked about their experience engaging in the TQRIS framework.

There was intentional engagement of communities of color, diverse languages, and rural providers. Feedback from school age programs and programs in K12 settings was also incorporated. Engagement occurred in five languages and included providers, parents, and community partners. In addition, the ELD provided a web-based survey for any stakeholder to provide input. The information was compiled and provided to participants, stakeholders, the Early Learning Council, and TQRIS revision teams.

For 2017, as the revision process continues, the participants and other stakeholders will be looped in to a feedback process about the revisions and how their input was incorporated. More opportunities for feedback will also be created. Additionally, the new TQRIS branding will be incorporated moving forward.

Quality Rating Improvement System: Branding

In April 2016, the Early Learning Division entered into a contract with Metropolitan Group to support the brand creation of Spark, our new name for the Tiered Quality Rating Improvement System.

The brand began rolling out in a low-key manner in December 2016, with key partners and current TQRIS providers due to the ongoing work to make program improvements to the system itself. Over the next year as the program advances, ELD will follow increased marketing activities. Simultaneously, it will test a deeper-level engagement strategy in three pilot areas: Marion and Polk Counties; Multnomah County; and Wallowa, Baker and Malheur Counties. The decision to focus on these areas was made based on local parent/child populations and needs, provider readiness, and on-the-ground support available through local county Early Learning Hubs and Child Care Resource & Referral organizations. The pilots in selected communities will engage the following priority audiences:

- Marion and Polk Counties - parents/family caregivers and providers
- Multnomah County - parents/family caregivers and providers
- Wallowa, Baker and Malheur Counties - providers

Objectives of the brand and marketing:

1. Engage providers to enroll or renew in Spark for training and professional support.
- Providers have an increased understanding of high-quality early care and grow the inherent value they place on delivering quality care to children.
- Providers are able to deliver quality care and improve ratings over time.
- Providers of color, those who provide culturally relevant care and those providing services in rural communities are reached and engaged.

2. Help parents and families identify and select providers delivering high-quality early care and education for their children.
- Parents and families have an understanding of high-quality early care and place value on quality care for their children.
- Parents and families have increased access to information and are able to find and access high-quality care.
- Parents and children who are furthest from economic and educational opportunity are given access to quality care and education programs.

3. Build an overall community expectation for quality early care and the perception of providers as professionals across the state.
- The media positively reports on early learning and Spark, and incorporates key messages in coverage.
- Provider and advocates consistently use Spark's key messages.

Vroom

The Early Learning Division utilized the Vroom program as a resource for parents of children ages 0-5. The Vroom program provides brain-building activities that parents can do with their children as part of their everyday parenting routines. Vroom is available via a free Smartphone app (Daily Vroom) and other hard-copy materials.

The Early Learning Division set a goal of reaching as many families as possible with the Vroom tools, with particular emphasis on reaching families from traditionally underserved communities. To achieve this goal, the Early Learning Division used Race to the Top funds to train and equip 25 regional pilot sites to implement the Vroom tools into their existing service offerings for families, including home visits, parent education classes, and more. The pilot sites also partnered with entities in their communities to expand their reach. For example, many worked with their local hospital systems to include Vroom materials in the baby kits that new parents took home from the hospital. These regional pilot sites were carefully selected to ensure that all regions of the state were provided for and that parents would be reached through a wide variety of programs, including teen parent services, migrant education programs, multiple tribal groups, libraries, Early Learning Hubs, and others. A full list of Vroom partners can be found at https://oregonearlylearning.com/vroom/.

These pilot sites participated in regular conference calls and completed multiple reports so that the Early Learning Division could assess their progress. Overall, the pilot sites reached an

estimated 90,000 Oregonians via the Vroom hard-copy tools (including 12,000 in traditionally underserved ethnic, tribal, and rural communities) and generated an estimated 95,000 unique sessions statewide on the Daily Vroom app since January 1st, 2016. In a further effort to make Vroom accessible to all of Oregon's families, the Early Learning Division translated select Vroom materials into Russian, Chinese, and Vietnamese. These new languages were widely distributed through the state ELD Office of Child Care, preschool, home visiting and other networks. Additionally, the Early Learning Division initiated large-scale continuing partnerships with Oregon WIC and Oregon Department of Human Services (specifically their Self Sufficiency offices) to incorporate trainings on the use of Vroom into their in-service days for staff and to distribute Vroom materials at their regional offices and during home visits.

Future goals for Vroom in Oregon include further outreach to families, a formalized Training of Trainers (expanding on an existing Vroom training approved on the Oregon Registry), and new outreach in the service areas of affordable housing and developmental screenings.

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.

Early Learning continues to be a priority of Oregon Governor Kate Brown, who has advanced two legislative concepts for the Early Learning Division Office of Child Care. The legislation, if enacted, would provide statutory clarity regarding the Council and Division's authorities to implement amendments to federal law as a result of the Child Care and Development Act of 2014. House Bill 2259 allows the Office of Child Care to fingerprint subject individuals upon initial and renewal applications, and conduct background checks through the databases and registries required under federal law. House Bill 2260 authorizes the Early Learning Division Office of Child Care to establish and maintain a consumer friendly website through which provider information can be disseminated to the public.

In addition, the Governor advanced legislation to support and promote professional development of Oregon's early learning workforce. Senate Bill 182 directs the Early Learning Division to build upon successful professional development systems and opportunities, including culturally and linguistically relevant training and curricula. The measure expands Oregon's educator mentorship program to include prekindergarten teachers; enhances and expands coaching and support through community-based mentors or quality improvement specialists; provides home visiting professionals access to a Professional Development Career Lattice and Oregon's Online Registry; and offers supports for the informal workforce providing family, friend and neighbor care by funding and implementing research-based strategies. RTT-ELC grant funds have contributed to laying the foundation for a sustainable professional development system in Oregon that meets the myriad needs of early childhood professionals.

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 or commitment of state agencies participating in the State Plan. The lead agency continues to be the Early Learning Division of the Oregon

Department of Education. The state advisory council continues to be the Early Learning Council. The Early Learning Division functions under the direction of the Early Learning Council with the Early Learning System Director as the administrative officer. In 2016, Megan Irwin stepped down as Early Learning System Director; David Mandell was appointed as Acting Early Learning System Director. We continue to work closely with our Oregon Health Authority and Department of Human Services partners.

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.

Oregon began field-testing the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) in 2013, and began its statewide field test in 2014. In 2014, significant improvements were made, including the revision of materials for greater clarity and ease of use for providers.

In 2015, numerous efforts were made to improve the quality of TQRIS, including translation and distribution of TQRIS materials in Spanish and Russian. A timeline and work plan were also developed for TQRIS revision for implementation in 2016-2017. The revision timeline has been extended due to multiple factors including: expansion of community engagement to ensure the application of the equity lens that guides ELD work; additional feedback loop with the Early Learning Council; longer timeline for gathering and analyzing data of the Validation Studies; and focus on continuing the implementation of the current TQRIS.

In the first quarter of 2016, a timeline, mission, vision, and guiding principles for the TQRIS revision were completed and published in five languages (http://triwou.org/projects/qris/revision).

In the first two quarters of 2016, multiple community engagement sessions were conducted throughout the state, including providers and stakeholders from urban and rural areas, five languages, and families. Analysis was completed and provided to the TQRIS revision teams.

Completion of Validation Study One occurred in the third quarter with publication in the fourth quarter (https://www.pdx.edu/ccf/sites/www.pdx.edu.ccf/files/QRISStudy1report_FINAL_Appendices_Nov17_2016.pdf).

Revision teams were created in the third and fourth quarters and continue to create revisions, obtain feedback, and work towards a final draft. This work will continue into 2017, with the completion of the revisions and implementation of the TQRIS framework. Data collection for Validation Study-2 has been completed.

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.

In 2014, Oregon expanded its TQRIS field test statewide making revisions based on input and feedback from 2013. It is important to note that while the field test was underway in eight of the 36 counties in Oregon, there was a substantial amount of work being done to have statewide perspective and prepare Early Learning and Development Programs (ELDP) for 2014. Oregon became more intentional in recruiting ELDPs and was able to target recruitment based on readiness indicators associated with the TQRIS standards in the second year of the grant.

During 2015, Oregon's participation focused on children furthest from opportunity including communities of color and communities speaking diverse languages and Head Start

Programs.

During 2016, Oregon continued to focus TQRIS participation for programs serving children of color, children of diverse language families, children in poverty, and children in rural communities.
Strategies included:

1. Further alignment with Early Learning Hubs for participation and TQRIS goals including shared TQRIS metrics and joint work with Focused Networks of providers of color, and Russian and Spanish speaking providers.
2. Targeted work with “Commitment to Quality Programs” that have intentionally engaged in quality improvements but not been rated yet.
3. Intentional work with Head Start programs to identify system barriers and create system alignment.
4. Continued conversations with tribal governments to identify, address and remove barriers to their participation in TQRIS
5. Specific work with contractors around Oregon's equity lens to inform the equitable implementation of TQRIS.
6. Expansion of the TQRIS portfolio review team including Russian and Spanish community reviewers to support equitable timeframes for diverse language reviews.
7. Marketing of the Department of Human Services Provider incentive payments for TQRIS rated programs serving families receiving ERDC subsidies.
8. Marketing of parent reduced ERDC copayments for families accessing TQRIS rated programs.
9. Coordination with Oregon Montessori Association to address OMA's desire for TQRIS alignment.
10. Coordination with Oregon's Preschool Promise (PP) programs to align the onboarding of PP programs into TQRIS.
11. Marketing and Branding of Oregon's TQRIS to Spark. https://oregonearlylearning.com/a-new- identity-for-qris-introducing-spark/

In 2017, under a no-cost extension, Oregon will continue to focus on increasing participation of programs serving children furthest from opportunity and ensuring smooth transitions and retention from Oregon's TQRIS field test through the revisions.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)
In the table, provide data on the numbers and percentages of Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in the State's TQRIS by type of Early Learning and Development Program. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.										
Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	70	27%	96	40%	193	80%	241	100%	241	100%
Early Head Start and Head Start[1]	72	30%	93	40%	186	80%	232	100%	232	100%
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%	3	9%	4	12%	5	14%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	2	50%	3	75%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	2,159	29%	2,490	33%	3,168	42%	3,470	46%	3,772	50%
Other 1	4,468	100%	4,493	100%	4,462	100%	4,462	100%	4,462	100%
Describe:	State Licensed									
Other 2										
Describe:										
Other 3										
Describe:										

[1] 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										
Describe:										
Other 5										
Describe:										
Other 6										
Describe:										
Other 7										
Describe:										
Other 8										
Describe:										
Other 9										
Describe:										
Other 10										
Describe:										

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	263	70	27%	241	96	40%	231	141	66%	31	21	68%	129	115	89%
Specify:	Include sites that operate Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten, Early Head Start, and Preschool Promise programs.														
Early Head Start and Head Start[1]	243	72	30%	232	98	42%	258	142	55%	276	192	70%	275	195	71%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	35	0	0%	35	0	0%	35	0	0%	35	0	0%	35	0	0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	35	0	0%	35	0	0%	35	0	0%	35	0	0%	35	0	0%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	4	0	0%	9	0	0%	10	0	0%	9	0	0%	11	0	0%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	7,544	2,159	29%	6,910	2,254	33%	6,879	3,259	47.3%	7,004	2,159	31%	5,707	2,064	36%
Other 1	4,468	4,468	100%	4,367	4,367	100%	4,286	4,286	100%	4,263	4,263	100%	4,128	4,128	100%
Describe:	State Licensed														
Other 2															
Describe:															
Other 3															
Describe:															

[1] 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															
Describe:															
Other 5															
Describe:															
Other 6															
Describe:															
Other 7															
Describe:															
Other 8															
Describe:															
Other 9															
Describe:															
Other 10															
Describe:															

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.

