

2013 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

Minnesota





Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge

Annual Performance Report

Minnesota

2013

CFDA Number: 84.412
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202
OMB Number: 1810-0713
Expiration Date: December 31, 2016

Table of Contents

APR Cover Sheet	1
Certification	2
Executive Summary	3
Successful State Systems	8
Governance Structure	8
Stakeholder Involvement	9
Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders.....	10
Participating State Agencies	10
High-Quality, Accountable Programs	11
Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application).....	11
Promoting Participation in the TQRIS (Section B(2) of Application)	14
Performance Measure (B)(2)(c).....	16
Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application).....	19
Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application).....	21
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1)	24
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2)	26
Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application).....	29
Focused Investment Areas: Sections (C), (D), and (E)	30
Promoting Early Learning Outcomes	31
Early Learning Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application)	31
Comprehensive Assessment Systems (Section C(2) of Application)	32
Early Childhood Education Workforce	34
Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials (Section D(1) of Application)	34
Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities (Section D(2) of Application)	35
Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1).....	37
Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2).....	39
Measuring Outcomes and Progress	42
Understanding the Status of Children’s Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry (Section E(1) of Application)	42
Early Learning Data Systems (Section E(2) of Application)	44
Data Tables	45
Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age.....	45
Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs	46
Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age	47

Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity.....	48
Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development.....	49
Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	51
Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards.....	52
Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State	53
Budget and Expenditure Tables.....	55
Budget Summary Table	55
Budget Table: Project 1 – Parent Aware	57
Budget Table: Project 2 – Early Learning Scholarships.....	59
Budget Table: Project 3 – Title I PreK Incentives.....	61
Budget Table: Project 4 – Early Learning Standards.....	63
Budget Table: Project 5 – Comprehensive Assessment System.....	65
Budget Table: Project 6 – Workforce Framework	67
Budget Table: Project 7 – Workforce Support	69
Budget Table: Project 8 – Kindergarten Entrance Assessment.....	71
Budget Table: Project 9 – Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System	73
Budget Table: Project 10 – Family Friend and Neighbor.....	75
Budget Table: Project 11 – Private-Public Partnership	77
Budget Table: Project 12 – Project Management	79

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



APR Cover Sheet

General Information

1. **PR/Award #:** S412A120019
2. **Grantee Name:** Office of the Governor, State of Minnesota
3. **Grantee Address:** 130 State Capitol, 75 Rev Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., St. Paul, MN 55155
4. **Project Director Name:** Melvin Carter
Title: Director of the Office of Early Learning
Phone #: (651) 582-8397 **Fax #:** (651) 797-1610
Email Address: Melvin.Carter@state.mn.us

Reporting Period Information

5. **Reporting Period:** 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2013

Indirect Cost Information

6. Indirect Costs

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

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s): 07/01/2013 to 12/31/2013

Approving Federal agency: ED HHS Other



Certification

The Grantee certifies that the State is currently participating in:

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program

Yes No

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

Signed by Authorized Representative

Name: Melvin Carter

Title: Director of the Office of Early Learning

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.

Year 2 of Minnesota's Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge grant has been one of great strides in the implementation of an aggressive early childhood reform agenda with a goal to improve outcomes for children through increased access to high quality services birth to grade three.

Minnesota has prioritized its work into the components of a successful state system: High Quality, Accountable Programs; Increased Access to High Quality; Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children; Great Early Childhood Workforce; and Measuring Outcomes and Progress. Below are highlights of 2013 accomplishments.

Component 1: High Quality, Accountable Programs

Minnesota Parent Aware is Minnesota's voluntary Quality Rating and Improvement System for early care and education programs.

Key Accomplishments

- Completed a planned review and revision of Parent Aware TQRIS standards and indicators, making modest changes to some standards and indicators to improve consistency and clarity in rating programs as we prepare for a more extensive review and revision of indicators in 2015.
- Continued steady expansion of Parent Aware, extending the TQIRS into additional counties for non-accredited child care programs, enabling programs funded through the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and charter schools with pre-kindergarten programs to seek an accelerated rating and strengthening partnerships with many stakeholders and supporters to recruit all types of programs into either the full rating or accelerated rating pathway.
- Exceeded targets for program participation in Parent Aware across almost every program type, rating 1,322 programs as of December, 2013 or 89 percent of our overall target of 1,491 for Year 2 of the grant.
- Significant increases in access for children with high needs to high quality programs were achieved with targets exceeded for children served across every type of program.
- Aggressively marketed Parent Aware to families through a unique public-private partnership with Parent Aware for School Readiness. Media ads resulted in significant increases in use of on-line ratings information and growing awareness of Parent Aware as an important tool for selecting high quality early care and education.
- Introduced new incentives for Parent Aware program participation that support access for young children to high quality early childhood programs. A new Child Care Assistance Program policy makes 3 and 4 Star Rated child care programs eligible for higher rates and expansion of Early Learning Scholarships to children using Parent Aware-participating programs has spurred stronger program interest in our TQIRS.
- Requests for Proposals to provide Child Care Health Consultation were posted for each Transformation Zone, and three grants were awarded for the four Transformation Zones. (One grantee serves two zones.)
- The MDH Child Care Health Consultant (CCHC) provided training to the grantees using curriculum developed by the National Training Institute for Child Care Health Consultants, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Gillings School of Public Health. The CCHC training was opened to participation by other public health agencies and individual practitioners who had interest in providing Child Care Health

Consultant services. Nine public health nurses (7 grantees and 2 public health nurses serving outside the Transformation Zones) completed the training. Participants reported that the training materials and tools were very informative to their work in early childhood settings.

- Grantees have been engaged in program development for the Transformation Zones which has included training of the CCHC's, meetings with local child care providers, quality coaches, and child care organizations. Outreach and CCHC service to individual providers has been initiated.

Challenges and Lessons Learned

- Lagging participation of non-accredited child care programs - both child care centers and family child care providers - remains a critical challenge and requires a multi-pronged approach to making progress: clear, strong and consistent messaging to programs; expanded recruitment efforts that promote new incentives and build on current and new partnerships with local and state leadership; and strategic use of administrative and evaluation data are priorities for 2014.
- Child care health consultation has been recognized as a valuable service and requested by providers outside the Transformation Zones. The challenges to providing CCHC services outside the Transformation Zones include limited resource availability and funding. CCHC services are not readily available in many parts of the state. Funded CCHC services are only available in the Transformation Zones through the RTT-ELC grant.
- Additional requests for CCHC training have been received. Given limited funding, the format by which future trainings might be offered is being explored.

Component 2: Increased Access to High Quality

Minnesota's Access Strategies include two approaches to increase children with high needs' access to high quality early childhood education and care. These two strategies are Early Learning Scholarships provided to families to financially support access to a program participating in Parent Aware and Title I PreK Incentive grants to school districts that contribute Title I funds to early childhood programming.

Key Accomplishments

- Each Transformation Zones continued implementing the Early Learning Scholarships in their local community. Across the four Transformation Zones, 809 Scholarships were awarded in the first year of implementation to increase access to high quality early education and care programs.
- SRI International, the evaluation contractor, conducted the first year of a multi-year evaluation. In interviews conducted by SRI in each of the Transformation Zones, key stakeholders described positive examples of how scholarships increased access to high quality programs, increased hours and continuity of care for children.
- Minnesota has increased the number of districts shifting Title I funds to early childhood from six districts in the first year of the grant to 23 in the second year through RTT-ELC funded Title I PreK Incentive grants. School districts in each of the Transformation Zones participated in the Title I PreK Incentive grant opportunity for the 2013-2014 school year. Additionally, Minnesota was able to expand the grant opportunity to thirteen new districts classified as focus school under Minnesota's ESEA waiver plan.

Challenges and Lessons Learned

- The Title I PreK Incentives opportunity has highlights the need to educate school districts more on the value of early childhood education and how the systems (child care, Head Start, school-based) in the state are organized.
- Schools have faced multiple challenges which have made accessing the Title I PreK Incentives difficult, these include an unstable school funding environment (education payments delayed, sequestration,

recession); time lines for budgeting requires new funds to be known early in the year; and the difficulty for smaller districts to reallocate Title I when it represents a large percentage of their budget.

- To address some of these challenges, Minnesota has moved the annual grant opportunity to earlier in the year to align with school budgeting process and offered Planning and Preparation Title I PreK Incentive grants offered in the White Earth Transformation Zone to improve the opportunity for these districts to participate in the grant.
- In interviews conducted by SRI in each of the Transformation Zones, the key challenges identified were transportation issues for families and difficulty with the initial start-up process.

Component 3: Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children

Minnesota is currently revising the Language, Literacy and Communication and the Social and Emotional domains of Minnesota's Early Learning Standards (Early Childhood Indicators of Progress; ECIPs). Additionally, Minnesota is working to develop a comprehensive system that supports early childhood professionals in the assessment and screening of individual children, environments and programs.

Key Accomplishments

- Two Early Learning Standards Revision Committees were created to review the current Early Learning Standards in each of the two domains, ensure revisions were grounded in current and commonly accepted research on brain development, curriculum, child learning, curriculum, and provide recommendations for revisions. Each committee held 10 meetings, and the first draft of revisions was sent out to over 20 state experts for input.
- The Comprehensive Assessment System Workgroup has adopted three overarching priorities for implementation (a) kindergarten entry assessment alignment with PreK-3 measures, (b) professional development initiatives that will embed aligned assessment definitions into new and existing PD on assessment and create quality assessment user groups and (c) a pre-PD online needs assessment designed to aid early care and education providers in choosing an appropriate assessment tool based on their needs.
- The Minnesota Interagency Developmental Screening Task Force expanded its focus to serve as an advisory group for the online screening initiative.
- Currently in the process of developing an implementation and training plan for the online screening pilot based on the analysis that was conducted during the first reporting period.

Challenges and Lessons Learned

- There is a lack of understanding by the Early Childhood field about what the Early Learning Standards are and how they can be used by many people in state.
- Using a broad, diverse statewide group for the committees, while a challenge, seems to be an effective method for establishing a cohort of people that have an appreciation of standards and are invested in the use of the standards.
- During the next round of domain review, we will need to attract more content experts to participate in the committees while maintaining our commitment to keeping the committees diverse and crossing program type.
- It is imperative to create a common language between early childhood educators and K-12 regarding assessment.

Component 4: Great Early Childhood Workforce

Minnesota is currently revising its Workforce Knowledge and Competencies Framework and ensuring professional development opportunities are aligned and accessible to Early Childhood Educators.

