

2013 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

Oregon





Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge

Annual Performance Report

Oregon

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	9
Governance Structure	9
Stakeholder Involvement	9
Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders.....	10
Participating State Agencies	11
High-Quality, Accountable Programs	12
Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application).....	12
Promoting Participation in the TQRIS (Section B(2) of Application)	15
Performance Measure (B)(2)(c).....	16
Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application).....	18
Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application).....	19
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1)	22
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2)	24
Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application).....	26
Focused Investment Areas: Sections (C), (D), and (E)	27
Promoting Early Learning Outcomes	28
Early Learning Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application)	28
Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application)	29
Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)	30
Early Childhood Education Workforce	32
Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials (Section D(1) of Application)	32
Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities (Section D(2) of Application)	33
Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1).....	35
Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2).....	36
Measuring Outcomes and Progress	38
Understanding the Status of Children’s Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry (Section E(1) of Application)	38
Early Learning Data Systems (Section E(2) of Application)	40
Data Tables	42
Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age.....	42
Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs	43
Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age	44

Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity.....	46
Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development.....	48
Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	50
Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards.....	51
Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State	52
Budget and Expenditure Tables	53
Budget Summary Table	53
Budget Table: Project 1 – Grant Management.....	55
Budget Table: Project 2 – TQRIS Validation Studies.....	57
Budget Table: Project 3 – Increase Participation of ELDP on the TQRIS	59
Budget Table: Project 4 – Workforce Build Capacity.....	61
Budget Table: Project 5 – Improve Rates of Developmental Screening at Regular Intervals	63
Budget Table: Project 6 – TQRIS Data System.....	65
Budget Table: Project 7 – Public Access	67
Budget Table: Project 8 – Align ECE to K-3 Teaching and Learning.....	69
Budget Table: Project 9 – Kindergarten Assessment	71

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 #:** S412A130030-13A
2. **Grantee Name:** Early Learning Division, Oregon Department of Education
3. **Grantee Address:** 775 Summer St NE, Salem, OR, 97301
4. **Project Director Name:** Jada Rupley
Title: Early Learning System Director
Phone #: (503) 373-0071
Email Address: Jada.Rupley@state.or.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 06/30/2014

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: Jada Rupley

Title: Early Learning System Director

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.

Oregon's best opportunity for distinction and success in the global economy of the 21st century is creating a world-class education system that starts early and produces results. Three years ago the state adopted the ambitious 40-40-20 goal: by 2025, 40% of adult Oregonians will earn a bachelor's degree or higher, 40% will earn an associate degree or post-secondary credential and 20% will earn a high school diploma or equivalent.

To achieve this goal we must dramatically transform the way our education system does its work. Consider the results our current system is getting:

- Five out of every 10 children in our state are born on Medicaid.
- Oregon ranks 13th in the nation for foster care placement.
- Oregon is in the bottom 25% for 3rd grade reading proficiency and high school graduation.
- 14% of Oregon kindergarteners enter school unable to recognize a single letter name or sound and 30% recognize 5 or fewer.

Under the leadership of Governor John Kitzhaber, the Oregon Legislature and the Early Learning Council, Oregon is making progress toward ensuring that children in Oregon are ready for kindergarten, raised in stable and attached families, and that systems and services are coordinated for families.

Through the Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge Grant funding, Oregon is launching significant system transformation and system-building efforts to establish the foundational elements that will support the state in reaching ambitious, but achievable goals. This 2013 Annual Performance Report summary provides an overview of our Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge Grant (RTT-ELCG) activities for the first grant year, highlighting early steps in creating a robust and high-quality early learning system for our youngest citizens:

1. *The establishment of Oregon's first Early Learning Hubs, our system transformation initiative, creates a stronger community infrastructure to accomplish our Race to the Top goals by providing integrated and coordinated services to children and their families.*
2. *Oregon's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) is creating a defined pathway for quality improvement that is critical for system transformation. Through the Early Learning Hubs, Oregon is well positioned to accelerate the impact of TQRIS as it expands statewide in 2014. A focus on highly qualified staff, strong educational components, developmentally appropriate environments, and quality family support is guided by the accepted standards of the TQRIS.*
3. *The statewide implementation of the kindergarten assessment in all 197 of Oregon's school districts is an important catalyst for establishing a measurable, concrete link between early learning and K-12. These data will drive system change as we focus on "age three to third grade" alignment of programs.*
4. *There is a confluence of transformations occurring in Oregon in the areas of health, human services, early learning, and K-12 education that create real opportunities for alignment and shared accountability between systems.*

Our 2013 early learning developments, accomplishments, and challenges are organized through the lens of the five key areas of reform defined by the federal RTT-ELCG competition:

Establishing Successful State Systems

The mission of the early learning system is to support Oregon's children to enter kindergarten ready to succeed; ensure their parents have the support and resources necessary that result in stable and attached families; and integrate resources and services statewide into a coordinated system for parents and families.

In 2012, the Oregon Legislature passed and the Governor signed legislation establishing the Early Learning Council (ELC) as the single body charged with guiding early learning and development programs in Oregon. In 2013, further legislation created the Early Learning Division within the Oregon Department of Education, streamlining Early Learning and Development Programs under one agency and codifying the transformation of the delivery system through the establishment of Early Learning Hubs.

Oregon's accomplishments are highlighted below:

- The Early Learning Division was established in statute to bring new levels of coordination to Oregon's early learning work (HB 3234). The Early Learning Division continues to be overseen by the Early Learning Council and the Oregon Education Investment Board, which is chaired by Governor Kitzhaber. The following programs and initiatives were brought into the Early Learning Division: community-based Early Learning Hubs, the Office of Child Care, Oregon Head Start PreKindergarten, Early Head Start, Healthy Families Oregon, and Relief Nurseries.
- The Early Learning Council established an inter-agency Data Steering Committee that includes representation from Oregon Department of Education, Oregon Health Authority, and the Department of Human Services to oversee the planning efforts and uses of cross-system early learning data.
- Unique alignment occurred through the establishment of a joint Early Learning Council and Oregon Health Policy Board that is establishing shared metrics for developmental screening for health and early learning. At the invitation of the Oregon Health Authority, early learning staff are embedded within their Transformation Center, reflecting close collaboration and shared resources between partner agencies in executing the work in the State Plan and RTT-ELCG funded projects.
- Stakeholder involvement was a major priority resulting in significant input and hundreds of staff hours on the road in community forums to engage with stakeholders about the signature initiatives of the Early Learning System, including the Early Learning Hubs, the TQRIS, Kindergarten Assessment and Health Promotion. This is part of the ongoing and expanding strategy to increase engagement.

While significant progress was made in our first year of the RTT-ELCG, we continue to address challenges to ensure rapid adjustment occurs while establishing successful state systems. System transformation efforts take time and persistence, at times requiring longer than anticipated timelines, including the hiring of staff. The newly formed Early Learning Division continues to prioritize and move forward with hiring processes to meet timelines and targets within our State Plan.

An additional challenge is balancing the need for expediency in system transformation efforts with the need to “meet the diverse field where they are” to move toward performance-based, accountable service delivery and achieve improvement goals. The Early Learning Division has embedded technical assistance, stakeholder engagement and input opportunities to support learning and rapid adjustment as system transformation activities are implemented. In addition, the Early Learning Division is implementing process evaluations and learning dialogues where appropriate, in particular with the TQRIS and Early Learning Hubs, to promote rapid learning so adjustment to technical assistance and supports are meaningful and effective. These efforts will continue into the second year to ensure successful state systems result in achieving Oregon's ambitious goals.

Defining High-Quality, Accountable Programs

The establishment of the TQRIS in Oregon created a common language for quality that is meaningful and understandable for parents, early learning and development programs, and policy makers. Increased engagement with programs and the workforce during phase one of the implementation has been critical to communicating the benefits of being a part of the TQRIS. In 2014 we expect an increased number of applicants and in turn, an expanded reach to bring quality programs to those children with the greatest needs.

Oregon's accomplishments are highlighted below:

- Created a set of TQRIS Program standards on five distinct domains. These standards are not only based on established national and state data but also support the legislative directives that created this effort - that effective early learning is accomplished with support not only in education, but in health and social improvements as well. Our standards support improvement in education, health and safety, high quality personnel, supportive families and efficient business practices.
- Implemented Phase 1 of the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System in eight counties.
- Completed crosswalks with Head Start and national accrediting bodies to increase participation and appropriately reflect the quality established by other accrediting bodies.
- Provided outreach to potential TQRIS participants. This has been crucial to the success of establishing high-quality programs. Staff visited the eight field test counties to deliver 25 presentations, held bi-monthly input sessions and also utilized social media, direct mail and telephone calls to create cohorts of early learning and development programs that shared information during the application process. Staff also conducted focus groups to determine potential improvements to the TQRIS.

One of our greatest challenges is that 40% of Oregon's children are cared for in unlicensed care. Additionally, in our efforts to increase participation in the TQRIS, we have encountered diverse levels of readiness amongst early learning and development programs creating a challenge for delivery of efficient technical assistance. The execution of effective, efficient supports for achieving our ambitious goals must be more individualized to particular needs. Based on input from stakeholders, we will modify and refine our implementation to increase participation and simplify the process of attaining star ratings in the TQRIS. The entire list of strategies is included in the "High Quality, Accountable Programs" section of this report.

Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children

Oregon is in the process of implementing Early Learning Hubs across the state which are self-organized consortiums with statutorily designated authority to integrate early learning services across systems and traditional geographic boundaries. Six Early Learning Hubs are underway following a competitive Request For Application process this past year, and we are now planning for a round two RFA that will establish up to 10 more in the coming year. The ultimate goal is to achieve higher levels of kindergarten readiness and stronger third grade reading proficiency. While communities have the flexibility to design their own operational model and set of strategies - acknowledging that a "one size fits all" approach to transformation doesn't work - each Hub shares the following responsibilities:

- Identify children at risk of arriving at kindergarten unprepared for school;
- Work with families to identify specific needs;
- Connect families to the supports or services that most meet their needs;
- Work across traditional silos; and
- Account for outcomes collectively and cost effectively.