Early Head Start (EHS) & Head Start (HS): Methodology for state preschool and HS/EHS # and % participation: HS/EHS # sites calculated using Center Report in Head Start Enterprise System.

Participation in TQRIS calculated from state-generated list of licensed Head Start/OPK sites (December 2016) and from WOU-TRI monthly TQRIS status report (November 2016) and for Preschool Promise by the Preschool Promise Program Specialist.

State-funded preschool data now includes Preschool Promise programs as of September 2016. Oregon Head Start PreKindergarten number of sites are gathered from the Site & Service Workbooks submitted by the grantees to the state. Preschool Promise data was reported by Preschool Promise Program Specialist.

Number of sites increased with the addition of Preschool Promise for state-funded programs. Number of sites for Early Head Start/Head Start decreased by 1 during this time due to programs shifting classrooms to larger sites; number of classrooms and children served did not decrease.

Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, Section 619: Data source is Annual Progress Report, ODE, 2016. The goal is to provide services to children with disabilities in typical settings with their peers. This will decrease the number of self-contained special education classrooms that could participate in TQRIS.

Programs funded by IDEA, Part C: Data source is Annual Progress Report, ODE, 2016. Early Intervention services are provided to families in their home.

Programs funded by Title I, ESEA: Data source is the Consolidated State Performance Report, 2015-16.

CCDF: Data provided by DHS and Special Populations Coordinator for October 2016-September 2016 period.

State Licensed: 2016 Facility data extracted from CCRIS Data System and provided by ELD data analyst.

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.

The target set for Head Start and state funded preschool sites was 100%. This target has allowed us the opportunity to learn that some sites have experienced challenges completing and/or maintaining the licensing requirements, which is an essential starting point for incorporation in TQRIS. Some of these challenges include local zoning requirements; temporary nature of some sites located in school districts, donated, or leased facilities; and logistics related to operating multi-site programs that do not easily connect to current child care regulations.

In response to this, the state is working closely with Head Start, state funded preschool programs, and child care to clarify challenges as well as develop and implement solutions. We convened a “systems alignment” workgroup in 2016, which is currently in the process of

implementing recommendations to streamline and coordinate standards and processes. One example is how changes were made to Head Start-TQRIS crosswalk in November 2016 so that Head Start personnel are now considered to meet 5-star rating in personnel qualifications.

The addition of a new Preschool Program in the state (which was only operational for less than three months in this reporting period) also means the addition of sites; all of which are legislatively mandated to participate in TQRIS. As a result, we have seen an increase in the percentage of sites that are working within this system.

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.

Oregon's TQRIS continues to be a portfolio-based system that requires programs to provide evidence including pictures, policies, and examples of implementation that are evaluated by expert review teams. Each TQRIS program receives annual visits through the licensing unit and 5-star programs may receive a CLASS observation to meet a specific standard as applicable.

In 2015, progress was made in the rating and monitoring system of the TQRIS through continued inter- rater reliability, additional training of Infant CLASS observers, and a streamlined review, resubmission and communication process. Streamlining licensing compliance information on TQRIS programs was also implemented.

In 2016, momentum continued, resulting in the following improvements to TQRIS rating and monitoring:

1. Increased capacity to monitor TQRIS programs' licensing compliance.
2. Implementation of a TQRIS rating review for TQRIS Rated or Rating Eligible programs with a serious valid noncompliance, which means OCC has made a valid finding when assessing a complaint that alleges:
   - (a) Children are in imminent danger;
   - (b) There are more children in care than allowed by law;
   - (c) Corporal punishment is being used;
   - (d) Children are not being supervised;
   - (e) Multiple or serious fire, health or safety hazards are present in the home;
   - (f) Extreme unsanitary conditions are present in the center;
   - (g) Adults are in the center who are not enrolled in the Central Background Registry;

or

(h) A facility is providing child care as defined in ORS 657A.250(4) which is not a certified child care center, by a person who has alleged that there are more children in care than allowed by law.

3. Creation of a Fraud Policy.
4. Creation of a TQRIS monitoring work group and initial plans for a monitoring protocol.
5. Addition of community reviewers in Spanish and Russian to increase capacity and efficiency of diverse language portfolio review.
6. Streamlined review schedule to decrease time between portfolio submission and review, now averaging 17 days
7. Continued progress on the ePortfolio process and review system.
8. Consistent inter-rater reliability (Cronbach's alpha=.87).

In 2017, a full monitoring protocol will be rolled out for the revised TQRIS including annual review, triennial renewal, audits, and complaints.

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.

In 2016, Oregon maintained its commitment to creating a system that provides access to high quality practitioner training. Additional trainings were added to Oregon's professional development system specifically in response to needs identified in TQRIS domains and standards, such as the ASQ-3. Efforts continue to be made to provide technical assistance to providers through Child Care Resource and Referral Programs.

Oregon upheld its commitment to program and practitioner level financial supports and incentives. As a result, practitioners were able to receive education awards for meeting professional development milestones however the second education awards for providers working in TQRIS rated programs was discontinued due to financial constraints. Programs continued to receive quality improvement support money as well as quality maintenance incentive money once they were rated. Programs in focused family child care networks and those receiving child care subsidies for serving special populations received enhanced support money (double the standard rate).

A system of tiered reimbursement to star rated programs receiving Employment-related Day Care (ERDC) subsidy was implemented, known as Provider Incentive Payments. In addition, reduced copays were implemented for parents receiving child care subsidies who voluntarily choose a star-rated provider.

In 2017, revision work will continue to increase program access to TQRIS and thus access to Provider Incentive Payments. Using Oregon's equity lens, TQRIS supports and incentives will be prioritized to programs serving children of color and children from diverse language families.

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.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.					
Targets					
	Baseline	**Year One**	**Year Two**	**Year Three**	**Year Four**
Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS	4,468	4,493	4,662	4,662	4,662
Number of programs in Tier 1	4,447	4,377	4,048	3,813	3,580
Number of programs in Tier 2	0	30	60	90	120
Number of programs in Tier 3	0	40	60	80	100
Number of programs in Tier 4	0	46	251	213	175
Number of programs in Tier 5	0	0	155	208	261
Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated					

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.					
Actuals					
	Baseline	**Year One**	**Year Two**	**Year Three**	**Year Four**
Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS	4,468	4,367	4,286	4,263	4,173
Number of programs in Tier 1	4,447	4,006	3,308	3,082	2,748
Number of programs in Tier 2	0	344	766	861	859
Number of programs in Tier 3	0	14	113	154	215
Number of programs in Tier 4	0	2	32	60	62
Number of programs in Tier 5	0	1	67	106	289
Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated					

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.

2016 data is extracted from The Research Institutes' TQRIS data. Total number from Tier One (Licensed programs) is from Early Learning Division CCRIS facility data for 2016.

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.

For year four targets, the overall intentional participation in TQRIS has increased from 28% of all licensed programs to 34% of all licensed programs. Oregon has well surpassed its level two goals (859 vs 120 target). Oregon has also surpassed its targets for 3-star programs. The 4- star levels reflects previous years' four star numbers where this tier is the least likely for programs to land. The five star numbers illustrate continued Head Start alignment work, with Head Starts now being at the five star tier in the Professional Development domain due to an interium fix and system integration around licensing and the professional development registry.

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"?

Oregon's TQRIS is a five tier system with the first tier being licensing, the second tier is a Commitment to Quality engagement, and a 3-,4-,5-star rating. Oregon defines the highest tiers as 3-, 4-, 5-star rated.

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.

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

Targets: Number and 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	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	0	0%	2,943	40%	5,886	80%	7,358	100%	7,358	100%
Early Head Start and Head Start[1]	0	0%	4,006	40%	9,434	80%	11,793	100%	11,793	100%
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%	30	0.4%	40	0.5%	50	0.7%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	160	25%	320	50%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	0	0%	579	4%	1,034	8%	1,754	12%	1,876	12%
Other 1										
Describe:										
Other 2										
Describe:										

[1] 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										
~~Describe:~~										
Other 4										
~~Describe:~~										
Other 5										
~~Describe:~~										
Other 6										
~~Describe:~~										
Other 7										
~~Describe:~~										
Other 8										
~~Describe:~~										
Other 9										
~~Describe:~~										
Other 10										
~~Describe:~~										

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	7,358	0	0%	7,358	0	0%	7,840	637	8%	7,922	1,801	22.7%	9,640	5,033	52%
Specify:	Includes Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten, state-funded Early Head Start programs and Preschool Promise.														
Early Head Start and Head Start[1]	10,014	0	0%	11,793	0	0%	11,143	996	9%	9,463	2,702	28.6%	9,804	6,325	28%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	2,989	0	0%	2,989	0	0%	3,302	0	0%	4,027	0	0%	3,615	0	0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	7,261	0	0%	7,261	13	0.2%	7,339	306	4.2%	6,783	694	9.8%	7,695	1,453	18.9%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	638	0	0%	638	0	0%	0	0	0%	415	0	0%	276	0	0%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	15,238	0	0%	15,238	48	0.32%	20,599	450	2.1%	26,909	1,702	6%	26,909	1,702	6%
Other 1															
Describe:															
Other 2															
Describe:															

[1] 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															
Describe:															
Other 4															
Describe:															
Other 5															
Describe:															
Other 6															
Describe:															
Other 7															
Describe:															
Other 8															
Describe:															
Other 9															
Describe:															
Other 10															
Describe:															

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.

