

2013 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

Wisconsin





Annual Performance Report

Wisconsin

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	10
Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders.....	11
Participating State Agencies.....	12
High-Quality, Accountable Programs	13
Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application).....	13
Promoting Participation in the TQRIS (Section B(2) of Application)	17
Performance Measure (B)(2)(c).....	18
Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application).....	20
Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application).....	22
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1)	25
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2)	26
Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application).....	27
Focused Investment Areas: Sections (C), (D), and (E)	29
Promoting Early Learning Outcomes	30
Early Learning Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application)	30
Engaging and Supporting Families (Section C(4) of Application)	32
Early Childhood Education Workforce	34
Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials (Section D(1) of Application)	34
Measuring Outcomes and Progress	36
Early Learning Data Systems (Section E(2) of Application)	36
Data Tables	39
Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age.....	39
Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs	40
Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age	42
Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity.....	44
Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development.....	46
Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	48
Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards.....	49
Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State	50

Budget and Expenditure Tables	52
Budget Summary Table	52
Budget Table: Project 1 – Overall Grants Management.....	54
Budget Table: Project 2 – YoungStar Training and Technical Assistance.....	56
Budget Table: Project 3 – Increase YoungStar Participation.....	58
Budget Table: Project 4 – Increase YoungStar Participation of High Needs Children.....	60
Budget Table: Project 5 – Increase Quality of YoungStar Program via Scholarships, Training and Bonuses.....	62
Budget Table: Project 6 – YoungStar Validation Study	64
Budget Table: Project 7 – Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards.....	66
Budget Table: Project 8 – Family Engagement.....	68
Budget Table: Project 9 – Professional Development.....	70
Budget Table: Project 10 – Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System	72

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

Reporting Period Information

5. **Reporting Period:** 1/1/2013 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 Until Amended

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: Scott Walker

Title: Governor

Executive Summary

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

In our first year of implementing the Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge ("RTT-ELC") grant, Wisconsin has made important progress in improving the quality of and access to high-quality child care, particularly for children of high needs. Crucially, the grant has provided the opportunity for our state to make strategic investments in the early childhood system, thereby creating a solid foundation for quality improvements throughout the grant period and beyond. Our efforts in 2013 focused on both improving the quality of care through our YoungStar program, as well as strengthening and aligning the overall early childhood system.

I. Improving the Quality and Accessibility of Care through YoungStar.

During 2013, our team enhanced our TQRIS system (YoungStar) through (1) improving the YoungStar rating system itself, (2) helping more children gain access to high-quality care, (3) helping providers improve their care and star level, and (4) validating the YoungStar methodology.

- **Improving the YoungStar rating system.**

Increasing family engagement in child care is a pillar of Wisconsin's strategy. In 2013, we laid important groundwork for the transition to a mandatory family engagement point in the YoungStar program quality criteria. To ensure that our family engagement standards use national best practices, we documented and analyzed TQRIS engagement standards from other states, including California's Steps to Excellence, Delaware Stars, New York's Quality Stars, New Hampshire, and Washington's Early Achievers. Based on these examples and related research, we began developing a set of strategic options for transitioning YoungStar to a mandatory point system. We also recruited a work group to provide critical feedback about the strategy, including professionals from the Children's Trust Fund, the Department of Public Instruction (DPI), the Department of Health Services (DHS), and members of the YoungStar Consortium (Supporting Families Together Association, Wisconsin Early Childhood Association, and Celebrate Children Foundation.) In order to support the enhancements to YoungStar and family engagement generally, the team is developing strategies that join both providers and families in collaborative efforts to improve engagement. Several options are under consideration including an expansion of "parent cafes" that use a sequence of guided meetings to join both parents and providers in a collective engagement effort. One of our greatest challenges has been identifying truly reliable and objective measures to judge the effectiveness of family engagement practices. We will be addressing this need through additional research, peer-to-peer support from professionals in other states, and external technical assistance.

Although we have continually worked to improve inter-rater reliability, we have learned the lesson that further improvements to the consistency and accuracy of indicator data entry (which are needed ensure rating validity and reliability) require additional systemic investments. In response, the team has selected an online data system to help support our YoungStar formal raters who perform observations using the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scales (ECERS) with an automated process for the entry of data and subsequent writing of reports via utilization of a PC tablet. Once implemented, this technology will increase the granularity and speed of YoungStar ERS rating. In addition, to promote excellence in validity and reliability we will be providing our formal raters with intensive training from experts on ECERS.

- **Helping children gain access to high-quality care.**

Actually getting children into high-quality care depends on reinforcing the YoungStar brand, raising awareness about quality child care programming, driving demand for high-quality care, and creating ownership of YoungStar in parents of children with high needs statewide. The state team has developed an initial communications strategy targeting families of high-need with the goal of getting more children into centers rated as 3-5 Star by YoungStar. The team has selected a well-known, local marketing firm with expertise in promoting social brands. This firm will further develop, refine, and implement the communication plan. From November through December 2013, the firm conducted interviews with 25 organizations to inform and refine the strategy. This work has challenged our assumptions about the best strategies for reaching families of high need. As a result of our learning in this area, the plan will include nontraditional methods to reach our target population such as providing information on the importance of quality early care and education to families as early as practical in the neonatal process, at the time of delivery, and using “porch chats” as a method to increase community involvement.

We also expanded Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards (WMELS) training to parents to reinforce their understanding of child development. This will assist them directly as parents, but also make them more informed consumers of child care services. Our team developed a training module including “Tip Sheets” to inform families on how the WMELS can be used with children at home and in child care, home visiting, Head Start, 4K, and all programs serving children from birth to first grade. We piloted the module in four early learning programs to help define the level of support needed to implement the model. The training materials are now available on the WMELS website. Our team also worked with the Department of Public Instruction's common core state standards team to design a training module to help school districts align community learning targets across WMELS, Common Core State Standards in Literacy and Math, and Common Core Essential Elements for students with disabilities. The process was piloted with 14 districts and then made available to other districts through "Live Binder" technology available online.

- **Helping providers improve their care and star levels.**

The state team also worked extensively in 2013 to make sure high-quality care is widely available by supporting providers in their quality improvement efforts.

Work in 2013 expanded providers' knowledge of comprehensive child screening and helped them become more effective at communicating with parents about screening findings. One lesson we have learned is that most programs require supportive on-site mentoring and coaching support to help turn classroom training into effective change in practice. In 2013, the team identified 71 YoungStar participating child care programs that have completed screening training and a subset of these programs have been targeted for additional on-site mentoring and coaching. To meet this need, we have contracted with Supporting Families Together Association (SFTA) to provide additional training and on-site support. Our team is currently working with SFTA to establish the exact on-site protocols that mentors will use. In upcoming grant years we will extend an innovative training and technical consulting method pioneered by Milwaukee Early Childhood Administration (MECA) staff to help programs become more inclusive of children with special health care needs, disabilities and/or challenging behaviors.

Wisconsin has also provided 329 new RTT-ELC funded T.E.A.C.H. scholarships in 2013, eliminating the need for a waiting list. These scholarships have helped providers complete credit-based instruction to support increased competencies related to developmentally appropriate practices and to increase quality at the lower-ranked programs in YoungStar - 75% of the scholarships support staff at programs with 2 or 3 Star ratings. T.E.A.C.H. is a

geographically diverse program that helps providers all across the state. Past T.E.A.C.H. scholarship recipients live in 68 of Wisconsin's 72 counties with credit-based instruction provided by 37 institutes of higher education, including all of the Wisconsin Technical College Systems and the majority of University of Wisconsin system schools across the state.

In upcoming grant years, we will increase access to provider training on Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards, the Pyramid Model, and family engagement strategies and provide on-site mentoring and coaching support to put these training competencies into practice.

One of the greatest challenges we have identified is the difficulty that providers have in achieving the educational attainment required to increase their YoungStar rating. A lack of educational attainment is one of the major factors that keeps providers from attaining a 3, 4, or 5 Star rating. However, we also learned that incredible strides can be made by developing more creative and flexible educational programs that focus on overcoming the barriers that providers face. Under a separate grant, the Department of Children and Families (DCF) supported free, credit-based instruction in community settings for students in three languages (English, Spanish, and Hmong). Students took courses in cohorts and each course had at least two facilitators/mentors that played a crucial role in supporting students through the course completion process. The results were outstanding with 251 providers earning three or more Early Childhood credits (the initial goal had been 125 providers). Of these 251 providers, 59 individuals were able to complete the entire 12 credit Infant Toddler Credential. The retention rate for most courses was between 93% and 100%. RTT-ELC will provide us the opportunity to expand and amplify this success. Building on this model, our state developed an implementation plan to replicate this project statewide. Courses are slated to begin in fall 2014 and will ultimately reach 1,500 2 Star providers across 15 community sites to help them achieve educational points to reach the 3 Star rating.

Improving quality also depends on quality training opportunities. Early childhood trainers are an important part of Wisconsin's early childhood system and through RTT-ELC we were able to increase the skill and knowledge base of our trainer community around the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards. Our system includes a WMELS coordinator, regional coordination, a 15-hour training format with 95 state approved trainers, and a website for trainers and the general community. Participation in this training is part of the YoungStar rating process. As a result of grant activities in 2013, our trainers have improved their ability to share WMELS information which will improve providers' work with children. In 2013, we supported statewide community of practice events to showcase new changes to WMELS training materials, assure training consistency, and share WMELS strategies as well as networking events in each of six regions where trainers learned WMELS skills and information and shared best practices with their peers. RTT-ELC also supported the revision of material, the update of curriculum and assessment training kits, and the creation of trainer and participant material packages. Grant funds also supported increasing the number of WMELS trainers by providing stipends to currently approved trainers to mentor new trainer candidates. Finally, RTT-ELC has funded the expansion of Pyramid Model for Social and Emotional Competence program wide implementation sites and increased targeted training to centers at the 2 Star level.

We have also faced several challenges. A Milwaukee program that had been approved as a Pyramid Model site lost its Head Start funding during the federal redesignation process and is no longer a program. To address the high-priority need in the Milwaukee area, a Pyramid Model Implementation Academy will be held in Milwaukee in April 2014. This Implementation Academy will offer general Pyramid Model training for providers. Another area of difficulty was identifying and incentivizing high-quality WMELS trainer candidates. We had a goal to provide 10 mentor stipends, a number we ultimately achieved, but demand was lower than expected with only three provided in the first half of the year. This has led us to consider restructuring training and trainer access.

- **Validating the YoungStar methodology.**

Validating the YoungStar system and identifying areas for refinement has been an important goal for the state and work in this area advanced rapidly in 2013. Dr. Katherine Magnuson of the University of Wisconsin's Institute for Research on Poverty completed determination of the sampling area, composed of the Northeast and Milwaukee Regions. She also selected appropriate assessment tools and survey instruments to collect several different types of data. Instruments included self-administered questionnaires, parent telephone interviews, and child assessments. The child assessment instruments were chosen to cover a broad set of school readiness skills, including measures of language and literacy, early math skills, concept development and self-regulatory capacity. She also obtained Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval for research from the University of Wisconsin - Madison and began actual data collection. A total of 157 sites were recruited, 68 in the Milwaukee area and 89 in the Northeast region of the state. Assessments by trained data collectors began in September. The first round of child assessments has been completed, the administration of family and administrator surveys is in progress, and the ERS observations are slated to begin early in 2014. The second round of child assessments will be completed in the spring of 2014.