Early Learning Hubs are a key, foundational strategy for system redesign that will move our state from a “scattershot” of well-intentioned but isolated programs to a coordinated system, aligned at the community and state level, dedicated to the needs of children and their families, and focused on results.

Oregon's accomplishments are highlighted below:

- Commitments to identify shared measures between Early Learning Hubs and health system (Coordinated Care Organizations - CCOs), including developmental screening rates and enrollment in Patient-Centered Primary Care Homes (medical home). This cooperation will bring new levels of awareness to our core ideal that healthy children result in successful students.
- Statewide, universal adoption of the Ages & Stages Questionnaire by the Early Learning Council.
- The Oregon Education Investment Board adopted an Equity Lens to guide policy recommendations and community engagement as we build a system that supports each and every student. The tool was vetted by more than 60 organizations and individuals throughout the state, including high school students. Feedback from the organizations added clarity and guided the development of our core beliefs. The Early Learning Council and Division is working to operationalize this lens in 2014.
- Increased investment from the Governor and Oregon Legislature for early learning services - Oregon Head Start PreKindergarten, Relief Nurseries, and Healthy Families Oregon.
- The Oregon Education Investment Board launched strategic investments that were approved by the legislature that will create an Early Learning Kindergarten Readiness Partnership and Innovation Program, Early Literacy Grants, and a statewide reading campaign.

Promoting cross-system, cross-sector outcomes is deeply complex and there are a number of coinciding transformations occurring (e.g. CCOs, home visiting system change supported through MIECHV, P-20 educational alignment). In partnership with the Governor's office, the Early Learning Division leadership continues to be listening and in dialogue with communities to support their alignment of transformations that leverage cross system outcomes.

Supporting A Great Early Childhood Education Workforce

Oregon has a well-established professional development system with a Career Lattice Registry that connects with state licensing data and tracks ongoing training requirements and degree attainment. Oregon is on track with the RTT-ELCG workforce targets and continues to build strategies to achieve 40-40-20 goals.

Oregon's accomplishments are highlighted below:

- As of 2012, the online registry provides workforce data on 100% of practitioners in regulated facilities and the data collection is linked to the TQRIS. It also provides aggregate data to policy makers to better inform workforce and quality improvement investments.
- The Professional Development System completed a crosswalk of the state's Early Learning Guidelines and TQRIS Programs standards that are integrated into our trainer program and connect the three sets of standards in professional development offerings.
- Education awards have been established since 2009 and are now incorporated into the TQRIS as incentives for practitioners in the classroom, augmenting incentives provided to the programs. The award amount is based on the professional development milestone an individual achieves on the Registry and range from \$100-\$500.
- Oregon's community colleges continue to work on aligning course work to the Core Body of Knowledge work force standards and are working with the Oregon Center for Career Development on the revision

of the Core Body of Knowledge. Oregon has exceeded the targeted trainer numbers who offer trainings aligned with the Core Body of Knowledge, having increased our cross sector trainer pool to 644 (target was 598).

Creating professional development opportunities that meet the needs for the early learning workforce is critical to continue the professionalization of the field of practitioners who support children ready for success in kindergarten. Oregon continues to struggle with the diverse levels of readiness for professional development and career advancement opportunities in the early childhood education workforce. As Oregon works towards the 40-40-20 goal, we have a need to operationalize the Equity Lens for adult learners and create portable and stackable pathways toward degree attainment that meet and support the needs of this varying workforce. Oregon is mapping professional development efforts across the state and establishing a strategic plan to support the workforce. In addition, the RTT-ELCG funded scholarships and focused networks will support this work and build upon public and private investments that support the professional pathway for the early learning workforce.

Measuring Outcomes and Progress

The establishment of the Early Learning Hubs creates a structure that not only increases access to critical services and resources for children and families, but fosters shared accountability and common metrics at the community level which include:

- Increase kindergarten readiness
 - Increase the number of children served by high quality early learning environments as measured by the statewide Quality Rating and Improvement System.
 - Improve readiness for kindergarten as measured by the statewide Kindergarten Readiness Assessment.
- Increase family stability
 - Increase the number of children who receive developmental screening prior to age 3.
 - Increase the number of children with access to a patient centered primary care home (PCPCH).
- Increase system coordination and efficacy
 - Increase the number of at risk children served across the system.
 - Decrease the cost of service (decreasing administrative overhead.)
 - Decrease the age of onset services.

Oregon's accomplishments are highlighted below:

- The statewide execution of a common Kindergarten Assessment. In this first year of implementation, all three sections of the assessment - literacy, numeracy and approaches to learning - were completed by 95% of entering kindergarteners. The approaches to learning section was an observational assessment and included self-regulation and social-emotional development which are proven to be strong predictors of reading and math achievement in elementary grades.
- Realizing the critical importance of a robust data capture and analysis to drive change and improvement, we have initiated a number of strategies including: the creation of an early learning data system steering committee to provide recommendations to the Early Learning Council, the development of aggregated data reports related to the Early Learning Hubs, and coordination with the Oregon Education Investment Board for the development of a data system business case for the Statewide Longitudinal Data System.

A challenge and high priority for the state is to ensure effective and sensitive communication about the kindergarten assessment. Equally important is appropriate interpretation of data and application of results. We convened broad and diverse stakeholders to obtain guidance for use and interpretation of the kindergarten assessment data and document improvement opportunities. One important area identified for improvement for the 2014-2015 school year is for additional guidance on successful kindergarten assessment practices for Spanish-speaking English language learners. Additionally we seek to streamline mechanisms for data entry and reporting. As an ongoing strategy, we will continue to engage experts and researchers to ensure communication is appropriate and effective.

In closing, the RTT-ELCG funding has launched a new phase of system change and strategic activities that fuel Oregon's work to reach and support more children with high needs faster. Oregon has strong leadership and the direct engagement of communities to forge the collective impact necessary to bring very real, positive changes to our early learning system. At a time when there is a sense of urgency to achieve better outcomes for Oregon's children and families, the RTT-ELCG resources let us know that we are not alone in our efforts and that our work is not only good for this state but for the entire nation.

Successful State Systems

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

Governance Structure

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

The Lead Agency for the RTT-ELCG is now the Early Learning Division, Oregon Department of Education. The State Advisory Council continues to be the Early Learning Council and the new Division functions under the direction and control of the Early Learning Council with the Early Learning System Director serving as the administrative officer.

In July 2013, the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill 3234, creating an Early Learning Division within the Oregon Department of Education (ODE). This bill changed Oregon's RTT-ELCG Governance Structure by bringing together the Early Learning Council staff (formerly part of the Governor's office), the Child Care Division (formerly a part of the Oregon Employment Department), and the Oregon Head Start Pre-Kindergarten program (previously within the ODE) into one division in the Oregon Department of Education. This governance change does not change any outcomes, goals or performance measures of our RTT-ELCG.

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.

Oregon made significant efforts to engage with stakeholders in 2013. The Early Learning Council met at different locations across the state and council members typically traveled a day early to visit with communities to meet with providers of early childhood services and programs, and conduct open community forums to engage and inform the design, delivery, and continuous improvement of the early childhood system in a less formal setting. Additionally, as part of the business agenda, the Council conducted hearings and accepted public comments.

In addition to the Council's outreach efforts, Early Learning Division staff engaged with stakeholders on the planning and implementation of our signature initiatives in Oregon, including:

Early Learning Hubs:

ELD staff actively engaged stakeholders in anticipation of the release of the Early Learning Hub request for applications. Nearly 100 stakeholders participated in three webinars and 300 took part in an Early Learning Summit designed to build capacity and support communities as they developed their collective impact efforts.

TQRIS:

More than 100 early childhood educators and stakeholders have provided valuable input during the initial phases of implementation of the TQRIS during bi-monthly input sessions, focus groups, and through state collective bargaining relationships with Oregon American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Council 75 which represents certain licensed Family Child Care Providers and Services Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 503 representing unlicensed family child care providers receiving government subsidies.

Kindergarten Assessment:

More than 40 stakeholders participated in a learning collaborative designed to guide next steps for the analysis and release of the first year of kindergarten assessment results. Diverse experts provided valuable guidance and input on data interpretation and reporting.

Health Promotion:

The joint Early Learning Council and Health Policy Board committee hold regular public meetings and have engaged stakeholders for coordination of health and early learning activities, working towards aligned metrics of developmental screening for health and early learning.

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.

As stated earlier, in July 2013, the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill 3234, creating an Early Learning Division within the Oregon Department of Education (ODE). This bill changed Oregon's RTT-ELCG Governance Structure by bringing together the Early Learning Council staff (formerly in the Governor's office), the Child Care Division (formerly a part of the Oregon Employment Department), and the Oregon Head Start Pre-Kindergarten program (previously within the ODE) into one division. The new Division will function under the direction and control of the Early Learning Council with the Early Learning System Director serving as the administrative officer. This governance change does not change any outcomes, goals or performance measures of our grant, nor does it affect the budgeted amounts in our RTT-ELCG.

In this same session, the Legislature also passed House Bill 2013, which puts in place the final pieces of statutory structure, timing and process for establishing Early Learning Hubs.