State-funded preschool, Early Head Start and Head Start: number of children served in Federal programs (including Migrant/Seasonal and Tribal Head Start) was taken from Head Start Enterprise System 2016 Program Information Report (PIR) data. Data on Preschool Promise was gathered from provider's first quarter report. The addition of Preschool Promise sites and an increase in the State's investment in Oregon Head Start PreKindergarten is reflected in these numbers.

Ranking in TQRIS was gained from quarterly reports provided by TQRIS Administrators.

CCDF: ACF 801 Data, October 2014 - September 2015 (this data was reported during the previous year- updated data not available in time for the 2016 report).

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.

We continue to work closely with Head Start programs to identify (through discussion and engagement) and address challenges in obtaining a TQRIS rating. Technical assistance was provided to help programs navigate the process to be involved in TQRIS. A workgroup has been convened to clarify and address challenges that arise between the Child Care and Head Start systems.

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.

Oregon is committed to have a data driven TQRIS, as demonstrated through our investments in a process evaluation as well as two validation studies.

The goal of the process evaluation was to evaluate how well the TQRIS met its objectives around program quality improvement. Findings include:

- 87% of rated programs definitely or probably will encourage others to participate;
- 81% of rated programs agree that they can maintain the level of quality represented by their rating.
- In addition, the racial demographics of children in QRIS engaged programs receiving Employment-related Day Care subsidy matches the demographics of children throughout the system.

Validation Study-1 examined the validity of rating levels against classroom quality as

measured by the CLASS observation tool as a standard. The study is complete and posted. https://www.pdx.edu/ccf/sites/www.pdx.edu.ccf/files/QRISStudy1report_FINAL_Appendices_Nov17_2016.pdf Results provide guidance for the revisions teams, including which standards best indicate differences in quality and how to strengthen the difference between tiers.

Validation Study-2, which began in 2015, examines the validity of rating levels against child and family engagement as measured by the inClass and Family Provider Teacher Relationship Quality measure. The goal is to observe 196 programs, including 116 centers and 80 certified family programs.

Portland State University (PSU) is collecting data for Study-2.

The Validation Study team has been diligently working to recruit and observe more family child care programs for inclusion in Study-2 over the past couple of months and data collection is almost complete. Meanwhile, the team is working on data entry and management. The timeline for completing the study is as follows:

- Complete data collection & data entry: Jan, 2017
- Data cleaning & management: Feb-April, 2017
- Data analysis & consult with partners about early findings & interpretation: May - Sept, 2017
- Write report: Oct-Dec 2017

It is noted that the Validation and Process Evaluation studies are impacted by any limitations the TQRIS as a whole has regarding equity and reaching diverse population, including its diverse language providers.

Key strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in 2017 include continued alignment and communication with key partners to encourage provider participation.

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

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

- [x] (C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.
- [ ] (C)(2) Supporting effective uses of Comprehensive Assessment Systems.
- [x] (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.
- [x] (D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.
- [x] (D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.
- [x] (E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.
- [x] (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.

In 2016, we completed the process of aligning Oregon's learning and developmental standards for children aged three to five with Oregon's kindergarten Common Core State Standards in the domains of language and communication, literacy, and mathematics. Additionally, our work group of external stakeholders and experts finalized new kindergarten standards in the domains of approaches to learning and social-emotional development, which also aligns with Oregon's early learning standards. The creation of these new kindergarten standards provides a crucial bridge for connecting early learning and K-3 education, and is designed to strengthen children's readiness for kindergarten and beyond in important non-cognitive skill areas. Each of these sets of newly aligned standards will be published in February, 2017 in a document titled *Oregon's Early Learning and Kindergarten Guidelines* (the Guidelines). This document also includes significant narrative guidance for early learning providers and kindergarten teachers on developmentally appropriate and culturally responsive practice, supporting children who are dual-language learners, and supporting children who have special needs.

Initial steps have been taken to ensure that the Guidelines strengthen practice. They have already been embedded and included in Oregon's foundational online training on early learning standards that is required of all licensed early learning practitioners. Additionally, we have begun offering training on how to use the Guidelines to shape classroom practice, daily interactions between adults and children, and the process of developing and implementing curriculum. We have developed a website that will launch simultaneously with the publication of the Guidelines, and provides practitioners with access to tools and resources that will help strengthen the implementation of the Guidelines. The Guidelines are also being embedded into local P-3 alignment efforts funded by Oregon's Early Learning Kindergarten Readiness Partnership & Innovation Program, a state funded initiative designed to strengthen connections between early learning and K-3.

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.

Not applicable.

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.

Throughout 2016, Oregon continued to make major progress in all areas of health promotion in the grant. Highlights include (1) delivery of workforce development trainings on implementation of developmental screening in early childhood settings, (2) development and delivery of webinars on topics relevant to developmental screening, (3) leveraging of other funds to support health promotion goals, (4) cross-systems coordination to support health and early learning system transformation, (5) exploration of electronic sharing of developmental screening results and (6) an equity focus in all components of our work.

Workforce Trainings & Sustainability

The six-hour early childhood professional development training, "*Implementing Developmental Screening Using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire - Third Edition (ASQ-3) Standardized*," has now been available throughout the state since August 2014. This curriculum was developed in partnership with the Oregon Screening Project (OSP) team at the University of Oregon (the creators of the ASQ-3), after Oregon's Early Learning Council adopted the ASQ-3 as the preferred developmental screening tool for early childhood service providers in our state (the ASQ-3 is also the most commonly used developmental screening tool in medical settings in Oregon).

This year we conducted a final Training of Trainers (TOT) using the curriculum, with targeted outreach to dual language speakers and a focus on culturally responsive screening. This brings the project to a total of five TOTs across diverse regions of the state. Oregon now has 108 Master Trainers and 29 Home Visiting Field Specialists trained and equipped with the curriculum and all accompanying resources and tools to conduct Training of Providers (TOPs) for early childhood professionals throughout Oregon. Of the 137 trained trainers, 22 are Spanish-speaking, four are Russian-speaking, one can train in Japanese, one in Chinese and Vietnamese, and one in American Sign Language. The Oregon Center for Career Development (OCCD) Professional Development Registry has been a partner throughout this project and provides official professional development credit for this training.

In addition to our Training of Trainers, our state team conducted a final Training of Providers in Seaside, Oregon, in March 2016, with 15 participants. We also contracted

with a Spanish-speaking trainer who delivered two TOPs in rural regions of Oregon where Spanish trainings had been requested by the early childhood community.

The performance of trained trainers delivering the ASQ-3 curriculum to early childhood professionals is evidence of the sustainability of promotion of developmental screening in early childhood settings beyond the RTT-ELC grant period. Master Trainers within the OCCD Registry are delivering the standardized training on an ongoing basis. In addition to the trainings delivered by our state team, during the 2016 calendar year this cadre of trainers

conducted 28 TOPs across the state with 332 participants. Three of these sessions were conducted in Spanish and one was conducted in Russian. These numbers do not include trainings conducted by trained Home Visiting Field Specialists, who are not currently members of the OCCD Registry. With the training curriculum now hosted by OCCD, OCCD will take charge of reviewing and updating the curriculum on a routine basis as well as continuing to conduct TOTs as needed to maintain a robust base of trainers. All training materials purchased to support these trainings have been transferred to OCCD to support ongoing training.

To further support sustainability, in 2016 we organized two Communities of Practice (COPs) to facilitate ongoing peer learning between trainers. One was developed at the request of trainers who conduct trainings in languages other than English to create space to learn from each other, share insights, discuss cultural responsiveness in screening and problem solve challenges together. Dual language staff from the Early Learning Division and OCCD hosted multiple sessions of this COP throughout 2016. In addition, our partners from the Oregon Screening Project hosted an initial session of a topic-based COP for trainers wishing to focus on specific aspects of training, and the OSP team will continue to host sessions as requested by trainers and provide ongoing technical assistance to members beyond the RTT-ELC project period.

The standardized ASQ-3 curriculum was translated into Spanish in 2015 in partnership with a group of native Spanish speakers who were trained through our TOT and created a Spanish glossary of developmental screening terminology. In 2016, additional early learning glossaries in Russian, Vietnamese, and Chinese were developed in partnership between the Early Learning Division, Oregon Health Authority and native speakers working in early childhood fields. These glossaries are now publicly available on the OCCD website. The standardized ASQ-3 curriculum has now been fully translated into Russian, reviewed and edited by Russian-speaking early childhood professionals, and disseminated to the training community. OCCD now retains ownership of the translated curricula as well as the English version, and will review and update them as needed going forward. Additional materials were translated using the glossaries, including a QRIS-specific developmental screening FAQ and a general developmental screening information sheet for early childhood service providers. Both documents are now available in the top five spoken languages in Oregon: English, Spanish, Russian, Chinese and Vietnamese.
During 2016 we also supported provision of Vroom tip cards in Russian, Chinese and Vietnamese for early childhood service providers and Vroom pilot sites across Oregon to disseminate to parents as part of statewide developmental promotion efforts. Oregon's parent-focused Vroom activities continue to complement our early childhood workforce efforts to promote developmental screening and follow-up.

In 2016 we delivered additional webinars in support of developmental screening goals and promotion of developmental awareness among parents. The first, “Trauma Informed Care for Children, Caregivers and Ourselves,” had 300 participants from at least five different states. “Creating a Developmental Screening Resource Library for Parents and Caregivers” was presented to Oregon Parent Educators as well as Quality Improvement Specialists with Oregon's QRIS system. The OCCD registry provided professional development credit for all webinar participants. All of our webinars were recorded, posted online, and disseminated through our networks. Developmental screening webinars directed at parents and providers were also translated and facilitated in Spanish, with the Spanish versions recorded and posted publicly.

In our work with early childhood professionals across the state, we have learned that training on social emotional development is a significant training need. We conducted a needs assessment in 2015 to elucidate specific training needs and disseminated results to the early childhood community. Due to changes in staffing at the Oregon Health Authority during 2016, curriculum development based on this assessment was delayed and has not yet been undertaken.