II. Strengthening and aligning the overall early childhood system.

YoungStar is part of a broader early childhood system and its success depends on the overall system's strength and alignment. In 2013, we put significant effort toward strengthening and articulating this broader system.

First, the state has increased coordination and information sharing between the eleven tribal nations and broader state collaborative efforts. The state team working with tribal leaders and the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, Inc. (GLITC) created a central point for coordination among the eleven tribal nations, state staff across multiple departments and other cross-sector professionals. This "Tribal-State Relations Work Group" includes three members from GLITC, ten members from the three state departments, a tribal liaison from each of the three departments, the Head Start Collaboration Office, five other tribal representatives working on specific early childhood efforts, and representatives from six other related associations. The group has developed a draft tribal early childhood "scan" identifying the service and professional development linkages and gaps between state and tribal programs for young children and families. Through these processes, we anticipate greater coordination between the state and tribal activities.

Second, the state made progress in the coordination and alignment of professional development and child care partnerships with school district four-year-old kindergarten (4K). With respect to professional development alignment, the team has created a baseline Professional Development Portfolio that houses a one-stop resource for information on the structures supporting career pathways for early childhood professionals. Work has started on an online version of the Professional Development Portfolio that will give policy makers, administrators, teachers, providers and trainers across the state a resource center on the "Wisconsin way" of doing professional development.

In 2013, grant funds also supported several Professional Development Initiative (PDI) workgroups that tackle specific parts of the system including the Cross Sector Alignment Workgroup that fosters agreement among all programs and educators on core content and evidence-based practices and the Pathways Workgroup that works to assure consistency and reduce duplication among educational providers. Grant funds also supported professional development coaches and coordinators who function as "air traffic controllers" within the Wisconsin system for professional development. They coordinate professional development activity to avoid overlap and conflict, maximize resource usage, coordinate system development, technical assistance

opportunities, and other relevant activities in each of six regions across the state and through the corresponding six Regional Action Teams.

With respect to 4K partnerships, the state has a unique model of school funding for 4K with districts having the ability to contract with child care or Head Start for on-site implementation of 4K. These 4K community approach locations have grown and there is a need to better align policies and practices especially related to YoungStar. The participating state agencies collaborated more extensively with each other and with the Superintendent's 4 Year-Old Kindergarten Task Force. The team has completed a comprehensive review of state education statutes, other state models, DCF rules, and DCF regulatory and QRIS policies to compare the current rules and policies across programming in 4K Community Approaches. Work began in 2013 (and will be ongoing throughout the grant) to ensure increased coordination and communication between CESAs, school districts, and YoungStar technical consultants and trainers. This included, among other things, a stakeholder meeting on November 5, 2013 hosted through the University of Wisconsin Pyle Center including 145 school district and 4K registrants from communities around the state. The conference was truly statewide with participants joining via teleconference technology in Tomahawk, Sheboygan, Pewaukee, La Crosse, and Chippewa Falls.

Third, the state team has made important progress on the Wisconsin Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System (ECLDS). The team has identified more than three dozen largely disconnected databases containing early childhood data across the three participating agencies. Our ultimate goal is to have the capability to use that data to answer policy- and practice-relevant research questions, understand trends, gauge the effectiveness of interventions, and target resources effectively. To reach this goal, the state is creating both a technological framework and a governance structure that defines how data will be shared in a way that facilitates research and learning while respecting privacy and legal considerations.

A Governance Orientation Workshop held in June included presentations and facilitation by national experts and participation by over 40 representatives from partnering agencies and other ECLDS stakeholders. A bi-weekly cross-departmental Data Governance Work Group continues to develop the governance framework. The team will soon complete the data governance charter, the state's overall data governance structure (diagram, roles and responsibilities), and use cases (description of process, examples for eventual policy manual.)

From an IT perspective, each state agency spent 2013 developing its internal capacity to fully integrate into a joint system. DPI, which has the most developed internal systems, was responsible for advancing the selection of OYSTER (Open-System Entity Resolution) as a matching tool for cross-departmental use across early childhood programs. DCF enhanced its "Enterprise Warehouse" by initiating internal data matching work to "de-silo" current disparate data systems, and interviewing 46 Subject Matter Experts from all RTT-ELC project areas, gathering 560 questions and metrics for potential inclusion in the ECLDS. The department also convened an internal data governance work group, which developed recommendations for standardizing internal data governance practices, set for administrative approval in early 2014. For its part, DHS further developed its "customer hub" that unites health data across numerous databases within the Public Health department. The DHS team created the customer hub database and populated the customer hub database with birth, immunizations, and Secure Public Health Electronic Record Environment (SPHERE) records. We recognize that outreach and communication about the purpose of the ECLDS is critical to allay concerns about privacy and data usage. We will increase communication to prevent misunderstandings about the nature, structure, and objectives of the ECLDS program. Specifically, we are developing an enhanced communication plan, including a standardized mission statement, presentation documents, and materials for sharing with multiple stakeholders.

Finally, to help increase the overall flow of funds to early childhood and guarantee sustainability over the long term, significant strides were made in creating a unique public private partnership system that is tailor-made to Wisconsin. Building on work done by the Governor's Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC) and related stakeholders the team worked closely with dozens of coalition members across the state, foundation personnel, national experts, and other stakeholders to develop a strategy for creating a functional, lasting, and sustainable public private system that will work within the state's unique context. After analyzing the advantages and disadvantages of two different public private partnership models, leadership across the participating agencies selected a locally focused model that builds on the best successes of prior work, reflects the unique nature of the state, and offers the best sustainability over the long term. The collaborative, statewide focus will continue as workgroups and advisory groups are currently being formed to help develop and implement the plan starting in 2014.

Throughout the year the team has worked hard to weave into its efforts the feedback, concerns, and views of stakeholders of all types. Key players such as the ECAC are critical to our work, but we also reached out to and collaborated with stakeholders throughout the state from many sectors. Workgroups have been formed around issues like WMELS and professional development and regional meetings along with communities of practice are entirely dedicated to spreading information and knowledge to and between stakeholders.

The State Superintendent's 4 Year-Old Kindergarten Advisory Council on 4K and Community Approaches is engaged in this alignment work and events bring 4K coordinators from school district from across the state to network and discuss issues with the state team. Family engagement outreach efforts have sought counsel from family-focused organizations across the state and dozens of coalitions, foundations, and other stakeholders across the state contributed to the public private partnership process. The team is also involved in many outreach activities to groups of all types to provide information about the grant and to receive suggestions for improved implementation. The result is a system-building effort that is deeply informed by the concerns and perspectives of providers, foundations, and other stakeholders from all corners of Wisconsin.

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 grant's governance structure has proven successful throughout the first year of the grant. At the highest level Wisconsin's grant is overseen by the Secretary of the Department of Children and Families (DCF), the top executive at the lead agency.

On a day-to-day basis a grant manager oversees the project. The grant manager is housed at DCF but has responsibility for overseeing the grant globally across the three participating state agencies. The grant manager reports to and is overseen by division administrators at DCF and the Department of Health Services (DHS) and by an Assistant State Superintendent at the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) who provide leadership and direction and assure that the project is guided with a collaborative, cross-departmental focus. As the single largest and most complex project, the Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System also has a cross-departmental portfolio manager. The ECLDS Portfolio Manager is housed at the Department of Public Instruction and works corroboratively with the grant manager.

The ECAC continues to play an important advisory role. The ECAC was instrumental in developing many of the foundational concepts that formed the basis of the state's original application. Throughout implementation the ECAC continues to provide feedback and information through a number of different avenues. The DCF Secretary, the State Superintendent, members of the RTT-ELC leadership team, the grant manager, and several other grant staff attend all ECAC quarterly meetings.

A core component of our system-building and overall governance efforts has been to create a central point for coordination among the eleven tribal nations, state staff across multiple departments, and other cross-sector professionals. In 2013, the state team working with tribal leaders determined that Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, Inc. (GLITC) was the right entity to act as this tribal central point and house a tribal coordination position. The team also formed the Tribal-State Relations Work Group to initiate work until GLITC hires a tribal coordinator to lead the process.

The work group met four times throughout the year. Current members include three members from GLITC, ten members from the three state departments, a tribal liaison from each of the three departments, the Head Start Collaboration Office, five other tribal representatives working on specific early childhood efforts, and six other related associations. As the work progresses, GLITC will convene the work group and include key representatives from each of the eleven tribes. The work group has assisted GLITC in recruiting a tribal coordinator, organizing an early childhood tribal listening session, and developing a draft tribal early childhood "scan" identifying the service and professional development linkages and gaps between state and tribal programs for young children and families.

We joined forces with the ECAC for a Tribal Gathering and Listening Session on May 28 in Lake of the Torches on the reservation of the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa. Over 100 people participated in the event that utilized a traditional Native American meeting process. Members from 7 of the 11 tribal communities shared their stories about their perceptions about early childhood programs and services, discussed challenges they were facing, and stated their hopes and concerns about greater links with each other and the broader state system through the RTT-ELC process. Through these processes we are now identifying potential methods for increasing access and utilization of state professional development opportunities.

Significant work has been accomplished on the development of a public-private partnership system. Starting with the foundational work done by the ECAC, Partners for Wisconsin's Economic Success (PWES), and the Celebrate Children Foundation, the grant manager interviewed more than three dozen coalition members across the state, foundation personnel, national experts, and other stakeholders to develop a strategy for creating a functional, lasting, and sustainable program that will work within the unique context of the state. The team then drafted an extensive options paper discussing the advantages and disadvantages of two different public private partnership models.

The grant manager briefed key staff across the three state agencies, including both the DCF Secretary and the State Superintendent and the team selected a locally focused model that builds on the best successes of prior work, reflects the unique nature of the state, and offers the best sustainability over the long term.

The plan takes a decentralized approach and will focus on supporting a network of local coalitions. The approach uses state support toward generating (and keeping) private investment at a local level, rather than developing a single, centralized, statewide fund. Among other advantages, we believe that by enhancing local skills, capacities, and investment relationships across a vibrant network of mutually supportive organizations we are reducing dependence on centralized processes and thereby increasing sustainability over the long term.

The plan was presented to the ECAC general meeting on December 10, 2013. Grant staff requested and received important feedback on issues such as finding a proper geographic balance in public-private partnership work and the optimum mix of funds dedicated to different aspects of the plan. The collaborative, statewide focus will continue as workgroups and advisory groups are currently being formed to help develop and implement the plan starting in 2014.

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.