Key Accomplishments

- The advisory group for the preschool version of the Knowledge and Competency Framework has met and completed a draft of the Framework which has been reviewed by national experts.
- The advisory group for the infant and toddler version of the Knowledge and Competency Framework will complete its version of the Framework in February.
- The advisory group for the family child care version of the Knowledge and Competency Framework began its draft version of the Framework in January 2014.
- Leadership of various membership associations have been contacted to inform and begin conversation about distribution, implementation and use of the Knowledge and Competency Framework documents when completed in summer of 2014.
- Progress toward completion of new or revised credentials and training aligned with Minnesota's Knowledge and Competency Framework and with our Parent Aware TQIRS add to the array of professional development options for Early Childhood Educators.
- There has been a steady increase in the total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by Institutions of Higher Education or training providers offering credentials and training aligned with our Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.
- In response to an increasingly diverse population of young children, a new trainer learning community is increasing knowledge and skills of trainers in four language communities - Hmong, Oromo, Somali and Spanish -- so that child care providers from these communities can find training that meets their needs.
- Increased resources in the form of scholarships and low-cost training have enabled child care providers and other Early Childhood Educators to access more training and education opportunities.

Challenges and Lessons Learned

- Timelines for completion of the Knowledge and Competency Framework were adjusted to accommodate the decision made to have different versions for each infant and toddler; preschool; and family child care.
- Having the infant toddler advisory group refine/edit the work of the preschool group has been value added. It has created an opportunity for a second set of stakeholders to offer critical feedback.
- Building relationships with people in membership associations enhances the implementation of the Framework by identifying champions.
- As Minnesota moves toward completion of a revised Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, system coordination issues between our non-credit-based training systems and Higher Education systems are becoming clearer, setting the stage for identifying priorities and defining decision-making processes through the remainder of the grant.

Component 5: Measuring Outcomes and Progress

The Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System (ECLDS) will enhance the state's ability to answer broad and meaningful questions jointly developed about outcomes for Minnesota's young children. This builds on the progress to develop robust student-level data over time that can track K-12 student outcomes in college and career. Additionally, Minnesota is revising its School Readiness Study in order to ensure the data provides a statewide picture of children's learning and development at Kindergarten entrance, and provide schools and teachers with information to improve instruction and services in the early elementary years.

Key Accomplishments

- Fall 2013 MDE piloted the first phase of the KEA. Schools were invited to participate in the voluntary study using a tool of their choice. A contractor has been hired to provide analysis of the 2013 pilot data and will provide recommendations for the 2014 phase two pilot.
- ECLDS Governance has been established, which includes cross membership from the Statewide Longitudinal Education Data System staff.
- Policy research questions and corresponding data elements are being identified by the Research and Data Committee for the ECLDS.

Challenges and Lessons Learned

There are many stakeholders interested in the new direction Minnesota is moving with the KEA and the ECLDS. These two efforts represent significant change to past practices and the state is working towards a clear communications strategy for internal and external partners to gain buy-in for the kindergarten entry assessment pilot and the ECLDS.

Looking Ahead:

- Beginning January 1, 2014, the Parent Aware full rating is now available in 45 out of 87 counties for non-accredited child care programs seeking a full rating.
- There are a few counties and private practitioners that provide child care health consultation service independently across the state. In an effort to promote high quality standards of care for health and safety of children, families and staff across RTT-ELC activities and other similar efforts in the state, the MDH CCHC is developing a communication plan and networking strategies for CCHC's in the state.
- The Minnesota Evaluation of Access Strategies will begin to collect child outcome data for the Early Learning Scholarships in the fall of 2014.
- The Early Learning Standards will be circulated for public input in the spring of 2014, and finalized later this year. Input from cultural and ethnic groups will be sought through a specific meeting scheduled called Reflecting Minnesota Expert group (RME).
- The second phase of the KEA pilot will continue with a menu of assessment tools determined to be aligned with Minnesota's early learning and kindergarten standards. Phase two, being implemented fall 2014, will examine concurrent validity among the menu of tools, paying particular attention to the items with established linkages to the standards.
- Data sharing agreements between the three participating state agencies are expected to be finalized by spring 2014 and data will begin to populate the early childhood longitudinal data system. Then file transfer protocols for receipt of external data from participating agencies will be employed shortly after.

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).

There has been no change in Minnesota's governance structure since the 2012 APR submission. Below is what was submitted in 2012:

As described in Minnesota's application there are three key governance structures: the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care (Early Learning Council), the Children's Cabinet, and the Office of Early Learning (OEL). Each of these structures includes an explicit focus on children from birth to grade three (Early Learning Council and Office of Early Learning) and beyond (Children's Cabinet focus includes birth to workforce entry). Each of these structures was implemented under the direction of Governor Mark Dayton, who has demonstrated a strong commitment to early learning and development since before he took office, and who has institutionalized that commitment by issuing "Better Schools for a Better Minnesota: 7 Point Plan for Achieving Excellence"

The Minnesota Children's Cabinet is designated as the cross-agency leadership team for programs serving children and youth, and includes the Commissioners of Education, Health, and Human Services. This Cabinet, led by the Education Commissioner, meets regularly to coordinate goals, make strategic decisions, and direct state services, programs, and funds in an efficient manner for children of all ages, building strong connections between systems and programs that focus on children birth to eight and the K-12 system.

The Early Learning Council and the Children's Cabinet are important points of stakeholder input and cabinet level decision making, but the day to day coordination and alignment of Minnesota's early childhood system falls under the Minnesota Office of Early Learning (OEL).

The Governor has designated the Department of Education as the lead agency for coordination of the State Plan, through the OEL. Commissioners from the three state agencies comprising the Children's Cabinet have each signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), delineating roles and responsibilities under the State Plan.

The Office of Early Learning Leadership Team (Leadership Team) includes the Director of the OEL, who oversees programs currently housed in the Department of Education; the Deputy Commissioner from the Department of Health; and the Assistant Commissioner for Children and Family Services from the Department of Human Services. The Leadership Team collectively has responsibility for making recommendations to the Children's Cabinet regarding policy, budgeting, and rule making across the scope of programs currently housed in all three agencies to reduce fragmentation and improve services for young children and their families.

Additionally, the State Plan is monitored and coordinated on a daily basis by the RTT-ELC project manager. The project manager is guided by the RTT-ELC Leadership Implementation Team which includes decision making leaders from each of the three agencies and meets on a monthly basis to review progress on the State Plan, ensure coordination across agencies and projects, assess potential risks, and provide direction on the overall State Plan.

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 implementation of Minnesota's State Plan has been developed in a manner that incorporates multiple feedback loops from participating programs, early childhood educators and other key stakeholders in the implementation of activities under the grant. For example, Parent Aware is guided by a governance structure that includes an advisory group that is made up of representatives from participating programs, the early childhood educator workforce, nonprofit partners, the Early Learning Council and leaders from each of the four Transformation Zones. Additionally, the Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment workgroup includes representatives from early childhood, K-12 and English learners. The Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System's governing body includes stakeholders from organizations that primarily collect data that will be included in the system, including cross membership with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System.

Moreover, each Transformation Zone has a leadership body that helps to determine policy decisions for initiatives affecting the Transformation Zone and which has been actively engaged with implementation decisions regarding many RTT-ELC activities. Minnesota holds quarterly meetings with the Transformation Zones to communicate progress on grant activities, receive feedback on implementation, and work collaboratively to resolve challenges across Transformation Zones and within a specific Transformation Zone.

Stakeholders are also involved with supporting and carrying out some of the activities included in the Statement of Work. The nonprofit organization Parent Aware for School Readiness (PASR) is involved in the communication and promotion of Parent Aware and is funding a portion of the Parent Aware Evaluation in conjunction with the Greater Twin Cities United Way and a portion of RTT-ELC funds. Both PASR and the Greater Twin Cities United Way have been partners with the state agencies in the implementation of these activities.

Minnesota has also been coordinating and seeking feedback from stakeholders in rural communities throughout Minnesota including the Minnesota Initiative Foundation leaders which have been included in conversations regarding continuous improvements on a variety of efforts including Parent Aware, Early Learning Scholarships, Title I PreK Incentives, Great Workforce Initiatives, and the Comprehensive Assessment System.

The Greater Twin Cities United Way and the McKnight Foundation have also sponsored efforts to promote coordination and collaboration with other similar initiatives occurring in the state of Minnesota including the Promise Neighborhood and 13 grants, the STRIVE Initiative, and the Accreditation Facilitation Project. They have developed a Learn Together website for stakeholders to learn more about and follow the progress of each of these grants over the grant period. They also have partnered with Minnesota Department of Education and the Office of Early Learning to support a statewide PreK-3rd Grade Leadership Training series.

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.

The 2013 Minnesota legislative session was a historical session for young children in Minnesota. The legislature increased spending in Early Childhood by approximately \$59.4 million dollars over the next biennium (2 year budgeting cycle). The highlights from the session include:

Early Learning Scholarships

- Increased state funded Early Learning Scholarships from \$6 million to \$46 million over the biennium.

Child Care

- Increased access to quality child care for children with high needs. This legislation, invested \$19.4 million for the biennium:
 - Reimburses providers who achieve a three-star Parent Aware rating up to 15 percent higher and providers who achieve a four-star rating up to 20 percent higher.
 - Encourages teen parents to finish their education, enabling them to access the fully funded Minnesota Family Investment Program Child Care Assistance Program, when funds are not available in the capped allocation Basic Sliding Fee program.
 - Increased continuity of care by allowing a 30-day reinstatement period for families served by Basic Sliding Fee, and allows children to remain in high quality care regardless of some changes in their parent's schedules.
 - Increased rates for some providers and simplifies the overall rate structure.

Participating State Agencies

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

There have been no changes in participation and commitment by any of the Participating State Agencies in the State Plan.

High-Quality, Accountable Programs

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

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

(1) Early Learning & Development Standards	
Yes or No	No

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

(3) Early Childhood Educator qualifications	
Yes or No	No

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

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

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

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

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

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

In Minnesota, we use both broader program standards and more specific indicators in our TQIRS, Parent Aware. The standards are utilized by all types of early learning programs. All of the indicators are used in the full rating for center-based ELD programs receiving funds from CCDF (i.e. licensed child care centers) that are not accredited. All indicators except the CLASS observation measure are used for full ratings for ELD programs receiving funds from CCDF (i.e. licensed family child care) that are not accredited. Five indicators are used in an accelerated rating for Head Start programs, school-based prekindergarten programs, ELD programs funded through IDEA and Title I and accredited child care centers and family child care homes. Minnesota conducted the first phase of the Parent Aware standards and indicator review process in 2013. This phase considered small changes to the standards and indicators. The changes will be implemented in April 2014. The second phase of this process, as described in Minnesota's Scope of Work, will be conducted in 2015, building on the first phase, and will consider more significant changes to the measures.

During this first phase, changes were made to one standard. Small changes were made to 19 of the 30 indicators in the full rating process. Small changes were also made to the five indicators in the accelerated rating process.

In the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge categories of standards above, there are two questions. First, we are asked if we have made progress developing and revising our program standards. We answer no to this question for Early Learning and Development Standards and Early Childhood Educators qualifications because no changes were made to the indicators in these areas. We answer yes to this question for the following categories because we made changes to indicators in these areas:

- Comprehensive Assessment System
- Family Engagement Strategies
- Health Promotion Strategies
- Effective Data Practices

In the Comprehensive Assessment System category, we reformatted and clarified the indicators related to using child assessment.

In the Family Engagement Strategies category, we added new requirements related to contact information for community resources that programs share with families.