The developmental screening training curriculum, in part, promotes the use of the free online version of the
ASQ-3 available in Oregon (www.asqoregon.com). Since September 2008 the creators of the ASQ-3, the Oregon Screening Project at University of Oregon, have conducted research on the ASQ-3 using data acquired through public use of the tool available on their website. Parents can go to the OSP website and screen their child free of charge. During 2015, the first full year of implementation of the ASQ-3 curriculum, OSP saw a 25% increase in completed ASQ-3s on-line, increasing from 2,303 in 2014 to 4,000 in 2015. An additional 1,870 screenings occurred through the OSP website in the first half of 2016. While it is not possible to directly correlate our training efforts with this increased use of the website, it is clear that, overall, there are increasing numbers of screens occurring through this alternative means of screening. Additionally, Oregon continues to show an increase in developmental screenings occurring in medical settings. Oregon Health Plan billing data through June 2016 indicate that 58.9% of Oregon children served by Medicaid received a developmental screening in the first 36 months of life, up from 54.7% in 2015 and nearly triple the baseline of 20.9% in 2011.

Increases in screening in both the early learning and health sectors continue to demand exploration of how to increase cross-sector screening coordination and sharing of data. Efforts are underway to explore means by which all screenings including those in medical settings and those completed online can be captured, tallied, shared across providers, aggregated, analyzed and tracked (see below).

Leverage of Funds

Following a collective impact model, we continued to leverage our Race to the Top funding with our Early Childhood Coordinated Systems (ECCS) funding focused on developmental screening, through the end of Oregon's ECCS grant in July of 2016.

Through leveraging State Innovation Model (SIM) grant funding, we contracted the Oregon Pediatric Improvement Partnership (OPIP) for calendar year 2016 to conduct a pilot in Yamhill County to map out resources and develop tools for facilitating streamlined referral and follow-up to developmental screening. A challenge widely recognized related to developmental screening is follow through with referral recommendations for a developmental diagnostic evaluation of children who screen at risk for developmental delays. In Oregon, as in most other states, children are too frequently lost to follow-up and do not receive the diagnostic evaluation that can lead to appropriate developmental interventions to address delays early. This project engaged a wide variety of local stakeholders in conducting an environmental scan, mapping referral pathways and community resources and drawing from that knowledge to construct methodology and tools to overcome barriers and challenges to follow through on recommended referral processes. A final report and findings from this project will be publicly available in February 2017; a similar project funded via the Oregon Department of Education through June 2017 enables OPIP to build on this work and engage in these processes across a broader geographic area of Oregon.

Cross Systems Coordination

Throughout 2016, we continued work to support and facilitate health and early learning collaboration across the state through multiple avenues. OHA's Child Systems Collaboration Coordinator meets regularly with the Early Learning Division Hub Facilitators to stay updated on local Early Learning Hub and Coordinated Care Organization (CCO) collaboration and provide information and technical assistance to support these partnerships. The Child

Systems Collaboration Coordinator and other OHA and ELD staff continue to connect regularly in order to stay aligned and support work on metrics that cross health and early learning, shared learning opportunities for health and early learning providers, implementation of the Vroom brain building initiative, and connection of policy-level efforts across health and education agencies.

During 2016 we worked with a University of Oregon graduate student and Oregon's 16 Early Learning Hubs and 16 Coordinated Care Organizations to develop a handbook for Hub & CCO collaboration. The graduate student used academic research, surveys and key informant interviews to develop concrete tools to assist local partnerships in advancing their work together. OHA staff and ELD Hub Facilitators worked together to gather partnership narratives from around the state so that the final handbook also highlights emerging practices for Hub/CCO collaboration and innovations from multiple regions of Oregon. This handbook will be available to the public in February 2017.

Exploration of Electronic Sharing of Developmental Screening Results

During 2016, we contracted with the Oregon Screening Project team to explore the potential for sharing screens conducted via asqoregon.com with primary care providers (PCPs) through connection to a health information exchange. The OSP team met with staff from the Jefferson Health Information Exchange (JHIE) throughout the summer of 2016 to explore the possibility of an electronic transfer of ASQ-3 results from OSP to JHIE. JHIE is one of the largest health information exchanges in Oregon and serves to electronically move clinical information among different health care information systems, including clinic-based electronic health records. JHIE maintains a HIPAA compliant Community Health Record to which multiple entities contribute data and from which medical providers can pull down information about services provided to their patients by other providers. JHIE is interoperable with many different electronic health record systems and thus serves as an intermediary for health information systems that cannot “talk” directly to each other.

Meetings between the OSP team and staff at JHIE determined that it is feasible to share developmental screening results using these systems; additional resources and capacity are needed to support the further testing, technological enhancements and piloting necessary to implement such a linked system. Both the HIE system and the OSP servers are HIPAA compliant; under the proposed system, parents completing an ASQ-3 through OSP who would like the screening results sent to their child's medical provider could opt into this option and complete a HIPAA authorization form prior to completing the screening. One limitation is that this would only work in cases where the child's PCP is a member of the HIE. Additional investigation is needed to explore how to identify the child's PCP during the electronic transaction; how to notify PCPs when a screen for one of their patients is available through the HIE; and how to generate adequate patient demographic identifiers through the OSP system without providing a full social security number, which is not an option given OSP's HIPAA constraints as a research project.

This exploration also considered the costs of building the system linkages between an HIE and OSP as well as a 12-month pilot of the system in a targeted geographic area or specific set of participating clinics. With this information, in 2017 OHA staff will explore options for sharing the findings of this exploration work and look at options for potential funding sources to continue investigation and/or piloting of this system.

Equity

Throughout 2016, equity has continued to be infused in all of our efforts as we worked to build more robust cultural responsiveness into our professional development activities, ensure training materials are available in the top spoken languages in Oregon, and increase rates of developmental screening in marginalized populations. As such:

- Our trainings focused on communities farthest from opportunity;
- We contracted with one of our Spanish-speaking trainers to conduct Training of

Providers in Spanish;

- We now have trained trainers with capacity to deliver trainings in the top five spoken languages in Oregon, as well as American Sign Language;
- Our training curricula have been translated into Spanish and Russian;
- Our webinars directed at parents and providers were translated and delivered in Spanish as well as being recorded and disseminated through our training networks;
- We organized and facilitated a community of practice for trainers conducting trainings in languages other than English;
- We supported creation and dissemination of Vroom materials to providers and parents in the top five spoken languages in Oregon;
- We leveraged funds to engage stakeholders in streamlining local processes to ensure children in need of referral and follow-up services receive needed services and do not fall through the cracks.

While we acknowledge that there is much work still to be done to ensure that all Oregonian children receive developmental screening and that children and providers furthest from opportunity are provided the resources they need to achieve their potential, we have had a successful final year of the RTT-ELC grant, completing our project and assuring that our accomplishments are carried onward by both local stakeholders and statewide partners.

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.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.					
Baseline and Annual Targets					
	Baseline	**Year One**	**Year Two**	**Year Three**	**Year Four**
Number of Children with High Needs screened	13,375	13,723	14,080	14,445	14,821
Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment	12,609	12,937	13,273	13,618	13,972
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care	314,062	314,062	314,062	314,062	314,062
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care	262,756	269,588	276,597	283,788	291,167

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.					
Actuals					
	Baseline	**Year One**	**Year Two**	**Year Three**	**Year Four**
Number of Children with High Needs screened	13,375	37,500	16,427	26,816	28,413
Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment	12,609	10,406	9,514	10,502	10,570
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care	314,062	339,315	267,143	223,133	199,489
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care	262,756	297,699	7,845	10,870	11,153

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.

Number of children with high needs screened:

Measure description: Percentage of children receiving Medicaid who were screened for risks of developmental, behavioral and social delays using standardized screening tools in the 12 months preceding their first, second, or third birthday

Source: Oregon's Health System Transformation 2016 Mid-Year Performance Report, January 2017, Measure period, July 2015 - June 2016, http://www.oregon.gov/oha/Metrics/Pages/HST-Reports.aspx

NOTE: This number represents a 58.9% of the measurement population.

Number of children with high needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care:

Measure description: Percentage of children 1-19 years old receiving Medicaid who had a visit with a primary care provider.

Source: Oregon's Health System Transformation 2016 Mid-Year Performance Report, January 2017; Measure period, July 2015 - June 2016, http://www.oregon.gov/oha/Metrics/Pages/HST-Reports.aspx

NOTE: This number represents 89.2% of the measurement population.

Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up to date in a schedule of well- child care:

Measure description: Percentage of children on Medicaid who had at least six well-child visits with a health care provider by age 15 months.

Source: Oregon's Health System Transformation 2016 Mid-Year Performance Report, January 2017; Measure period, July 2015 - June 2016, http://www.oregon.gov/oha/Metrics/Pages/HST-Reports.aspx

NOTE: This number represents 63.9% of the measurement population.

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.

Oregon's developmental screening continues to exceed our targeted developmental screening rate. This year, Oregon's screenings at mid-year 2016 exceed our target by almost 92%. This is a dramatic increase in screening even compared to last year's excellent performance. Last year's screenings exceeded last year's target by 86%. The percentage of children enrolled in Medicaid receiving developmental screening in the first three years of life has shown consistent improvement, from 33.1% in 2013 (Year 1), 42.6% in 2014 (Year 2), 54.7% in 2015 (Year 3) and now 58.9% as of June 30, 2016. Developmental screening is an incentive metric for which Oregon's Coordinated Care Organizations (CCOs) receive financial incentives when demonstrating improved rates of developmental screening in their member clinics. The benchmark for this CCO metric was 50% of children screened for 2013 - 2015. In 2015 all 16 of Oregon's CCOs increased their screening rates and 12 of 16 met or exceeded the 50% benchmark. For 2017, the screening benchmark was increased to 60.1%, which represents the 75th percentile of CCOs' screening rates in 2015.

An additional positive influence on developmental screening rates is the work of Oregon's 16 Early Learning Hubs covering the entire state. These Hubs are community-based

organizations charged with addressing health and other early childhood disparities among their target populations of children birth to five years old. A focus of their work is promoting developmental screening in collaboration with their local healthcare providers. The improvements in developmental screening are likely attributable to this Collective Impact approach to screening in addition to the CCO incentive metric. The Oregon Health Authority's Office of Health Analytics continues to closely track performance of our Coordinated Care Organizations. Similarly, efforts are underway to track and document the Hubs' and early learning providers' contribution to developmental screening rates, which is not currently reflected in statewide data. Much of the work performed under Project 5 of RTT-ELC has been directed at not only increasing screening rates in the early learning sector but supporting connection, coordination and sharing of screening results between health and early learning providers to reduce duplication of screening and generate more robust screening data.