Representatives from many different sectors and interest groups play an important role in the implementation of Wisconsin's grant. Many of the activities in Wisconsin's scope of work, by their very nature, are focused on engaging stakeholders with the state team and with each other. As described in areas C(1) and D(1), workgroups have been formed around issues like WMELS and professional development. Regional meetings and communities of practice are entirely dedicated to spreading information and knowledge to and between stakeholders. Project area B(2) is focused on work by the Superintendent's 4 Year-Old Kindergarten Task Force and as described below the grant sponsored an event that brought 4K coordinators from school districts from across the state to network and obtain relevant information.

Family engagement work provides another example. Formative work in 2013 in family engagement and outreach to communities of high needs will lead to extensive participation by parents throughout the remaining grant years. Throughout the grant period work with families will take the form of two-way communication with information about YoungStar and other programs flowing out from the state agencies - but just as importantly - information from families guiding our work to make it more responsive to families of high needs.

In other cases the state team specifically seeks out stakeholder feedback. For instance, as described above, the grant manager interviewed dozens of coalitions, foundations, and other stakeholders across the state as part of the public private partnership process. The result is a plan that is deeply informed by the concerns and perspectives of providers, foundations, and other stakeholders from all corners of Wisconsin.

The grant team seeks guidance from and provides information to the ECAC whose membership includes representatives from Head Start Parents, the Head Start Collaboration Office, Tribal Head Start, Migrant Head Start, and MPS Head Start. The grant manager regularly reports to the ECAC on grant progress, responds to questions, and takes suggestions and feedback. For example, the ECAC was formally consulted on priorities for the supplemental funding request at its June 11, 2013 quarterly meeting. The ECAC formed workgroups, discussed priorities and options, and reported their guidance which contributed significantly to establishing request priorities. The ECAC also continues to have important informal influence. Several grant personnel have official liaison roles with the ECAC and both staff and the grant manager regularly consult with ECAC leadership on important grant issues.

The team is also involved in many outreach activities to groups of all types to provide information about the grant and to receive suggestions for improved implementation. Team members have presented to groups such as the Marathon County Early Years Coalition or the Tribal Gathering and Listening Session and at conferences such as the Investing Early Summit, Pathways, and Poverty Matters conference. Team members have written articles in provider newsletters and answered letters from providers.

These are just a few of the many ways that stakeholder involvement is woven throughout Wisconsin's grant work as is more fully described below.

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.

Several legislative and policy changes have occurred in 2013 that may directly or indirectly affect work under the grant:

- Both DPI and DCF are reviewing existing four-year-old kindergarten community approaches policies. The policy documents will be revised to incorporate decisions on participation of 4K programs in YoungStar.
- DPI is implementing a new performance-based educator effectiveness evaluation. This is a major change to teacher evaluation systems in Wisconsin. The program entered “full pilot” in the 2013-2014 school year. This will have impact on 4K community sites and DPI is considering how policies and practices will be influenced by YoungStar/4K alignment related to teacher evaluation and hiring.

- The Wisconsin legislature unanimously resolved that policy decisions enacted by the Wisconsin state legislature acknowledge and take into account the principles of early childhood brain development. As a result they will, whenever possible, consider the concepts of toxic stress, early adversity, and buffering relationships, and note the role of early intervention and investment in early childhood years as important strategies to achieve a lasting foundation for a more prosperous and sustainable state through investing in human capital. While this resolution is welcome and reflects an important shift in consciousness about early childhood issues, we do not expect it to have significant short-term impact on grant activities.
- The Wisconsin legislature increased the tiered reimbursement for 4 Star programs from 5% above the base level to 10% above the base level, effective January 1, 2014. More than ever, providers have both a professional and practical incentive to reach a higher level of program quality. This makes the grant's support for lower rated programs even more critical and timely.
- 2013 Wisconsin Act 20, the 2013-2015 biennial budget, made two changes to existing statutory authority concerning building a state longitudinal data system (SLDS). It directed that the Department of Children and Families (DCF) and the Department of Workforce Development (DWD) be included in an interagency agreement with the Department of Public Instruction (DPI), the University of Wisconsin System (UW System), the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS), and the Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (WAICU). The four educational organizations were already members of an SLDS compact formed in 2010. In addition, Act 20 directed the partners in this interagency agreement to submit a report on progress made toward establishing an SLDS to the Secretary of the Department of Administration by October 1st of each year. Although this legislation does not change or directly affect any RTT-ELC activities, it supports data sharing efforts already underway as part of the ECLDS project and paves the way for collaboration with additional partners (e.g., DWD, UW System, WTCS, WAICU) which, although not currently part of RTT-ELC grant activities, could provide excellent data sharing and research opportunities in the future.
- Both DPI teacher licensing and the child care Registry system are undergoing changes and the development of cross sector and technical assistance core competencies will influence the program standards and provider levels.

Participating State Agencies

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

Each of the participating state agencies remains fully committed to the grant and our collective scope of work. The only significant change is an increase in the level of participation by the Department of Health Services with the addition of new activities made possible by the supplemental funding.

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.

NOTES: (a) YoungStar, Wisconsin's TQRIS has been in place since January 2011 but is being rolled out in phases for different types of care. In 2010, family and group child care programs were eligible to participate. In 2012, school-age care programs became eligible and CCDF funded child care subsidies were tied to a program's TQRIS rating in July 2012. In 2013, we worked with a group of stakeholders in the day camp arena to develop standards for rating licensed day camps in Wisconsin. These camps will be included in YoungStar beginning in March 2014. In addition to the major roll out initiatives, each year we review and make revisions to our rating criteria based on feedback from our staff in the field or from child care or school-age programs. We also utilize new research or best practice findings to inform any changes we make year-to-year. (b) TQRIS standards only apply to programs receiving CCDF funds, not to Head Start or State-funded pre-k. In our RTT-ELC work, we encourage Head Start and 4K programming with wrap around child care hours to participate in our TQRIS system. The TQRIS system is housed at DCF and was put into place, in part, to reimburse child care providers based upon the quality of care they are providing. Child care providers are regulated under the authority of DCF. Because of this, only the time of day that is under the authority of DCF is rated. The times of the day that are funded through other public sources are under the authority of DPI or the Administration for Children and Families and are not rated in our TQRIS.

In 2013 our state focused on building and refining our existing YoungStar system, particularly through (1) expanding provider knowledge of comprehensive child assessments and communication with parents about assessment findings, (2) strengthening family engagement standards in YoungStar, and (3) reinforcing training and technical assistance available for providers serving special populations of children with high needs.

In 2013 we made important progress in each of these areas. Specifically we:

- **Set the stage for a new mandatory YoungStar family engagement standard.**

Currently YoungStar includes the opportunity for a child care program to earn an "optional point" for meeting specific family engagement quality indicators. In 2013, we laid important groundwork to transition from the optional point to a mandatory family engagement point in the YoungStar program quality criteria.

To ensure that our mandatory family engagement standards represents best practices in the TQRIS field we documented, analyzed, and cross-walked family engagement standards across the country including California's Steps to Excellence, Delaware Stars, New York's Quality Stars, New Hampshire, and Washington's Early Achievers. Based on this research our Family Engagement Analyst has identified family engagement practices

that represent consensus best practices across systems as well as concepts that seem to fit well with the particularities of Wisconsin's system and culture. For instance, Wisconsin is a strongly "local control" focused state and we are exploring the range of options offered to providers in California's Steps to Excellence as a model which may be particularly applicable to Wisconsin.

The team has formed a work group that includes professionals from the home visiting program, the Children's Trust Fund, the Department of Public Instruction, the Department of Health Services, and members of the YoungStar Consortium (Supporting Families Together Association, Wisconsin Early Childhood Association, and Celebrate Children Foundation). This workgroup will provide critical feedback about the best course of action for implementing the mandatory family standards and practices. For example, this group will help us ensure that the new family engagement standards align with the Head Start Parent, Family, Community Engagement Framework and Strengthening Families Framework. This will avoid contradicting well-established, evidence-based practice and ensure that providers are not faced with a multitude of differing family engagement requirements. The first work group meeting will convene early in 2014.

- **Expanded provider knowledge of comprehensive child assessments and communication with parents about assessment findings.**

The state team expanded child care providers' knowledge of comprehensive child screening and helped them become more effective at communicating with parents about screening findings.

Experience has shown us that most programs require supportive on-site mentoring and coaching support to help turn classroom training into effective change in practice. Helping providers understand how screening can be effectively integrated into their program and their procedures makes a huge difference in effective implementation. In 2013, the team identified 71 YoungStar participating child care programs that have completed screening training and a subset of these programs have been targeted for additional on-site mentoring and coaching. To meet this need, we contracted with SFTA to provide additional training and on-site support. The team is currently working with SFTA to establish the exact on-site protocols that mentors and coaches will use.

SFTA will begin accepting applications in early spring 2014 and will start providing technical assistance by summer 2014.

- **Began development of training and technical assistance plan for providers serving special populations of children with high needs.**

Team members worked closely with Milwaukee Early Childhood Administration (MECA) staff to develop plans for resource development using lessons learned from MECA's innovative training and technical consultation program. MECA has created a model that allows child care programs in Milwaukee to become more inclusive of children with special health care needs, disabilities and/or challenging behaviors. In upcoming grant years the resources developed will be made available online to locations across the state.

Our Inclusion Analyst has also convened a working group across state agencies and statewide partners to catalog services available to support families who have children with special needs. She is also developing an inclusive practices resource webpage to be housed on the YoungStar website, which will be a single point of information collection to support families and child care providers alike. A priority in our inclusion efforts is to improve the understanding of the roles and responsibilities of IDEA part C, IDEA Part B 619, and child care in the provision of services to children with disabilities in child care settings.

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.

- **Laid the foundation for bringing more 4K providers into YoungStar.**

We are working to increase participation in the YoungStar program by assuring continuity and alignment between YoungStar and 4K standards, expectations, and systems. This will allow programs to provide effective collaborative programming supporting children in full day care arrangement services when needed by families.

In 2013, the participating state agencies collaborated more extensively with each other and with the Superintendent's 4-Year-Old Kindergarten Task Force (the stakeholder group focused on building quality 4K collaborative programming and guiding the alignment of quality practices between YoungStar and the 4-Year-Old Kindergarten Community Approaches.) The Professional Development Program and Policy Analyst along with the Program and Policy Supervisor have completed a comprehensive review of state education statutes, other state models, DCF rules, and DCF regulatory and QRIS policies to compare the current rules and policies across programming in 4K Community Approaches. The team has drafted a preliminary report comparing these different rules and policies and is in the process of creating an options paper that analyzes future professional development and quality improvement across 4K programming and YoungStar.

The team has also worked to ensure that providers and other stakeholders are engaged in the process. This included, among other things, a stakeholder meeting on November 5, 2013 hosted through the University of Wisconsin Pyle Center including 145 school district and 4K registrants from communities around the state. The conference was truly statewide with participants joining via teleconference technology in Tomahawk, Sheboygan, Pewaukee, La Crosse, and Chippewa Falls.