In the Health Promotion Strategies, we added a new requirement related to sharing nutrition guidelines and sample menus with families.

In the Effective Data Practices category, we made small changes to the wording of the indicator on using assessment data to inform instruction.

The second question asks us to identify the types of early learning program to which our standards now apply. Based on Minnesota's definition of program standards, and our interpretation of this question, we checked all the boxes for all program types because our program standards and indicators, taken together, apply to all of the program types included in the check boxes.

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.

Minnesota made measurable progress in promoting participation in Parent Aware, Minnesota's TQRIS, through three key strategies -- increasing market penetration, recruiting targeted programs, and expanding marketing to families.

Parent Aware continues to be available statewide for programs eligible for the Accelerated Pathway to Rating. Roll out of the full rating for non-accredited child care programs, both center-based and family child care homes, has been planned in stages. In 2013, we continued to increase market penetration of the TQRIS by expanding the availability of full ratings for non-accredited child care programs from 8 to 22 counties as planned in our Scope of Work. In mid-2013, the Office of Early Learning also adjusted the Parent Aware roll out plan for 2014 by adding six new counties to our planned expansion into 39 counties beginning January, 2014. The addition of these six counties aligns the availability of the full rating pathway for non-accredited child care programs with the communities identified as receiving Early Learning Scholarship funds. Thus, beginning January 1, 2014, the Parent Aware full rating is now available in 45 out of 87 counties for non-accredited child care programs seeking a full rating.

Child Care Aware, Minnesota's child care resource and referral system, remains under contract to recruit non-accredited and accredited child care programs. This system works in partnership with the Minnesota Association for the Education of Young Children, the Minnesota Licensed Family Child Care Association, and the Minnesota Department of Education to coordinate their efforts on recruiting targeted programs eligible for an accelerated rating. Minnesota has made great progress and exceeded targets for Parent Aware participation among programs eligible for the Accelerated Pathway to Rating, including Head Start programs, accredited child care programs and school-based pre-kindergarten programs. Participation rates of programs eligible for the accelerated rating are expected to continue to climb as a result of the state's new Early Learning Scholarships, which may only be used in Parent Aware-participating programs. Additionally, we have expanded program types that are eligible for the accelerated rating to include ELD programs funded through IDEA and charter schools with pre-kindergarten programs that are officially recognized by the Minnesota Department of Education. We continue to refine targeted outreach and technical assistance to programs eligible for the accelerated rating in 2014 to ensure measurable progress continues through the end of the grant period.

Minnesota continued to aggressively expand its marketing to families. Advertising efforts led by Parent Aware for School Readiness (PASR), a private business-led partner, drive parent interest in ratings information. September, 2013 marked the six month point in a PASR-sponsored Parent Aware Ratings ad campaign. Since April, radio, on-line, television and print ads drove the bulk of 39,735 unique visitors to

www.parentawareratings.org. This generation of new traffic can be expected to continue as the campaign expands to new geographic areas in the future. A random sample survey of parents of 0-5 year olds in the state found that: 1) 61% of parents who recall the ads say the ads “made them stop and think about the need to have pre-kindergarten children in stimulating learning environments;” 2) 72% of parents who can recall the ads agreed that “all parents should be asking questions about a child care provider's Parent Aware Rating;” and 3) 78% of Minnesota parents of young children who recall the ads say that if all other things are equal, they would choose a rated provider over an unrated one, while only 4% would choose an unrated provider. PASR will continue to fund a strategic advertising campaign as well as a revamped on-line parent search tool for parents to find early care and education options in 2014.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)

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

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

Targets										
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	53	10.0%	158	31.0%	193	38.0%	255	50.0%	330	65.0%
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	23	10.0%	123	43.0%	169	59.0%	212	74.0%	226	79.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	68	58.0%	100	85.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	144	47.0%	174	57.0%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	23	58.0%	34	62.0%	46	66.0%	62	70.0%	81	74.0%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	203	5.0%	227	8.0%	685	16.0%	866	25.0%	1,212	35.0%
Other	110	0.1%	57	0.6%	565	6.0%	1,225	13.0%	1,884	20.0%
Describe:	Licensed centers and licensed family child care programs not receiving CCDF funds.									
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.										

Actuals									
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs									
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	509	53	10.0%	509	138	27.0%	509	464	91.0%
Specify:	School-based preschool programs funded by Minnesota's School Readiness Program								
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	286	23	10.0%	286	229	80.0%	286	258	90.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	118	0	0.0%	118	0	0.0%	118	1	1.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	306	0	0.0%	306	0	0.0%	306	2	1.0%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	40	23	58.0%	54	37	69.0%	141	138	98.0%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	3,462	203	5.0%	3,462	112	3.0%	3,221	385	12.0%
Other	9,422	110	0.1%	9,422	59	0.1%	7,016	219	3.0%
Describe:	Licensed centers and licensed family child care programs not receiving CCDF funds.								
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.									

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

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

State-funded preschool: The 2013 numbers are the number of School Readiness-funded school-based PreK sites rated as of December 31, 2013, as verified by both the Parent Aware Rating Tool Database and the records at the Department of Education. In Minnesota, there are additional school-based PreK programs operating without state School Readiness funding. These programs are eligible for ratings if they are meeting School Readiness standards. We rated 32 such programs (sites) in 2013. These programs are not included in this count because they do not meet the the state definition of "state-funded preschool" as defined in the grant application and in the 2012 APR.

Head Start & Early Head Start: The 2013 numbers are based on the number of Head Start/Early Head Start sites rated as of December 31, 2013, as verified by both the Parent Aware Rating Tool Database and the records at the Department of Education.

Programs funded by IDEA Parts B & C: For programs funded by IDEA Parts B and C, the total number of programs in the state was pulled from the Minnesota Department of Education's ORG data system, which tracks Part C and Preschool Special Education programs that have signed Statements of Assurances for FFY2013. That list of programs was then compared to the list of programs rated in the TQRIS as of December 31, 2013. Unlike all other program types, Early Childhood Special Education programs are rated at the district level rather than at the site level.

Programs funded under Title I of ESEA: The 2013 numbers are based on the number of ELD sites in school districts identified through agency financial reporting systems as using Title I funds for Preschool in SFY2013, and that were also in the TQRIS as of December 31, 2013.

Programs receiving CCDF Funds: The count of programs receiving CCDF funds were pulled from Minnesota's administrative data system (MEC2) for programs paid for service in the month of October 2013. Reporting October service data allows most provider bills to be submitted and paid by the time the counts are pulled for February reporting. The count represents the number of Minnesota and tribally licensed family and center based child care providers paid for caring for at least one child aged 0-5 and not yet in Kindergarten. The count of programs participating in Parent Aware includes the sub-set of those programs that were rated and/or had agreed to participate in Parent Aware (as of December 2013). License exempt center based providers are eligible to participate in Parent Aware. However, Minnesota cannot currently link license exempt providers participating in Parent Aware and receiving CCDF funds, for reporting purposes. Therefore, this table does not include these providers. To address this data gap, Minnesota has begun collecting MEC2 identifiers from programs participating in Parent Aware. Therefore, in 2014 Minnesota will be able to link both licensed and license-exempt providers to MEC2 data and therefore include license exempt providers receiving CCDF funds in this report.

Other (Licensed child care centers and family child care providers not receiving CCDF funds): There are 10,237 licensed child care programs in the state of Minnesota as of December 31, 2013. Of those, 3,221 receive CCDF funding and 7,016 do not. Of the 7,016 licensed child care programs that do not receive CCDF funds, 219 were verified as rated in the Parent Aware Rating Tool Database as of December 31, 2013.

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.

In 2013, targets were not reached in Minnesota for child care programs receiving and not receiving CCDF funds. Midway through 2013, DHS and key partners identified a critical challenge in the roll out of Parent Aware - a lag in the participation of non-accredited child care programs. Strategies employed to understand the complexities of this challenge include closely monitoring participation data, convening stakeholders to determine possible causes and solutions of the lag in non-accredited program participation, and gleaning best practices in recruitment from other states. Additionally, Child Trends, the evaluator of Parent Aware, conducted surveys to help understand the interest and awareness of Parent Aware providers who were in roll out counties, but not participating. A notable result of the findings was that 44% of those surveyed reported only knowing a little about Parent Aware. This finding along with the information gathered from other sources and legislative action, launched the development and implementation of a number of strategies designed to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets for number and percentage of programs that are non-accredited child care and receiving CCDF funds by the end of the grant period.

Specialized recruitment positions: A new recruitment effort, housed in the Child Care Aware system and focused on child care programs, especially family child care providers, was planned in 2013 and will be implemented in 2014. Previously, recruitment responsibilities were delegated to Parent Aware quality coaches who also support Parent Aware-participating providers through the rating process. In 2014, the roles of recruitment and coaching will be differentiated and enhanced. Five new positions specializing in recruitment will be in place around the state. Recruiters will use community organizing principles, receiving on-going training and support on how to reach "hard to reach" communities and minimize geographical challenges faced in Greater Minnesota. These positions will allow quality coaches to specialize in engaging with providers to improve the quality of their programs.

Marketing and Incentives: The Child Care Aware of Minnesota Coordinating Office remains under contract to lead Parent Aware communications efforts. This work is executed in close collaboration with Parent Aware for School Readiness. Marketing materials for providers will focus heavily on the benefits for providers, especially those serving children of high need:

- **Quality Improvement Supports and Incentives:** Non-accredited child care programs that serve higher percentages of children with high needs continue to be eligible to participate in a year-long coaching relationship focused on a strengths-based approach to building program quality in alignment with Parent Aware indicators. These programs can also receive up to \$1500 in quality improvement supports.
- **Alignment of Parent Aware in Child Care Assistance:** Effective in March 2014, programs that earn a 3 or 4 Star Parent Aware rating will be eligible for higher Child Care Assistance Program (CCAP) rates. Rates of 15 or 20 percent above the standard maximum rate will be available to 3 and 4 Star programs, respectively. Messages around this new benefit of Parent Aware were integrated into our marketing materials and will be refined as this incentive becomes available to providers.
- **Early Learning Scholarships:** In 2013, \$46 million in Early Learning Scholarships were made available to low-income families who choose a early childhood program that is participating in Parent Aware. Scholarships are up to \$5,000 per child.

As these incentives become fully available in 2014, marketing strategies will be refined to maximize impact. Additional efforts are underway to provide Parent Aware promotional materials to other programs and services working with parents and family child care providers at the local level.

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

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

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

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

In 2013, Minnesota continued successes from 2012 and also expanded efforts toward validly and reliably rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development programs. We continued to:

- Use the CLASS observation tool, which has been shown to be valid and reliable.
- Monitor the interrater reliability of CLASS observers by requiring that 1 in 10 observations be co-coded by an anchor observer.
- Re-rating programs at least every two years.
- Providing rated programs with marketing materials to post on-site and distribute to the families they serve.
- Making ratings and licensing information available to parents via the Parent Aware website and the Minnesota Department of Human Services' Licensing Lookup website.