Oregon's number of children enrolled in Medicaid who had a visit with their primary care provider is 36.5% lower than our Year Four target with a decrease of 7.6% when compared to last year's report. Statewide, the well care rate for this age group (12 months to 19 years) decreased slightly from 89.5% of children at the end of 2015 to 89.2% of children at mid-year 2016. Statewide efforts to engage and serve Medicaid children continue. OHA's Office of Health Analytics continues to monitor CCO performance for this metric closely; this is not a CCO incentive metric, which may account for some of the lack of increase in well care rates. Early Learning Hubs are also tracking this and helping facilitate child and family connection with medical providers at the local level. [The decrease of 16.5% from Year Two to Year Three is due to an inclusion criterion change between reporting years for the data].

The number of children up to date in their schedule of well child care increased by 2.6% compared to last year's reporting. The previously reported baseline, Year One and targets were founded on National Survey of Children's Health (NSCH) reporting, which reports every four years. Meaningful comparison of our performance to targets set in accordance to NSCH data is challenging. In Year Two we shifted to annual Medicaid billing data from our Coordinated Care Organizations. A significant increase in this data was seen between Years Two and Three, which may be related to an increase in the percentage of CCO members who were enrolled in a recognized patient-centered primary care home (PCPCH). Another contributing factor may be the inclusion of well-child visits as a success metric for Oregon's Early Learning Hubs, and increased efforts on the part of Hubs to connect children and families with healthcare services.

Overall, at mid-year 2016, 63.9% of Oregon children on Medicaid received six or more well-child visits in the first 15 months of life, up slightly from 63.7% in 2015. This measure is a performance metric, not an incentive metric, for Oregon's CCOs, and remains a success metric for the Early Learning Hubs. Additionally, starting in 2016 childhood immunization rates at age two became a CCO incentive metric. Because immunizations often occur in the context of well-child visits, this new metric may continue to bolster CCOs' and Hubs' efforts to help children get to all six recommended well-visits by 15 months. The performance of CCOs on the well-child metric continues to be closely monitored by OHA's Health Analytics team.

The target for the “Number of children with high needs referred for services who received follow-up treatment was not met. The Baseline and Year One data were investigated for accuracy and found to be a duplicated count (the same children referred multiple times) of children. During Year Two of the grant the duplicate count issue was resolved. The number of children reported this year (Year Four) represent an “unduplicated count” of children with high needs referred for services who received follow-up. The unduplicated count for the Baseline Year is 9,188; Year One is 9,120, Year Two 9,514.

Data source for number of children with high needs referred for services who received follow-up treatment: Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education Referral and Evaluation

Report, ODE, 2016.

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.

Not applicable.

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.

Oregon's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework is known as the Core Body of Knowledge (CBK). The CBK has gone through an extensive community engagement process among the early learning workforce community. Feedback was given in face to face meetings as well as online. Once the final revisions were made, they were given to a specialized consultant to review the documents from an equity perspective. A document designer is working with the Oregon Center for Career Development to get the document into a user-friendly format and this will be disseminated to all the state and regional early learning conferences, including the community colleges, early learning hubs, the Quality Improvement Specialists assisting programs to acquire a QRIS rating.

As of 2016, 12 of 17 of Oregon's Community Colleges use Oregon's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework (Core Body of Knowledge) in their early childhood Care and Education Degree curriculum.

In 2016, The Oregon Center for Career Development added an “Oregon Registry and Community Colleges” section on their website. The section includes a map of the state of Oregon with details about the community college including links and a google maps photo of the college, and the college's “credit for prior learning” criteria.
https://www.pdx.edu/occd/oregon-registry-and-community-colleges

This section encourages early learning professionals to:

- Increase their Oregon Registry Step,
- Gain credit for prior learning at community college (Step 7 and/or a CDA)
- Apply for scholarships

In April 2016, the Grand Articulation Summit (a meeting of all of the community colleges Early Childhood Degree Directors, and early learning workforce leaders) met. Topics included:

- Addressing educational needs of staff that are working in facilities seeking higher QRIS ratings,
- The rates at which Oregon Registry Step applications have increased as a result of the desire/need to gain higher Oregon Registry steps.
- An overview of the demographics of the early learning workforce over the past year including data on their professional development journeys and continuing professional

development needs.

- Roundtable discussions on the “What would it take to make these pathways available and successful for everyone who wants to take the college journey?”
- An overview of two RTT college scholarships pathways. This panel presentation included the community college Early Childhood Degree Director and their support agencies.

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.

In 2016, we took an opportunity to look at our workforce growth in each county. From May 2014 - September 2016, Oregon saw tremendous growth in the Oregon Registry. The statewide pilot of the TQRIS has stimulated providers' growing interest in demonstrating their professional development. As Oregon's TQRIS increases, these numbers will follow, as early learning providers demonstrate that they meet the necessary personnel requirements to help attain the highest TQRIS rating for their program.

Oregon continues to support the growth and development of early childhood educators by providing diverse opportunities for the workforce to augment their knowledge and skills in areas that align with the Core Body of Knowledge (CBK). For example, Master Trainers meet the highest trainer qualifications and can train on advanced content connected to CBK workforce standards.

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.					
Baseline and Annual Targets					
	Baseline	**Year One**	**Year Two**	**Year Three**	**Year Four**
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	12	12	12	13	13
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	2,155	2,259	3,374	3,454	3,534

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.					
Actuals					
	Baseline	**Year One**	**Year Two**	**Year Three**	**Year Four**
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	12	12	12	12	13
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	2,155	2,788	4,141	5,245	6,243

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

Oregon continues to be on track in this area. The above table reflects the baselines, targets and actuals for the following metric definitions.

Aligned institutions- defined as community colleges.

Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an aligned institution or provider- defined as achieving Step 7 - 9.5 on the Oregon Registry, a CDA or Oregon Registry Credential.

The data source for these metrics is the Oregon Registry.

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.

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.

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.

Baseline and Annual Targets										
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	*Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year*									
	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
<Select Progression>	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Credential Type 1	1,536	14%	1,601	11%	3,166	23%	3,226	23%	3,286	24%
Specify:	Oregon Registry Steps 3-6 or higher									
Credential Type 2	1,900	14%	2,004	14%	2,060	15%	2,116	15%	2,172	16%
Specify:	Step 7 – 8.5/CDA or Oregon Registry Credential									
Credential Type 3	1,338	9%	1,338	9%	2,397	17%	2,421	17%	2,445	18%
Specify:	Step 9 – 9.5/Associate Degree									
Credential Type 4	2,381	17%	2,381	17%	3,056	22%	3,312	24%	3,568	26%
Specify:	Step 10/Bachelor Degree									
Credential Type 5										
Specify:										
Credential Type 6										
Specify:										
Credential Type 7										
Specify:										
Credential Type 8										
Specify:										
Credential Type 9										
Specify:										
Credential Type 10										
Specify:										
Credential Type 11										
Specify:										
Credential Type 12										
Specify:										
Credential Type 13										
Specify:										

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)	*Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year*									
	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
<Select Progression>	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Credential Type 1	1,536	14%	1,995	19%	2,654	16%	3,215	23%	3,604	33%
Specify:	Oregon Registry Steps 3-6 or higher									
Credential Type 2	1,900	14%	2,277	16%	3,277	20%	3,412	24%	4,231	39%
Specify:	Step 7 – 8.5/CDA or Oregon Registry Credential									
Credential Type 3	1,338	9%	1,516	11%	1,979	12%	1,833	13%	2,012	18%
Specify:	Step 9 – 9.5/Associate Degree									
Credential Type 4	2,381	17%	2,945	21%	3,834	23%	4,054	29%	4,052	37%
Specify:	Step 10/Bachelor Degree									
Credential Type 5										
Specify:										
Credential Type 6										
Specify:										
Credential Type 7										
Specify:										
Credential Type 8										
Specify:										
Credential Type 9										
Specify:										
Credential Type 10										
Specify:										
Credential Type 11										
Specify:										
Credential Type 12										
Specify:										
Credential Type 13										
Specify:										

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2) Data Notes
Please describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information.

Data that is documented through the Oregon Registry. Percentage represents number of participants with that credential related to total of Teachers, Head teachers, Directors and providers that are recorded in the Oregon Office of Child Care's Criminal Background Registry - total **10,883.** This data reflect data available through December, 2016.

As of 2016, almost all of the Head Start staff are included in the above data set.

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.

Oregon was very successful in meeting the workforce targets that we set. We exceeded in all workforce target areas except for Steps 9-9.5 which was short by 433. It should be noted, however, we still met the percentage of our overall workforce having achieved 18% of the workforce achieving a Step 9-9.5. Also, we exceeded the Step 10 by 484, showing 37% of the workforce at this level. Table: D)(2)(d)(2) Performance Measures illustrates this success.

We have also been very successful in our efforts to bring more cross sector trainers into the Oregon Registry Trainer Program, including trainers from Head Start, Health, Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education.

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.

Oregon's Statewide Kindergarten Assessment includes measures in the domains of Social and Emotional Development, Approaches to Learning, Cognition and General Knowledge, and Language and Literacy. The Kindergarten Assessment is administered within the first six weeks of kindergarten. The six week window was established to accommodate the staggered start dates of the school districts in Oregon. Districts select the six week window based upon their individual start date.

Social and Emotional Development/Approaches to Learning:

The statewide Kindergarten Assessment includes the Child Behavior Rating Scale (CBRS) which is based upon teacher observation of the student during regular classroom activities and routines. The items focus on a child's approaches to learning, self-regulatory skills, and social-emotional development. The CBRS has been demonstrated to be strongly predictive of reading and math achievement in the elementary grades and has been validated in a wide range of cultural contexts and countries.

Cognition and General Knowledge:

The statewide Kindergarten Assessment includes a 16 item math measurement, modified from the EasyCBM assessment from the University of Oregon. The modified math measure focuses on numbers and operations. EasyCBM is an assessment system for kindergarten through 8th grade designed to provide benchmarking and progress monitoring in both literacy and math to inform instruction. Validity studies of the instruments have included populations of African-American, Latino, and other racial-ethnic groups. The EasyCBM measures were developed to be used within a RTI system and went through both reliability and validity studies.