Work began in 2013 (and will be ongoing throughout the grant) to ensure increased coordination and communication between CESAs, school districts, and YoungStar technical consultants and trainers. Funds have been used to support the 4K Coordinators' role in alignment with YoungStar and efforts to increase cross sector best practices and resource sharing on the regional and local level. School districts have typically viewed YoungStar as a child care program and unrelated to their work. The 4K Coordinator works with coaches, districts, and DPI staff to promote use of the community approaches model and participation in YoungStar. This strategy provides increased opportunity for shared training content delivery, including cross-system participation for Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards and Wisconsin Pyramid Model training. A 4K Content Coach is available to provide YoungStar information to school districts interested in collaborative programming, including dissemination of the YoungStar Tips and Tools resource information pages. The team will track these efforts through an annual training report produced by DCF that provides specific information regarding Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards training opportunities and participation.

YoungStar and 4K coordination will be woven into various activities throughout the grant period. This year, the Preserving Early Childhood Conference will be held on March 2014 and will include sessions and round table discussions to bring together 4K providers, child care and Head Start providers in order to reinforce the importance of forming 4K and community partnerships. The grant support will help assure that 4K school district programs can attend jointly with their child care partners.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)

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

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

Targets										
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	5	1.0%	21	5.0%	42	10.0%	63	16.0%	100	25.0%
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	37	27.0%	54	40.0%	88	65.0%	108	80.0%	136	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	3,858	100%	4,000	100%	4,200	100%	4,500	100%	5,000	100%
Other	4,897	77.0%	5,000	79.0%	5,100	80.0%	5,150	81.0%	5,200	82.0%
Describe:	All regulated programs									

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	393	5	1.0%	389	17	4.0%
Specify:	-					
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	136	37	27.0%	127	42	33.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619						
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA						
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	3,858	3,858	100.0%	3,510	3,481	99.0%
Other	6,361	4,897	77.0%	5,912	4,593	78.0%
Describe:	All regulated programs					

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.

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

The number of programs that received CCDF funds is calculated as a "point in time" figure. The total number who received funds at some point during the year is higher but we used a methodology consistent with the original application. All programs that are eligible to participate in TQRIS must participate in order to receive Wisconsin Shares funding. A small number of in-home providers receive Wisconsin Shares subsidies but are not eligible to participate in TQRIS so the percentage is 99%.

State-funded pre-school: We are presenting data by district. The state has 413 school districts (414 at baseline). For the state-funded preschool data, the 393 baseline and 389 year one statistics represent the number of districts that offer 4K: approximately 25% are community-based.

Head Start and Early Head Start: The number we use is the number of programs that had a Head Start designation in our automated system, not the total number of programs that received Head Start funding in the state. The number is lower than baseline because we have reviewed data and changed our system such that only programs that are stand-alone Head Starts or provide less than 3 hours per day of wrap around child care can be designated as Head Start. Previously, we had an automated system of tracking Head Start sites that allowed any program that had any affiliation with Head Start to be designated as Head Start (not just those programs that are Grantees or Delegates, but instead included subcontracted child care partner sites that delivered some Head Start services). The designation served to give the program an automatic 5 Star rating in our TQRIS. Since then, we have clarified our rules around which Head Start sites get the automatic 5 Star rating (only those providing fewer than 3 hours per day of child care on average). Because of this clarification, we have "cleaned up" our data to exclude many sites that were not meeting that threshold. (Note that the original data were not complete either because all sites that are listed on the Head Start federal website were not in our system.) We are currently working on a system of designating sites as Head Start without tying that designation to an automatic 5 Star rating. Once that is in place, we will do a scan of the Head Start sites in Wisconsin and will be able to see the full picture of Head Start sites in Wisconsin. This may be in place by the end of 2014. All Head Start programs continue to have the opportunity to participate in YoungStar through the regular YoungStar service delivery and points calculation process to earn a YoungStar rating.

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

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

The absolute numbers are not a good reflection of the progress made in Wisconsin. Like many states, Wisconsin saw a decrease in the overall number of childcare providers throughout 2013. We believe there are several causes for this decrease, including the fact that more rigorous YoungStar requirements have discouraged the lowest quality providers from participating in the market. The decline in the total number of child care providers reflects a historical trend that predates the implementation of YoungStar. Other factors that may be affecting the number of providers include changing demographics and reduction in workforce participation rates.

Nonetheless, the number of children receiving Wisconsin Shares subsidies who attend a 3, 4, or 5 Star rated facility grew to over 65% during this past year.

The Head Start totals and percentages are also somewhat misleading due to changes in the measurement methodology.

It is clear that the state has made significant progress on all targets on a percentage basis. Given that this progress was achieved with only a partial year of full implementation we believe the best way to ensure further sustained progress is to continue the activities originally defined in our scope of work. The progress so far gives us confidence that full implementation over the coming grant years will show similar results as implementation pace increases.

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.

- **Created strategies to bring more children of high needs into YoungStar.**

The RTT team has developed an initial communications strategy to get more children designated as high-need into 3-5 Star rated YoungStar programs. Through an RFP process the team has selected Knupp & Watson & Wallman (KW2), a well-known local marketing firm with experience promoting social brands to bring their marketing expertise and further develop, refine, and implement the communication plan. KW2, with input from the state team, is creating a plan targeting parents by reinforcing the YoungStar brand, raising awareness, driving more usage, and creating ownership of YoungStar in target populations statewide. From November through December 2013, KW2 conducted interviews with 25 organizations and developed an "Outreach Report." Some of the organizations consulted include: the Salvation Army, UMOS (Milwaukee), Wisconsin United Coalition of Mutual Assistance Associations (statewide), Wisconsin Association for Runaway and Homeless Children, Life Navigators (Wauwatosa), Southeast Regional Center for Children and Youth with Special

Health Care Needs (Milwaukee), WI Facets (Milwaukee), Adoption Choice, Inc., Coalition for Children, Youth and Families, Lutheran Social Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan, Children & Youth with Special Health Care Needs (Madison), Family Voices of Wisconsin, New Horizons Un-Limited Inc. (Milwaukee), Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (statewide), Wisconsin Family Ties, Children's Hospital of Wisconsin (Milwaukee), Community Advocates (Milwaukee), and Pastors United. We continue to research best practices for reaching children with high needs. Building on the federal definition of high needs, we focus in addition on children in foster care, children with special needs, children living in poverty, teen parents, children of migrant workers and children from low-income minority families, including Native American, Asian, Latino/Hispanic, and African American. The final plan will include nontraditional methods to reach our target population such as providing information on the importance of quality early care and education to families as early as practical in the neonatal process, at the time of delivery, and using "porch chats" as a method to increase community involvement. We will be implementing this communication plan later in 2014.

- **Identified and selected methods for improving the reliability, validity, and speed of YoungStar Raters.**

The team is in the final stages of selecting an online data system to help support our YoungStar formal raters who perform observations using the Environment Rating Scales (ERS) with an automated process for the entry of data and subsequent writing of reports via utilization of a PC tablet. Once implemented, this technology will increase the granularity and speed of YoungStar ERS rating. The team has researched various options and talked with peer Race to the Top states and other states that are currently using such software including Georgia, Washington, Pennsylvania, Louisiana, Illinois, Florida, Rhode Island, and Hawaii. Based on that research and feedback, the YoungStar team outlined recommended software features. On the basis of those recommended features, the team identified the ERS Data System developed by the Branagh Information Group as the most appropriate and is currently developing a contract to purchase rights to the software, PC tablets, three-day training for up to 14 staff, and ongoing costs of using the online data system.

To promote excellence in validity and reliability of ratings, Wisconsin is providing our formal raters with intensive training from experts. The team has identified the best expert trainers for this effort - Thelma Harms at the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill - and is currently collaborating with the YoungStar Consortium and other statewide partners to develop a contract with them to provide Wisconsin-based Environment Rating Scale (ERS) training to formal raters and other Wisconsin stakeholders. The team and Consortium are currently developing a schedule, venue, and related logistic tasks for the additional days of ERS training for technical consultants.

Both the Branagh Software and validity and reliability training are slated to be delivered in 2014 and will positively affect YoungStar throughout the grant period and beyond.

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

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

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

Number of tiers/levels in the State TQRIS
5

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

	State-funded preschool programs	Early Head Start	Head Start programs	Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	Center-based Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	Family Child Care Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program
TQRIS Programs that Moved Up at Least One Level						169	113
TQRIS Programs that Moved Down at Least One Level						34	30

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.

- **Touched counties across Wisconsin with new access to credit-based instruction through expanded T.E.A.C.H. scholarships.**

RTT-ELC funding has supported 392 new T.E.A.C.H. scholarships, eliminating the need for a waiting list in 2013. A total of 1090 scholarships were awarded in the most recent completed contract year. These scholarships have helped providers complete credit-based instruction to support increased competencies related to developmentally appropriate practices and to increase quality at the lower ranked programs in YoungStar - of the 934 programs with active T.E.A.C.H. scholarship recipients, approximately 75% have a 2 or 3 Star rating. Seventy of seventy-two counties (95%) have had a scholarship recipient in the history of the T.E.A.C.H. program in Wisconsin, a trend that is continuing with RTT-ELC support. These scholarships have helped many providers accumulate the points necessary to increase their YoungStar rating. Approximately 57% of T.E.A.C.H. recipients are teachers or assistant teachers, 22% are administrators or directors, and 21% are family child care providers.

T.E.A.C.H. is a geographically diverse program that helps providers all across the state. Scholarship recipients live in 68 of Wisconsin's 72 counties. Instruction was provided by 37 institutes of higher education, including all of the Wisconsin Technical College Systems and the majority of University of Wisconsin system schools across the state.

We have developed a new two-year RTT-ELC funded contract to support the administration of the T.E.A.C.H. scholarship program to provide increased opportunities to access scholarships for credit-based instruction in 2014 and 2015.

- **Developed strategy for expanded training and technical assistance.**

In upcoming grant years we will increase access to provider training on Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards, the Pyramid Model, and family engagement strategies. To prepare for this work, the team developed a contract with the YoungStar Consortium to define the scope of service for these training activities, including developing training materials for YoungStar technical consultants, protocols for individualized on-site technical assistance and mentoring, a means of delivering this training through an application process, and a data collection system for monitoring which programs have received this additional technical assistance/expanded training, technical assistance, and coaching and mentoring. The scope of work also specifies targeted coaching and mentoring to assure that training content is put into practice.

For upcoming years this work will be supplemented by a program based on the great success Wisconsin has had with a pilot project through the Milwaukee Area Technical College that offered child care providers an innovative way to obtain credit-based instruction. The program (funded through another grant) offered free, credit-based instruction in community settings to students in three languages (English, Spanish, and Hmong). Students took courses in cohorts and each course had at least two facilitators/mentors that played a crucial role in supporting students through the course completion process. The retention rate for most courses was between 93% and 100%. Building on that success, in 2013 our state developed an implementation plan to replicate this project on a larger scale. The free, community-based, multi-format, credit-based instruction plan is focused on 2 Star providers. Courses are slated to begin in fall 2014 and will ultimately reach 1,500 child care providers from 2 Star-rated YoungStar programs across 15 community sites to help them achieve educational points to reach the 3 Star rating.