We have improved or expanded our efforts by:

- Increasing the pre-service and ongoing training requirements for CLASS observers.
- Reaching 95% reliability among CLASS observers (meaning that dimensions scores of anchors and observers are within one point of each other in 95% of cycles)

- Establishing interrater reliability among TQRIS raters by requiring that at least 1 in 10 full ratings issued to licensed child care providers be co-coded by an anchor rater. In 2013, 19% of full ratings were co-coded and demonstrated exact agreement on 89% of indicators.
- Gathering stakeholder input on needs and possibilities for a redesigned website for parents to find Early Learning Development programs and make child care decisions.
- Starting development of a data system that brings together Professional Development Registry features with an on-line TQRIS application and case management features for programs and coaches engaged in quality improvement.

Strategies for improvement in the remainder of the grant period:

- Establish interrater reliability for the Accelerated Pathway to Rating.
- Explore the possibility of implementing a valid and reliable observation measure in Family Child Care settings.
- Further standardize and improve the reliability of observations and scoring by examining areas of greatest challenge and providing raters and observers with additional training and clearer rules for decision-making.

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?

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

Number of tiers/levels in the State TQRIS
4

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

	State-funded preschool programs	Early Head Start	Head Start programs	Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	Center-based Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	Family Child Care Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program
TQRIS Programs that Moved Up at Least One Level	0	0	0	0	0	2	8
TQRIS Programs that Moved Down at Least One Level	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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

Regarding program movement up or down rating levels, because Calendar Year 2013 represented the second year of ratings issued under Parent Aware's statewide expansion and because ratings are issued for a two-year period, little movement was possible during this reporting period. A small number of programs sought an earlier re-rating and moved up, as is allowed, and indicated above. The majority of programs will seek re-ratings in Calendar Year 2014.

In 2013, Minnesota made progress in developing high quality benchmarks by making modest changes to the Parent Aware standards, indicators and scoring with the primary purpose of helping staff implement the Parent Aware program with consistency. These changes will be rolled out in April 2014.

The categories included in the check boxes, above, were checked for the following reasons:

In the Comprehensive Assessment System category, we reformatted and clarified the indicators related to using child assessment.

In the Family Engagement Strategies category, we added new requirements related to contact information for community resources that programs share with families.

In the Health Promotion Strategies, we added a new requirement related to sharing nutrition guidelines and sample menus with families.

In the Effective Data Practices category, we made small changes to the wording of the indicator on using assessment data to inform instruction.

In the Program quality assessments category, we made a change to the cut point for 3 stars for the indicator that uses the CLASS observation measure.

In 2014 - 2015, Minnesota will plan for and conduct the second phase of the Parent Aware standards and indicator review process. This phase will include a review of the research, incorporating new research into the process including findings from the Parent Aware evaluation. Alignment charts will also be created and used to analyze the relationships between the Parent Aware standards and indicators and standards included in the Federal Head Start performance standards, the State preschool standards, and national accreditation standards. The emphasis in this phase will be on considering more significant changes to the measures and will include a public input process.

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

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

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

Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline	Targets				Actuals	
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2
Total number of programs covered by the TQRIS	1,405	3,996	7,780	10,538	14,112	3,996	6,630
Number of Programs in Tier 1	4	40	150	300	450	30	68
Number of Programs in Tier 2	24	70	250	500	750	16	135
Number of Programs in Tier 3	64	90	350	700	1,050	5	26
Number of Programs in Tier 4	301	454	741	1,110	1,450	478	1,093
Number of Programs in Tier 5							

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.

The 2013 count of programs covered by the TQRIS is defined as the number of programs (sites) in the state that are currently eligible to participate in Minnesota's TQRIS. That count includes 5,038 non-accredited licensed programs, 373 accredited licensed programs, 286 Head Start/Early Head Start sites, 118 districts funded by IDEA Part C, 306 districts funded by IDEA Part B, and 509 state-funded preschool sites. Data on licensed child care providers comes from Minnesota's NACCRRAware database as of December 2, 2013. Accredited child care programs were eligible for rating regardless of their location. Non-accredited child care programs were eligible for rating only if located in one of the 22 counties where full ratings have been made available. The data sources for Head Start/Early Head Start sites, programs funded by IDEA Part C, programs funded by IDEA Part B, and state-funded preschool are explained in the notes to Table B2c. The 2013 count of rated programs comes from the Parent Aware Rating Tool Data system and includes all programs with an active rating as of December 31st, 2013. The total number of Parent Aware rated programs as of December 31st, 2013 was 1,322. In other words, Minnesota reached 89% of its target of 1,491 rated programs. While the distribution of ratings is not as predicted, Minnesota is moving closer to reaching its overall target for rated programs.

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.

Minnesota exceeded targets for 4 Star rated programs and has not met targets for 1 to 3 Star rated programs. As described in our **Performance Measure B(2)(c) Target Notes**, the difference between actuals and targets for 1 to 3 Star is due to the lag in participation of non-accredited child care programs. In 2013, great progress was made in rating Accelerated Pathway to Rating eligible programs. APR programs already meet a set of standards that mirror or exceed Parent Aware indicators and must meet two indicators to earn a 4 Star rating. A 4 Star rating is the top tier of Minnesota's TQRIS. The number of programs currently rated at the top tier represents many APR rated programs in addition to fully rated child care programs. As we recruit more non accredited

child care programs into Parent Aware, we expect to see more programs rated at 1 to 3 Star levels. Parent Aware, through the strengths-based coaching model, is designed to help participating non accredited child care providers and those seeking a re-rating increase quality and move up Star levels over time.

Minnesota is pursuing multiple strategies to increase participation of non accredited child care providers, which are designed to ensure that measurable progress is made in reaching targets by the end of the grant. These strategies are outlined in **Performance Measure B (2) (C) Target Notes** and address/include specialized recruitment positions, specific marketing and incentives, continuing QI supports, higher child care assistance rates for those earning a 3 or 4 star rating and early learning scholarships.

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

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

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

Targets											
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS											
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
State-funded preschool	2,857	12.0%	7,228	31.0%	8,860	38.0%	11,658	50.0%	13,990	60.0%	
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	3,397	24.0%	6,997	50.0%	8,797	62.0%	10,297	73.0%	10,897	77.0%	
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1,253	25.0%	2,507	50.0%	
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2,754	25.0%	4,958	45.0%	
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	1,182	53.0%	1,854	57.0%	2,579	61.0%	3,488	66.0%	4,690	71.0%	
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	4,049	20.0%	4,261	21.0%	4,870	24.0%	6,088	30.0%	8,117	40.0%	

¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Actuals									
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS									
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	23,317	2,857	12.0%	23,317	7,401	32.0%	26,108	21,489	82.0%
Specify:	School-based preschool programs funded by Minnesota's School Readiness Program								
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	14,096	3,397	24.0%	14,096	11,163	79.0%	12,435	11,747	94.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	5,013	0	0.0%	5,027	0	0.0%	5,162	0	0.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	11,017	0	0.0%	11,102	0	0.0%	10,865	14	0.0%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	2,246	1,182	53.0%	3,252	1,812	56.0%	4,989	4,936	99.0%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	20,292	4,049	20.0%	20,292	2,395	12.0%	18,152	5,150	28.0%

¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

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

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

For state-funded preschool, the number of Children with High Needs comes from the Minnesota Department of Education's School Readiness Annual Report 2012-2013 for children receiving more than 30 hours of service/involvement. The number of children who are served in programs/sites that are rated by Parent Aware as of December 31st, 2013 uses the same pool of children but includes only those that were served in programs/sites that were rated by Parent Aware as of December 31st, 2013. Since state-funded preschool programs are only eligible for 4 Star ratings, all rated programs are in the top tiers. In Minnesota, additional school-based PreK programs operate without School Readiness funding. These programs are eligible for ratings if they are meeting School Readiness standards. We rated 32 such programs (sites) in 2013. Children served in those programs are not included in this count as we do not have data on whether those children meet the definition of Children with High Needs.

For Early Head Start and Head Start, the number of Children with High Needs served comes from data pulled from the MN Head Start Funded Enrollment report for SFY2013 as reported to the Minnesota Department of Education by programs receiving Head Start funds. The count is for children served in: Center-based, combination sites, family child care, and child care centers. It does not include home-based settings. Since Head Start programs are only eligible for 4 Star ratings, all rated programs are in the top tiers. The 2012 number comes from the MN Head Start Funded Enrollment report for SFY2013 and only includes children served in programs that were rated by Parent Aware as of December 31st, 2012.

For programs funded by IDEA Parts B and C, the number of children served in programs funded by IDEA was determined based on numbers of preschool-aged children with an IEP or IFSP as of December 1, 2013 as reported to the Minnesota Department of Education via the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS) and pulled for the purpose of federal OSEP reporting. Those children served on December 1, 2013 with IEPs or IFSPs located in districts that were rated in the TQRIS as of December 31, 2013 are counted here. Each year, the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) requires states to submit the number of children served in each district as of December 1. In the past, this report to OSEP was due on February 1 of the following year. In 2013, the federal Office of Special Education Programs changed its reporting requirements and now does not require the report be submitted until April 1.

For programs funded under Title I of ESEA, the number of children in Title I program in SFY2013 was collected from school districts via a survey. (Two districts did not respond.) All children in Title I programs are considered Children with High Needs. The number of children in the top tiers of the TQRIS was determined by cross-referencing the child counts per site with the list of rated sites as of December 31, 2013.

For programs receiving CCDF funds, the count of children receiving CCDF funds were pulled from Minnesota's administrative data system (MEC2) for the children receiving service in October 2013. Reporting October service data allows most provider bills to be submitted and paid by the time the counts are pulled for February reporting. The count represents the number of children aged 0-5 and not yet in Kindergarten for which CCDF funds were paid to a Minnesota and tribally licensed family and center based child care. The count of children in programs participating in the TQRIS includes children attending the sub-set of the licensed programs that were rated in the top tiers of the TQRIS as of December 2013. License exempt center based providers are eligible to participate in TQRIS, but Minnesota cannot currently link license exempt providers in the TQRIS with those receiving CCDF funds. Thus, children attending these providers are not included.

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

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

Minnesota met or exceeded all Performance Measures (B)(4)(c)(2) targets. This was accomplished through multiple initiatives targeting families, programs and other state and private partners.

For parents there are two financial supports in the market place designed to promote the number of children with high needs in rated programs. First, legislative action aligning child care subsidy tiered reimbursement with higher Parent Aware rating was passed by the 2013 legislature. This supports access to high quality care for children with high needs. Secondly, families with children of high need are eligible to receive a state-funded Early Learning Scholarship of up to \$5000 for use at a Parent Aware participating program. More broadly, our private partner Parent Aware for School Readiness is promoting ratings to families in an advertising campaign (details in under the narrative entitled *Promoting Participation of TQRIS*)

For school-based programs, we have increased the number of school districts using Title I funds to serve more children in high quality rated programs by expanding the RTT-ELC Title I PreK Incentive grants to 23 school districts.