Early Learning Hubs must:

- Coordinate the provision of early learning services to the community served by the Hub;
- Include service providers, parents, community members, county governments, school districts and other stakeholders in the creation of the Hub;
- Align services coordinated by the Hub with the services provided by public schools;
- Align services coordinated by the Hub with services provided by Coordinated Care Organizations and county public health departments;

- Integrate efforts across health, K-12 education, human services, early education and the business community using coordinated and transparent budgeting and through a governing body with representation of each of the above sectors as well as parents of children using early learning services;
- Demonstrate an ability to improve results for at risk children;
- Leverage additional private and public funds - including in kind support; and
- Keep administrative overhead at 15% or lower.

The implementation of Early Learning Hubs will strengthen our local infrastructure to accomplish our RTT-ELCG goals and targets. The Early Learning Council and the Early Learning Division began implementation and launch of the Early Learning Hubs in the Fall of 2013. Oregon is currently halfway through Early Learning Hub implementation and has six Early Learning Hubs under contract. By the end of 2014 we will have up to 10 more under contract. Oregon statute allows for no more than 16 Early Learning Hubs total to cover the entire state.

The Early Learning Council is the state level governing body with authority over Early Learning Hub contracts. Functionally, the Early Learning Hubs are managed statewide by Early Learning Division staff. Locally, Early Learning Hubs are managed by locally-established governing boards, required by statute to reflect representation from health care, human services, early education, K-12 education, the private/non-profit sector and parents.

The state holds a contract with a single fiscal agent for each community. Entities acting as the fiscal agent vary from local county government, to health/managed care organizations (in Oregon known as Coordinated Care Organizations), education service districts and non-profits.

Early Learning Hub leaders are convened in a learning collaborative on a monthly phone call and quarterly in person. Each Hub also submits a monthly progress report to the Early Learning Division to monitor what's working, what isn't and to identify community-specific coaching and technical assistance needs.

Participating State Agencies

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

As stated earlier, two Participating State Agencies (PSA) have moved into the Early Learning Division - the Child Care Division and Head Start Pre-Kindergarten unit of ODE.

The Department of Human Resources, the Oregon Health Authority and the State Library continue to be in Oregon's State Plan as Participating State Agencies.

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	Yes
Early Learning & Development Standards 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>	✓

(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	Yes
Early Childhood Educator qualifications 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)

(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>	✓

(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.

Oregon began field-testing the TQRIS in January of 2013. In preparation for the field test, Oregon developed a statewide set of tiered Program Standards. The ELD incorporated Early Learning Guidelines, Workforce and Competency Standards recognizing the importance of aligning these three sets of standards. Oregon's TQRIS Program Standards build upon the foundation of licensing standards and compliance history. The second tier is identified as a "Commitment to Quality" level which requires an initial TQRIS training and application, with additional "readiness standards" including licensing compliance history. The 3-5 star levels continue to include increased compliance standards as well as incremental standards of quality. Significant work was completed at the 3, 4, and 5 star level to ensure standards were culturally and linguistically responsive and "languaged" for both family and center based care. Additionally, Oregon completed a cost modeling analysis of standards to ensure the Program Standards were reasonable in terms of cost for small child care businesses and utilized existing state data from prior quality efforts to assist in determining achievable personal qualification thresholds and other important standards.

This work resulted in a set of TQRIS Program standards that focuses on five distinct domains or sets of standards:

- Children's Learning & Development,
- Health & Safety,
- Personnel Qualifications,
- Family Partnerships, and
- Administration & Business Practices.

The standards are based on research indicating a positive impact on young children's lives as well as national standards coupled with state data to establish an achievable quality threshold for ELDPs.

When ELDPs apply for the initial Commitment to Quality designation, standards are verified through the licensing data system. If all standards are met the program receives a "Commitment to Quality" designation. Additionally, the program gains access to supports including a resource website, access to a coach and financial supports to begin implementing and documenting 3, 4 and 5 star levels of quality. Programs determine the appropriate star level for their application using a self-assessment and Quality Improvement Plan.

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

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

In 2013, Oregon engaged ELDPs across the eight field test counties in Oregon and stakeholders statewide to encourage participation in the TQRIS and solicit feedback. State staff delivered more than 25 presentations to community and providers regarding TQRIS. A bimonthly TQRIS input session offered opportunities for stakeholders and ELDPs to provide input and guidance as the TQRIS was developed and the field test began. Child Care Resource and Referral staff who serve the eight field test counties utilized an array of strategies to promote participation and engage ELDPs within their communities. These strategies included: emails, postings on Facebook, newsletters, personalized letters to ELDPs, direct personal calls, and the organization of ELDP cohorts working together. A TQRIS contractor delivered awareness trainings at state and regional conferences and continues to provide information and tools on the TQRIS website. <http://www.wou.edu/tri/QQRIS/>

Oregon's TQRIS is designed to incorporate both supports and incentives to ELDPs to promote participation. ELDPs that achieve a "Commitment to Quality" designation earn access to a rich resource website that offers information and materials to assist in implementing TQRIS Program standards. Additionally, ELDPs may request a coach from their local Child Care Resource and Referral agency to assist them in creating the required Quality Improvement Plan, which then gains them access to financial supports. Coaches continue to assist ELDPs in meeting the goals outlined in the Quality Improvement Plan as continuous quality improvement support. Oregon has tiered financial supports based on the licensed capacity of the ELDP, offering \$1,000, \$1,500 and \$2,000 support funds to assist the ELDP in meeting TQRIS Standards. Once an ELDP achieves a star rating, they also receive financial rewards between \$500 and \$2,500 depending on their size and star rating awarded. Oregon recognizes the importance of staff to implement the TQRIS Standards within ELDPs and has built upon the existing Oregon Registry Education Awards program. Staff who work in a star rated program may earn an additional Education Award based on their step on the Oregon Registry.

In addition to these ongoing strategies, state staff conducted three regional focus groups with ELDPs and one with TQRIS coaches to gather information on what was working well, current challenges, and to obtain recommendations on how to improve Oregon's TQRIS. These focus groups provided a wealth of information, which was then combined with preliminary results from the process evaluation to inform changes and improvements as Oregon expands the field test statewide in 2014.

As Oregon continues transformation efforts in early learning, the TQRIS has been identified as a key strategy to help ensure children's kindergarten readiness. Each early learning hub is responsible for promoting participation in the TQRIS and is accountable for specific TQRIS metrics. The early learning hubs are an important strategy to help promote participation and to assist children with high needs to have access to high quality early learning opportunities.

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	70	27.0%	96	40.0%	193	80.0%	241	100%	241	100%
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	72	30.0%	93	40.0%	186	80.0%	232	100%	232	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	9.0%	4	12.0%	5	14.0%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	3	75.0%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	2,159	29.0%	2,490	33.0%	368	42.0%	3,470	46.0%	3,772	50.0%
Other	4,468	100%	4,493	100%	4,462	100%	4,462	100%	4,462	100%
Describe:	State Licensed									
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		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	263	70	27.0%	241	96	40.0%
Specify:	Include sites that operate Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten and Early Head Start programs.					
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	243	72	30.0%	232	98	42.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	35	0	0.0%	35	0	0.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	35	0	0.0%	35	0	0.0%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	4	0	0.0%	9	0	0.0%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	7,544	2,159	29.0%	6,910	2,254	33.0%
Other	4,468	4,468	100%	4,367	4,367	100%
Describe:	State Licensed					
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.

Participation in the TQRIS in Oregon includes licensing as the first level of quality, Commitment to Quality as the second level, and the 3, 4, and 5 star ratings.

In an effort to comply with new data categories for the APR report (which do not align with Oregon RTT-ELCG application) we have disaggregated our previously titled "State and federally funded preschools including Migrant and Tribal" into the new state-funded and federally-funded categories. This required new baseline numbers, which have also been updated for these new categories. We updated the targets to appropriately reflect the program categories, per the instructions of our federal grant officers. The actual number of programs in 2013 was used as the baseline for years 2, 3, and 4 targets.

Data Sources and Years for Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) table, in order of table rows:

- Office of Child Care licensing data are cross-referenced with grantee report to ODE in Site and Service Workbooks. The data provided are actual figures, not estimates. Data from the Office of Child Care may underreport licensed Head Start sites and we are working to improve our data for the future.
- Office of Child Care licensing data are cross-referenced with grantee report to ODE in Site and Service Workbooks to omit Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten-only sites. Migrant and Tribal Head Start data were collected via phone call for 2013 and were unavailable for 2012 baseline data. The data provided are actual figures, not estimates. Data from the Office of Child Care may under-report licensed Head Start sites and we are working to improve our data for the future.
- Annual Progress Report, ODE, 2012.
- Annual Progress Report, ODE, 2012.
- ODE, Consolidated State Performance Report, 2012
- ACF-801 Report; unduplicated numbers of licensed facilities and license-exempt programs receiving CCDF subsidy funds. Represents January-September 2013 data.
- Early Learning Division, CCRIS Statewide monthly report, December 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.

Oregon met all targets (as measured by the percent target). Oregon had a reduction in subsidy caseload resulting in a lower number of CCDF programs, however the number of CCDF programs participating in the QRIS increased by 4%. We believe the increase was affected by contracted slots and parent education to families who qualify for child care subsidies. Additionally, during the last year, Oregon's Head Start Collaboration Director has been working with the state's licensing manager to develop a coordinated licensing approach, which has been implemented in the first months of 2014 to ensure we reach our ambitious 2014 targets.

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.

Oregon's TQRIS assigns star ratings based on a portfolio model. The portfolio model requires programs to provide evidence involving pictures, policies, and examples of implementation that are evaluated by expert review teams. Inter-rater reliability has been established within review teams to develop and refine scoring rubric. The TQRIS utilizes existing licensing data systems to verify compliance standards and utilizes the workforce data system to ensure professional development qualification requirements are met. Additionally, to achieve a 3, 4 and 5 star rating the TQRIS requires a family survey, which serves as evidence across multiple domains. ELDPs that apply for a 5 star rating are required to receive a CLASS observation to ensure positive adult/child interactions are occurring in the program.