Our RTT-ELC grant will allow us to provide incentives to providers that progress to higher YoungStar QRIS levels. In 2013, 288 programs increased their Star rating from 2 to 3 stars, 78 programs increased their Star rating from 3 to 4 Stars, and 69 programs increased their Star rating from 4 to 5 Stars. In upcoming grant years we will provide a monetary award to these programs and incentives to other programs to continue striving to increase their quality. The team is developing an options paper how best to distribute the \$674,200 available for this activity.

- **Increased training and technical assistance capacity at DCF**

With RTT support, the lead agency, the Department of Children and Families, successfully expanded its capacity to provide training and technical assistance to the early care workforce in YoungStar by recruiting a Professional Development Supervisor and a Professional Development Analyst. The Professional Development Supervisor has over 10 years of experience in the field of early childhood education. She has experience both working directly with families and children and researching early childhood assessment. The Professional Development Policy Analyst has over 20 years of experience in the field of preK-12 education, with three years specifically devoted to early childhood education. She has worked directly with children and with the researchers, educators, and providers who serve them.

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	4,897	5,000	5,100	5,150	5,200	4,593
Number of Programs in Tier 1	36	36	34	32	30	27
Number of Programs in Tier 2	2,980	3,400	3,000	2,662	2,200	2,621
Number of Programs in Tier 3	852	1,069	1,426	1,581	2,000	1,228
Number of Programs in Tier 4	128	165	240	386	420	174
Number of Programs in Tier 5	269	330	400	489	550	342

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

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

All of the data are actual data based on YoungStar enrollment and do not use any estimates.

The total number of programs covered by TQRIS is greater than the sum of programs in each tier due to the fact that some participating programs have their rating yet pending.

Note: Wisconsin does not track TQRIS movement data for state-funded preschool programs, head start, IDEA B & C, or ESEA.

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.

We have met and significantly exceeded all of the targets for the higher tier levels (3 through 5) despite a decrease in overall providers in the YoungStar system (due to general decline in providers throughout the state.)

As discussed above, given the excellent progress made despite only a partial year of full implementation, we believe the best course of action is to continue the activities defined and approved in our scope of work.

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

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

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

Targets										
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool										
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	2,432	15.0%	5,775	35.0%	8,250	50.0%	12,375	75.0%	16,500	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	6,219	15.0%	6,913	17.0%	8,132	20.0%	9,759	24.0%	10,572	26.0%
Other	8,325	15.0%	9,435	17.0%	11,100	20.0%	13,332	24.0%	14,430	26.0%
Describe:	All regulated programs									

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						
Specify:						
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	16,500	2,432	15.0%	15,433	2,983	19.3%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619						
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA						
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	40,662	6,219	15.0%	42,831	8,432	19.7%
Other	55,000	8,325	15.0%	57,934	11,413	19.7%
Describe:	All regulated programs					

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.

Children in programs receiving CCDF funding is based on the actual number of children in the Wisconsin Shares program with an open authorized at the time of the data run.

Head Start totals are actual as reported by the Executive Director of the Wisconsin Head Start Association.

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

The definition of “high needs” includes children that are neither subsidy recipients (CCDF/Wisconsin Shares) nor Head Start participants. Therefore, the baseline number of 55,000 for “all regulated programs” is intended to capture both those listed for Head Start and CCDF as well as those high needs children in 4 and 5 Star rated programs that do not take Wisconsin Shares subsidies (as may occur with children that may be high need for reasons other than income.) As Wisconsin does not currently have a method for tracking this number, it is necessarily an estimate. We expected this “all regulated programs” total to change over time at the same rate as the CCDF/Wisconsin Shares change. The “all regulated programs” actuals are estimated on that basis. We intended that the ECLDS project will permit more exact data to be collected by the end of the grant period.

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.

For programs receiving CCDF funds, we have met and significantly exceeded the target.

As described above, Head Start totals and percentages are misleading due to changes in the measurement methodology. Under our current system of measurement, only programs that are stand-alone Head Starts or provide less than 3 hours per day of wrap around child care can be designated as Head Start in our system.

Given the excellent progress made despite only a partial year of full implementation, we believe the best course of action is to continue the activities defined and approved in our scope of work.

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.

Prior work preparing for a validation study allowed our state team to move quickly in this project area. The team selected Dr. Katherine Magnuson of the University of Wisconsin's Institute for Research on Poverty to run the validation study. Dr. Magnuson is a well-known expert in early childhood research with special expertise in the well-being and development of economically disadvantaged children and their families. Many important milestones of this project were completed in 2013.

- **Completed experimental design.**

In 2013 Dr. Magnuson completed determination of the sampling area, selected the appropriate assessment tools and survey instruments, and obtained IRB approval for research from the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

The selected sampling area is comprised of the Northeast and Milwaukee regions. Milwaukee was chosen because of the high density of child care providers and the large proportion of children who receive Wisconsin Shares subsidies within the region. The Northeast region was selected because it has a larger distribution of providers in the higher quality levels (3-5 stars) than some other regions, and because it is also somewhat less geographically dispersed than other possible regions. An important goal of the sampling plan was to make sure that we had providers distributed across the rating scale levels, at both the low and high end. For this reason, the sample is stratified by quality rating, with lower rated providers and higher rated providers in roughly equal numbers split across both regions.

The survey instruments were designed to collect several different types of data. Tools included self-administered family and group administrator questionnaires, teacher self-administered questionnaires, parent telephone interviews, and child assessments. The child assessment instruments were chosen to cover a broad set of school readiness skills, including measures of language and literacy, early math skills, concept development and self-regulatory capacity. Selected assessments include the Woodcock Johnson III (applied problems, and letter-word identification subtests), Test of Early Preschool Early Literacy (TOPEL) 3 (phonological awareness subtest), Bracken Basic School Readiness, Head Shoulders Knees and Toes, teacher version of the Social Competence and Behavior Evaluation - 30 (SCBE-30), teacher version of the Preschool Learning Behavior Scale, parent version of the Social Skills Information System. The following classroom observational quality measures were selected: the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised and the Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale-Revised.

- **Recruited providers.**

During the summer of 2013, University of Wisconsin staff called providers and explained the study to them. Only providers who expected that they would have a sufficient number of children ages 3-5 in the fall of 2013 were eligible to participate (6 for group centers, and 2 for family providers). Center providers who agreed to participate in the study filled out a site permission template. Consent forms were mailed to family and group providers who agreed to participate. A total of 157 sites were recruited, 68 in the Milwaukee area and 89 in the Northeast region of the state. One of the biggest challenges this project has faced is recruitment of sites and families. In order to combat this challenge, Dr. Magnuson has worked closely with the survey center at the University to use the most effective recruitment procedures. She has also chosen to over-sample in order to ensure that at the end of the study a large enough sample has been obtained to develop results with statistical significance.

- **Initiated data collection.**

Assessments by trained data collectors began in September. The first round of child assessments has been completed, the administration of family and administrator surveys is in progress, and ERS observations are slated to begin early in 2014. The second round of child assessments will be completed in the spring of 2014.

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

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

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

Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

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

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

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

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

- **Increased skill and knowledge base of the early childhood trainer community.**

Early childhood trainers are an important part of Wisconsin's early childhood system and through RTT-ELC we were able to increase the skill and knowledge base of our trainer community around the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards. In Wisconsin, WMELS is the common framework that specifies developmental expectations for children from birth through entrance to first grade. The standards reflect attention to all the domains of a child's learning and development. Wisconsin has a robust, cross sector, professional development framework for implementing training on the standards. The system includes a WMELS coordinator, regional coordination, a 15-hour training format with 95 state approved trainers, and a website for trainers and the general community. Participation in this training is part of the YoungStar rating process.

The grant supported a statewide community of practice event on May 6-7 in Appleton for the cross sector early childhood technical assistance network to build cross sector resources, connect with higher education, and build trainer skills in evidence-based strategies. Later in 2013, on August 27-28, over 100 people attended the statewide WMELS community of practice event showcasing the new changes to WMELS training materials, assure training consistency, and share WMELS strategies.

RTT-ELC also supported the revision of material, updates to curriculum and assessment training kits, and creation of trainer and participant material packages. Our trainers are now more prepared to work directly with providers and share WMELS information that will inform providers' work with children.

RTT-ELC was also active regionally. For instance, RTT-ELC supported community of practice events in each of Wisconsin's six regional communities of practice regions. These events increased consistency of regional coordination, improved coordination of training delivery, provided networking opportunities, and provided a venue for distributing information, updated material, evidence-based practices, and related resources.

Increased the number of WMELS trainers.

Grant funds have supported increasing the number of WMELS trainers by providing stipends to currently approved trainers to mentor new trainer candidates. Ten mentor stipends were awarded in 2013. These mentors help assure consistency and best-practice adoption by new trainers.

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

We also reached out to families to share more about WMELS. Our team developed a training module including "Tip Sheets" to inform families on how the WMELS are used with children at home and in child care, home visiting, Head Start, 4K, and all programs serving children birth to first grade. We piloted the module in four early learning programs to help define the level of support needed to implement the model. Some changes were made to the content to assure that center directors, after participating in a 15 hour WMELS training, could implement the WMELS family training in their child care program. The training materials are now available on the WMELS website. Our team also worked with the Department of Public Instruction common core state standards team to design a training module to help school districts align community learning targets across WMELS, Common Core State Standards, and Common Core Essential Elements. The process was piloted with 14 districts and then made available to other districts through "Live Binder" technology available on the web. We also held a conference, including video participation from remote locations, with district 4-year-old kindergarten coordinators statewide. At this video conference, 24 districts indicated they are interested in implementing the process. These districts were connected with the Early Childhood Program Support Coordinators within the 12 CESA's to involve them in the process. The process was implemented in the CESA's and in school districts during 2013.

- **Implemented Pyramid Model sites to foster social and emotional development of children.**

Finally, the WMELS were on display in another high-profile effort funded by RTT-ELC. Assisting the social emotional development of children has been a very high priority in Wisconsin. This work is done using the Pyramid Model for Social and Emotional Competence. RTT-ELC has allowed us to expand this effort by increasing the number of program-wide implementation sites (previously called demonstration sites), involve Regional Coaches in the training coordination and trainer application processes, increase targeted training to child care programs with lower Young Star rating, and consider ways to expand these successful strategies to other initiatives. RTT-ELC funds allowed us to add a Milwaukee implementation site. Grant funds supported two existing program-wide implementation sites by providing additional external coaching and funds for the external coaching cadre. These program-wide implementation sites will serve both their community and as a model for other communities.

The work in this project is closely tied to the Professional Development Portfolio work discussed below. The team worked with the professional development cross sector framework to help define the structure and components of the Pyramid Model. The results were then used to represent the Pyramid Model work within the Professional Development Portfolio (described below). Bringing the Pyramid Model work into the Portfolio helps clarify the skills, knowledge, and competencies needed to implement this social and emotional standard and document how it relates to the other domains of our WMELS standards.