Additionally, we are working with multiple partners to concentrate our efforts on recruiting programs that serve children with high need into Parent Aware. Partners engaged in this effort include the Child Care Resource and Referral System and other current DHS contract holders, Parent Aware for School Readiness, the Greater Twin Cities United Way, the Start Early Funders Coalition, the Minnesota Department of Education and the Minnesota Department of Health. We continue to learn and improve our efforts toward the common goal of increasing the number of children with high need in the top tiers of Minnesota's TQRIS.

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.

Minnesota's plan to validate the effectiveness of the TQRIS focuses on four goals:

Goal 1: The Evaluation will examine the effectiveness of indicators by evaluating the methods used to determine when a quality indicator has been met, the patterns of indicators met by programs, and the experience of programs in meeting those indicators.

Goal 2: The Evaluation will examine how well the hybrid rating structure is differentiating quality by comparing star ratings to quality as determined by both the CLASS and the Environmental Rating Scales and by examining which indicators at each level are most challenging for providers.

Goal 3: The Evaluation will examine the linkages between star ratings and children's progress toward school readiness by analyzing the relationship between a child's gains over the course of a school year and the quality rating of the program in which the child was served.

Goal 4: The Evaluation will examine the effectiveness of quality improvement supports and the extent to which the TQRIS rating scale can detect changes in quality over time.

In 2013, Minnesota made progress in Goal 1 and Goal 2. As part of Goal 1, Minnesota engaged in an indicator review process, examining the strength of the research basis underpinning each TQRIS indicator. Minnesota's external evaluator, Child Trends, has also examined the pattern of indicators met by programs and has surveyed ELD programs about their experience with the rating process and their perception of its validity and fairness. The results of these analyses will be presented in the Year 2 Evaluation report, to be released in March 2014.

As part of Goal 2, the external evaluator, Child Trends, has also examined whether scores on the CLASS observation measure and on the Environment Rating Scales are significantly different for programs in each TQRIS tier. Minnesota requires programs to use an Environment Self-Assessment tool as part of the rating process. Child Trends is also examining whether the results of that self-assessment are correlated to TQRIS tier and/or to scores on the Environment Rating Scales. The results of those analyses will be presented in the Year 2 Evaluation report, to be released in March 2014.

As more programs are rated and re-rated during the grant period, Minnesota will be able to collect a more robust data set and therefore make progress on Goals 3 and 4 in the Year 3 and Year 4 Evaluation Reports.

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

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

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

Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

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

Has the State made progress in ensuring that its Early Learning and Development Standards:

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

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

Minnesota is currently revising the Language, Literacy and Communication domains of Minnesota's Early Learning Standards (Early Childhood Indicators of Progress; ECIPs). During the spring of 2014 the draft standards will be taken out for public input and finalized in June, 2014. At the same time, Minnesota is revising the Workforce Knowledge and Competencies Framework as well as our Kindergarten Entrance Assessment and the Early Learning Standards will be embedded or considered as those are developed. Currently the ECIPs are reflected in many Parent Aware TQRIS program standards as well as in trainings offered to Early Childhood Educators.

Reflecting Office of Early Learning coordination, the Minnesota Department of Human Services, as lead agency for CCDF, includes these Race to the Top --Early Learning Challenge grant activities in its Federal Fiscal Year 2014-15 CCDF Plan and reports on efforts to provide training on the ECIPs in its annual federal reporting.

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

Has the State made progress in implementing a developmentally appropriate Comprehensive Assessment System working with Early Learning and Development Programs to:

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

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.

Minnesota continues to make progress on implementing the comprehensive assessment system and developing a framework to support early learning and development programs in choosing and using research-based appropriate assessment tools. To this end, the Assessment Workgroup ([AWG]- formed in December 2012) has adopted three overarching priorities for implementation (a) kindergarten entry assessment alignment with PreK-3 measures; (b) professional development initiatives that will embed aligned assessment definitions into new and existing PD on assessment and create quality assessment user groups; and (c) a pre-PD online needs assessment designed to aid early care and education providers in choosing an appropriate assessment tool based on their needs. As a result of the work completed in 2013, three implementation priorities have been adopted by the AWG to be completed in 2014. Note, the KEA is not a priority implementation plan listed in this section; only formative assessment measures and PD are located here. Please see the KEA section for detailed plans on this initiative.

- Priority 1. Common set of assessment terms and definitions. The AWG has proposed a common set of assessment terms that span B-8 that can be embedded into new and existing PD opportunities. In 2013, the AWG convened a small group and created the list of terms with initial definitions.
- Priority 2. Quality assessment user groups. There is a large need for training on specific assessment tools in Minnesota and thus the AWG is prioritizing the building of capacity for training and ongoing relationship based PD on assessment by creating user groups. DHS and MDE are working together to set competitive rates for training and subscription agreements and begin to train ECE providers on specific tools. In late 2013, a work charter and MOU terms were agreed upon by DHS and MDE.
- Priority 3. Pre-PD online needs assessment. The AWG will be exploring options to create an online needs assessment in the spring of 2014 to aid teachers and providers in choosing an appropriate assessment while not using jargon with a goal launch the assessment in late 2015.

Each priority is being triangulated with DHS initiatives to ensure seamless information for all providers B-8. All PD is being implemented for multiple groups including administrators, teachers and providers.

In addition, the State continues to make progress in improving the delivery of developmental and social-emotional screening through a pilot of online access to the Ages & Stages Questionnaires, Third Edition (ASQ-3)

and Ages & Stages Questionnaires: Social-Emotional (ASQ:SE) screening tools. Activities during the reporting period include:

- The Minnesota Interagency Developmental Screening Task Force continues to convene and serve as an advisory group for the online screening initiative.
- Currently in the process of developing an implementation and training plan for the online screening pilot based on the analysis that was conducted during the first reporting period.

Some timelines in the Scope of Work specific to the online screening initiative have been adjusted, including the dates for launching online access in the pilot sites. These dates have been adjusted to indicate that this activity will start in spring 2014. One reason for this change is that Minnesota is currently exploring the implementation of the National Help Me Grow system, and we are ensuring that efforts around screening and early identification are aligned across current state initiatives, including the National Help Me Grow discussion and the work of the Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems grant recently awarded to Minnesota.

A plan for a formative and summative evaluation of the online screening initiative has been drafted. The State plans to look at data already or currently collected as well as explore the potential to collect additional data to measure the impact of the online screening initiative.

Early Childhood Education Workforce

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

Has the State made progress in developing:

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

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

A cross sector advisory group was formed to make recommendations on the revision of the Knowledge and Competency Framework. It was decided to integrate Minnesota's field developed core competencies with the Board of Teaching Standards which are in rule. Three versions of the Knowledge and Competency Framework will be created. Commonalities in knowledge and skills needed will be maintained to the extent possible in all three versions while recognizing and highlighting the specialized skill sets needed when teaching children of preschool age, infants and toddlers and providing care and education in a family child care home. Also, it was determined that the core competencies would be reduced from five levels in the original document to three levels. Activities to date include:

- A first draft of the Framework has been developed;
- It's been reviewed by national experts; feedback has been incorporated;
- An infant and toddler advisory group has been convened;
- The first draft of the preschool version has been refined; and
- The first draft of the infant and toddler version has been created.

Institutions of Higher Education use the Board of Teaching standards to develop learning objectives and to guide course development. Child Care Aware programs use the core competencies to develop learning objectives and guide course development. With the integration of the two, opportunities exist for better alignment between these delivery systems.

**Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities
(Section D(2) of Application)**

Has the State 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:

Supporting Early Childhood Educators	
Providing and expanding access to effective professional development opportunities that are aligned with your State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework	Yes
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:	Yes
<i>Scholarships</i>	Yes
<i>Compensation and wage supplements</i>	Yes
<i>Tiered reimbursement rates</i>	Yes
<i>Other financial incentives</i>	
<i>Management opportunities</i>	
Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention	Yes
Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for:	Yes
<i>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</i>	Yes
<i>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</i>	Yes

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

Progress continued in 2013 on two key strategies to support Early Childhood Educator development and advancement, first to develop new or revise existing credentials and training, and second, to provide increased supports to educators to access training and education aligned with our Knowledge and Competency Framework and Parent Aware TQRIS. All efforts will continue through the end of the grant period.

Highlights of this year's progress on developing new or revising existing credentials and training:

- Completed revision of the Minnesota Child Care Credential (MNCCC). The MNCCC is aligned with our Knowledge and Competency Framework and now meets all of the Parent Aware training indicator requirements. Due of the need for revision after the initial pilot phase, the MNCCC was not offered as frequently statewide in 2013. MNCCC cohorts will begin again in spring of 2014.
- Launch of development of a new Minnesota Infant/Toddler Credential with completion set for June 30, 2014. The 30 hour Credential will meet some of the total Parent Aware training requirements as well as the Minnesota Association of Infant and Early Childhood Mental Health professional endorsement at Level 1.

- Development is underway on an additional 108 hours of advanced Parent Aware training curriculum. All advanced Parent Aware will be available as of June 30, 2015.

Highlights of progress to provide increased supports to access training and education:

- Continued provision of Parent Aware Quality Coaches -- 248 child care providers earning ratings through the Parent Aware Full Rating Process received coaching and technical assistance in 2013.
- Increased bilingual/bicultural trainer capacity through a new trainer learning community. Nine trainers representing four language communities participated in the first cohort.
- Continued support for immigrant providers from Hmong, Latino, Somali, East African, and Karen communities through a New American Immigrant Network. Providers received training in Child Development, Health and Safety and CPR.
- Increased participation in the Minnesota Center for Professional Development Registry -- 3,306 new individuals submitted applications to join the Registry, receive help in tracking professional development, access high quality training opportunities, and establish a pathway of professional growth through a Career Lattice.
- Redesign of the T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood Scholarship program to open additional opportunities for early childhood professionals to access higher education opportunities and to more closely align with Parent Aware and the Minnesota Center for Professional Development Registry.
- Scholarships for training that applies toward the Child Development Associate Credential were awarded through Child Care Aware to early childhood professionals on a first come basis.
- Low cost training for state-funded Parent Aware curriculum continued to be made available statewide to all programs.
- Coaches, consultants and trainers with expertise in developmental disabilities, special health care needs and behavioral disorders provided of relationship-based coaching services to child care providers participating in Parent Aware who have children with special needs in their care through the Center for Inclusive Child Care and include coaching on the social-emotional pyramid model.
- Professional Development Advisors in Child Care Aware agencies continued to provide advising services primarily to child care providers participating in Parent Aware and /or completing the Minnesota Child Care Credential.
- Alignment of Parent Aware in Child Care Assistance: Effective in March 2014, programs that earn a 3 or 4 Star Parent Aware rating will receive higher Child Care Assistance Program (CCAP) rates. Rates of 15 or 20 percent above the standard maximum rate will be available to 3 and 4 Star programs, respectively. These higher rates recognize achievement of program standards.