The monitoring system of the TQRIS will require ELDPs to submit an annual report to the TQRIS agency to ensure program standards are being maintained. Oregon will rely heavily on existing data systems and licensing information to efficiently monitor the maintenance of these standards. Oregon is currently working on a differentiated monitoring system for licensing which will include key TQRIS indicators and serve as on-site monitoring. More intensive monitoring will occur every three years to ensure program standards are being maintained.

Oregon believes it is important to have a critical mass of quality rated programs prior to the launch of a robust website to inform parent decision-making. In the interim the state is developing messaging through the Child Care Resource and Referral agencies to inform families of rated programs as appropriate. Additionally, the state is beginning work on branding and marketing broadly the importance of early learning including the importance of choosing high quality child care. While the state works to develop a statewide campaign, rated programs have been given marketing materials to promote and advertise the quality rating of their program. These materials include Facebook and Twitter templates, family letter templates, newsletter content, talking points specific to star rating, voice mail message script and window badge template.

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	
Increased compensation	

Number of tiers/levels in the State TQRIS
5

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

	State-funded preschool programs	Early Head Start	Head Start programs	Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	Center-based Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	Family Child Care Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program
TQRIS Programs that Moved Up at Least One Level	0	0	0	0	0	188	185
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)	Yes
Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet Federal Head Start Performance Standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, there is a reciprocal agreement between Head Start and the TQRIS, or there is an alternative pathway to meeting the standards)	Yes
Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet national accreditation standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, or an alternative pathway to meeting the standards)	Yes
Early Learning and Development Standards	Yes
A Comprehensive Assessment System	Yes
Early Childhood Educator qualifications	Yes
Family engagement strategies	Yes
Health promotion practices	Yes
Effective data practices	Yes
Program quality assessments	Yes

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

Oregon Standards are based on leading research focused on supporting kindergarten readiness. The intent and design of the TQRIS is to be a true representation of high quality learning environments that lead to kindergarten readiness and children achieving 3rd grade reading level, with a particular emphasis to ensure children with high needs have access to these high-quality learning opportunities.

Standards alignment: In 2012, Oregon adopted the Head Start Child Development Early Learning Framework for the Oregon Head Start PreKindergarten (OPK) program. A crosswalk of TQRIS Program Standards and Head Start Performance Standards has been completed which determined which standards aligned and the verification process to create a streamlined process for OPK and federal Head Start programs to participate in the TQRIS. This same process has been completed with National Assn. for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), National Assn. for Family Child Care (NAFCC) and Assn. for Christian Schools International (ASCI) national standards and a modified introductory training and application materials have been developed and disseminated. These standards align with the TQRIS standards at the 3, 4 and 5 star high quality tiers.

A comprehensive assessment system: Oregon's TQRIS incrementally requires ELDPs to utilize an assessment system. This requirement is found in the Children's Learning and Development Domain and initially requires developmental screening and a curriculum, which connects to early learning standards, and progresses to requiring a formative assessment used by the ELDP. Oregon's TQRIS has environmental standards woven throughout. Standards for positive adult/child interactions are evaluated at the 5 star tier through a Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) observation.

Early childhood educator qualifications: Oregon's TQRIS integrates personnel qualifications within a domain of program standards. Our research included national standards and workforce data available at the state level.

Family engagement strategies: Oregon's TQRIS infuses the importance of family engagement across the domains and incorporates the results of a Family Survey into the evidence required to meet standards. Additionally, there is a domain on Family Partnerships that establishes and defines quality practices for family engagement.

Health promotion practices: Health promotion practices are incorporated in the Children's Learning and Development Domain by requiring that programs complete a development screening. Additionally, QRIS Standards have a Health and Safety domain, which sets health standards above and beyond the foundational licensing requirements.

Effective data practices: The TQRIS is utilizing existing licensing and workforce data systems to efficiently coordinate the evidence of meeting TQRIS standards.

Program quality assessments: As part of the comprehensive assessment system, 4 and 5 star rated programs conduct a child-level assessment that aligns with Oregon's Early Learning Standards and directly links to the curriculum. ELDPs at the 5 star level use a formative assessment to guide instruction.

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
Total number of programs covered by the TQRIS	4,468	4,493	4,662	4,662	4,662	4,367
Number of Programs in Tier 1	4,447	4,377	4,048	3,813	3,580	4,006
Number of Programs in Tier 2	0	30	60	90	120	344
Number of Programs in Tier 3	0	40	60	80	100	14
Number of Programs in Tier 4	0	46	251	213	175	2
Number of Programs in Tier 5	0		155	208	261	1

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 data for Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) were collected by Western Oregon University Oregon’s TQRIS Administrator paired with Early Learning Division, Office of Child Care licensing data.

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.

As Oregon developed and defined the TQRIS process over the last year, we have listened and learned from stakeholders, ELDPs, and data. Oregon’s TQRIS has been met with enthusiasm by ELDPs within the eight field test counties and we have received information from the other 28 counties that they are excited to bring TQRIS to their ELDPs. As of December 31, 2013 Oregon exceeded the number of ELDPs that achieved the second “Commitment to Quality” tier, which is a required step in the TQRIS process. Oregon has sufficient data based on the number of programs at the Commitment to Quality tier and in exceeding workforce targets that there is a pipeline of ELDPs that are preparing to submit their portfolio for a star rating.

Oregon has completed a crosswalk between the Oregon TQRIS star levels and requirements for NAEYC, NAFCC, and ASCI accreditation. This led to the creation of streamlined application processes for ELDPs that have met these national standards. To date, 26 ELDPs have achieved the initial Commitment to Quality designation and are beginning the necessary work to apply for a star rating. Although the crosswalk work with Head Start directors took longer than anticipated, the high level of engagement and buy-in has helped build enthusiasm and will lead to increased participation.

Oregon has recognized the time it takes ELDPs to increase the professional development of early learning practitioners and is continuing to explore additional supports to achieve required qualification and implementation of quality practices. The following list contains strategies Oregon is implementing to improve and support the attainment of star ratings. These changes are based on the process evaluation and focus group data:

- Implement a streamlined process for Head Start programs to apply for a star rating.
- Implement a streamlined process for nationally accredited programs to apply for a star rating.
- Adjustments to the coaching model to offer more direct support and follow up to ELDPs working to apply for a 3, 4 or 5 star rating.
- Utilize workforce data to identify and target ELDPs with “ready staff” at TQRIS step level for Portfolio submission.
- Outreach to special populations to participate in the TQRIS including family child care, ELDPs in low income neighborhoods, and inclusive EI/ECSE ELDP.
- Provide coaches for targeted populations including Teen Parent, Alcohol & Drug, and school age programs.
- Waive the fee to apply for a Step on the Oregon Registry.
- Simplify the look and language within the TQRIS portfolio and the instructions for self-assessment, portfolio format, and evidence required.
- Translation of materials for Spanish and Russian speaking ELDPs.
- Establish child care networks in at-risk communities and offer additional supports and incentives to ELDPs participating in these child care networks.
- Establish targets within the Early Learning Hubs to increase the number of ELDPs with a star rating within their community.
- Offer early achiever awards during statewide roll out as well as additional submission bonuses to the initial four field test regions.
- Child Care Resource and Referral agencies leverage additional resources to provide localized incentives and supports, including scholarships for training and submission bonuses.
- Create pathways for ELDP practitioners to increase professional qualifications and community college entrance and success. Explore additional supports for professional development by practitioners to achieve required qualifications and implementation of quality practices.
- Provide individual access to Oregon Registry Online (workforce data system) to ease provider updates to Professional Development records.
- Conduct ongoing focus groups of community partners, providers, national experts, and staff on strategies to increase participation.

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	0	0.0%	2,943	40.0%	5,886	80.0%	7,358	100%	7,358	100%
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	0	0.0%	4,006	40.0%	9,434	80.0%	11,793	100%	11,793	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	30	0.4%	40	0.5%	50	0.7%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	160	25.0%	320	50.0%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	0	0.0%	579	4.0%	1,034	8.0%	1,754	12.0%	1,876	12.0%

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		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	7,358	0	0.0%	7,358	0	0.0%
Specify:	Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten and state-funded Early Head Start programs					
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	10,014	0	0.0%	11,793	0	0.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	2,989	0	0.0%	2,989	0	0.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	7,261	0	0.0%	7,261	13	0.2%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	638	0	0.0%	638	0	0.0%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	15,238	0	0.0%	15,238	48	0.3%

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.

Oregon defines the top tiers of the TQRIS as 3, 4, and 5 star ratings.

In an effort to comply with new data categories for the APR report (which do not align with Oregon RTT-ELCG application) we have disaggregated our previously titled "State and federally funded preschools including Migrant and Tribal" into the new state-funded and federally-funded categories. This required new baseline numbers, which have also been updated for these new categories. We updated the targets to appropriately reflect the program categories, per the instructions of our federal grant officers. The actual number of programs in 2013 was used as the baseline for years 2, 3, and 4 targets.

State-funded preschool participation data are the total funded enrollment for Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten and state-funded Early Head Start, which is consistent with what we provided in our application. Total cumulative participation figures for state funded slots would require an estimate because data collected at this level blends Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten and federal Head Start.

Early Head Start and Head Start data source is the Program Information Report (PIR), Total Cumulative Enrollment of Children. Baseline is the 2011-2012 program year and year 1 is the 2012-2013 program year.

Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 (annual December 1 count) data source is Annual Special Education Child Count, 2012.

Programs funded under Title 1 of ESEA, (annual December 1 count) data source is Annual Special Education Child Count, 2012.