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

Has the State made progress in:

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

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

- **Recruited advisory workgroup on family engagement.**

The Family Engagement Analyst recruited a work group that includes individuals from the Department of Children and Families (including home visiting), Children's Trust Fund, Department of Public Instruction, the Department of Health Services, Strengthening Family Together Association, Wisconsin Early Childhood Association, and Celebrate Children Foundation. This group is tasked with providing key input to assure quality and depth in Wisconsin's family engagement work. For instance, the workgroup will assist with ensuring that the YoungStar family engagement standards align with other similar standards that affect early childhood providers such as the Head Start Parent, Family, Community Engagement Framework and Strengthening Families Framework. This alignment will ensure that providers are not faced with a multitude of differing family engagement requirements and avoid conflicts with well-established, evidence-based practices.

- **Developing innovative family engagement strategies.**

Our family engagement analyst spent the last months of 2013 identifying specific techniques for engaging families in child care processes and particularly on methods that would join both providers and families in collaborative efforts to improve engagement. We have identified various strategies that we will be developing in the remaining grant years. Our Family Engagement Analyst will have the opportunity to learn more about one such strategy already in limited use in Wisconsin - "parent cafes." The analyst will explore parent cafes currently underway in Wisconsin through exploration of the protective services delivery model through Waukesha County and through active coordination and collaboration with the Kimberly Child Care Resource and Referral.

- **Strengthened internal capacity.**

Internal capacity was increased by the recruitment and hiring of a full-time Family Engagement Analyst. She will soon be joined by a DPI Parent/Family/Community Partnership Consultant who we expect to hire in the first quarter of 2014.

The Family Engagement Analyst and Inclusion Analyst work closely together developing opportunities to link family engagement strategies and child care inclusive practice support and resource development. Both analysts

share information across systems, and work within focus groups to ensure that information and resources developed will be of benefit to both families and child care providers.

In 2014 the Family Engagement Analyst will be working with our communications partner Knupp & Watson & Wallman and parent focus groups to develop and test messages. The purpose of focus groups is to develop messages around family engagement that are understandable and culturally sensitive. This work will be modeled on similar focus group work done in Minnesota as part of Parent Aware.

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.

Different programs and educators across the state often have various views about what skills and knowledge professional early childhood educators should have. While this is understandable - after all each program and educator represents a particular view of early childhood - that makes it extremely difficult for administrators and policy makers to understand the complexity of the system or for early childhood professionals to find a clear path for their professional development. In response, leaders from across many different early childhood programs and educational institutions formed the Professional Development Initiative (PDI), a group dedicated to strengthening systems for career pathways and cross sector alignment.

- **Developed a baseline Professional Development Portfolio and Professional Development Snapshot.**

In 2013, the team completed an important step in increasing coordination and alignment across the various currents of professional development - the creation of a baseline Professional Development Portfolio. This portfolio is supported by PDI as the place to house information on the structures supporting career pathways. This portfolio is a one-stop document to describe the professional development structures that make up the Wisconsin early childhood care and education systems. The portfolio provides both a description of the various components of the systems as well as the links or documents that show each component. Various base-line documents are being included to document changes to the structures throughout the grant cycle.

The Professional Development Snapshot was created to highlight components of the system such as competencies, teacher licensing, the Registry, alternate pathways, articulation efforts, and cross sector alignment including core content, practices, and system partners. The Snapshot is a concise framework that helps PDI participants identify sectors that require more support and align incoming funding opportunities. For example, the Wisconsin Early Childhood Association wrote a grant specifically to address the higher education alignment component of the Snapshot. Through this project a technical college and university systems group will be convened to update cross system credit transferability and articulation agreements.

Planned for enhanced Professional Development Portfolio.

In 2013, our team started design of an online version of the Professional Development Portfolio that describes and collects the components of the Wisconsin professional development system. Once implemented, this online system will give providers and trainers across the state a unified, one-stop hub and resource center that archives the “Wisconsin way” of doing professional development. In 2013, we focused on collecting key materials and designing the Portfolio concept with an eye toward actual implementation in 2014.

- **Supported ongoing improvement of cross-sector alignment.**

In 2013, grant funds also supported several PDI workgroups that tackled specific parts of the system, including the Cross Sector Alignment Workgroup that fosters agreement among all programs and educators on core content and evidence-based practices and the Pathways Workgroup that works to assure consistency and reduce duplication among educational providers.

Much of this coordination work was (and will continue to be) overseen and coordinated by the grant-supported Professional Development Coordinator. This position is viewed as an “air traffic controller” for professional development at the state level. The coordinator coordinates professional development activities to avoid overlap and conflict, maximize resource usage, and help maximize cross sector efforts. In addition, the Professional Development Coordinator provides planning support, manages the new Professional Development Portfolio, and plans and supports cross sector networking activities. The Professional Development Coordinator also serves as co-chair of PDI and co-chair of the Professional Development Project Team on the ECAC.

- **Supported regional Collaboration Coaches in their system coordination roles.**

Grant funds also supported the work of regional Collaboration Coaches. Similar to the role that the Professional Development Coordinator plays at a state level, Coordination Coaches provide critical “air traffic control” at a regional level by coordinating system development, trainings, technical assistance opportunities, and other relevant activities in each of six regions across the state and through the corresponding six Regional Action Teams (five regions plus Milwaukee). Their work increases collaboration, reduces redundancies, identifies gaps for further support, and helps make the system work more efficiently. The grant also supported improved communication and coordination between coaches through tighter involvement in PDI meetings and through tools like a new Collaborators, Committees, Confirmations, and Calendars chart.

Measuring Outcomes and Progress

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

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

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

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

Work on Wisconsin's Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System began in early 2013. Work focused on four main areas.

- **Established structure for sustainable ECLDS data governance.**

Despite some earlier work, the real data governance kickoff was a Data Governance Orientation Workshop held on June 27, 2013. The workshop included presentations and facilitation by national experts and technical assistance providers, Missy Cochenour and Jeff Sellers. Attendees included over 40 representatives from partnering agencies and other ECLDS stakeholders. This work has carried on in the form of a Cross-Departmental Data Governance Work Group including representatives from each of the three partnering agencies. The Workgroup has held bi-weekly meetings since August and will continue to do so in 2014.

Team members have also been active in cross-state activities. Three Wisconsin project representatives attended and presented at the Department of Education-Privacy and Technical Assistance Center (PATC) workshop in Denver in August.

The team has been active in developing the conceptual framework for Wisconsin's data governance process. The team has nearly completed the data governance charter, the state's overall data governance structure (diagram, roles, and responsibilities), and use cases (description of process, examples for eventual policy manual).

Finally, the team selected SharePoint as the ongoing data governance collaboration tool due to its wide acceptance in our departments and ease of deployment. The SharePoint site is slated for development in early 2014.

- **Began selection and implementation of an Entity Resolution Tool (ERT).**

Wisconsin collects a wealth of information about young children, early childhood programs, and educators. However, this information (from over 30 programs) is housed in multiple siloed datasets across multiple state agencies, each of which use program-specific unique identifiers. As a result, the state has little capacity to connect early childhood data across programs and services, track children's progress over time, or use data to assess the State's early childhood system. The ERT will solve this problem by creating and maintaining linkages and a crosswalk of identifiers between data sets, while still maintaining and respecting the security and privacy controls currently in place. The ERT also allows the source programs to clean up their data at their own pace, while auditing and maintaining the identifiers in a separate secure environment.

In the first grant year, the team drafted the ERT project charter and formed an initial work group including representatives from each of three partnering agencies. The participating agencies also established an initial data sharing agreement to use production data from two departments to test ERT tools.

The team conducted tests with DCF and DPI production data using two different tools (Data Ladders and OYSTER) before finalizing the matching tool solution. Ultimately the team selected OYSTER (Open-System Entity Resolution) as the tool for cross-departmental use across early childhood programs.

- **Enhanced the DCF Enterprise Warehouse.**

DCF strengthened its internal capacity to manage and utilize data, which is an important contribution to the overall ECLDS goals. The DCF team established its internal project staffing structure (including overall project manager, cross-divisional work group, program staffing, IT staffing) and charter, as well as year-1 sub-charters for internal data matching, data governance, and business requirements gathering efforts. Staffing is critical given the complexity of the grant, and the team engaged current department information technology (IT) staff, including a Senior Business Analyst, Technologist, and various managers to begin ECLDS work, and hired several additional full-time contract staff, including a Project Manager, Tech Lead, Data Modeler, and Data Governance Specialist (Business Analyst) for DCF ECLDS work.

DCF also convened an internal data governance work group, which produced a final report, including recommendations to department administration regarding internal data-governance structure, standardized research request vetting process, standardized data-sharing agreement template and approval process, security protocols, and improved interface for publicly available data on a department website. All of these initiatives are set for official administrative approval and implementation in early 2014.

Staff also began internal data matching work, to “de-silo” current disparate data systems (early care and education data, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families [TANF] data, child welfare data, and child support data). Important achievements in this area in 2013 include:

- Leveraged technical assistance relationship with University of Wisconsin-Institute for Research on Poverty (UW-IRP), who previously built an integrated data system including much of DCF's data, the Multi-sample Person File (MSPF), in order to support the management and evaluation of integrated services for TANF-eligible Families.
- Created a high-level data flow document for the conformed dimension of “the person” within DCF, which helps in identifying unique individuals across different applications in DCF.

- Successfully loaded person data from CARES (TANF data, 4 million records) and SACWIS (child welfare data, 2.1 million records) systems into the staging area of the newly built DCF-ECLDS database schema. The DCF IT Team is also working on conforming the person data from both SACWIS and CARES into a common record format.

In addition, the RTT-ELC DCF Business Analyst identified Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) from all RTT-ELC project areas and DCF bureaus, to be interviewed to determine questions and metrics to be addressed by the ECLDS. Specifically, the RTT-ELC Business Analyst:

- Conducted requirements gathering meetings with 46 SMEs;
- Documented 560 questions and metrics for potential inclusion in the ECLDS; and
- To help prioritize “build” efforts, mapped each question/metric to the state's five key policy questions and categorized based on subject area.

- **Initiated build and implementation of DHS Division of Public Health Customer Hub.**

The DHS facet of the ECLDS project is focused on creation of an internal “customer hub” that unites health data across numerous databases, and which will subsequently form part of the collective ECLDS effort. In 2013, the DHS team created the customer hub database. The team then populated the customer hub database with birth, immunizations, and SPHERE records

DHS ECLDS personnel also participated in broader ECLDS activities such as the ERT tool selection process and creating the charter, workflow and organization for the ECLDS Governance process. This was also tied to internal processes as DHS developed its own data sharing principles and mechanics for the ECLDS effort.

ECLDS staff also contributed to national data system development efforts by participating in two federally-led national work groups: ECIDS State Guide Development and IT (technical design) focus.

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	30,846	46.0%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	61,691	46.0%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	94,786	44.0%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	187,323	45.0%

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 is from 2011 as reported by the National Center for Children in Poverty (NCCP), Demographics of Young, Low-Income Children (http://nccp.org/profiles/WI_profile_8.html)

NCCP provides data for birth through three and three through five, so for purposes of this table we are (1) using data for children under 6 as "prior to kindergarten entry" and (2) assuming an equal distribution of children in each grouping (i.e. an equal distribution across each year of the 92,537 children birth through three and of the 94,786 children three through five.)