Performance Measure (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	Targets				Actuals	
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	16	25	35	45	51	16	16
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	471	555	809	883	954	555	726

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

Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers: See Table (A)(1)-11 in the application. It shows 16 aligned institutions - MNCPD, MNAEYC, National Council for Professional Recognition, and 13 Technical/Community Colleges. No additional progress was made in 2013 to impact the number of aligned institutions. The revised Knowledge and Competency Framework will align with the Minnesota Board of Teaching Standards. When the new Knowledge and Competency Framework is released in 2014 we expect it will better aligned with the curricula at the postsecondary institutions in Minnesota and our numbers in this category will increase.

Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider: The 2013 total reflects the sum of the actual numbers in the 2013 column of Table D2d2 for Credential Types 1 through 6. The total number of Early Childhood Educators that were credentialed in 2013 is below the target, but is still a 31% increase from 2012. This increase is impressive given that no progress was made to increase the number of aligned institutions, as was intended.

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.

A number of activities are taking place to ensure the new versions of the Framework (to be completed summer of 2014) will be used by professional development providers. Faculty from the Institutions of Higher Education and non-credit based professional development providers have been included on advisory groups for the Knowledge and Competency Framework. Staff has provided updates to membership groups. Articles are being written for inclusion in various newsletters. A survey was distributed to determine whether professional development providers are aware of the work being done to create a new Framework. An implementation team made up of various early childhood stakeholders will be coming together in the spring of 2014 to develop an implementation plan and identify champions.

We plan to increase the number of aligned institutions by first revising our Knowledge and Competency Framework so that it is aligned with the Minnesota Board of Teaching standards. We believe that many Institutions of Higher Education in Minnesota already align their programs with the Board of Teaching standards, so we expect the number of aligned institutions to increase when the new Framework is released. The Framework was originally scheduled for release in 2013, but has been pushed back to summer 2014 in order to accommodate multiple versions for different audiences. This delays the increase in aligned institutions until 2014 as well.

Performance Measure (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.

Targets										
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	<i>Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year</i>									
	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Credential Type 1	27		93		140		140		140	
Specify:	Minnesota Child Care Credential									
Credential Type 2	26		14		15		20		25	
Specify:	MNAEYC Director's Credential									
Credential Type 3	180		193		206		221		236	
Specify:	National Child Development Associate (CDA)									
Credential Type 4	81		87		93		100		107	
Specify:	Certificate or Diploma in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708									
Credential Type 5	157		168		180		192		206	
Specify:	Associate Degree in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708									
Credential Type 6	0		0		175		210		240	
Specify:	Bachelor degree in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708, 13.1015, 13.1209									
Credential Type 7	4,013		4,214		4,424		4,646		4,878	
Specify:	Teacher licenses of staff working in Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), School Readiness, and Early Childhood Family Education									

Actuals						
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	<i>Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year</i>					
	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Credential Type 1	27	%	73		62	
Specify:	Minnesota Child Care Credential					
Credential Type 2	26		6		11	
Specify:	MNAEYC Director's Credential					
Credential Type 3	180		223		351	
Specify:	National Child Development Associate (CDA)					
Credential Type 4	81		94		108	
Specify:	Certificate or Diploma in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708					
Credential Type 5	157		159		194	
Specify:	Associate Degree in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708					
Credential Type 4	0		0		0	
Specify:	Bachelor degree in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708, 13.1015, 13.1209					
Credential Type 5	4,013		4,487		6,013	
Specify:	Teacher licenses of staff working in Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), School Readiness, and Early Childhood Family Education					

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

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

Percentages are left blank because Minnesota does not have an accurate count of the number of early childhood educators in the state. The 2011 Child Care Workforce Study estimates the size of the workforce in Minnesota at 31,000 (including all family child care providers and all directors, teachers, assistant teachers, and aides working in non-school-age child care centers). This number does not include Head Start staff and may not fully reflect those working in school-based pre-K programs.

Cumulative Numbers vs Yearly Gains: To achieve consistency and clarity, Minnesota reports only on Yearly Gains rather than on the total number of early childhood educators in the State that hold the Credential.

Notes on Credential Type 1: Data comes from the Minnesota Professional Development Registry. The Minnesota Child Care Credential is aligned with Minnesota's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Notes on Credential Type 2: Data comes from MnAEYC administrative records. The MnAEYC Director's Credential is aligned with Minnesota's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Notes on Credential Type 3: Data on CDAs awarded to Minnesota practitioners comes from the National Council for Professional Recognition. The Child Development Associate is aligned with Minnesota's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Notes on Credential Type 4, 5, and 6: Data on certificates and diplomas earned at Minnesota institutions was pulled from the 2011-12 IPEDS Completion Survey Data. Minnesota counts certificates, diplomas, and degrees in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210 (Early Childhood Education and Teaching), 19.0706 (Child Development), 19.0709 (Child Care Provider/Assistant), 19.0708 (Child Care and Support Services Management) from institutions that have documented their alignment with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. Type 4 Data includes only awards of less than 2 academic years.

Notes on Credential Type 7: Data was pulled from STAR (Minnesota Department of Education's data system for teacher licensure and employment) and captures the Count of Active 2012-2013 Licensed Staff for License Codes 180102, 190500, and 180402.

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.

We were pleased to see a large increase in early childhood professionals that have obtained their CDA. In 2013, Minnesota exceeded its target for number of new CDA graduates by 70 percent. We have several programs that support CDA attainment that have contributed to this increase, including scholarships for non-credit-based CDA courses, advising for CDA students, delivery of free CDA courses for a targeted group of providers serving high needs children, and scholarships for credit-based CDA courses through our T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood scholarship program.

The numbers in credential type 6, Bachelors Degrees, are affected by the revised time lines for the release of the new Knowledge and Competency Framework. Our targets for 2013 were based on the assumption that the release would happen in 2013 and all Minnesota State Colleges and Universities would be aligned with the new standards as they also aligned with the Board of Teaching Standards. Due to the change in release date we could only identify the same 16 institutions of higher education that we used last year. None of those institutions awarded BA degrees in an early childhood field in 2013.

The Minnesota Child Care Credential underwent revision during 2013, but completion was somewhat delayed. It was decided to not offer the credential statewide until all class module revisions were complete.

The number in credential type 2 only reflects credentials awarded. We are hearing anecdotal reports of increased enrollment in Director's Credential classes in 2013 and 2014 so we anticipate an increase in credentials awarded in 2014.

The numbers in credential types 4, 5 and 7 align with certificates, diplomas and degrees from institutions that align with the Core Knowledge and Competency Framework. When the revised Framework is released in 2014 we will likely see the numbers of certificates, diplomas, and degrees increase to reflect the increased number of institutions that align with the new Framework.

Measuring Outcomes and Progress

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

Has the State made progress in developing a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that:

Kindergarten Entry Assessment	
Is aligned with the State's Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness	Yes
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	Yes
Is administered beginning no later than the start of the school year in the third year of the grant to children entering a public school kindergarten (e.g., the 2014-2015 school year for Round 1 grantee states, the 2015-2016 school year for Round 2 grantees). States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation	Yes
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	Yes
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)	Yes

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.

In the fall of 2013, MDE piloted the first phase of the KEA. The first phase of the pilot study will determine the empirical alignment between a menu of assessment tools and Minnesota's early learning and kindergarten standards. Assessment tools were selected based on demand in the field, federal guidance from the National Research Council report, “Early Childhood Assessment: Why, What and How”, and in consultation with a cross-sector assessment workgroup that advises MDE on the study process. Required criteria for assessment tools includes: coverage of multiple domains (language and literacy, cognitive, social-emotional, the arts and physical development), validity and reliability for its purpose, item specificity, meet the purpose of informing instruction and have adaptations for early childhood special education and culturally & linguistically diverse populations. Chosen tools for phase one include:

- Beginning Kindergarten Assessment (BKA; Minneapolis) with Social Skills Improvement System
- Brigance Inventory of Early Development
- Desired Results Developmental Profile- School Readiness
- Early Learning Scales-Kindergarten
- Teaching Strategies Gold
- Work Sampling System- Minnesota Version

Schools were invited to participate in the voluntary study using a tool of their choice. A contractor has been hired to provide analysis of the 2013 pilot data and will provide recommendations in late spring for the 2014 phase two pilot.

The second phase of the pilot will continue with a menu of assessment tools determined to be aligned with Minnesota's early learning and kindergarten standards. Phase two, being implemented fall 2014, will examine concurrent validity among the menu of tools, paying particular attention to the items with established linkages to the standards.

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

The state successfully completed the initial phase of implementation for the kindergarten entry assessment and is on target to meet all KEA goals outlined in the grant. The state also finalized the 2012 School Readiness Study report, Minnesota's previous kindergarten entry assessment and can be found at <http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/StuSuc/EarlyLearn/SchReadiK/index.html>.

The state is working towards a clear communications strategy for internal and external partners to gain buy-in for the kindergarten entry assessment pilot to ensure current plans move forward.

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

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

Early Learning Data Systems	
Has all of the Essential Data Elements	Yes
Enables uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating State Agencies and Participating Programs	
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	
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.

In the last year multiple milestones have been achieved that position the project for progress in 2014. In particular,

1. Governance has been established, which includes cross membership with SLDS staff.
2. Policy research questions and corresponding data elements are being identified.
3. Architecture and file transfer protocols have been identified and approved. (We are leveraging and maximizing existing architecture.)
4. File transfer protocols for receipt of external data from participating agencies will be employed within the next few months.
5. Data sharing agreements between agencies expected to be finalized by spring.

The convergence of the completion of these activities ensures that construction of the longitudinal data system (LDS) can begin this year and should allow for swift recovery of delayed milestones, if any, and the realignment of activities with time lines. This concurrent work will support the phased construction of the system while we will also begin gathering stakeholder feedback to support communications, analytic design, Common Education Data Standards alignment, and identifying and meeting user needs. Throughout the ECLDS work there has been an active involvement of leadership from Minnesota's SLDS while the ECLDS team has also been actively involved in the SLDS planning.

Data Tables

Commitment to early learning and development

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

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

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	24,973	36.6%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	49,068	35.7%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	72,316	34.2%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	146,357	35.1%

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

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

ACS Data from previous year was used to estimate current year. ACS Public Use Microdata Sample DataSets used: 2012 (accessed through Data Ferrett). Universe: ((AGEP in (00) OR AGEP between 01 and 05)) AND (((ST in (27))))). Weight used: PWGTP. POVPIP Income to poverty ratio recoded.

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

Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs		
Special Populations: Children who...	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...
Have disabilities or developmental delays ¹	16,129	3.7%
Are English learners ²	38,350	11.8%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	4,238	1.0%
Are migrant ³		
Are homeless ⁴	17,680	4.1%
Are in foster care	3,220	0.0%

¹For 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).

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

³For 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).

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

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

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

Counts for the 0-5 population residing on "Indian Lands" obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau, 2005-2009 American Community Survey.

Migrant data not available.

Homeless counts from Homeless Children and Their Families, 2009 Minnesota Homeless Study, Wilder Research, May 2011.