Programs receiving CCDF funds data source is the ACF 801-October 2013 Report.

Program participation in the TQRIS is recorded by Oregon's TQRIS Administrator, Western Oregon University.

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.

Oregon launched the TQRIS in 4 regions of the state in 2013, which is why baseline participation is listed as zero for 2012 for all program types. Over the course of 2013, Oregon worked to implement a coordinated approach to support the licensing of Head Start Programs and a streamlined application for a star rating. The crosswalk for Head Start required more time than originally planned during our RTT-ELCG application, creating a lag in participation numbers this first year as programs waited for the streamlined process to be finalized.

Many Head Start programs are exempt from state licensing, but are interested in becoming licensed and applying for a star rating. To support this work, the Office of Child Care (OCC) has reviewed its systems to support multi-site Head Start grantees. The OCC has also identified licensing specialists to respond specifically to Head Start programs. Finally, support staff in Oregon's Professional Development Registry system will assist programs in demonstrating personnel qualifications relating to the TQRIS. These efforts are part of a coordinated approach to support the licensing of Head Start Programs and application for a star rating.

Additionally, in partnership with Region X Office of Head Start staff and Oregon Head Start grantee leadership, Oregon established a streamlined process for licensed programs who have completed an on-site review to apply for a star rating.

As indicated by our ambitious targets, we had planned to complete the crosswalk earlier, which is why the CCDF contracted slots across Head Start and Oregon Programs of Quality (OPQ) were initially provided as an estimate in our baseline data. Despite this delay, we are confident that we will be able to reach our targets over the grant period based on the ongoing improvements to streamline the application and rating process. At the end of 2013, 11 Head Start grantees indicated interest in applying for a TQRIS star rating and of the 11, seven grantees representing 72 licensed sites will soon be scheduling the initial TQRIS training and portfolio process.

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

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

The first Validation Study is currently underway and is moving forward with the analysis to differentiate levels of quality within the TQRIS.

- The study has completed the required approvals and training.
- Data collectors have been hired and trained on the PreK and Toddler CLASS; all have passed CLASS reliability protocols.
- Additional forms and protocols have also been developed to ensure consistent and reliable data collection occurs.

Submission for a star rating has occurred slower than expected. The Validation Team is revising timelines to ensure both validation studies occur within the timeline of the grant. The Validation Team coordinates closely with various TQRIS partners to ensure alignment between the implementation of the TQRIS and the validation studies.

As Oregon completes Validation Study 1, work is beginning to finalize the design of the Validation Study 2. A key strategy to the second validation study, which focuses on child outcomes, is the kindergarten assessment which will enter the second year of statewide implementation. These data, analyzed with CLASS and other QRIS indicators will help us ensure that QRIS Standards support positive outcomes for young children.

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	
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.

In 2012, Oregon adopted the Head Start Child Development Early Learning Framework and the Common Core State Standards. Oregon intends to build on the standards alignment work completed by other states and organizations so it can focus on training early childhood educators and K-3 teachers to align teaching and learning practices for children and help ensure a smooth transition to school.

In Oregon's 2012 Early Childhood RTT-ELCG application focused on statewide training with early childhood education workforce and public school personnel to help ensure ECE & K-3 alignment. It also focused on smooth transitions for children between ECE and K-3 at the regional or local level through partnerships with Early Learning Hubs and the K-12 school system.

To date, ODE is partnering with state professional development organizations and associations to discuss professional development opportunities for early learning partners and Kindergarten personnel. Of particular interest is the transition of children between programs, learning standards and full day kindergarten. These collaborations provide multiple opportunities to connect ECE workforce and K-3 personnel though out the year.

In fall 2013 Oregon joined the K- grade 3 Consortium led by North Carolina. This is a nine state consortium that has been awarded an Enhanced Assessment Grant (EAG) by the U.S. Department of Education. It is anticipated that aligning with Common Core State Standards will be accomplished through this collaboration.

Over the next four years, the nine states will work together to develop a common K-3 formative assessment that will begin at kindergarten entry and continue through third grade. This type of assessment can strengthen the connection between early learning and K-3 education, as well as strengthen teachers' abilities to differentiate instruction to meet the unique learning and developmental needs of each child on an ongoing basis.

Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application)

Has the State made progress in:

Child Health Promotion	
Establishing a progression of standards for ensuring children's health and safety	Yes
Ensuring that health and behavioral screening and follow-up occur	Yes
Promoting children's physical, social, and emotional development across the levels of your TQRIS Program Standards	Yes
Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators who are trained and supported in meeting the health standards	Yes
Promoting healthy eating habits, improving nutrition, expanding physical activity	Yes
Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual targets	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 has been made in all areas of health promotion. Highlights of our progress include:

- The largest TQRIS domain is focused on Children's Learning and Development; an additional domain is focused on Health and Safety; both go beyond basic licensing requirements.
- The ELC has adopted the Ages & Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) for statewide use. Substantial state efforts to increase the rate of developmental screening have resulted in a significant increase from baseline and has exceeded our five year target.
- The following state and local resources have been leveraged to achieve targets for developmental screening, including: Project LAUNCH grant, Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems (ECCS) grant, the State Innovation Model (SIM) grant, Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Systems (MIECHV) grant, and the Title V Maternal Child Health (MCH) Block Grant.

The following strategies are underway and will continue through the grant period to ensure that measurable progress will be made through the grant period:

- Alignment between Oregon's health and early learning systems is underway, including the development of shared metrics among the regional, health focused Coordinated Care Organizations (CCOs) and Early Learning Hubs. These entities will work collaboratively within communities to achieve better outcomes for children.
- Systems development is underway to expand health and behavioral screening and follow-up for children, including:
 - Completion of a needs assessment of training needs among ELDPs
 - Exploration of statewide online screening and referral
 - Beginning development of workforce training curriculum related to developmental screening
 - Alignment of screening and information sharing across health and early learning
- Further work to provide and emphasize workforce training related to promoting healthy eating habits, improving nutrition and expanding physical activity are needed.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)

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

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.

	Baseline	Targets				Actuals
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1
Number of Children with High Needs screened	13,375	13,723	14,080	14,445	14,821	37,500
Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment	12,609	12,937	13,273	13,618	13,972	10,406
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care	314,062	314,062	314,062	314,062	314,062	339,315
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care	262,756	269,588	276,597	283,788	291,167	297,699

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

Data Sources and Years (in order of table rows):

"Number of Children with High Needs Screened" data source is National Survey of Children's Health (NSCH) 2011/12, survey question 4.16. Data query from the Data Resource Center for Child and Adolescent Health website www.childhealthdata.org. All numbers are weighted estimates of the population at the time of the survey.

"Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment" is defined as children ages 0-5 years (all incomes) who were referred and received a screen or evaluation or has an IFSP. Data source is the Oregon Department of Education, Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education, monthly count data 2013.

"Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up treatment" data source is NSCH 2011/12, survey question 4.9a and defined as children ages birth to 17 with household incomes of <200% FPL. Data query from the Data Resource Center at www.childhealthdata.org. All numbers are weighted estimates of the population at the time of the survey.

"Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care" data source is NSCH 2011/12, survey question 4.1 and defined as children ages birth to 17 with

household incomes of <200% FPL. Data query from the Data Resource Center at www.childhealthdata.org. All numbers are weighted estimates of the population at the time of the survey.

In future annual performance reports, we will consider utilizing a new data source in place of National Survey of Children's Health (NSCH) data, which is only available every 4 years. RTT-ELCG benchmark and targets for screening were established based on the NSCH. Our state now also reports on developmental screening for children as part of our Health System Transformation Quarterly Report. The data source is administrative claims data and represents the percentage of children who were screened for risks of developmental, behavioral and social delays using standardized screening tools in the 12 months preceding their first, second or third birthday. The number of children enrolled in Medicaid who were screened in 2011 (baseline year) was 20.9%. During the first 3 quarters (January-September) of 2013, 32% of children were screened. Full data for 2013 will be available this spring.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) Target Notes

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

Oregon exceeded the five year target in screening during the first year of RTT-ELCG. Oregon has undergone significant health care reform since our first RTT-ELCG application, including substantial expansion in children's insurance coverage and the creation of a new Medicaid delivery system based on the coordinated care model. Increasing access to a medical home and monitoring of access to medical care are priorities of Oregon's health care reform efforts, and measurement of these domains is being followed closely statewide. Additionally, we will be comparing NSCH results with our statewide monitoring of healthcare utilization (as measured by well child care via Medicaid billing data, for example).

The target for "Number of children with high needs referred for services who received follow-up" was not met. The reason(s) for this decline is being explored. Some of the data sources are being reviewed for accuracy, including the source for the number of children with high needs referred who received follow-up services.

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.

Oregon has made great progress on revising the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework (Core Body of Knowledge). A work group has done an extensive assessment of the current Core Body of Knowledge compared to the NAEYC personnel preparation standards with the guidance of a NAEYC/PDW TA specialist. The results found the Core Body of Knowledge to be well informed by national standards with minor enhancements recommended. Revisions are currently underway, guided by state level stakeholders.

A common progression of credentials and degree work began at Oregon's annual Articulation Summit in spring of 2012. Action plans were developed and progress has been made on those plans. Oregon's community colleges are working to ensure all coursework aligns with NAEYC national personnel standards which will automatically align with the Core Body of Knowledge. They are also working on a "one-year" certificate that would provide the same number of credits at all colleges and would link to the State Registry and be applicable towards a two-year Associate degree.

In response to input from cross-sector partners, including home visiting and parent education, Oregon has adjusted the timeline for creating a set of core standards that would be common across the various early learning workforce. Oregon is continuing to work with the PDW Center to complete this activity by March 31, 2015.