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	22,458	5.4%
Are English learners ²	19,267	46.0%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	3,603	0.9%
Are migrant ³	351	0.1%
Are homeless ⁴	5,497	1.3%
Are in foster care	4,064	1.0%
Other as identified by the State	132	0.03%
Describe:	Are refugees	
<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.

Have disabilities or developmental delays data is a sum of data for IDEA part B and C. Data Source for Part B is 2012-2013 Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES)/State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) data and for Part C is 2012 Federal Child Count. In the past, we reported only 4 and 5 year olds. This year we included 3 year olds which accounts for apparent increase.

English learners data source: US Census WI population, 2013 estimate
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/55000.html> DPI WISEdash data pull (2012)

Reside on "Indian Lands" data source: CLASP calculations of American Community Survey 2010 data, Tables B01001 and B01001A thru B01001I, (B01001C - 2012 3 year estimates)

Migrant data source: US Census WI population, 2013 estimate (from
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/55000.html>) DPI WISEdash data pull (2012)

Homeless data source: National Center on Family Homelessness, "America's Youngest Outcasts: State Report Card on Child Homelessness" (2010)

Are in foster care data source: Child Welfare Administrative Data (eWiSACWIS), Placement Activity and Detail Report-SM10A112, (2013). The SM10A110 report was enhanced and renamed SM10A112. Data reported are for children ages five and under.

Refugees data source: Department of State Reports on Arrivals for the year 2013. Wisconsin does not collect information on secondary migrant children separately from other migrant children. In addition, the children who may have been born to refugee parents during this time, but born in Wisconsin, are U.S. citizens, and therefore not included in this count.

Denominator for percentage calculations is 419,270 - all children count from American Community Survey data, Table B17024, <http://www.census.gov/acs/>, 2012 without regard to poverty.

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	0	0	48,590	48,590
Data Source and Year:	2011-2012 ISES enrollment data for state funded 4-year-old kindergarten (does not include children in early childhood special education, Title 1, or Head Start)			
Early Head Start & Head Start¹	1,426	1,425	16,312	19,631
Data Source and Year:	2012-13 Head Start Program Information Report (PIR). Wisconsin Office of Head Start			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619	713	5,420	16,325	22,458
Data Source and Year:	Part B: 2011-2012 ISES/SLDS data; Part C: 2012 Federal Child Count Submission			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	0	18,369	18,369
Data Source and Year:	Wisconsin 2012-12 End of Year Title IA report			
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	3,789	17,897	31,973	53,659
Data Source and Year:	Child Care Child Universe in WebI (Wisconsin State Administrative Data). Data based on the child's age (under age 6) as of 12/31/12			
Other 1	1,124	837	176	2,137
Specify:	Home Visiting			
Data Source and Year:	Wisconsin Public Health Information Network, 2013 https://phin.wisconsin.gov/sphere/			
Other 2	1,494	6,924	1,229	9,647
Specify:	Medicaid Therapy Services			
Data Source and Year:	DHS Medicaid Fee For Service Claims Data			
Other 3	4	69	153	226
Specify:	Children's LTS Waivers (non-autism)			
Data Source and Year:	2012-13 data is from CLTS database.			
Other 4	0	7	267	274
Specify:	Children's LTS Waivers (autism)			
Data Source and Year:	2012-13 data is from CLTS database.			

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.

Head Start: Head Start Program Information Report (PIR) provides a combined number of children through 2 (2,851), so we assumed an equal split between the first two years.

Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program: All Wisconsin Shares recipients are considered high needs, with eligibility starting at 185% FPL and continuing until income reaches 200% FPL.

Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619: Data for first two categories is for Part C only (Part B is not applicable). The "preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry" includes Part B only (Part C is not applicable.) The "total" category has combined data.

Programs funded under Title I of ESEA: data through year 2 is not applicable.

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

Children's LTS Waivers: Includes those with autism and other long-term disabilities. These participants are eligible for both Medicaid card services and Medicaid Waiver services. Most waiver services are not covered by the Medicaid card. The waiver services are paid for by Medicaid, but there are different eligibility criteria for this population which enable them to be covered, without the waiver they would not get these services. These numbers reflect children less than age 5 as of 9/1/12.

Medicaid Therapy Services: Includes the following sub categories of service to children ages birth to over the age of 2: (outpatient and inpatient) occupational therapy, outpatient physical therapy, outpatient speech therapy, physical therapy, rehabilitative occupational, physical and speech therapies, restorative care occupational, physical and speech therapies. This also applies to School Based Services where children ages 0 to over 2 can receive speech therapy. Because of claims lag, SFY 12 recipients may be over or under estimated.

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	6,911	559	1,973	6,332	54	1,722	37,457
Specify:	For "state-funded preschool" enrollment numbers from WISEdash for K3, K4 & PK combined, 3rd Friday of September, 2012-13.						
Early Head Start & Head Start¹	5,023	1,386	664	4,948	16	1,796	9,791
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	861	63	102	618	5	25	3,809
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	2,282	211	326	1,719	25	458	11,304
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	50,332	6,098	256	75,338	2	4,806	150,698
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	6,017	981	892	19,552	57	353	27,618
Other 1	441	66	52	404	2	100	719
Describe:	Home Visiting						
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 data source: enrollment from WISEdash for K3, K4 & PK combined, 3rd Friday of September, 2012-13.

Head start data source: Head Start PIR 2013-13.

IDEA Part B data source: 10-1-12 Child Count, Ages 3-5 by Race/Ethnicity

IDEA Part C data source: Program Participation System October 1, 2012 child count.

ESEA data source: The ESEA End of Year Report for 11-12 and for 12-13. Wisconsin's ESEA data does not distinguish between Asian children and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children. The total combined

figure is 268. Across the other programs listed in table (A)(1)-3b children of Asian descent made up 95.6% of the program recipients, so to estimate the correct distribution for ESEA we assumed the same distribution, or 256 Asian and 2 Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander.

CCDF data source: Child Care Child Universe in WebI (Wisconsin State Administrative Data). Data based on the child's age (under age 6) as of 12/31/12

Home Visiting data source: Wisconsin Public Health Information Network, 2013

<https://phin.wisconsin.gov/sphere/>

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	\$5,775,000	\$5,775,000
State-funded preschool	\$148,350,000	\$162,350,000
Specify:	State School Aid Appropriation and 4K start up grants	
State contributions to IDEA, Part C	\$20,968,343	\$23,158,380
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry	\$14,914,061	\$14,866,070
Total State contributions to CCDF²	\$28,849,400	\$28,849,400
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Met	Met
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>		
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs³	\$217,030,087	\$161,334,925
Other State contributions 1	\$3,881,300	\$4,032,234
Specify:	School Based Services	
Other State contributions 2	\$9,778,200	\$11,062,453
Specify:	MA Therapies	
Other State contributions 3	\$1,985,030	
Specify:	CLTS Waivers	
Other State contributions 4	\$781,158	\$1,148,552
Specify:	Home Visiting	
Total State contributions:	\$452,312,579	\$412,577,014
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.

CLTS Waiver data was excluded for 2013 as it had not yet been reconciled for 2013 by the time of this report.

Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start data source: Wisconsin State Statute (WSS) Chapter 20 appropriation schedule

State-funded preschool data source: 4K startup grants; WSS Chapter 20 appropriation schedule; State-funded preschool; DPI school finance formula

State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry data source: amount of aid paid in fiscal year 2013 for reported expenditures under function 152000 IDEA categorical aid

MA Therapies data source: DHS Medicaid Fee For Service Claims Data.

TANF, CCDF, and Home Visiting data source: WisMart general ledger expenditures.

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 <i>(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)</i>	46,914	48,590
Specify:	2012-13 school year	
Early Head Start and Head Start² <i>(funded enrollment)</i>	19,302	19,920
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 <i>(annual December 1 count)</i>	22,458	0
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA <i>(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report)</i>	79,443	85,122
Programs receiving CCDF funds <i>(average monthly served)</i>	51,776	47,803
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 data source: 2012-13 school year.

Early Head Start and Head Start data source: Wisconsin Office of Head Start PIR Report (2012).

Programs and services funded by IDEA Part B data is not available.

ESEA data source: ESEA End of Year Report for 11-12 and 12-13. ESEA number represents school year students that have disabilities, have limited English proficiency, are homeless, or are migrant.

CCDF data source: Child care attendance of children with subsidies.

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

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

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

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

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

No significant changes have occurred.

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				
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.

State-funded preschool data source: In 2012 Wisconsin adopted the PALS Literacy screener for all public 5K programs and then expanded it to 4K and 1st grade. Wisconsin is currently exploring comprehensive screening and assessment through the expansion of Response to Intervention to the early childhood community and through the efforts of the ECAC Healthy Children committee to promote a vision for comprehensive screening and assessment practices from birth through 1st grade. Best practice suggests that teachers/districts screen and assess Pre-K students; however, there is no standardized state assessment system for 4K. This is a local decision, and the State does not collect this data.

Early Head Start and Head Start data source: The Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework: Promoting Positive Outcomes in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children 3-5 Years Old, December 2010, U.S. DHHS, ACF, OHS.

Programs funded under IDEA Part B, section 619 data source: WI Stats 115.77 (1m)(a).

Programs funded under IDEA Part C, section 619, data source: DHS Policy and Procedure Manual (2010)

Programs funded under Title I of ESEA data source: 34CFR 300.304.

Programs receiving CCDF funds data source: Wisconsin Department of Children and Families, Five Year Plan (see QRIS for additional information).

Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements data source: YoungStar policy implemented beginning November 2010; Department of Children and Families YoungStar Five Year Plan as adopted by the Wisconsin Legislature's Joint Finance Committee in Motion 42 on December 14, 2010.

Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements data notes: Programs that reach 3, 4, or 5 stars have had an on-site technical rating or formal rating by a valid and reliable observer. Those programs may receive points for using child screening measures or formative assessments. Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions apply to 4 and 5 star programs.

State licensing requirements data source: Professional Education Preparation Program's Content Guidelines for State Content Exams and/or DPI Approval.

Home visiting data source: Wisconsin Public Health Information Network/SPHERE. Screening measures are ASQ-3 and ASQ-SE. Measures of Environmental Quality and Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions are HOME assessments.

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	\$140,392	\$140,392
2. Fringe Benefits	\$64,614	\$64,614
3. Travel	\$7,348	\$7,348
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$78,040	\$78,040
6. Contractual	\$440,876	\$440,876
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$1,661	\$1,661
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$732,931	\$732,931
10. Indirect Costs	\$524	\$524
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$1,290,935	\$1,290,935
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$1,226	\$1,226
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$2,025,616	\$2,025,616
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,023,665	\$1,023,665
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$3,049,281	\$3,049,281

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.

None.

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

None.

Budget Table: Project 1 – Overall Grants Management

Budget Table: Project 1		
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$65,034	\$65,034
2. Fringe Benefits	\$26,101	\$26,101
3. Travel	\$1,706	\$1,706
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$24,479	\$24,479
6. Contractual	\$0	\$0
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$117,320	\$117,320
10. Indirect Costs	\$173	\$173
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	\$1,226	\$1,226
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$118,719	\$118,719
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$16,857	\$16,857
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$135,576	\$135,576

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.