Language and Literacy:

The statewide Kindergarten Assessment includes an Early Literacy measure that was originally modified from the EasyCBM assessment from the University of Oregon. Validity studies of the instruments have included populations of African-American, Latino, and other racial-ethnic groups. The EasyCBM measures were developed to be used within a RTI system and went through both reliability and validity studies. In 2016, the Early Literacy measure was revised from letter naming and letter sound fluency to upper and lowercase letter name recognition and letter/sound recognition to better align with Oregon's Early Learning Standards and the Common Core State Standards. In contrast to previous years, the revised measure is not timed. To allow for continued ability to analyze longitudinal data trends, approximately 3,600 students taking the Kindergarten Assessment in the fall of 2016 also received one of the timed legacy (administered in previous years) literacy measures in addition to the new untimed operational (currently administered) literacy measures. These students were given the legacy English letter names or the legacy English letter sounds measure.

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 Fall of 2016, Oregon completed the fourth statewide administration of the Kindergarten Assessment.

During the last year of the RTT-ELC grant, Oregon's work related to the Kindergarten Assessment focused on strengthening both the administration and content of the assessment. This work aligns with the cross-agency Kindergarten Assessment work plan developed in 2015 which identified four primary focus areas: communications, data analysis and interpretation, training and technical assistance, and continuous improvement.

As a result of stakeholder feedback and an alignment study of Oregon's Early Learning and Common Core State Standards, the Early Literacy measures were revised to provide, with increased accuracy, a picture of the strengths of Oregon's incoming kindergartners and a measurement of growth over time. The Early Literacy measure changed from timed letter name and letter sound fluency to untimed letter and sound recognition (26 English upper case letters, 26 lower case letters, 26 English sounds, and 26 Spanish sounds for officially identified Spanish English Learners). To preserve the ability to look at data longitudinally, approximately 3,600 students participated in a linking study that used the previous literacy measures, now referred to as “*Legacy*” literacy measures.

Last Fall, Oregon's Kindergarten Assessment is non-secure which allows for greater transparency about the skills that are assessed. For clarity, “secure” refers to the materials and not the assessment results. A benefit of making the assessment non-secure is that parents and teachers are able to teach the self-regulatory behaviors that are essential for academic success. In addition, schools and districts are able to use the data from the assessment in a timelier manner, enhancing the assessment's use for instructional decisions and allocation of resources.

Oregon reconvened the Kindergarten Assessment Advisory Panel (comprised of early learning professionals, kindergarten teachers, school district administrators, and university researchers). The panel reviewed the assessment, examined

data, and provided recommendations for implementation and future revisions. The panel also provided recommendations to ensure that test items and implementation procedures are culturally responsive and help to eliminate opportunity gaps from communities of color and students who are emerging bilinguals. A subset of the Kindergarten Assessment Advisory Panel met in February 2016 to evaluate research in Early Spanish Literacy to identify measures that provide an increasingly robust picture of children's early Spanish language and literacy development. Outcomes from the meeting included recommendations for the Spanish letter sound recognition measure that was embedded into the 2016 assessment. ODE staff and panelists continue to review and revise the current measure to reflect the latest research.

As part of an ongoing commitment to strengthening assessment measures, implementation supports, and data interpretation, Oregon engages in research and collaborates with other states around the development of new and improved assessments for kindergarten entry. For example, Oregon is participating in the K-3 Assessment Consortium led by North Carolina.

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.

Oregon is contracting with TCC Software Solutions on the development of the Early Learning Information system (ELIS). TCC's business analyst met with each work unit within the Office of Child Care to document work flow and functionality requirements. An independent quality assurance vendor has also been hired for the duration of the project to ensure ELD's needs are being adequately met.

In 2016, the following four documents were prepared and vetted:

- Functional Requirements,
- Systems Design,
- Gap Analysis, and
- Requirements Traceability Matrix.

The ELIS system will include an interactive system that captures:

- Child care facility information
- Central Background Registry (CBR) for individual background information
- Quality rating and improvement system for facilities
- A mobile technology system for licensing staff to use in the field
- An on-line system to complete and submit facility applications: This includes submitting applications to become a licensed child care facility. In addition, once licensed a facility will also be able to complete and submit their TQRIS/Spark applications.

- An on-line system to complete and submit CBR applications
- ELIS will interact with NIC USA, a system allowing the public to make payments with credit cards
- Interact with the professional development system (ORO) hosted by Portland State University

Many of the forms used in ELIS will be translated into four additional languages, including Spanish, Russian, Vietnamese, and Chinese. Registration and profile pages within ELIS will also be translated into the four additional languages. At this time TQRIS will be translated into two additional languages - Spanish and Russian.

We anticipate a successful completion of this project by the end of the no-cost extension period.

Data Tables

Commitment to early learning and development.

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

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income[1] families, by age		
	Number of children from Low-Income families in the State	**Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State**
Infants under age 1	20,786	20.2%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	40,772	39.8%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	40,972	40%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	102,530	100%

[1] 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.

Data Source and Year: 2015 1 year PUMS and One year Public Use Microdata Sample of the American Community Survey published in 2016.

Table (A)(1)-2: Special populations of Children with High Needs
The State should use these data to guide its thinking about where specific activities may be required to address special populations' unique needs.

Special populations: Children who	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who…	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who…
Have disabilities or developmental delays[1]	10,810	4.3%
Are English learners[2]	34,829	15.3%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	795	0.34%
Are migrant[3]	3,763	1.6%
Are homeless[4]	1,314	0.57%
Are in foster care	4,328	1.88%
Other 1 as identified by the State	2,845	1.23%
Describe:	Urban Native American/ Alaska Native Birth-5 in Portland Metro area	
Other 2 as identified by the State		
Describe:		

[1]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).
[2]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.
[3]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).
[4]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.

Migrant: report from state data report provided by Migrant Education Coordinator.

Homeless: Oregon Statewide Report Card

Foster Care: Child Welfare Data Book, Oregon Dept. of Human Services

There was no updated data to report on English Language Learners and Urban Native American/Alaska Native birth to five in Portland Metro Area.

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.

Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Infants under age 1**	**Toddlers ages 1 through 2**	**Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry**	**Total**
State-funded preschool	20	44	9,576	9,640
Specify:	Includes state-funded Early Head Start and Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten.			
Data Source and Year:	HS 2016 PIR			
Early Head Start and Head Start[1]	1,159	2,814	5,831	9,804
Data Source and Year:	2015 PIR report (Region X, Region XI American Indian Head Start, Region XII Migrant/Seasonal Head Start excluding non-ACF).			
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619	613	3,414	6,783	10,810
Data Source and Year:	Annual Special Education Child Count, 2015.			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	0	415	415
Data Source and Year:	Consolidated State Performance Final Report, 2015.			
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	946	4,543	7,508	12,997
Data Source and Year:	ACF-801, Oct 2014-Sept 2015			
Other 1	3,550	2,694	720	6,964
Specify:	Home Visiting -- public health programs, Healthy Families Oregon, MIECHV			
Data Source and Year:	Oregon Health Authority, Public Health Division, Office of Family Health, 2015 report			
Other 2	340	1,249	1,594	3,183
Specify:	Relief Nurseries			
Data Source and Year:	Self report by each nursery to Oregon Association of Relief Nurseries (OARN) by calendar year 2015.			
Other 3	967	809	978	2,831
Specify:	TANF			
Data Source and Year:	Department of Human Services provider pay claims and claims history January 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015.			
Other 4	1,818	4,346	4,825	10,989
Specify:	Employment-Related Day Care (ERDC)			
Data Source and Year:	Department of Human Services Provider pay claims and claims history, January 1, 2015 December 31, 2015.			
Other 5				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				

Table (A)(1)-3a - Additional Other rows				
	Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age			
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Infants under age 1**	**Toddlers ages 1 through 2**	**Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry**	**Total**
Other 6				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
Other 7				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
Other 8				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
[1] 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.

Head Start/Early Head Start: (including Migrant/Seasonal and Tribal Head Start) data from Head Start Enterprise System 2016 Program Information Reports (PIR); state-funded preschool data provided by programs using 2016 PIR forms submitted to ELD

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	1,091	49	12	69	18	97	401
Specify:	Fall 2016 State quarterly demographic report (submitted by programs, includes Preschool Promise						
Early Head Start and Head Start[1]	7,995	599	323	1,072	104	1,430	5,140
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	927	34	125	71	12	135	2,723
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	1,684	74	168	175	29	260	4,393
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	129	10	12	14	4	17	224
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	5,886	359	246	2,188	144	621	11,286
Other 1	868	80	15	88	11	193	1,788
Describe:	Relief Nurseries						
Other 2							
Describe:							

[1] 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**
Other 3							
Describe:							
Other 4							
Describe:							
Other 5							
Describe:							
Other 6							
Describe:							
Other 7							
Describe:							
Other 8							
Describe:							

Data Table A(1)-3b Data Notes

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

Data source for state-funded preschool: Fall 2016 state demographic report (submitted by programs). Migrant/Seasonal and Tribal Head Start extrapolated from 2014 Head Start Program Information Reports.

Programs funded by IDEA, Part C, Data Source: Annual Special Education Child Count, 2015-16
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619, Data Source: Annual Special Education Child Count, 2015-16
Programs funded by Title I, ESEA, Data Source: the Consolidated State Performance Plan, 2014-15

CCDF: ACF 801 Data, October 2015 - September 2016. Figures include kids of all ages.