Foster care data from Minnesota Department of Human Services and Minnesota Foster Care Report Card. Children in Out of home Care by Age and Gender. Format did not allow for entering less than one percent.

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.

Table (A)(1)-3a: Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
State-funded preschool			26,108	26,108
Specify:	ELS Annual Reports SFY13			
Data Source and Year:				
Early Head Start & Head Start¹	2,110		12,110	14,220
Data Source and Year:	SFY2014 Approved Enrollment Chart. Toddler counts included in infants.			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619	667	4,495	10,865	16,027
Data Source and Year:				
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	594	4,057	4,651
Data Source and Year:				
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	1,657	6,510	10,399	18,566
Data Source and Year:	Year: SFY 13 monthly average children served with annual unduplicated age data applied. Source: Administrative data from the eligibility and payment system, MEC2			
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.				

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

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

*Early Head Start and Head Start counts include home-based services.

*IDEA Part C & Part B: 12/1/13 OSEP reporting

Title I data is as reported by direct contact with districts; the districts using Title I for young children were identified through reports to agency.

Title I estimated number of children: These number reflect the children served in the spring session and in the fall session of 2013 (some are duplicates). Additional sources of funds that may have supported these programs include state early childhood scholarships and state School Readiness funding, as well as any local funding a district may use for the program.

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

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

Table (A)(1)-3b: Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Hispanic Children	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Non-Hispanic Black or African American Children	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Non-Hispanic White Children
State-funded preschool	2,004	483	1,172	2,201	78	617	18,631
Specify:	ELS Annual Reports, SFY13						
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	3,276	1,653	787	3,686	27	1,398	7,942
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	421	105	195	444	2	206	3,654
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	1,075	219	432	987	15	466	7,908
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA							
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	1,265	406	525	7,013	7	1,393	7,405

¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

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

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

Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program - Counts are for children for whom a payment was made through CCAP, Minnesota's subsidy program. Counts are based on SFY 13 monthly average children served aged 0-5. Annual unduplicated race and ethnicity information for the entire CCAP population was applied to these counts.

Early Head Start and Head Start counts are pulled from the federal Program Information Report, FFY13

Race/ethnicity data is unavailable for Early Learning and Development programs funded under Title I of ESEA.

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.

Table (A)(1)-4: Funding for each Fiscal Year				
Type of investment	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start & Head Start¹	\$20,100,000	\$20,100,000	\$20,100,000	\$20,100,000
State-funded preschool	\$9,792,000	\$9,958,393	\$10,095,000	\$10,095,000
Specify:	School Readiness Program			
State contributions to IDEA, Part C	\$30,163,979	\$30,163,979	\$30,163,979	\$30,163,979
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry	\$124,568,148	\$124,568,148	\$124,568,148	\$124,568,148
Total State contributions to CCDF²	\$80,990,440	\$93,987,000	\$82,426,900	\$97,212,047
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>	52,710,490	64,402,563	53,008,044	68,042,601
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs³	\$55,041,000	\$44,083,000	\$62,086,000	\$48,099,000
Other State contributions 1	\$426,456			
Specify:	Early Child Mental Health Infrastructure Grant			
Other State contributions 2	\$21,177,000	\$22,636,263	\$22,639,000	\$22,639,000
Specify:	Early Childhood Family Education			
Other State contributions 3	\$3,434,000	\$3,513,640	\$3,617,000	\$3,617,000
Specify:	Early Childhood Screening			
Other State contributions 4	\$8,451,503	\$8,557,000	\$8,557,000	\$8,557,000
Specify:	TANF expenditures on Home Visiting			
Other State contributions 5	\$0	\$402,500	\$552,786	
Specify:	Private Funding: Marketing of Parent Aware (Parent Aware for School Readiness)			
Other State contributions 6	\$0	\$400,509	\$420,337	
Specify:	Private Funding: TQIRS Evaluation (Parent Aware for School Readiness/Greater Twin Cities United Way)			
Other State contributions 7	\$0	\$713,970	\$751,630	
Specify:	Private Funding: Quality Improvement (Greater Twin Cities United Way)			
Other State contributions 8	\$0	\$540,000	\$540,000	
Specify:	Private Funding: Minnesota Reading Corps			
Total State contributions:	\$354,144,526	\$359,624,402	\$366,517,780	\$365,051,174

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.

Minnesota has a biennial budget and state fiscal years run from July 1 of the preceding year to June 30 of the current year.

Baseline and Year 1 state contributions are reported from Minnesota's Statewide Integrated Financial Tools (SWIFT).

Year 2 and Year 3 state contributions are reported from Minnesota Management and Budget's General Fund Balance Analysis 2013 End of 2013 Legislative Session as of June 25, 2013.

Private funding for Years 1 and 2 are reported by each funder.

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.

Table (A)(1)-5: Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program¹			
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2
State-funded preschool <i>(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)</i>	24,790	24,736	26,108
Specify:			
Early Head Start and Head Start² <i>(funded enrollment)</i>	14,085	14,988	14,220
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 <i>(annual December 1 count)</i>	16,162	16,129	16,027
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA <i>(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report)</i>	2,246	3,252	4,651
Programs receiving CCDF funds <i>(average monthly served)</i>	20,292	19,691	18,566
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.

None.

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

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

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

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

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

Early Childhood Indicators of Progress: Minnesota's Early Learning Standards for ages 3 to 5 can be found at: http://education.state.mn.us/mdeprod/idcplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&dDocName=005130&RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&Rendition=primary

Early Childhood Indicators of Progress: Minnesota's Early Learning Standards for ages birth to 3 can be found at: <https://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfsrserver/Legacy/DHS-4438-ENG>

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

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

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

¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

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

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

Screening Measures

Programs receiving CCDF funds are required to have training which includes awareness about screening.

The current Quality Rating and Improvement System requires that all programs must provide parents with information on screening - Tier 1 and above.

Formative Assessments

For programs receiving CCDF funds, MN licensing regulations for child care centers (not family child care) require that a child's intellectual, physical, and social and emotional development be reported during parent conferences. There is no reference to formative assessment.

For the current Quality Rating and Improvement system, Tier 1, all FC providers & lead teachers have at least 2 hours training on authentic observation. Tier 2 requires that families are given summary of child's observation records. Tiers 3 & 4 - assessments are conducted using an approved tool at least twice per year in at least the following domains: social-emotional, language and literacy, mathematical thinking and physical development; all lead teachers/providers must complete 8 hours of training on authentic child assessment OR

Conducts assessment using an approved tool with all children at least once per year in two or more domains, and all lead teachers/providers have completed at least 8 hours of training on authentic child assessment.

(If program is using an approved assessment tool with some but not all age groups, partial credit is given.)

Provides families with child assessment results, and if a child has an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) OR

Individual Family Services Plan (IFSP), shares assessment results with team with family's permission. For a child with a special need who is receiving specialty services (for example, physical or occupational therapy), shares assessment results with service providers with family's permission.

MN licensing regulations for child care centers (not family child care) require that a child's intellectual, physical, social and emotional development be reported during parent conferences. There is no reference to formative assessment.

Measures of Environmental Quality

For programs funded under IDEA Part B, section 619, continue to scale-up using Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool.

For programs receiving CCDF funds and participating in the current Parent Aware QRIS in Tier 2 must complete an environment self-assessment based on the Environment Rating Scales (ITERS/ECERS/FCCERS) and develop goals for areas where improvement is needed.

Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions

For programs funded under IDEA Part B, section 619, continue to scale-up using Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool.

For programs receiving CCDF funds and participating in the current Quality Rating and Improvement system, Tier 3 & 4 Centers only: All preschool and toddler classrooms must receive a CLASS score of 2.5 or higher in the Instructional Support category of the CLASS to achieve 3 stars.

Budget and Expenditure Tables

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

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

Budget Summary Table

Budget Summary Table			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$208,154.00	\$865,524.00	\$1,073,678.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$56,233.00	\$244,348.00	\$300,581.00
3. Travel	\$1,665.00	\$8,398.00	\$10,063.00
4. Equipment	\$414.00	\$0.00	\$414.00
5. Supplies	\$762.00	\$22,434.00	\$23,196.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$1,579,302.00	\$1,579,302.00
7. Training Stipends	\$1,000.00	\$1,359.00	\$2,359.00
8. Other	\$16,197.00	\$52,242.00	\$68,439.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$284,425.00	\$2,773,607.00	\$3,058,032.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$55,861.00	\$307,949.00	\$372,048.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$317,763.00	\$4,923,176.00	\$5,240,939.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$9,625.00	\$38,006.00	\$47,631.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$667,674.00	\$8,042,738.00	\$8,718,650.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$13,665,854.00	\$15,631,024.00	\$29,296,878.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$14,333,528.00	\$23,673,762.00	\$38,015,528.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Budget Summary Table Narrative

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

Minnesota's expenditures have dramatically increased since Year 1 of the grant. Minnesota's budget reflects work associated with staff and contracts. Minnesota is now fully staffed, as reflected in expenditures, and all of the grants and contracts that are scheduled to begin have been executed and work begun. Delays in contracts and grants caused the majority of the discrepancies between expenditures and budget. These delays are varied from a carryover lag from Year 1, work plans and timelines being revised, and the 2013 Calendar Year expenditures do not reflect State Fiscal Year second quarter expenditures.

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

All grants and contracts have work plans that require the work outlined in the State's Work Plan to be completed by December, 31, 2015. This will mean increased expenditures in grants and contracts over the next two years. Minnesota will adjust budgets to reflect this shift in work timelines and work with contractors to ensure work is completed in a timely manner.

Budget Table: Project 1 – Parent Aware

Budget Table: Project 1			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$29,216.00	\$251,075.00	\$280,291.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$6,039.00	\$59,518.00	\$65,557.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$2,210.00	\$2,210.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$18,669.00	\$18,669.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$277,694.00	\$277,694.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$524.00	\$524.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$35,255.00	\$609,690.00	\$644,945.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$8,391.00	\$92,431.00	\$100,822.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$8,807.00	\$8,807.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$43,646.00	\$710,928.00	\$754,574.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$4,369,924.00	\$4,631,862.00	\$9,001,786.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$4,413,570.00	\$5,342,790.00	\$9,756,360.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 1 Budget Table Narrative

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

The lower expenditures than budgeted for the Parent Aware Project are reflective of several factors: (1) A delayed start in some activities in 2012 also extended into 2013; (2) There is a lag in project contractor expenditures at the end of the grant reporting year because of Department of Human Services practice to award most contracts on a State Fiscal Year basis (July 1 - June 30). More specifically, the 2013 Calendar Year expenditures do not reflect State Fiscal Year second quarter expenditures. These will be reflected as expended in early 2014 by Department of Human Services with a subsequent request to the Department of Education for reimbursement. (3) Department of Human Services was able to cover some expenditures with funds from the Child Care Development Funds, rather than Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge grant funds in 2013; (4) Lower than anticipated participation of child care programs in Parent Aware resulted underspending of contractor funds for quality improvement supports and for on-site observations.