Work with the tribal nations has required additional time due to the complexity of the sole source procurement process and the need to establish a communication structure that addresses all of the eleven sovereign nations, pushing some activities into 2014.

Our 2013 outreach and stakeholder discussions around public private partnerships guided us toward a different approach than we had initially envisioned. Though this will not affect the overall budget expenditures we felt it was prudent to more fully develop the program before initiating expenditures.

(Note: In addition to factors specific to this project, the entire portfolio of projects was affected by expected startup considerations such as the time required for hiring processes, the subsequent effect on the start date of activities, and federal spending restrictions prior to final scope of work approval granted on August 7, 2013. In addition, please note that budget totals do not reflect funds obligated in 2013, but not yet spent.)

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 to the 2014 budget except:

- a. Funds unspent in 2013 will be utilized in 2014 for the same activities for which they were originally budgeted.
- b. Underspending for salary and related costs that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2014 will be used to expand and strengthen activities in this project area and entirely consistent with the approved SOW. Our team will solicit approval for these activities through the established budget amendment process.

Budget Table: Project 2 – YoungStar Training and Technical Assistance – Expand Screening

Budget Table: Project 2		
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$14,942	\$14,942
2. Fringe Benefits	\$5,997	\$5,997
3. Travel	\$1,138	\$1,138
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$11,141	\$11,141
6. Contractual	\$0	\$0
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$33,218	\$33,218
10. Indirect Costs	\$80	\$80
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)	\$33,298	\$33,298
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$384,396	\$384,396
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$417,694	\$417,694

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.

Some activities under this project have initiated later than expected due to the time required to identify and hire the Inclusion Analyst, who was hired on September 23, 2013.

(Note: In addition to factors specific to this project, the entire portfolio of projects was affected by expected startup considerations such as the time required for hiring processes, the subsequent effect on the start date of activities, and federal spending restrictions prior to final scope of work approval granted on August 7, 2013. In addition, please note that budget totals do not reflect funds obligated in 2013, but not yet spent.)

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 to the 2014 budget except:

- a. Funds unspent in 2013 will be utilized in 2014 for the same activities for which they were originally budgeted.
- b. Underspending for salary and related costs that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2014 will be used to expand and strengthen activities in this project area and entirely consistent with the approved SOW. Our team will solicit approval for these activities through the established budget amendment process.

Budget Table: Project 3 – Increase YoungStar Participation

Budget Table: Project 3		
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 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.

Some activities for this project area were implemented in 2013, but will not appear in our accounting system until 2014.

(Note: In addition to factors specific to this project, the entire portfolio of projects was affected by expected startup considerations such as the time required for hiring processes, the subsequent effect on the start date of activities, and federal spending restrictions prior to final scope of work approval granted on August 7, 2013. In addition, please note that budget totals do not reflect funds obligated in 2013, but not yet spent.)

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 to the 2014 budget, except that funds unspent in 2013 will be utilized in 2014 for the same activities for which they were originally budgeted.

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

Budget Table: Project 4		
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	\$1,598	\$1,598
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$1,598	\$1,598
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)	\$1,598	\$1,598
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0	\$0
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,598	\$1,598

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.

Some funds for this project area were obligated or activities implemented in 2013, but will not appear in our accounting system until 2014.

(Note: In addition to factors specific to this project, the entire portfolio of projects was affected by expected startup considerations such as the time required for hiring processes, the subsequent effect on the start date of activities, and federal spending restrictions prior to final scope of work approval granted on August 7, 2013. In addition, please note that budget totals do not reflect funds obligated in 2013, but not yet spent.)

Project 4 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate substantive changes to the 2014 budget, except that funds unspent in 2013 will be utilized in 2014 for the same activities for which they were originally budgeted.

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

Budget Table: Project 5		
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$40,250	\$40,250
2. Fringe Benefits	\$16,154	\$16,154
3. Travel	\$2,612	\$2,612
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$21,208	\$21,208
6. Contractual	\$0	\$0
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$80,224	\$80,224
10. Indirect Costs	\$151	\$151
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$1,290,935	\$1,290,935
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$1,371,310	\$1,371,310
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0	\$0
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,371,310	\$1,371,310

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.

Some activities under this project have initiated later than expected due to the time required to identify and hire the Professional Development Supervisor, who was hired on September 23, 2013, and the Professional Development Analyst, who was hired on June 17, 2013.

A significant amount of funds in this project have been obligated but not yet spent or have been spent by contractors but not yet been invoiced to DCF.

(Note: In addition to factors specific to this project, the entire portfolio of projects was affected by expected startup considerations such as the time required for hiring processes, the subsequent effect on the start date of activities, and federal spending restrictions prior to final scope of work approval granted on August 7, 2013. In addition, please note that budget totals do not reflect funds obligated in 2013, but not yet spent.)

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 to the 2014 budget except:

- a. Funds unspent in 2013 will be utilized in 2014 for the same activities for which they were originally budgeted.
- b. Underspending for salary and related costs that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2014 will be used to expand and strengthen activities in this project area and entirely consistent with the approved SOW. Our team will solicit approval for these activities through the established budget amendment process.

Budget Table: Project 6 – YoungStar Validation Study

Budget Table: Project 6		
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	\$35,919	\$35,919
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$35,919	\$35,919

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.

Spending for this project is proceeding as expected. A significant amount of obligated funds have not yet been invoiced by our contracted partner.

(Note: In addition to factors specific to this project, the entire portfolio of projects was affected by expected startup considerations such as the time required for hiring processes, the subsequent effect on the start date of activities, and federal spending restrictions prior to final scope of work approval granted on August 7, 2013. In addition, please note that budget totals do not reflect funds obligated in 2013, but not yet spent.)

Project 6 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate substantive changes to the 2014 budget, except that funds unspent in 2013 will be utilized in 2014 for the same activities for which they were originally budgeted.

Budget Table: Project 7 – Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards

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	\$11,605	\$11,605
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$11,605	\$11,605
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)	\$11,605	\$11,605
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$244,560	\$244,560
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$256,165	\$256,165

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

Project 7 Budget Narrative

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

Budget figures for Project 7 do not fully reflect actual or obligated spending as there can be a significant delay between obligation, expenditure, and accounting. We do not account funds as spent until they are processed by DCF. However, activities under this project are implemented by the Department of Public Instruction, a participating state agency. Most of their sub-contracts require quarterly invoices; therefore it may take up to 6 months before DPI invoices DCF.

(Note: In addition to factors specific to this project, the entire portfolio of projects was affected by expected startup considerations such as the time required for hiring processes, the subsequent effect on the start date of activities, and federal spending restrictions prior to final scope of work approval granted on August 7, 2013. In addition, please note that budget totals do not reflect funds obligated in 2013, but not yet spent.)

Project 7 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate substantive changes to the 2014 budget, except that funds unspent in 2013 will be utilized in 2014 for the same activities for which they were originally budgeted.

Budget Table: Project 8 – Family Engagement

Budget Table: Project 8		
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$20,166	\$20,166
2. Fringe Benefits	\$16,362	\$16,362
3. Travel	\$1,757	\$1,757
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$21,212	\$21,212
6. Contractual	\$0	\$0
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$59,497	\$59,497
10. Indirect Costs	\$120	\$120
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)	\$59,617	\$59,617
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0	\$0
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$59,617	\$59,617

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

Project 8 Budget Narrative

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

Some activities under this project have initiated later than expected due to the time required to identify and hire the Family Engagement Consultant, who was hired on September 23, 2013. Another 0.5 FTE position with participating state agency DPI had not yet been filled by year end 2013.

(Note: In addition to factors specific to this project, the entire portfolio of projects was affected by expected startup considerations such as the time required for hiring processes, the subsequent effect on the start date of activities, and federal spending restrictions prior to final scope of work approval granted on August 7, 2013. In addition, please note that budget totals do not reflect funds obligated in 2013, but not yet spent.)

Project 8 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate substantive changes to the 2014 budget except:

- a. Funds unspent in 2013 will be utilized in 2014 for the same activities for which they were originally budgeted.
- b. Underspending for salary and related costs that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2014 will be used to expand and strengthen activities in this project area and entirely consistent with the approved SOW. Our team will solicit approval for these activities through the established budget amendment process.

Budget Table: Project 9 – Professional Development

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	\$65,482	\$65,482
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$65,482	\$65,482
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)	\$65,482	\$65,482
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$72,748	\$72,748
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$138,230	\$138,230

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 9 Budget Narrative

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

Budget figures for Project 9 do not fully reflect actual or obligated spending as there can be a significant delay between obligation, expenditure, and accounting. We do not account funds as spent until they are processed by DCF. However, activities under this project are implemented by the Department of Public Instruction, a participating state agency. Most of their sub-contracts require quarterly invoices; therefore it may take up to 6 months before DPI invoices DCF.

(Note: In addition to factors specific to this project, the entire portfolio of projects was affected by expected startup considerations such as the time required for hiring processes, the subsequent effect on the start date of activities, and federal spending restrictions prior to final scope of work approval granted on August 7, 2013. In addition, please note that budget totals do not reflect funds obligated in 2013, but not yet spent.)

Project 9 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate substantive changes to the 2014 budget except:

- a. Funds unspent in 2013 will be utilized in 2014 for the same activities for which they were originally budgeted.
- b. Underspending for salary and related costs that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2014 will be used to expand and strengthen activities in this project area and entirely consistent with the approved SOW. Our team will solicit approval for these activities through the established budget amendment process.

Budget Table: Project 10 – Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System

Budget Table: Project 10		
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0	\$0
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0
3. Travel	\$135	\$135
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$0	\$0
6. Contractual	\$362,191	\$362,191
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$1,661	\$1,661
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$363,987	\$363,987
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)	\$363,987	\$363,987
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$269,185	\$269,185
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$633,172	\$633,172

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

Project 10 Budget Narrative

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

Staff losses had a disproportionate effect on spending levels in 2013 due to the many dependencies within this project area. Soon after the scope of work was approved our Portfolio Manager left the team due to family health issues. This is a critical position within the state plan and served as the nexus and coordinator between all of the project areas and three participating agencies. Soon thereafter, our Data Governance Specialist left state government service.

We have kept the project on track throughout these changes and have no concerns about our ability to fulfill all of the grant activities. However, those losses did significantly slow down the pace of implementation in 2013.

All key personnel and managers in this grant meet regularly and we have developed a plan to assure that all project deliverables will be met in a timely manner.

(Note: In addition to factors specific to this project, the entire portfolio of projects was affected by expected startup considerations such as the time required for hiring processes, the subsequent effect on the start date of activities, and federal spending restrictions prior to final scope of work approval granted on August 7, 2013. In addition, please note that budget totals do not reflect funds obligated in 2013, but not yet spent.)

Project 10 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 to the 2014 budget, except that funds unspent in 2013 will be utilized in 2014 for the same activities for which they were originally budgeted.