2016 Relief Nurseries data collected from programs.

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**
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start[1]	$752,006	$754,653	$762,770	$793,155	$793,155
State-funded preschool	$61,069,890	$62,437,835	$63,361,629	$69,863,625	$89,364,487
Specify:	Oregon Prekindergarten				
State contributions to IDEA Part C	$11,737,518	$13,787,983	$14,623,788	$18,617,318	$18,822,565
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry	$44,155,427	$52,872,711	$55,018,299	$54,999,515	$63,014,674
Total State contributions to CCDF[2]	$31,313,274	$31,051,232	$31,204,708	$31,063,928	$31,063,928
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded
If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded	$7,863,951	$7,428,186	$7,110,554	$7,420,368	$7,420,368
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs[3]	$984,432	$2,817,838	$4,439,501	$4,434,163	$4,434,163
Other State contributions 1	$2,824,690	$4,360,843	$3,209,349	$8,300,000	$4,300,000
Specify:	26 Relief Nurseries serving birth to age 6, therapeutic classrooms, parent education, home visiting.				
Other State contributions 2	$1,161,786	$1,475,362	$2,270,921	$1,734,686	$1,734,686
Specify:	Department of Human Service state contribution to CCDF				
Other State contributions 3	$666,667	$666,667	$666,667	$666,667	$666,667
Specify:	Child Care Contribution Tax Credit				
Other State contributions 4	$6,216,448	$3,952,999	$4,020,679	$4,487,891	$6,713,637
Specify:	Local government Portland Children's Levy – early childhood birth to 5 contributions				
Other State contributions 5					
Specify:					
Other State contributions 6					
Specify:					

Table (A)(1)-4 - Additional Other rows					
Funding for each Fiscal Year					
Type of investment	**Baseline**	**Year One**	**Year Two**	**Year Three**	**Year Four**
Other State contributions 7					
Specify:					
Other State contributions 8					
Specify:					
Total State contributions:	**$160,882,138**	**$174,179,123**	**$182,249,364**	**$202,381,316**	**$228,328,330**

[1] Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.
[2] Total State contributions to CCDF must include Maintenance of Effort (MOE), State Match, and any State contributions exceeding State MOE or Match.
[3] 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.

Supplemental state spending on EHS and HS: Figure reflects state-funded EHS only.

State-funded preschool: Figure includes both state funded Head Start (Oregon Prekindergarten) and Preschool Promise.

State contributions to IDEA Part C, Data Source: Oregon Early Intervention/Early Childhood Legislatively Approved budget for 2016-17.

State contributions to IDEA Part B, 619, Data Source: Oregon Early Intervention/Early Childhood Legislatively Approved budget for 2016-17.

Portland Children's Levy**:** The increase from the previous year is due to the Levy experiencing significant increase in revenues from the substantial increase in property values, and from those increased revenues, allocations were made to: expand preschool slots locally, re-start a childcare affordability initiative that helps working families through supplementing their ERDC subsidy to access providers participating in the QRIS system, and expanding home- based support services for children in families involved with childcare welfare.

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.

Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program[1]					
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Baseline**	**Year One**	**Year Two**	**Year Three**	**Year Four**
State-funded preschool *(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)*	7,358	7,358	7,840	7,922	9,640
Specify:	Oregon Head Start PreKindergarten, state-funded Early Head Start, and Preschool Promise.				
Early Head Start and Head Start[2] *(funded enrollment)*	10,014	11,793	11,433	9,463	9,804
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 *(annual December 1 count)*	10,250	10,585	10,641	10,810	11,310
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA *(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report)*	638	525	350	415	276
Programs receiving CCDF funds *(average monthly served)*	15,238	16,481	16,278	16,652	15,090
Other 1	3,390	3,136	3,548	3,013	3,182
Describe:	Relief Nurseries				
Other 2	20,625	12,717	12,062	10,210	9,342
Describe:	Home Visiting				
Other 3					
Describe:					
Other 4					
Describe:					
Other 5					
Describe:					
Other 6					
Describe:					
Other 7					
Describe:					
Other 8					
Describe:					

[1] Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.

[2] 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.

Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, Section 619, Data Source: Annual Special Education Child Count, 2015-16.

Programs funded under Title I of ESEA, Data Source: Consolidated State Performance Report, 2015-16.

2016 Relief Nurseries data collected from state program coordinator.

CCDF: ACF 801 Data, October 2015 - September 2016.

Home Visiting: Includes state and federally funded home visitation programs operating in Oregon.

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.

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

Data Table A(1)-6 Notes

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

No changes have occurred since the submission of the application.

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	
Specify:					
Early Head Start and Head Start[1]	X	X	X	X	
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	X	X			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	X	X			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	X	X		X	
Programs receiving CCDF funds					
Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier) **Tier 1**					
Tier 2					
Tier 3	X		X		
Tier 4	X	X	X		
Tier 5	X	X	X	X	
State licensing requirements					
Other 1	X	X	X	X	
Describe:	Home Visiting Programs funded by the Affordable Care Act Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program				
Other 2					
Describe:					
Other 3					
Describe:					
Other 4					
Describe:					
Other 5					
Describe:					

[1] 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
Other 6					
Describe:					
Other 7					
Describe:					
Other 8					
Describe:					

Data Table A(1)-7 Notes

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

Not applicable.

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.

Major discrepancies between the State's approved budget and total expenditures for year-4 are in three budget categories:

Personnel and Fringe Benefits: Lower than projected expenditures for project-6 and the timing of payroll payments for the month of December 2016 are the major factors in the discrepancies in the overall budget projection for these categories. The state payroll payments for December 2016 were paid January 3, 2017 and thus not accounted for in this APR period.

Equipment: Project-6 contains the majority of the equipment purchases planned for the Race To The Top grant. The purchases will be made in year-5, as the data system goes into testing and live status.

Supplies: Supplies is over year-4 projections due to coding of expenditures by the state accounting system. The largest discrepancy is in project-7. The agreement for Vroom materials with the Bezos Foundation requires the Early Learning Division to purchase materials for partners. These purchases were considered supplies and not contract payments.

Funds distributed to localities and partner programs: lower than budgeted. The accounting month closed prior to submission of invoices for payment or payment of said invoices were made.

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 State of Oregon will make minor changes between projects. The substantive changes will be in the State's request to carry forward budget balances into the year-5 no-cost extension. Payments to vendors for work completed by December 31, 2016, account for much of projects-2, -3, -4, and -5. Project-6 work continues and will be completed by December 31, 2017; however, the carry-forward amounts estimated a year ago were lower than anticipated for this project.

Project Budget 1

Project Name: **Grant Management**

Project Budget Narrative

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

The expenditures projected for the approved equity training for the Early Learning Division (ELD) staff was lower than budgeted. Training of staff has been scheduled for the next few months of 2017.

Due to the timing of state payroll for the month of December, ELD staff's payroll were moved from Race To the Top Grant to state expenditures. This accounted for the under budget amounts paid for year-4.

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.

Oregon's approved no-cost extension includes projections for the continuation of equity training for early learning. We seek permission to move the approved equity training costs to year-5 as well as the balance of the personnel and fringe benefits to assist with the close out of the grant.

Project Budget 2

Project Name: TQRIS Validation Study

Project Budget Narrative

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

Work for project-2 is contracted with Oregon State University. Payment for the quarter ending December 31, 2016 was not made before the state closed the accounting month of December 2016.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

The budget for year-5 will be increased to make the payments not made in year-4.

Project Budget 3

Project Name: Increase Participation of ELDP of TQRIS

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.

Due to the timing of state payroll for the month of December, ELD staff's payroll were moved from Race To the Top Grant to state expenditures. This accounted for the under budget amounts paid for year-4.

Payments to partners and contractors were either not received or payment was not made before accounting month of December 2016 was closed based on state accounting rules.

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.

There are no substantive changes; however, Oregon requests to increase the year-5 budget to cover payments not made by the end of the year, December 31, 2016.

Project Budget 4

Project Name: Workforce Build Capacity

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.

Due to the timing of state payroll for the month of December, ELD staff's payroll were moved from Race To the Top Grant to state expenditures. This accounted for the under budget amounts paid for year-4.

Payments to partners and contractors were either not received or payment was not made before accounting month of December 2016 was closed, based on state accounting rules.

Travel for year was higher than budgeted. This increase was due to the amount of time spent with Hub collaboration, training, and monitoring.

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.

There are no substantive changes; however, Oregon requests to increase the year-5 budget for payments not made for the year ending December 31, 2016 as well as to cover staff salaries to continue Hub work.

Project Budget 5

Project Name: Improve Rates of Developmental Screening at Regular Intervals

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.

Work for project-5 is contracted with Oregon Healthy Authority. Payment for quarter ending December 31, 2016 was not made before the state closed the accounting month of December 2016.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

The Oregon Health Authority has been successful in completing the work of the project under the projected budget; however, until final invoices are received, the exact amount has yet to be determined. The amount is estimated to be between $115,000 and $190,000. While we have met the deliverables for project-5 of the RTT-ELC grant, Oregon would like to use the remaining funds to support current efforts to identify and implement a social emotional training for the field, which will require temporary staffing.

Project Budget 6

Project Name: TQRIS Data

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.

Work under project-6 for development of the Early Learning Information System (ELIS) has increased and is on track to go live in the Fall of 2017; however, budget expectations were projected higher than actual expenditures due to staffing changes. At present, this project has a vendor to develop the system as well as an internal project manager to usher the work through the completion of this project.

The equipment purchases budgeted for year-4 were not made; however, such purchases are anticipated to be made by summer 2017. In addition, contractual payments for year ending December 31, 2016 were not paid prior to the state's month end close.

The increase in "other" payments was over budget due to coding of payment for costs associated with the Request For Proposal work that the Oregon Department of Administrative Services performed. The object code for payment is considered `other' in reporting for the APR. The budget was projected in "contractual", not "other" in the RTT-ELC year-4 budget.

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.

Year-5 projected expenditures will be augmented to reflect an increase in contractual amounts to account for the project manager firm and changes in personnel/fridge benefits. The remaining budgets for year-5 will be increased to reflect remaining budget of project.

Project Budget 7

Project Name: Public Access

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.

Due to the timing of state payroll for the month of December, ELD staff's payroll were moved from the RTT-ELC grant to state expenditures. This accounted for the under budget amounts paid for year-4.

Supplies: The agreement for Vroom materials with the Bezos Foundation requires the Early Learning Division to purchase materials for partners. These purchases were considered supplies and not contract payments.

Website work and other branding work were successfully completed; however final payments have not yet been made to contractors.

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.

There have been no substantive changes; however, the remaining budgets for year-5 will be increased to reflect the remaining budget of project-7.

Project Budget 8

Project Name: Aligned ECE to K-3 Teaching and Learning

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.

Due to the timing of state payroll for the month of December, ELD staff's payroll were moved from the RTT-ELC grant to state expenditures. This accounted for the under budget amounts paid for year-4.

Payment for a conference held in November 2016 is still pending.

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.

There have been no substantive changes; however, the remaining budgets for year-5 will be increased to reflect the remaining budget of project-8.

Project Budget 9

Project Name: Oregon Kindergarten Assessment

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.

Due to the timing of state payroll for the month of December, ELD staff's payroll were moved from the RTT-ELC grant to state expenditures. This accounted for the under budget amounts paid for year-4.