**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>	Yes
<i>Management opportunities</i>	Yes
Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention	
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>	
<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.

Oregon has a well-established professional development system with a Career Lattice Registry that connects with state licensing to track and document ongoing training requirements and degree attainment. The professional development system also has an established Trainer Program which utilizes the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework to offer training to the field.

Efforts have been made to increase the number of trainers within the Trainer Program and a 10% increase has been made since the beginning of the grant. We have exceeded the target for cross sector trainer numbers by 46.

The Professional Development System has also completed a crosswalk of the state's Early Learning Guidelines and TQRIS Programs standards and is beginning to integrate into the Trainer Program, connecting the three sets of standards in professional development offerings.

As a part of the TQRIS field test Oregon has offered Education Awards to individuals who work in programs that achieve a star rating. An Education Award is a financial incentive that rewards providers for educational achievements and encourages continued education. The award is provided to individuals, and supervisors, who are working at least 20 hours a week with children under the age of 13. The award amount ranges from \$100-\$500 and is based on the professional development milestone an individual achieves on the Registry. Our goal is to recognize and incentivize the workforce to implement quality standards within their programs. Oregon continues to offer statewide scholarships and financial education awards to practitioners working directly with children and achieving Steps on the Oregon Registry.

Since the beginning of the grant, Oregon has increased the number of individuals who have achieved a step on the Oregon Registry by 32%. This progression is dependent on training and education that align with Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. We have exceeded our workforce target numbers in all Oregon Registry Step categories.

Oregon is on track for meeting professional development targets and in fact is exceeding targets in some areas. Oregon's community colleges continue to work on aligning course work to the Core Body of Knowledge workforce standards and are working with OCCD on the revision of the Core Body of Knowledge. Oregon continues to offer statewide scholarships and financial education awards to practitioners working directly with children and achieving Steps on the Oregon Registry.

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
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	12	12	12	13	13	12
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	2,155	2,259	3,374	3,454	3,534	2,788

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

The above table reflects the baselines, targets, and actuals for the following metric definitions.

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

The data source for these metrics is the Oregon Registry.

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

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

All 2013 targets were reached.

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>									
Progression: Low to High	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Credential Type 1	1,536	14.0%	1,601	11.0%	3,166	23.0%	3,226	23.0%	3,286	24.0%
Specify:	Oregon Registry Steps 3-6 or higher									
Credential Type 2	1,900	14.0%	2,004	14.0%	2,060	15.0%	2,116	15.0%	2,172	16.0%
Specify:	Step 7 – 8.5/CDA or Oregon Registry Credential									
Credential Type 3	1,338	9.0%	1,338	9.0%	2,397	17.0%	2,421	17.0%	2,445	18.0%
Specify:	Step 9 – 9.5/Associate Degree									
Credential Type 4	2,381	17.0%	2,381	17.0%	3,056	22.0%	3,312	24.0%	3,568	26.0%
Specify:	Step 10/Bachelor Degree									

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>			
Progression: Low to High	Baseline		Year 1	
	#	%	#	%
Credential Type 1	1,536	14.0%	1,995	19.0%
Specify:	Oregon Registry Steps 3-6 or higher			
Credential Type 2	1,900	14.0%	2,277	16.0%
Specify:	Step 7 – 8.5/CDA or Oregon Registry Credential			
Credential Type 3	1,338	9.0%	1,516	11.0%
Specify:	Step 9 – 9.5/Associate Degree			
Credential Type 4	2,381	17.0%	2,945	21.0%
Specify:	Step 10/Bachelor Degree			

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

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

Data in this section represent the sum totals of data from the following sources:

- Oregon Registry
- Head Start PIR - 2012-13
- ODE special education staff position collection for the 2012-13 school year

These are the same data sources used in our RTT-ELCG application and we have calculated the 2013 actuals in a consistent way.

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

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

Oregon is on track with workforce targets and actually exceeding in all areas. We are also exceeding in our efforts to bring more cross sector trainers into the Oregon Registry Trainer Program to ensure that their trainings connect to the Core Body of Knowledge.

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	
Is valid, reliable, and appropriate for the target population and for the purpose for which it will be used, including for English learners and children with disabilities	
Is administered beginning no later than the start of the school year in the 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.

Oregon's Statewide Kindergarten Assessment includes measures in the domains of Early Literacy (letter names, letter sounds), Early Math (Numbers and Operations), and Approaches to Learning (which includes Self-Regulation and Social-Emotional Development).

The literacy and math assessments are easyCBM measures. easyCBM is an assessment system for kindergarten through 8th grade designed by researchers from the University of Oregon to provide benchmarking and progress monitoring in both literacy and math to inform instruction. Validity studies of the instruments have included populations of African-American, Latino, and other racial-ethnic groups. The administration conditions for the easyCBM measures were modified for the statewide Kindergarten Assessment, with input and permissions from the University of Oregon, to accommodate the needs of entering kindergarten students.

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

Beginning in the 2013-2014 school year, all students were administered the statewide Kindergarten Assessment. To accommodate staggered start dates throughout the state, the Oregon Department of Education establishes a statewide window from the middle of August through late October. Within that timeframe, schools are required to establish their own six week window to get a true picture of a child's learning and development at kindergarten entry.

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

In 2012, the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill 4165 which directed the Early Learning Council and the Department of Education to jointly develop a Kindergarten Readiness Assessment to be piloted in the Fall of 2012 and implemented statewide in the Fall of 2013. The multi-stage process for implementing a statewide kindergarten assessment included: (1) a systematic review and information gathering about current assessments used in Oregon and nationally, and their appropriateness and usefulness in predicting academic success; (2) the selection of a recommended tool, adopted by the Early Learning Council in July 2012; (3) a Fall 2012 pilot study of the recommended set of assessments for statewide implementation; and (4) plans for a statewide rollout in Fall 2013.

On March 8, 2013 the State Board of Education adopted into rule a directive that all school districts administer the Oregon Kindergarten Assessment to all students enrolled in kindergarten beginning with the 2013- 2014 school year. To help communicate to the field about the new Kindergarten Assessment, webpages were added to the Early Learning System Website for parents, early learning and development providers, and school districts/teachers. A Kindergarten Assessment Resource page was added to the ODE website that includes test specifications, the test administration manual, training materials, and additional resources. Regional In-Person Trainings for administering the kindergarten assessment were provided from May through August, 2013. ODE also provided additional web-based training on assessment administration and data entry.

From August 15 through October 24, 2013 school districts administered the kindergarten assessment statewide. Data from the assessments were due to the Oregon Department of Education by November 1, 2013. Approximately 95% of Oregon's kindergarten students participated in the first administration of the assessment.

ODE convened a panel of stakeholders in November 2013 to elicit recommendations from the field prior to finalizing and releasing Kindergarten Assessment data and reports. The panel consisted of K-3 teachers, early educators, administrators and researchers that reflected a range of perspective and areas of expertise. Panelists reviewed five prototype reports, including aggregate score reports at the school, district and state levels, classroom roster reports and regional Early Learning Hub reports. They discussed the data and results and provided feedback on report presentations, score interpretation, assessment data uses, and messaging. An independent evaluator reviewed training and workshop materials, assessment results and computations, report templates, and presentations. The evaluator also summarized key panel recommendations, analyzed and reported panelist's evaluation of the workshop and documented validity.

The panel's recommendations, along with those of Oregon's Education Leadership, has informed a reporting timeline that includes the release of Student Roster and School Summary Reports to districts in January 2014. Reports broken out by Early Learning HUBs are anticipated to be released in February 2014.

A Closure/Lessons Learned Document has been prepared to evaluate the 2013-2014 year roll-out and to document the lessons learned to improve processes for the 2014-2015 assessment implementation. Some areas identified for improvement for the 2014-2015 school years are the inclusion of kindergarten students attending

virtual schools, additional guidance on successful kindergarten assessment practices for Spanish-speaking ELLs, and streamlined mechanisms for data entry and reporting.

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	
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	Yes

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

Oregon has made initial progress in policy alignment and decisions related to a statewide early learning data system that aligns with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System. Through our Advancing Data for Educational Reform (ALDER) grant, our Statewide Longitudinal Data System will include data for all children enrolled in Head Start, Oregon Head Start PreKindergarten (OPK) and Early Intervention-Early Childhood Special Education. For Head Start and OPK, the data will include Teaching Strategies GOLD assessment data, Oregon's first universally-adopted early childhood formative assessment.

We continue to work toward a more functional, inter-operable system and our progress includes:

- Creation of an early learning data system steering committee that provides data system-related recommendations to the Early Learning Council and includes representation from the state's education, health and human services agencies.
- Creation of an early learning data dictionary that enumerates and defines the data elements of interest. The data elements will be mapped through the Common Education Data Standards (version 4) as each participating data system undergoes annual maintenance and enhancements.
- Engagement of consultants to inform the development of initial aggregated data reports for use as a continuous learning tool and for strategic planning related to Early Learning Hubs. A needs assessment of system capacity and integration strategies are starting.

- Close coordination with the Oregon Education Investment Board to inform the development of a data system Business Case for enhancing the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, which will be presented during the 2014 Legislative session. The business case will recommend the approach for integrating early childhood through workforce data systems.

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	23,680	52.4%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	47,493	52.4%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	49,522	52.4%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	120,695	52.4%

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.

Data Source and Year: Population: State of Oregon Office of Economic Analysis, 2013; Population of children under 5 years of age is 230,383. Poverty rate: American Community Survey, 2012.