Project 1 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Due to a better understanding of the needs for administering Parent Aware across activities to promote and monitor ratings, Minnesota will request some modifications to this project budget's personnel and contractor line items.

Budget Table: Project 2 – Early Learning Scholarships

Budget Table: Project 2			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$31,594.00	\$57,415.00	\$89,009.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$7,166.00	\$17,940.00	\$25,106.00
3. Travel	\$339.00	\$689.00	\$1,028.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$791.00	\$791.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$2,903.00	\$7,031.00	\$9,934.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$42,002.00	\$83,866.00	\$125,868.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$8,193.00	\$17,990.00	\$26,183.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$269,669.00	\$2,752,053.00	\$3,021,722.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$319,864.00	\$2,853,909.00	\$3,173,773.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$470,000.00	\$470,000.00	\$940,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$789,864.00	\$3,323,909.00	\$4,113,773.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 2 Budget Table Narrative

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

The Early Learning Scholarships expenditures reflects the State's approved budget closely. The slightly lower expenditures in the Early Learning Scholarship grants due to the delayed start of the Early Learning Scholarships in 2012. Additionally, the 2013 Calendar Year expenditures do not reflect the second quarter expenditures for the State Fiscal Year. The grantees administering the Early Learning Scholarships have reported to the state that the funds have been fully committed to families through the December 30, 2015.

Project 2 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Due to a better understanding of the timing of the Early Learning Scholarship expenditures, Minnesota will request that the Early Learning Scholarship grant funds be more evenly spread out across the remaining two years of the grant period.

Budget Table: Project 3 – Title I PreK Incentives

Budget Table: Project 3			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$9,342.00	\$60,260.00	\$69,602.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$1,780.00	\$12,439.00	\$14,219.00
3. Travel	\$688.00	\$1,758.00	\$2,446.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$181,931.00	\$181,931.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00
8. Other	\$527.00	\$5,115.00	\$5,642.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$12,337.00	\$262,703.00	\$275,040.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$2,134.00	\$27,594.00	\$29,728.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$48,094.00	\$2,162,316.00	\$2,210,410.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$62,565.00	\$2,452,613.00	\$2,515,178.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$48,094.00	\$2,162,316.00	\$2,210,410.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$110,659.00	\$4,614,929.00	\$4,725,588.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 3 Budget Table Narrative

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

The grants expenditures for the Title I PreK Incentives project is slightly lower than budgeted due to the slower than expected start-up and the delay in payment requests from grantees in the second quarter of the state fiscal year. Contract expenditures are also delayed due to the finalized evaluation plan that includes higher cost data collection activities in the spring and fall of 2014 instead of 2013.

Project 3 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Minnesota anticipates a budget change request to reflect the reality of new evaluation timelines and payment requests from grantees.

Budget Table: Project 4 – Early Learning Standards

Budget Table: Project 4			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$12,680.00	\$12,680.00
7. Training Stipends	\$1,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$41.00	\$41.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$1,000.00	\$12,721.00	\$13,721.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$208.00	\$2,538.00	\$2,746.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$1,208.00	\$15,259.00	\$16,467.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$374,630.00	\$0.00	\$374,630.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$375,838.00	\$15,259.00	\$391,097.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 4 Budget Table Narrative

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

There is a lag in contract expenditures due to a revised timeline for the work that delayed the public input process to early 2014.

Project 4 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Minnesota anticipates a budget change request to reflect this new timeline.

Budget Table: Project 5 – Comprehensive Assessment System

Budget Table: Project 5			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$16,327.00	\$74,565.00	\$90,892.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$3,858.00	\$21,555.00	\$25,413.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$1,170.00	\$1,170.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$43.00	\$0.00	\$43.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$61,506.00	\$61,506.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$551.00	\$8,223.00	\$8,774.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$20,779.00	\$167,019.00	\$187,798.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$3,453.00	\$32,801.00	\$36,254.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$24,232.00	\$199,820.00	\$224,052.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$4,728,206.00	\$4,641,846.00	\$9,370,052.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$4,752,438.00	\$4,841,666.00	\$9,594,104.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 5 Budget Table Narrative

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

The contract expenditures for the Comprehensive Assessment System are lower than budgeted for two reasons: 1) the Comprehensive Assessment Workgroup has not made final recommendations for the system; and 2) the Online Screening project will be finalizing contracts in early 2014.

Project 5 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Minnesota anticipates a budget change request to reflect this new timelines and the final recommendations from the Comprehensive Assessment Workgroup.

Budget Table: Project 6 – Workforce Framework

Budget Table: Project 6			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$22,402.00	\$22,402.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$4,741.00	\$4,741.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$1,598.00	\$1,598.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$28,741.00	\$28,741.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$5,979.00	\$5,979.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$34,720.00	\$34,720.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$100,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$50,000.00	\$84,720.00	\$134,720.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 6 Budget Table Narrative

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

The budget and expenditures for this project are on target for the 2013 calendar year.

Project 6 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

We are in the process of reviewing the budgetary needs of each project, and may need to adjust budget lines to ensure continued progress.

Budget Table: Project 7 – Workforce Support

Budget Table: Project 7			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$832,786.00	\$832,786.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$832,786.00	\$832,786.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$832,786.00	\$832,786.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$3,195,000.00	\$3,195,000.00	\$6,390,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$3,195,000.00	\$4,027,786.00	\$7,222,786.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 7 Budget Table Narrative

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

The lower expenditures than budgeted for the Great Workforce Supports Project are reflective of several factors: (1) A delayed start in some activities in 2012 also extended into 2013; (2) There is a lag in project contractor expenditures at the end of the grant reporting year because of Department of Human Services practice to award most contracts on a State Fiscal Year basis (July 1 - June 30). More specifically, the 2013 Calendar Year expenditures do not reflect State Fiscal Year second quarter expenditures. These will be reflected as expended in early 2014 by Department of Human Services with a subsequent request to the Department of Education for reimbursement.

Project 7 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Minnesota will request some modifications to this project budget's contractor line item, shifting some unexpended funding to Project 1 to support emerging needs for Parent Aware and carrying forward the remaining unexpended funding into the remaining grant years to ensure that planned activities will be fully executed.

Budget Table: Project 8 – Kindergarten Entrance Assessment

Budget Table: Project 8			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$12,871.00	\$12,871.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$3,107.00	\$3,107.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$41.00	\$41.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$1,333.00	\$1,333.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$17,352.00	\$17,352.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$3,552.00	\$11,790.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$20,904.00	\$29,142.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$281,000.00	\$281,000.00	\$562,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$281,000.00	\$301,904.00	\$591,142.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 8 Budget Table Narrative

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

The KEA 2.0 pilot plan was finalized in May of 2013. The pilot plan includes collecting KEA data in the fall of 2013 and the analysis to be performed in the spring of 2014. The contract expenditures line under budget due to the new timeline and will be incurring expenses in the first half of 2014 in alignment with the finalized pilot plan.

Project 8 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Minnesota will be requesting a budget amendment that aligns contract expenses with the new timelines for analysis in the spring of 2014 and 2015 instead of 2013 and 2014.

Budget Table: Project 9 – Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System

Budget Table: Project 9			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$66,346.00	\$298,583.00	\$364,929.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$19,000.00	\$95,984.00	\$114,984.00
3. Travel	\$142.00	\$1,354.00	\$1,496.00
4. Equipment	\$414.00	\$0.00	\$414.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$1,559.00	\$1,559.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$211,205.00	\$211,205.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$159.00	\$159.00
8. Other	\$3,559.00	\$17,098.00	\$20,657.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$89,461.00	\$625,942.00	\$715,403.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$17,680.00	\$96,727.00	\$114,407.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$107,141.00	\$722,669.00	\$829,810.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$100,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$250,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$207,141.00	\$872,669.00	\$1,079,810.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 9 Budget Table Narrative

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

The contract expenditures line is lower than budget due to two reasons. One is the reduction of upfront resources by utilizing the current architecture of the system built for the Statewide Longitudinal Education Data System. However, now that the architecture is determined, it is expected that the third and fourth years of the RTT-ELC grant will realize expenditures at a greater pace than recent months and the data begins to load into the system and enhancements are needed to meet the needs of the ECLDS. Additionally, Minnesota provided a competitive grant process during 2013 to assist school districts and Head Start grantees in reporting data to the state. Those grants were awarded in late 2013 and expenditures will be realized in the next year.

Project 9 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

There will be increased pace for expenditures in the contract line in 2014 to reflect the increased workload for adding new data sets and the requirement gathering of an analytics portal.

Additionally, Minnesota is in the process of consolidating all IT resources, so there may be other changes in the budget to reflect new budgeting structure for all IT costs.

Budget Table: Project 10 – Family Friend and Neighbor

Budget Table: Project 10			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$1,035.00	\$1,035.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$2,535.00	\$2,535.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$558.00	\$558.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$3,093.00	\$3,093.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$49,000.00	\$49,000.00	\$98,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$49,000.00	\$52,093.00	\$101,093.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 10 Budget Table Narrative

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

The overall timeline to complete the work is being extended from a 12 month time period to a 32 month period in response to community feedback and alignment with other RTT-ELC activities, so expenditures are slower than originally anticipated. Grants have been encumbered and work is being performed.

Project 10 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Further environmental scans have determined existing resources that can be leveraged for this project, and we are currently determining how best to align resources in order to maximize the use of the funds.

We are in the process of reviewing the budgetary needs of each project, and may re-allocate funds to align with RTT-ELC performance measure and priorities.

Budget Table: Project 11 – Private-Public Partnership

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

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 11 Budget Table Narrative

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

The expenditures for the Private-Public Partnership have been delayed due to a re-evaluation of the project to ensure it is supporting Minnesota's RTT-ELC performance measures. Minnesota will be submitting an amendment request to this budget to align better with areas Minnesota has identified as needed improvement.

Project 11 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

We are in the process of reviewing the budgetary needs of each project, and may re-allocate funds to align with RTT-ELC performance measure and priorities.

Budget Table: Project 12 – Project Management

Budget Table: Project 12			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$55,329.00	\$88,353.00	\$143,682.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$18,390.00	\$29,064.00	\$47,454.00
3. Travel	\$496.00	\$1,176.00	\$1,672.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$719.00	\$380.00	\$1,099.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$8,657.00	\$11,279.00	\$19,936.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$83,591.00	\$130,252.00	\$213,843.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$15,802.00	\$27,779.00	\$43,581.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$9,625.00	\$38,006.00	\$47,631.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$109,018.00	\$196,037.00	\$305,055.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$109,018.00	\$196,037.00	\$305,055.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 12 Budget Table Narrative

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

The Project Management expenditures reflect the State's approved budget closely. The delay in the expenditures in the grants line is a lingering effect of the delayed start of the work with Transformation Zones. These grants have been executed and each Transformation Zone has a work plan to finish the work by December 30, 2015. Minnesota has also included the reporting of the Technical Assistance funds in the Project Management budget.

Project 12 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Minnesota anticipates a budget change request to reflect this new timeline for the grants.