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.

There have been no substantive changes; however, the remaining budgets for year-5 will be increased to reflect the remaining budget of project-9.

Project Budget 10

Project Name: _____

OREGON'S RTT-ELC APPLICATION INCLUDED 9 PROJECTS.
PAGES 89-108 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	$153,799.00	$796,742.51	$1,470,591.45	$1,406,273.92	$3,827,406.88
2. Fringe Benefits	$80,147.00	$361,661.06	$650,694.46	$620,118.50	$1,712,621.02
3. Travel	$691.00	$56,367.60	$75,373.63	$66,710.25	$199,142.48
4. Equipment	$616.00	$16,894.86	$13,715.32	$1,964.10	$33,190.28
5. Supplies	$7,718.00	$43,648.92	$118,510.38	$200,891.40	$370,768.70
6. Contractual	$62,727.00	$457,503.38	$219,164.62	$1,038,308.93	$1,777,703.93
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$4,018.37	$14,936.08	$72,341.29	$91,295.74
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$305,698.00	$1,736,836.70	$2,562,985.94	$3,406,608.39	$8,012,129.03
10. Indirect Costs*	$22,563.00	$272,922.54	$441,716.88	$420,161.73	$1,157,364.15
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	$1,342,325.00	$3,503,253.24	$5,616,636.15	$4,365,158.44	$14,827,372.83
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$9,023.00	$23,183.41	$56,118.10	$21,374.46	$109,698.97
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$1,679,609.00	$5,536,195.89	$8,677,457.07	$8,213,303.02	$24,106,564.98
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$357,731,587.00	$41,173,810.00	$528,368,131.00	$1,605,915,832.00	$2,533,189,360.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$359,411,196.00	$46,710,005.89	$537,045,588.07	$1,614,129,135.02	$2,557,295,924.98

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 - Grant Management

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$49,861.00	$181,692.19	$306,134.68	$300,449.38	$838,137.25
2. Fringe Benefits	$25,003.00	$75,935.58	$135,084.93	$134,430.80	$370,454.31
3. Travel	$0.00	$1,622.93	$5,687.14	$16,695.93	$24,006.00
4. Equipment	$413.00	$0.00	$2,594.42	$0.00	$3,007.42
5. Supplies	$2,691.00	$5,945.75	$7,816.74	$9,176.18	$25,629.67
6. Contractual	$60,506.00	$101,296.98	$22,060.30	$0.00	$183,863.28
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$217.00	$147.00	$0.00	$364.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$138,474.00	$366,710.43	$479,525.21	$460,752.29	$1,445,461.93
10. Indirect Costs*	$4,607.00	$73,082.54	$97,213.00	$79,873.23	$254,775.77
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	$9,023.00	$23,183.41	$56,118.10	$21,374.46	$109,698.97
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$152,104.00	$462,976.38	$632,856.31	$561,999.98	$1,809,936.67
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)	$152,104.00	$462,976.38	$632,856.31	$561,999.98	$1,809,936.67

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 - TQRIS Validation Studies

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$283.45	$0.00	$0.00	$283.45
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$0.00	$283.45	$0.00	$0.00	$283.45
10. Indirect Costs*	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	$69,003.00	$158,867.95	$271,852.68	$348,683.95	$848,407.58
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)	$69,003.00	$159,151.40	$271,852.68	$348,683.95	$848,691.03
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)	$69,003.00	$159,151.40	$271,852.68	$348,683.95	$848,691.03

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 - Increase Participation of ELDP on the TQRIS

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$12,587.00	$101,749.65	$183,219.01	$165,146.00	$462,701.66
2. Fringe Benefits	$7,286.00	$55,801.10	$79,193.42	$66,649.46	$208,929.98
3. Travel	$9.00	$10,615.71	$6,680.63	$1,100.86	$18,406.20
4. Equipment	$0.00	$1,693.14	$2,302.47	$0.00	$3,995.61
5. Supplies	$675.00	$3,439.18	$2,827.81	$2,128.76	$9,070.75
6. Contractual	$2,221.00	$0.00	$18,787.64	$407.39	$21,416.03
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$300.00	$660.44	$0.00	$960.44
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$22,778.00	$173,598.78	$293,671.42	$235,432.47	$725,480.67
10. Indirect Costs*	$1,748.00	$34,719.00	$51,106.87	$47,008.42	$134,582.29
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	$953,856.00	$1,920,959.06	$3,138,475.31	$2,035,801.55	$8,049,091.92
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)	$978,382.00	$2,129,276.84	$3,483,253.60	$2,318,242.44	$8,909,154.88
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)	$978,382.00	$2,129,276.84	$3,483,253.60	$2,318,242.44	$8,909,154.88

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 - Workforce Build Capacity

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$1,387.00	$101,744.27	$293,454.63	$407,331.00	$803,916.90
2. Fringe Benefits	$554.00	$43,154.80	$135,793.04	$181,128.50	$360,630.34
3. Travel	$0.00	$24,154.14	$47,172.03	$40,614.60	$111,940.77
4. Equipment	$0.00	$4,814.62	$6,900.67	$617.12	$12,332.41
5. Supplies	$0.00	$24,142.01	$7,327.86	$9,301.57	$40,771.44
6. Contractual	$0.00	$240,721.65	$10,126.50	$0.00	$250,848.15
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$3,217.92	$3,351.13	$48.00	$6,617.05
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$1,941.00	$441,949.41	$504,125.86	$639,040.79	$1,587,057.06
10. Indirect Costs*	$240.00	$45,245.00	$77,496.00	$87,416.94	$210,397.94
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	$319,466.00	$1,358,537.58	$1,811,487.30	$1,314,239.38	$4,803,730.26
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)	$321,647.00	$1,845,731.99	$2,393,109.16	$2,040,697.11	$6,601,185.26
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$271,272,072.00	$0.00	$423,571,661.00	$1,488,337,257.00	$2,183,180,990.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$271,593,719.00	$1,845,731.99	$425,964,770.16	$1,490,377,954.11	$2,189,782,175.26

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 - Improve rates of developmental screening at regular intervals

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
10. Indirect Costs*	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	$0.00	$0.00	$394,676.86	$433,894.14	$828,571.00
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	$0.00	$394,676.86	$433,894.14	$828,571.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$85,449,072.00	$41,173,810.00	$104,796,470.00	$117,578,575.00	$348,997,927.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$85,449,072.00	$41,173,810.00	$105,191,146.86	$118,012,469.14	$349,826,498.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 6 - TQRIS Data

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$82,765.00	$223,143.77	$293,531.40	$167,882.53	$767,322.70
2. Fringe Benefits	$45,283.00	$115,832.06	$138,634.22	$77,874.94	$377,624.22
3. Travel	$682.00	$4,490.25	$1,796.24	$1,925.05	$8,893.54
4. Equipment	$203.00	$5,548.42	$1,715.27	$0.00	$7,466.69
5. Supplies	$4,352.00	$2,269.12	$6,205.15	$3,010.56	$15,836.83
6. Contractual	$0.00	$53,016.00	$39,110.00	$422,317.23	$514,443.23
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$70,508.17	$70,508.17
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$133,285.00	$404,299.62	$480,992.28	$743,518.48	$1,762,095.38
10. Indirect Costs*	$15,150.00	$75,257.00	$70,225.17	$67,706.50	$228,338.67
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	$0.00	$64,888.65	$0.00	$0.00	$64,888.65
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)	$148,435.00	$544,445.27	$551,217.45	$811,224.98	$2,055,322.70
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)	$148,435.00	$544,445.27	$551,217.45	$811,224.98	$2,055,322.70

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 - Public Access

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$0.00	$29,828.76	$124,328.83	$133,799.73	$287,957.32
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$8,888.25	$40,738.52	$52,127.12	$101,753.89
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$3,867.19	$2,107.08	$5,974.27
4. Equipment	$0.00	$2,167.07	$202.49	$0.00	$2,369.56
5. Supplies	$0.00	$5,469.10	$91,481.32	$169,232.51	$266,182.93
6. Contractual	$0.00	$62,468.75	$128,424.83	$590,547.48	$781,441.06
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$1,456.04	$1,785.12	$3,241.16
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$0.00	$108,821.93	$390,499.22	$949,599.04	$1,448,920.19
10. Indirect Costs*	$0.00	$6,953.00	$78,088.00	$85,139.00	$170,180.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	$0.00	$0.00	$144.00	$232,539.42	$232,683.42
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	$115,774.93	$468,731.22	$1,267,277.46	$1,851,783.61
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$1,010,443.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,010,443.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$1,010,443.00	$115,774.93	$468,731.22	$1,267,277.46	$2,862,226.61

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 8 - Aligned ECE to K-3 teaching and learning

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$7,199.00	$143,878.82	$178,591.52	$169,851.00	$499,520.34
2. Fringe Benefits	$2,021.00	$57,884.32	$83,543.15	$77,496.15	$220,944.62
3. Travel	$0.00	$15,484.57	$5,729.23	$3,986.43	$25,200.23
4. Equipment	$0.00	$2,671.61	$0.00	$1,346.98	$4,018.59
5. Supplies	$0.00	$2,383.76	$2,183.47	$5,251.56	$9,818.79
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$23,749.61	$23,749.61
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$8,508.38	$0.00	$8,508.38
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$9,220.00	$222,303.08	$278,555.75	$281,681.73	$791,760.56
10. Indirect Costs*	$818.00	$33,345.00	$46,376.84	$39,876.50	$120,416.34
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$10,038.00	$255,648.08	$324,932.59	$321,558.23	$912,176.90
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)	$10,038.00	$255,648.08	$324,932.59	$321,558.23	$912,176.90

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 9 - Oregon Kindergarten Assessment

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$0.00	$14,705.05	$91,331.38	$61,814.28	$167,850.71
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$4,164.95	$37,707.18	$30,411.53	$72,283.66
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$4,441.17	$280.30	$4,721.47
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$668.03	$2,790.26	$3,458.29
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$655.35	$1,287.22	$1,942.57
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$813.09	$0.00	$813.09
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$0.00	$18,870.00	$135,616.20	$96,583.59	$251,069.79
10. Indirect Costs*	$0.00	$4,321.00	$21,211.00	$13,141.14	$38,673.14
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	$23,191.00	$156,827.20	$109,724.73	$289,742.93
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	$23,191.00	$156,827.20	$109,724.73	$289,742.93

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.