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	10,585	4.6%
Are English learners ²	33,358	14.5%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	734	14.5%
Are migrant ³	1,674	0.7%
Are homeless ⁴	1,674	0.7%
Are in foster care	5,479	2.3%
Other as identified by the State	2,845	1.20%
Describe:		
<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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)).</p>		

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

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

Population data source: State of Oregon Office of Economic Analysis, 2013; Population of children under 5 years of age is 230,383. Poverty rate: American Community Survey, 2012.

"Have disabilities or developmental delays" source is the ODE Annual Special Education Child Count, 2012.

"Are English learners" was calculated by the State of Oregon Office of Economic Analysis by using the number of households in Oregon with home language other than English ONLY.

"Are migrant" is the sum of the 2012-2013 PIR report for Region XII Migrant Seasonal Head for Sept 1, 2012-Aug 31, 2013 and data from the Migrant Education Program in the Oregon Department of Education.

"Are homeless" source is the Oregon Department of Education, NCLB Title X: Homeless 12-13 Collection, Jan 2013.

"Are in foster care" source is the Oregon Department of Human Services Child Welfare Foster Care, Jul 1, 2012 - Jun 30, 2013.

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	24	44	7,290	7,358
Specify:	Includes state-funded Early Head Start and Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten.			
Data Source and Year:	ODE State enrollment numbers, 2012-2013 program year.			
Early Head Start & Head Start¹	1,349	2,424	8,020	11,793
Data Source and Year:	2013 PIR report (Region X, Region XI American Indian Head Start, Region XII Migrant/Seasonal Head Start excluding non-ACF).			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619	361	2,857	7,367	10,585
Data Source and Year:	Annual Special Education Child Count, 2012.			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	0	525	525
Data Source and Year:	Consolidated State Performance Final Report, 2012.			
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	10,950	24,519	64,342	99,810
Data Source and Year:	ACF-801, July 2012-June 2013			
Other 1	7,834	3,293	1,311	12,717
Specify:	Home Visiting -- public health programs, Healthy Families Oregon, MIECHV			
Data Source and Year:	Oregon Health Authority, Public Health Division, Office of Family Health, 2013 report of 2012 data.			
Other 2	638	1,113	1,385	3,136
Specify:	Relief Nurseries			
Data Source and Year:	Self report by each nursery to Oregon Association of Relief Nurseries (OARN) by calendar year 2013.			
Other 3	245	723	720	1,688
Specify:	TANF			
Data Source and Year:	Department of Human Services provider pay claims and claims history January 1, 2013 – December 31, 2013.			
Other 4	1,176	3,523	4,557	9,256
Specify:	Employment-Related Day Care (ERDC)			
Data Source and Year:	Department of Human Services Provider pay claims and claims history, January 1, 2013- December 31, 2013.			

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.

In an effort to comply with new data categories for the APR report (which do not align with Oregon RTT-ELCG application) we have disaggregated our previously titled "State and federally funded preschools (including Migrant and Tribal)" into the new state-funded and federally-funded categories.

State-funded preschool data is actual data for the age range of 3-kindergarten entry. The age break-down for infants under 1 and toddlers ages 1 through 2 is an estimate because data collected for state-funded Early Head Start does not include age. The Early Head Start estimate is extrapolated using the 2013 PIR report of the age break down of federally funded slots.

The Early Head Start and Head Start data represent ACF funded cumulative enrollment for RX, RXI, RXII. To prevent duplicative counts, non-ACF funded enrollment was deducted from RX cumulative enrollment data and the result was added to RXI & RXII cumulative enrollment data found in the 2013 State level PIR Report.

Duplicative counts were discovered in our RTT-ELCG application in the Home Visiting row with the inadvertent inclusion of Relief Nursery, IDEA part C and B, Early Head Start data. This has been correct in the APR.

Employment Related Day Care numbers are highly duplicative to numbers identified under Programs receiving CCDF funding programs.

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	2,551	258	147	431	59	61	4,042
Specify:	Includes state-funded Early Head Start and state funded Oregon Prekindergarten slots.						
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	5,842	663	175	699	88	733	7,369
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	749	40	90	80	17	72	2,170
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	1,830	90	209	208	36	139	4,855
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	147	5	0	52	0	0	321
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	4,184	191	196	1,199	87	245	8,724
Other 1	799	70	13	100	15	347	1,792
Describe:	Relief Nurseries						
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.

State-funded preschool participation data is an estimate based on 2013 PIR, race and ethnicity data collection for Region X for Head Start and Early Head Start. Using the total Region X Head Start and Early Head Start cumulative enrollment numbers, we extrapolated the percent of non-ACF funded participation.

Early Head Start and Head Start data source is the 2013 PIR report and represents the race and ethnicity data collection for ACF funded cumulative enrollment for Head Start and Early Head Start in Region X, Region XI, Region XII.

Title 1 does not collect data by race/ethnicity for children under school age. These numbers are extrapolated from the school age numbers. Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 (annual

December 1 count) data source is Annual Special Education Child Count, 2012. Programs funded under Title 1 of ESEA, (annual December 1 count) data source is Annual Special Education Child Count, 2012.

Programs receiving CCDF funds data source is Department of Human Services provider pay claims and claims history, January 1, 2013 - December 31, 2013. Please note there are some children who do not fall into any category because the parent/caretaker did not provide the information, which is purely voluntary. About 82% provide both race and ethnicity.

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
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start & Head Start¹	\$752,006	\$754,653
State-funded preschool	\$61,069,890	\$62,437,835
Specify:	Oregon Prekindergarten	
State contributions to IDEA, Part C	\$11,737,518	\$13,787,983
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry	\$44,155,427	\$52,872,711
Total State contributions to CCDF²	\$31,313,274	\$31,051,232
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Exceeded	Exceeded
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>	7,863,951	7,428,186
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs³	\$984,432	\$2,817,838
Other State contributions 1	\$2,824,690	\$4,360,843
Specify:	22 Relief Nurseries serving birth to age 6, therapeutic classrooms, parent education, home visiting.	
Other State contributions 2	\$1,161,786	\$1,475,362
Specify:	Department of Human Service state contribution to CCDF	
Other State contributions 3	\$666,667	\$666,667
Specify:	Child Care Contribution Tax Credit	
Other State contributions 4	\$6,216,448	\$3,952,999
Specify:	Local government Portland Children’s Levy – early childhood birth to 5 contributions	
Total State contributions:	\$160,882,138	\$174,179,123
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.

Updated baseline figures include:

- "Total contributions to CCDF" - estimated figures were provided in our application
- "TANF spending on ELDPs" - the amount to-date was provided in our application
- "Other State Contributions 2" (Department of Human Service state contribution to CCDF) - estimated figures were provided in our application

Early Head Start data source is the state's 2013-15 legislatively adopted budget and the state fiscal year (Jul 1 - Jun 30).

Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten data source is the state's 2013-15 legislatively adopted budget and state fiscal year (Jul 1 - Jun 30).

Relief Nurseries data source is the state's 2013-15 legislatively adopted budget and the state fiscal year (Jul 1 - Jun 30).

Child Care Contribution Tax Credit data source is the state's 2013-15 legislatively adopted budget and the state fiscal year (Jul 1 - Jun 30).

State contributions to CCDF data source is the ACF-696 CCDF report plus DHS data and are based on the federal fiscal year (Oct 1 - Sept 30).

State Match to CCDF data source is the ACF-696 CCDF report plus DHS and are based on the federal fiscal year (Oct 1 - Sept 30).

TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs data source is DHS provider pay claims and is based on the federal fiscal year (Oct 1 - Sept 30).

DHS state contribution to CCDF - data source is DHS and is based on the federal fiscal year (Oct 1 - Sept 30).

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
State-funded preschool (annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)	7,358	7,358
Specify:	Oregon Head Start PreKindergarten and state-funded Early Head Start	
Early Head Start and Head Start² (funded enrollment)	10,014	11,793
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 (annual December 1 count)	10,250	10,585
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA (total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report)	638	525
Programs receiving CCDF funds (average monthly served)	15,238	16,481
Other	3,390	3,136
Describe	Relief Nurseries	
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.

State-funded preschool participation data are the total funded enrollment for Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten and state-funded Early Head Start, which is consistent with what we provided in our application. Total cumulative participation figures for state funded slots would require an estimate because data collected at this level blends Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten and federal Head Start.

Early Head Start and Head Start data source is the 2013 PIR report, Total Cumulative Enrollment of Children.

Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 (annual December 1 count) data source is Annual Special Education Child Count, 2012.

Programs funded under Title 1 of ESEA, (annual December 1 count) data source is Annual Special Education Child Count, 2012.

Programs receiving CCDF funds data source is the ACF 801-October 2013 Report.

Self report by each nursery to Oregon Association of Relief Nurseries (OARN) by calendar year 2013.

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

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

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

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

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

No changes have occurred since submission of the application. Oregon will revise the Early Learning Foundations Standards for children birth through age two. Oregon adopted the Head Start Child Development Framework for children ages three to five.

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:	Home Visiting Programs funded by the Affordable Care Act Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program				

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.

Not applicable.

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)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$153,799	\$153,799
2. Fringe Benefits	\$80,147	\$80,147
3. Travel	\$691	\$691
4. Equipment	\$616	\$616
5. Supplies	\$7,718	\$7,718
6. Contractual	\$62,727	\$62,727
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$305,698	\$305,698
10. Indirect Costs	\$22,563	\$22,563
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$1,342,325	\$1,342,325
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$9,023	\$9,023
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$1,679,609	\$1,679,609
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$357,731,587	\$357,731,587
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$359,411,196	\$359,411,196

Columns (a): 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.

- Personnel & Fringe Benefit expenses were lower than estimated due to the delays in hiring qualified staff.
- Travel expenses were lower than estimated due to the delay in hiring qualified staff. Also, the small amount of travel that did occur was paid for by our Federal Technical Assistance funds.
- Equipment expenses were lower than estimated because we had anticipated purchasing equipment for our TQRIS electronic portfolio, however we are still in the process of determining the best solution.
- Supplies were higher than estimated, due to a few larger unanticipated expenditures made (such as manuals & forms), as well as our original estimate being too low.
- Contracts were lower than estimated because it took longer to finalize most contracts than we had anticipated. Also, a couple of contracts ended up being categorized as "participating programs" instead of contracts, thus shifting the expenditures from contracts to participating programs line items.
- Our other expenditures were set aside for technical assistance related to our new Kindergarten Assessment. This first year of implementation required a focus on operationalizing the assessment and we were not able to provide the RTT-ELC funded technical assistance and support as anticipated during year 1. With the baseline information and lessons learned from the first assessment, we will use the RTT funds for technical assistance and support during 2014 and 2015.
- Indirect Costs were lower than estimated because we had fewer direct expenditures than was anticipated.
- Funds distributed to localities & partner programs were less than estimated because it took longer to finalize agreements than we had anticipated.

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

Overall the Early Learning Division only anticipates a few substantive changes in our year 2 budget.

- In project #4, we increased funding for technical assistance for Early Learning Hubs, our delivery system transformation effort, by \$200,000 to support their success.
- In project #9, we increased our budget by \$45,000 to help support the growing "3 to 3rd" focus of the Oregon Education Investment Board (OEIB), which will include an annual ECE to K-3 alignment conference to be coordinated between our Early Learning Division, OEIB and Oregon Department of Education K-12 system.
- In project #8, we increased our budget by \$50,000 for technical assistance and support of our new statewide Kindergarten Assessment.
- The remaining budgetary increases are due to delays in contracting and hiring employees during year 1.

Budget Table: Project 1 – Grant Management

Budget Table: Project 1		
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$49,861	\$49,861
2. Fringe Benefits	\$25,003	\$25,003
3. Travel	\$0	\$0
4. Equipment	\$413	\$413
5. Supplies	\$2,691	\$2,691
6. Contractual	\$60,506	\$60,506
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$138,474	\$138,474
10. Indirect Costs	\$4,607	\$4,607
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$9,023	\$9,023
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$152,104	\$152,104
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0	\$0
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$152,104	\$152,104

Columns (a): 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 Narrative

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

During year 1 of the grant, there was a delay in hiring qualified staff to manage the grant. Due to this delay, expenditures in personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment and indirect costs were lower than estimated.

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.

We do not anticipate substantive changes in our budget for year 2. The year 2 budget will increase to support the program work that was anticipated to happen in year 1, but weren't paid until year 2.

Budget Table: Project 2 – TQRIS Validation Studies

Budget Table: Project 2		
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0	\$0
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0
3. Travel	\$0	\$0
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$0	\$0
6. Contractual	\$0	\$0
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0	\$0
10. Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$69,003	\$69,003
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$69,003	\$69,003
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0	\$0
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$69,003	\$69,003

Columns (a): 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 Narrative

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

During year 1 of the grant, there was a delay in getting agreements finalized and starting the TQRIS validation study, causing expenditures to be less than originally estimated. Also, the validation study agreement has been set up with a participating program, so the expenditures are included in the participating program budget category instead of the contract budget category. The attached budget reflects this category change.

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.

We do not anticipate substantive changes in our budget for year 2. The year 2 budget will increase to support the program work that was anticipated to happen in year 1, but was delayed due to getting agreements finalized.

Budget Table: Project 3 – Increase Participation of ELDP on the TQRIS

Budget Table: Project 3		
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$12,587	\$12,587
2. Fringe Benefits	\$7,286	\$7,286
3. Travel	\$9	\$9
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$675	\$675
6. Contractual	\$2,221	\$2,221
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$22,778	\$22,778
10. Indirect Costs	\$1,748	\$1,748
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$953,856	\$953,856
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$978,382	\$978,382
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0	\$0
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$978,382	\$978,382

Columns (a): 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 Narrative

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

During year 1 of the grant, some payroll expenses were coded incorrectly, causing a shortage in expenditures in the personnel, fringe benefits, and indirect costs budget categories. These expenditures will be adjusted and included in the year 2 budget.

Travel expenditures were lower than estimated because the travel that was taken was paid by the Federal TA funds.

Participating programs expenditures were less than estimated, due to agreements with local Resource & Referral Networks taking longer to finalize than anticipated.

Project 3 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate substantive changes in our budget for year 2.

Budget Table: Project 4 – Workforce Build Capacity

Budget Table: Project 4		
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$1,387	\$1,387
2. Fringe Benefits	\$554	\$554
3. Travel	\$0	\$0
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$0	\$0
6. Contractual	\$0	\$0
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$1,941	\$1,941
10. Indirect Costs	\$240	\$240
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$319,466	\$319,466
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$321,647	\$321,647
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$271,272,072	\$271,272,072
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$271,593,719	\$271,593,719

Columns (a): 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 Narrative

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

During year 1 of the grant, one participating program had a slower start creating materials and curriculum than expected, so expenditures were lower than estimated.

Due to the slow start on curriculum, less translation of materials into other languages was needed, causing contractual expenditures to be lower than estimated. Also, in future years, these translations will be done through a participating program and not a contract. We have adjusted the budget to reflect this change.

Project 4 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

The only substantive change expected during year 2 is a \$200,000 increase in funding for technical assistance for Early Learning Hubs, our delivery system transformation effort, to support their success.

Budget Table: Project 5 – Improve Rates of Developmental Screening at Regular Intervals

Budget Table: Project 5		
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0	\$0
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0
3. Travel	\$0	\$0
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$0	\$0
6. Contractual	\$0	\$0
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0	\$0
10. Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0	\$0
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$85,449,072	\$85,449,072
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$85,449,072	\$85,449,072

Columns (a): 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 Narrative

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

During year 1, grant funds were not fully utilized due to delays in hiring well-qualified employees and contracting. Significant progress on these delays have been made and are expected to be under review by the end of March.

Project 5 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate substantive changes in our budget for year 2. The year 2 budget will decrease to account for the delay in hiring well-qualified employees.

Budget Table: Project 6 – TQRIS Data System

Budget Table: Project 6		
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$82,765	\$82,765
2. Fringe Benefits	\$45,283	\$45,283
3. Travel	\$682	\$682
4. Equipment	\$203	\$203
5. Supplies	\$4,352	\$4,352
6. Contractual	\$0	\$0
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$133,285	\$133,285
10. Indirect Costs	\$15,150	\$15,150
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$148,435	\$148,435
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0	\$0
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$148,435	\$148,435

Columns (a): 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 Narrative

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

During year 1 of the grant, equipment and contract expenses were lower than estimated because we are still in the process of determining our best solution for a TQRIS data system.

Supply costs were higher than estimated due to a low estimate that was used in the original budget.

Project 6 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

The year 2 budget will increase to support the program work that was anticipated to happen during year 1. During year 2 final determinations will be made and there will be progress made towards a new or refined TQRIS data system.

Budget Table: Project 7 – Public Access

Budget Table: Project 7		
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0	\$0
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0
3. Travel	\$0	\$0
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$0	\$0
6. Contractual	\$0	\$0
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0	\$0
10. Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0	\$0
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,010,443	\$1,010,443
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,010,443	\$1,010,443

Columns (a): 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 Narrative

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

During year 1 of the grant, it took longer to finalize the Early Learning System branding contract, causing contract expenses to be lower than estimated. This contracted work was anticipated to be completed during year 1, but the timeline was delayed due to the contracting process and work started finally began in December. Branding work should be completed during year 2.

Project 7 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

The year 2 budget will increase to support the program work that was anticipated to happen in year 1. The branding contract was finalized in December and work has now begun and should be finalized during year 2.

Budget Table: Project 8 – Align ECE to K-3 Teaching and Learning

Budget Table: Project 8		
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$7,199	\$7,199
2. Fringe Benefits	\$2,021	\$2,021
3. Travel	\$0	\$0
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$0	\$0
6. Contractual	\$0	\$0
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$9,220	\$9,220
10. Indirect Costs	\$818	\$818
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$10,038	\$10,038
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0	\$0
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$10,038	\$10,038

Columns (a): 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 Narrative

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

During year 1 of the grant, a highly qualified Education Specialist was hired to help with the ECE to K-3 alignment. This employee was not scheduled to be hired until year 2, so the personnel, fringe benefits and indirect costs were higher than estimated for year 1.

Project 8 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

The year 2 budget will increase by \$45,000 to help support the growing “3 to 3rd” focus of the Oregon Education Investment Board (OEIB), which will include an annual ECE to K-3 alignment conference to be coordinated between our Early Learning Division, OEIB and Oregon Department of Education K-12 system. The year 2 budget will also increase because of the hiring of a highly qualified Education Specialist at a salary marginally higher than originally estimated.

Budget Table: Project 9 – Kindergarten Assessment

Budget Table: Project 9		
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0	\$0
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0
3. Travel	\$0	\$0
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$0	\$0
6. Contractual	\$0	\$0
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0	\$0
10. Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0	\$0
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0	\$0
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0	\$0

Columns (a): 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 Narrative

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

During year 1 of the grant, Oregon implemented a new Kindergarten Assessment statewide. This first year of implementation required a focus on operationalizing the assessment and we found we were not able to provide the RTT-ELC funded technical assistance and support as anticipated during year 1. With the baseline information and lessons learned from the first assessment, we will use the RTT funds for technical assistance and support during 2014 and 2015.

Project 9 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

The year 2 budget will increase by \$50,000 to help support Oregon's new statewide Kindergarten Assessment. Through the first year of implementation and the collection of lessons learned, there is a clearer understanding of the technical assistance and support needs moving forward.